

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 Wayne County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	167	Median	95.44
Total Sales Price	\$15,940,520	Mean	98.88
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$15,940,520	Wgt. Mean	94.65
Total Assessed Value	\$15,088,485	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$76,680
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$95,452	Avg. Assessed Value	\$90,350

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.98 to 98.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.49 to 96.82
95% Mean C.I	96.22 to 101.54
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	16.70
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.10
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.37

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	195	95	95
2010	192	96	96
2009	192	96	96
2008	199	96	96

2012 Commission Summary for Wayne County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	24	Median	94.48
Total Sales Price	\$4,873,000	Mean	102.13
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,873,000	Wgt. Mean	92.39
Total Assessed Value	\$4,501,995	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$139,674
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$203,042	Avg. Assessed Value	\$187,583

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	80.17 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	52.38 to 132.40
95% Mean C.I	76.79 to 127.47
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.15
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.92

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	24	97	97
2010	26	95	95
2009	21	93	93
2008	22	93	93

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Wayne 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	95	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
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Wayne County

The assessment actions in Wayne County included the listing of new construction and increasing the lots and improvements in the village of Wakefield ten percent for the 2012 assessment year.

Wayne County has completed the physical review and inspection of the residential class of property as stated in the 3 year plan of assessment as of 11/17/2011.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	All in the office help but coordinated by Dawn Duffy with the help of road men from one of the road districts.	
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>
	01	Beverly Hills – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	02	Carroll
	03	Hoskins
	04	Muhs Acres – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	05	Rural and Sholes
	06	Wakefield – adjoins Dixon County
	07	Wayne – County seat, college, retail, schools, hospital
	08	Winside
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost approach and sales comparison approach	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
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?	
	We develop the depreciations based on the local market.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	They are looked at each year	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2012 – Wakefield, others as needed.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Sales Comparison, we use square foot method and front foot method	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	When the parcel has changed enough that it does not represent what was there at the time of the sale.	

**90 Wