

Table of Contents

2012 Commission Summary

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Sales Verification
- III. Measure of Central Tendency
- IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Sales Verification
- III. Measure of Central Tendency
- IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Sales Verification
- III. Measure of Central Tendency
- IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary for Thomas County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	Median	97.99
Total Sales Price	\$772,900	Mean	97.87
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$772,900	Wgt. Mean	93.12
Total Assessed Value	\$719,726	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$27,670
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$45,465	Avg. Assessed Value	\$42,337

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.80 to 100.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.21 to 101.03
95% Mean C.I	90.81 to 104.93
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	9.06
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.12
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.30

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	21	99	99
2010	16	98	98
2009	23	100	100
2008	32	99	99

2012 Commission Summary for Thomas County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	3	Median	94.68
Total Sales Price	\$219,500	Mean	92.40
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$219,500	Wgt. Mean	93.60
Total Assessed Value	\$205,447	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$48,066
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$73,167	Avg. Assessed Value	\$68,482

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	70.14 to 114.66
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.36
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.84
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.89

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	1	0	100
2010	3	100	90
2009	5	100	90
2008	6	100	94

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Thomas County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

***A level of value displayed as NEI (not enough information) represents a class of property with insufficient information to determine a level of value.*

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Thomas County

A review of the village of Seneca was completed in 2011, along with all of the pickup work. The review of the villages of Thedford and Halsey had been completed in 2010. New photographs were taken along with new measurements. Conditions were reviewed and adjusted as needed, and the sketches of all residential properties were completed.

A study of land values was completed; suburban land values were also studied. For 2012 land values were adjusted in Seneca and Halsey, and the suburban (small acreage) land values were reviewed based on sales and adjusted to meet the market.

The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift December of 2008 cost index. For assessment year 2012 the depreciation tables were reviewed and modified for the residential properties based on the sales for Seneca, Halsey and Thedford/suburban and values changed accordingly.

A sales file book is available in the assessor's office showing all properties that have been sold during the study period and is available for anyone to view.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Thomas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Dave Young and Ted Taylor, 2 part-time employees	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Theford has four neighborhoods within it, is the central business area for the county and has access to highways 2 and 83.
	2	Rural Residential, Seneca (has some business by no highway), and Halsey (abuts the forest, highway 2 and some business).
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The cost approach is the primary method with sales being utilized in the development of the depreciation. It is difficult to build models for the other two approaches with limited sales and income data.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county develops depreciation based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2006 – Theford and Halsey, and 2010 – Seneca	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	A per square foot cost has been developed.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	From a sales review, when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, or when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.	

86 Thomas
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 17
Total Sales Price : 772,900
Total Adj. Sales Price : 772,900
Total Assessed Value : 719,726
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,465
Avg. Assessed Value : 42,337

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 98
COD : 08.05
PRD : 105.10

COV : 14.04
STD : 13.74
Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.89
MAX Sales Ratio : 127.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 64.95

95% Median C.I. : 93.80 to 100.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.21 to 101.03
95% Mean C.I. : 90.81 to 104.93

Printed:3/29/2012 3:41:17PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	92.98	92.98	92.98	00.00	100.00	92.98	92.98	N/A	12,000	11,157
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	111.45	111.45	103.92	10.73	107.25	99.49	123.40	N/A	13,500	14,029
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	100.03	100.16	99.93	01.73	100.23	97.64	102.82	N/A	62,333	62,293
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	95.04	95.04	94.12	01.30	100.98	93.80	96.28	N/A	34,500	32,473
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	89.16	89.16	93.11	09.90	95.76	80.33	97.99	N/A	162,450	151,252
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	98.01	103.22	99.94	07.82	103.28	94.38	127.50	N/A	10,600	10,593
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	81.48	81.48	73.22	20.29	111.28	64.95	98.01	N/A	50,000	36,609
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	8	98.57	100.81	98.66	05.71	102.18	92.98	123.40	92.98 to 123.40	36,875	36,380
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	9	97.99	95.26	89.70	10.10	106.20	64.95	127.50	80.33 to 100.70	53,100	47,632
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	12	97.82	98.75	95.80	05.89	103.08	80.33	127.50	94.38 to 100.70	52,825	50,608
<u>ALL</u>	17	97.99	97.87	93.12	08.05	105.10	64.95	127.50	93.80 to 100.70	45,465	42,337

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	98.01	97.86	98.14	02.03	99.71	92.98	102.82	93.80 to 100.03	62,889	61,721
02	8	95.89	97.88	79.38	14.69	123.31	64.95	127.50	64.95 to 127.50	25,863	20,529
<u>ALL</u>	17	97.99	97.87	93.12	08.05	105.10	64.95	127.50	93.80 to 100.70	45,465	42,337

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	17	97.99	97.87	93.12	08.05	105.10	64.95	127.50	93.80 to 100.70	45,465	42,337
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	17	97.99	97.87	93.12	08.05	105.10	64.95	127.50	93.80 to 100.70	45,465	42,337

86 Thomas
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 17
Total Sales Price : 772,900
Total Adj. Sales Price : 772,900
Total Assessed Value : 719,726
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,465
Avg. Assessed Value : 42,337

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 98
COD : 08.05
PRD : 105.10

COV : 14.04
STD : 13.74
Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.89
MAX Sales Ratio : 127.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 64.95

95% Median C.I. : 93.80 to 100.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.21 to 101.03
95% Mean C.I. : 90.81 to 104.93

Printed:3/29/2012 3:41:17PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	7	96.28	104.39	100.85	10.20	103.51	92.98	127.50	92.98 to 127.50	7,714	7,780	
Less Than 30,000	10	98.01	102.63	99.48	07.35	103.17	92.98	127.50	94.38 to 123.40	12,600	12,535	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	17	97.99	97.87	93.12	08.05	105.10	64.95	127.50	93.80 to 100.70	45,465	42,337	
Greater Than 14,999	10	98.00	93.31	92.54	06.50	100.83	64.95	102.82	80.33 to 100.03	71,890	66,527	
Greater Than 29,999	7	97.64	91.08	91.88	09.03	99.13	64.95	102.82	64.95 to 102.82	92,414	84,911	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	7	96.28	104.39	100.85	10.20	103.51	92.98	127.50	92.98 to 127.50	7,714	7,780	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	98.01	98.50	98.46	00.50	100.04	98.01	99.49	N/A	24,000	23,631	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	100.23	100.23	99.84	02.58	100.39	97.64	102.82	N/A	46,000	45,925	
60,000 TO 99,999	4	87.07	84.78	85.10	13.94	99.62	64.95	100.03	N/A	79,975	68,061	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999	1	97.99	97.99	97.99	00.00	100.00	97.99	97.99	N/A	235,000	230,285	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	17	97.99	97.87	93.12	08.05	105.10	64.95	127.50	93.80 to 100.70	45,465	42,337	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

A. Residential Real Property

The statistical sampling of 17 residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Thomas County. Overall the three measures of central tendency will somewhat correlate, the qualitative measurement, coefficient of dispersion (COD), meets the prescribed parameters of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards, the other qualitative measurement, price-related differential (PRD), is slightly above at 105.27.

For 2012 land values were updated in Seneca, Halsey and the rural residential. The review of the rural residential and agricultural homes and outbuildings was completed. All residential homes are costed with the Marshall and Swift December of 2008 cost index, the depreciation tables were modified to market and all residential property values changed accordingly.

The Thomas County Clerk is an ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. These offices are useful in the verification of sales; the assessor is aware of such things as special financing, foreclosures, and has the opportunity to visit with abstractors, realtors, mortgage lenders, and the taxpayers of Thomas County. The assessor is very attentive of the real estate market in Thomas County. In a review of the qualified and non-qualified sales there appears to be no bias in the qualification determinations.

To accommodate budget cuts the assessor has made a commendable effort to become knowledgeable in the field of mass appraisal. Currently she is utilizing an individual skilled in mass appraisal to assist in building depreciation tables but eventually will do all residential reappraisal work in-house. The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and physical review cycle of properties in the county. Because assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the residential class.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value of the residential property in Thomas County is 98%.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Thomas County

A reappraisal of commercial properties in Seneca and suburban areas was completed in 2011, along with all of the pickup work in the county. Commercial properties in Thedford and Halsey had been reviewed in 2010.

The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift October of 2010 cost index for all commercial properties. The depreciation tables were also reviewed based on the sales and some values changed accordingly.

For assessment year 2012 the suburban land values were reviewed based on the sales and were adjusted accordingly. Commercial and industrial sites were also adjusted based on the sales.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Thomas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Two part-time listers.	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	All commercial
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The cost approach is the primary method with sales being utilized in the development of the depreciation. It is difficult to build models for the other two approaches with limited sales and income data.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	A contracted appraiser will be consulted to value unique commercial properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Not applicable.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Not applicable.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	From the market a square foot method has been developed.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	From a sales review, when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, or when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.	

86 Thomas
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 3
Total Sales Price : 219,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 219,500
Total Assessed Value : 205,447
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 73,167
Avg. Assessed Value : 68,482

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 92
COD : 06.16
PRD : 98.72

COV : 09.70
STD : 08.96
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.83
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.01
MIN Sales Ratio : 82.52

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 70.14 to 114.66

Printed:3/29/2012 3:41:18PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	100.01	100.01	100.01	00.00	100.00	100.01	100.01	N/A	12,500	12,501
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	82.52	82.52	82.52	00.00	100.00	82.52	82.52	N/A	25,000	20,630
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	94.68	94.68	94.68	00.00	100.00	94.68	94.68	N/A	182,000	172,316
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	1	100.01	100.01	100.01	00.00	100.00	100.01	100.01	N/A	12,500	12,501
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	2	88.60	88.60	93.21	06.86	95.05	82.52	94.68	N/A	103,500	96,473
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	100.01	100.01	100.01	00.00	100.00	100.01	100.01	N/A	12,500	12,501
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	82.52	82.52	82.52	00.00	100.00	82.52	82.52	N/A	25,000	20,630
<u>ALL</u>	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482
<u>ALL</u>	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482
04											
<u>ALL</u>	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482

86 Thomas
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 3
Total Sales Price : 219,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 219,500
Total Assessed Value : 205,447
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 73,167
Avg. Assessed Value : 68,482

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 92
COD : 06.16
PRD : 98.72

COV : 09.70
STD : 08.96
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.83
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.01
MIN Sales Ratio : 82.52

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 70.14 to 114.66

Printed:3/29/2012 3:41:18PM

SALE PRICE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	1	100.01	100.01	100.01	00.00	100.00	100.01	100.01	N/A	12,500	12,501
Less Than 30,000	2	91.27	91.27	88.35	09.59	103.31	82.52	100.01	N/A	18,750	16,566
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482
Greater Than 14,999	2	88.60	88.60	93.21	06.86	95.05	82.52	94.68	N/A	103,500	96,473
Greater Than 29,999	1	94.68	94.68	94.68	00.00	100.00	94.68	94.68	N/A	182,000	172,316
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	100.01	100.01	100.01	00.00	100.00	100.01	100.01	N/A	12,500	12,501
15,000 TO 29,999	1	82.52	82.52	82.52	00.00	100.00	82.52	82.52	N/A	25,000	20,630
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999	1	94.68	94.68	94.68	00.00	100.00	94.68	94.68	N/A	182,000	172,316
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482

OCCUPANCY CODE											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
350	1	94.68	94.68	94.68	00.00	100.00	94.68	94.68	N/A	182,000	172,316
386	1	82.52	82.52	82.52	00.00	100.00	82.52	82.52	N/A	25,000	20,630
391	1	100.01	100.01	100.01	00.00	100.00	100.01	100.01	N/A	12,500	12,501
<u>ALL</u>	3	94.68	92.40	93.60	06.16	98.72	82.52	100.01	N/A	73,167	68,482

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

A. Commercial Real Property

The calculated median from the statistical sampling of 3 commercial sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Thomas County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. Such a small sample would not be considered adequate for statistical reliability and would not be representative of the population. Thomas County is an agricultural based county and a viable commercial market does not exist.

The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class of property.

For assessment year 2012 the depreciation tables were modified to market and some values changed accordingly. Commercial and industrial sites were also adjusted based on the sales.

To accommodate budget cuts the assessor has made a commendable effort to become knowledgeable in the field of mass appraisal and do as much work in-house as possible. An individual skilled in mass appraisal will continue to assist with the commercial properties.

The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and physical review cycle of properties in the county. Because assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the commercial class.

However, based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Thomas County

A reappraisal of all improved rural parcels was completed in 2011. The assessor's office hired two local individuals, trained by contracted appraiser Larry Rexroth, to complete this work. New photographs were taken along with new measurements of the buildings. Conditions were reviewed and adjusted as needed. The part-time employee in the assessor's office has drawn all of the sketches for the improvements.

Home site values were reviewed and adjustments were made based on the sales.

A farm site plan was drawn for each rural parcel. The farm site plan is a layout of all the outbuildings as they are located on the parcel. These farm site plans will aid in future reviews to see what buildings may have been removed or added.

The assessor works with the local Natural Resource District (NRD) to keep all irrigated land listed correctly.

The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift December of 2008 cost index for all rural homes, and a new market depreciation study was also completed and new values established for 2012 .

The assessor also developed a book of rural sales to aid in explaining the reappraisal process to the taxpayers. The assessor also has a map of Thomas County showing all of the current agricultural land sales to help show the taxpayers what sales are affecting the values of agricultural land.

A sales study was completed on agricultural land. The irrigated land will see a 2% increase for 2012, with grass land remaining the same as 2011.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Thomas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Two part-time listers.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	0	Thomas County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grass land. The small remaining percentage is a mixture of irrigated and waste acres.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Not applicable.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	This area is primarily ranch land. Small acreages that are not adjoining or part of a larger ranch holding, or would not substantiate an economically feasible ranching operation are considered rural residential. As of this interview non-agricultural influences have not been identified that would cause a parcel to be considered recreational.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS is used to review land use and soil types, along with the continued use of FSA, NRCS, and NRD maps. Also physical inspections and a review of the personal property schedules for added irrigation systems.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Currently the market is not recognizing a non-agricultural influence.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	From a sales review, when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, or when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.	

86 Thomas
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 26
Total Sales Price : 17,970,533
Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,970,533
Total Assessed Value : 11,543,462
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 691,174
Avg. Assessed Value : 443,979

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 64
MEAN : 69
COD : 20.53
PRD : 107.78

COV : 25.65
STD : 17.76
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.85
MAX Sales Ratio : 98.11
MIN Sales Ratio : 35.15

95% Median C.I. : 56.73 to 81.97
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.93 to 71.54
95% Mean C.I. : 62.06 to 76.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:41:19PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	56.73	56.73	56.73	00.00	100.00	56.73	56.73	N/A	220,000	124,800
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	79.26	79.26	79.21	03.42	100.06	76.55	81.97	N/A	621,050	491,910
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	74.04	70.69	56.67	14.69	124.74	52.70	85.33	N/A	1,739,000	985,437
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	91.94	82.31	90.14	10.81	91.31	53.00	92.36	N/A	393,895	355,066
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	74.20	74.20	74.17	00.13	100.04	74.10	74.29	N/A	696,877	516,850
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	78.65	78.65	72.81	10.20	108.02	70.63	86.67	N/A	88,250	64,258
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	42.23	42.23	47.53	15.77	88.85	35.57	48.88	N/A	890,000	423,032
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	81.42	81.42	80.64	20.50	100.97	64.73	98.11	N/A	305,750	246,560
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	65.89	67.78	64.15	17.82	105.66	48.33	87.32	N/A	965,820	619,548
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	47.51	47.51	47.42	26.02	100.19	35.15	59.87	N/A	352,500	167,165
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	74.04	69.15	60.73	14.99	113.86	52.70	85.33	52.70 to 85.33	985,586	598,533
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	74.20	71.94	69.60	20.89	103.36	35.57	92.36	48.88 to 92.14	492,583	342,854
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	9	64.73	66.31	63.87	21.92	103.82	35.15	98.11	48.33 to 87.32	682,844	436,132
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	76.55	77.11	67.82	13.70	113.70	52.70	92.36	53.00 to 92.14	857,130	581,281
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	65.89	67.59	61.72	22.75	109.51	35.57	98.11	48.33 to 87.32	672,464	415,040
<u>ALL</u>	26	72.34	69.24	64.24	20.53	107.78	35.15	98.11	56.73 to 81.97	691,174	443,979

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	26	72.34	69.24	64.24	20.53	107.78	35.15	98.11	56.73 to 81.97	691,174	443,979
<u>ALL</u>	26	72.34	69.24	64.24	20.53	107.78	35.15	98.11	56.73 to 81.97	691,174	443,979

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	24	74.07	71.33	68.35	18.36	104.36	35.15	98.11	58.84 to 85.33	560,022	382,795
0	24	74.07	71.33	68.35	18.36	104.36	35.15	98.11	58.84 to 85.33	560,022	382,795
<u>ALL</u>	26	72.34	69.24	64.24	20.53	107.78	35.15	98.11	56.73 to 81.97	691,174	443,979

86 Thomas
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 26
 Total Sales Price : 17,970,533
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,970,533
 Total Assessed Value : 11,543,462
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 691,174
 Avg. Assessed Value : 443,979

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 64
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 20.53
 PRD : 107.78

COV : 25.65
 STD : 17.76
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.85
 MAX Sales Ratio : 98.11
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.15

95% Median C.I. : 56.73 to 81.97
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.93 to 71.54
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.06 to 76.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:41:19PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	1	35.57	35.57	35.57	00.00	100.00	35.57	35.57	N/A	180,000	64,026
0	1	35.57	35.57	35.57	00.00	100.00	35.57	35.57	N/A	180,000	64,026
_____Grass_____											
County	25	74.04	70.59	64.53	18.79	109.39	35.15	98.11	58.84 to 81.97	711,621	459,177
0	25	74.04	70.59	64.53	18.79	109.39	35.15	98.11	58.84 to 81.97	711,621	459,177
_____ALL_____											
	26	72.34	69.24	64.24	20.53	107.78	35.15	98.11	56.73 to 81.97	691,174	443,979

Thomas County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
86.10	Thomas	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	540	535	#DIV/0!	450	#DIV/0!	450	466
16.10	Cherry	1	#DIV/0!	950	900	875	837	834	844	850	851
5.10	Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	590	#DIV/0!	590	575	560	500	465	516
21.20	Custer	2	#DIV/0!	770	583	509	#DIV/0!	442	445	445	452
57.10	Logan	1	#DIV/0!	1,150	1,150	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,116
60.10	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	490	490	#DIV/0!	490	490	490	490
46.10	Hooker	1	#DIV/0!	450	450						

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Thomas	1	#DIV/0!								
	Cherry	1	#DIV/0!	550	525	475	450	425	400	400	463
	Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	465	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	290	290	290	290	293
	Custer	2	#DIV/0!	450	440	400	335	330	325	320	364
	Logan	1	#DIV/0!	570	440	395	355	325	315	315	403
	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	275	#DIV/0!	275	275	275	275
	Hooker	1	#DIV/0!								

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Thomas	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	260	260	#DIV/0!	260	260	260	260
	Cherry	1	#DIV/0!	425	400	375	350	325	230	225	244
	Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	290	#DIV/0!	290	290	290	290	290	290
	Custer	2	#DIV/0!	315	315	315	315	315	314	315	315
	Logan	1	#DIV/0!	315	315	315	315	315	315	315	315
	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	245	245	#DIV/0!	245	245	245	245
	Hooker	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	235	235	215	215	216

*Land capability grouping averages calculated using data reported on the 2012 Form 45, Abstract of Assessment

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

A. Agricultural Land

Thomas County is part of the Nebraska Sand Hills which sits atop the Ogallala aquifer. The land use make up of the county is 99% grass and 1% irrigated, there is no dry land in Thomas County. A large portion of the county is taken up with the Nebraska National Forest near Halsey. Thomas County is included in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District, there is a small area that has moratoriums and restrictions, but part of the district has a 2500 acre annual new well maximum. Good roads and proximity to the sale barns are an attribute that affects the local grass markets. The primary roads through Thomas County are highway 85 going north to south and highway 2 running east to west.

To determine the qualification of a sale, the various responsibilities of an ex officio assessor (register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner) are useful. The assessor is aware of such things as special financing arrangements or foreclosure filings, and the opportunity exists to visit with abstractors, realtors, mortgage lenders, and the taxpayers of Thomas County. Sales verification forms have been utilized however, the response has been poor. Phone interviews will garner the best results. Occasionally on-site reviews will be done while doing pickup work.

Since the county is very homogenous in makeup, no market areas have been created. A review of the agricultural sales over the three year study period indicate 1 sale occurred from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09, 6 sales occurred from 7/1/09 to 6/30/10 and 4 occurred from 7/1/10 to 6/30/11. The sample is not proportionate among each year of the study period the statistical measures are being skewed toward the second and third years of the study period and may cause Thomas County to be compared to a different time standard than others. Sales need to be brought into the analysis to make the sample proportionate and a reliable tool for the measurement of the agricultural property class.

Comparable sales were identified and pooled together from the surrounding counties of Cherry, Blaine, Custer, Logan, McPherson, and Hooker. The sales were stratified by geo code to first determine the distance from Thomas County. The sand hills cover a wide expanse of area, common characteristics and influences can be observed over larger regions, a large number of comparable sales within a six mile radius would not be typical. The comparable sales were then further stratified by sale date, land use and topography. From the pool 6 sales were brought into the first year, 4 into the second year, and 5 into the third year. The sample was considered adequate and proportionate and there was not a difference of more than 10 percentage points between each year. The land use makeup of the sales file was not distorted with the inclusion of these sales and remained representative of the population.

The analysis, based on a sample of 26 sales, demonstrated the overall median to be 72.34%. Within the subclass Majority Land Use (MLU) greater than 95% strata grass the median is shown to be 74.07% utilizing 24 sales and with a coefficient of dispersion (COD) of 18.36. The median for the subclass MLU greater than 95% strata grass will be given the most consideration in determining the level of value for Thomas County since the makeup of the county is ninety-nine percent grass.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

From the assessors analysis of the agricultural land market the decision was made not to change the grass land values for the 2012 assessment year. There are seldom any irrigated sales within Thomas County however, in an attempt to recognize the upward trend in the agricultural market the irrigated values were increased 2% to create better uniformity and equalization across county lines. Thomas County has a consistent method of assigning and implementing agricultural land values, it is believed that the assessments remain uniform and proportionate within and across county lines.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural land class of property.

There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural class of property in Thomas County.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 1,662	Value : 126,155,082	Growth 925,335	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	83	146,027	15	61,854	19	318,682	117	526,563	
02. Res Improve Land	235	467,929	24	208,385	41	730,716	300	1,407,030	
03. Res Improvements	238	6,111,405	22	1,006,514	35	2,353,469	295	9,471,388	
04. Res Total	321	6,725,361	37	1,276,753	54	3,402,867	412	11,404,981	756,935
% of Res Total	77.91	58.97	8.98	11.19	13.11	29.84	24.79	9.04	81.80
05. Com UnImp Land	9	6,756	3	23,392	3	48,123	15	78,271	
06. Com Improve Land	36	49,609	5	33,998	5	76,908	46	160,515	
07. Com Improvements	36	911,390	5	513,320	5	1,128,900	46	2,553,610	
08. Com Total	45	967,755	8	570,710	8	1,253,931	61	2,792,396	0
% of Com Total	73.77	34.66	13.11	20.44	13.11	44.91	3.67	2.21	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	1	11,710	0	0	1	11,710	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	1	175,990	0	0	1	175,990	
12. Ind Total	0	0	1	187,700	0	0	1	187,700	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.15	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	2,800	1	2,800	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	19,820	1	19,820	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	22,620	1	22,620	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.06	0.02	0.00
Res & Rec Total	321	6,725,361	37	1,276,753	55	3,425,487	413	11,427,601	756,935
% of Res & Rec Total	77.72	58.85	8.96	11.17	13.32	29.98	24.85	9.06	81.80
Com & Ind Total	45	967,755	9	758,410	8	1,253,931	62	2,980,096	0
% of Com & Ind Total	72.58	32.47	14.52	25.45	12.90	42.08	3.73	2.36	0.00
17. Taxable Total	366	7,693,116	46	2,035,163	63	4,679,418	475	14,407,697	756,935
% of Taxable Total	77.05	53.40	9.68	14.13	13.26	32.48	28.58	11.42	81.80

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	1	2	31	1,518	32	1,520	0
25. Total	0	0	1	2	31	1,518	32	1,520	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	36	5	6	47

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	9	60,930	994	86,388,609	1,003	86,449,539
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	14	216,184	138	12,144,629	152	12,360,813
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	14	990,234	138	11,945,279	152	12,935,513
30. Ag Total							1,155	111,745,865

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	2,800	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	9	9.00	25,200	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	11	0.00	858,120	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	6	21.37	38,466	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	10	117.15	188,184	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	13	0.00	132,114	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	4	21.58	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	20	20.00	56,000	21	21.00	58,800	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	88	99.00	277,200	97	108.00	302,400	
33. HomeSite Improvements	100	0.00	9,343,160	111	0.00	10,201,280	168,400
34. HomeSite Total				132	129.00	10,562,480	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	11	105.32	175,573	17	126.69	214,039	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	92	267.99	460,406	102	385.14	648,590	
37. FarmSite Improvements	135	0.00	2,602,119	148	0.00	2,734,233	0
38. FarmSite Total				165	511.83	3,596,862	
39. Road & Ditches	184	1,448.56	0	188	1,470.14	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				297	2,110.97	14,159,342	168,400

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

* LB 968 (2006) for tax year 2009 and forward there will be no Recapture value.

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	241.70	7.27%	130,518	8.42%	540.00
48. 2A	370.60	11.15%	198,271	12.80%	535.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	1,128.22	33.94%	507,699	32.77%	450.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	1,583.96	47.65%	712,783	46.01%	450.00
53. Total	3,324.48	100.00%	1,549,271	100.00%	466.02
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	134.00	0.04%	34,840	0.04%	260.00
66. 2G	971.75	0.26%	252,655	0.26%	260.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	7,576.06	2.06%	1,969,774	2.06%	260.00
69. 4G1	1,780.91	0.48%	463,036	0.48%	260.00
70. 4G	357,708.44	97.16%	93,004,197	97.16%	260.00
71. Total	368,171.16	100.00%	95,724,502	100.00%	260.00
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	3,324.48	0.89%	1,549,271	1.59%	466.02
Dry Total					
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total					
Grass Total	368,171.16	98.55%	95,724,502	98.09%	260.00
72. Waste	2,085.00	0.56%	312,750	0.32%	150.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	57.99	0.02%	71,073	0.07%	1,225.61
75. Market Area Total	373,580.64	100.00%	97,586,523	100.00%	261.22

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,324.48	1,549,271	3,324.48	1,549,271
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	75.44	19,614	368,095.72	95,704,888	368,171.16	95,724,502
79. Waste	0.00	0	19.00	2,850	2,066.00	309,900	2,085.00	312,750
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	13.33	21,713	44.66	49,360	57.99	71,073
82. Total	0.00	0	94.44	22,464	373,486.20	97,564,059	373,580.64	97,586,523

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	3,324.48	0.89%	1,549,271	1.59%	466.02
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	368,171.16	98.55%	95,724,502	98.09%	260.00
Waste	2,085.00	0.56%	312,750	0.32%	150.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	57.99	0.02%	71,073	0.07%	1,225.61
Total	373,580.64	100.00%	97,586,523	100.00%	261.22

2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

86 Thomas

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	9,902,452	11,404,981	1,502,529	15.17%	756,935	7.53%
02. Recreational	18,554	22,620	4,066	21.91%	0	21.91%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	9,768,843	10,562,480	793,637	8.12%	168,400	6.40%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	19,689,849	21,990,081	2,300,232	11.68%	925,335	6.98%
05. Commercial	2,615,635	2,792,396	176,761	6.76%	0	6.76%
06. Industrial	185,655	187,700	2,045	1.10%	0	1.10%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	3,152,861	3,596,862	444,001	14.08%	0	14.08%
08. Minerals	1,520	1,520	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	5,955,671	6,578,478	622,807	10.46%	0	10.46%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	25,645,520	28,568,559	2,923,039	11.40%	925,335	7.79%
11. Irrigated	1,522,148	1,549,271	27,123	1.78%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	95,725,213	95,724,502	-711	0.00%		
14. Wasteland	312,750	312,750	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	154,774	0	-154,774	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	97,714,885	97,586,523	-128,362	-0.13%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	123,360,405	126,155,082	2,794,677	2.27%	925,335	1.52%

THOMAS COUNTY, NEBRASKA

2011 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

June 15, 2011

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15th of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31st of each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31st of each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.
Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

General Description of Real Property in Thomas County:

Per the 2011 County Abstract, Thomas County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential/Rec	411	25%	10,002,861	8%	1,447,161	8,555,700
Commercial/Ind	61	4%	2,801,100	2%	199,305	2,601,795
Agricultural	1187	71%	110,423,297	90%	98,679,991	11,743,306
Total	1659	100%	123,227,258	100%	100,326,457	22,900,801

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Thomas County, with the majority consisting of grassland, primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Additional information is contained in the 2011 Reports & Opinions, issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2011.

Current Resources:

Staff/Budget/Training

In addition to the ex-officio clerk/assessor, there is a part-time deputy clerk on staff. The county contracts with an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance. Two additional staff have been hired for physical reviews of the real property in Thomas County.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the clerk's budget for FY 2011-2012 is \$38,750.

The assessor believes continuing education is vital to maintaining proper assessment action. The assessor attends as many monthly district meetings as possible, as well as workshops offered by the Nebraska Association of County Officials, the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue and the International Association of Assessing Officers.

Record Maintenance

Thomas County's cadastral maps have not been consistently maintained since the mid 1990's. The county board has recognized the need for consistent maintenance of the records and approved the development of a web based GIS system through GIS Workshop. Development began in June 2007 and was completed the spring of 2011. All maintenance to the GIS data for 2011/2012 and hosting of the GIS on the Internet will be handled by GIS Workshop.

New property record cards were created for each parcel of real property in 2008. Each property record card is filed by legal description and contains up-to-date listings, photographs and sketches for those properties that have improvements.

Thomas County utilizes software provided by MIPS for assessment and CAMA (computer assisted mass appraisal) administration. Upon completion of development of the GIS system, this office will have the ability to maintain all records electronically and make them available via the Internet at <http://thomas.assessor.gisworkshop.com>.

Assessment Procedures:

Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor also serves as register of deeds and zoning administrator, which is an aid in the process of property discovery. Data collection is done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA, NRCS, and NRD offices is also useful in tracking land usage.

Thomas County processes less than one-hundred Real Estate Transfer Form 521's annually. These are filed on a timely basis with the Department of Assessment & Taxation. Standards of sales review from the International Association of Assessing Officers, Standard of Ratio Studies, 1999, are adhered to.

Data Collection

Thomas County will implement procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

Ratio Studies

Ratio studies are a vital tool in considering any assessment actions taken. Ratio studies are conducted internally to determine whether any assessment action is required in a specific area or class of property. Consultation with the field liaison is an important part of this process.

Value Approaches

Market Approach: The market approach is used on all classes of property to obtain market value for each parcel of property. Sales comparison is the most common way to determine market value on similar properties.

Cost Approach: The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. Marshall/Swift costing dated June 2010 is used to arrive at Replacement Cost New (RCN). A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value. A depreciation study completed in 2010 by the

county's contracted appraiser for residential, rural residential and commercial revaluation was used for the current year market values.

Income Approach: The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties. Collection and analysis of income and expense data was completed in 2006 by the county's contracted appraiser.

Land valuation studies will be performed on an annual basis. A three-year study of arms-length transactions will be used to obtain current market values.

Reconciliation of Value

A reconciliation of the three approaches to value (if applicable) will be completed and documented.

Sales Ratio Review

Upon completion of assessment actions, sales ratio studies are reviewed to determine if the statistics are within the guidelines set forth by the state.

Notices

Change of value notices are sent to the property owner of record no later than June 1st of each year as required by §77-1315. Prior to notices being sent, an article is published in the paper to keep taxpayers informed of the process.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2011:

Property Class	Ratio (Level of Value)	*COD	*PRD
Residential	99.00	3.93	101.10
Commercial	n/a	0.00	100.00
Agricultural	74.00	20.66	101.20

(*Co-efficient of dispersion and price-related differential)

For more information regarding statistical measures, see 2011 Reports & Opinions issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2011.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential: A physical inspection of all urban and suburban residential parcels within the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A physical inspection of all ag-improved parcels within the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: A physical inspection of all commercial parcels within the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be

completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 20 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 40 applications annually.

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report: Compile tax loss due to Homestead Exemptions and report no later than November 30 annually.

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 100 personal property schedules annually.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Assessed Value Update: Compile all real property valuation information and report no later than March 19 annually.

Board of Educational Land and Funds Report: Compile all valuations for properties owned by BELF and report no later than March 31 annually.

Change of Value Notification: Notification sent no later than June 1 annually to all property owners whose value changed from the prior year.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Personal Property: Compile all personal property valuation information and file by June 15 annually.

Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list corrections documents for County Board of Equalization review.

Taxable Value and Growth Certifications: Total assessments for real, personal and centrally assessed properties are reported to all political subdivisions no later than August 20 annually.

School District Taxable Value Report: Final report of taxable value for all school districts located within the county to be filed no later than August 25 annually.

Annual Inventory Statement: Report of all personal property in possession of this office to be filed with the County Board by August 31 annually.

Average Residential Value Report: Certification of the average residential value for Homestead Exemption purposes filed no later than September 1 annually.

Three Year Plan of Assessment: Assessment plan detailing the next three years that must be prepared by June 15 annually, submitted to the County Board of Equalization no later than July 31 annually and filed no later than October 31 annually.

Ag Land Trust Report: Report of all property within the county owned by trusts to be filed with the Secretary of State no later than October 1 annually.

Tax List: Certification of the tax list, for both real and personal property within the county, which must be delivered to the treasurer no later than November 22 annually.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: Final report of the total taxes to be collected by the county to be filed no later than December 1 annually.

Government Owned Properties Report: Report of taxable and exempt state or governmental political subdivision owned properties to be filed for the year 2004 and every 4th year thereafter no later than December 1 annually.

Conclusion:

The Thomas County Assessor makes every effort to comply with state statute and the rules and regulations of the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation to attempt to assure uniform and proportionate assessments of all properties in Thomas County.

Considering the broad range of duties this office is responsible for, it is anticipated that there will always be a need for the services of a contract appraiser. However, it is a goal of this office to ultimately complete the majority of the appraisal work by the assessor and deputy, as budgetary concerns exist.

Lastly, it is a high priority that this office makes every effort to promote good public relations and keep the public apprised of the assessment practices required by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorissa Hartman
Thomas County Assessor

2012 Assessment Survey for Thomas County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	3
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 38,750
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$ 20,000 (\$15,000 part-time & \$5,000 contract)
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	none
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$ 9,500
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 1,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$ 7,750
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$ 14,240.77

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Not applicable.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	www.thomas.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Except for the villages.
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Contract on an as needed basis.
2.	Other services:
	GIS Workshop

2012 Certification for Thomas County

This is to certify that the 2012 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Thomas County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

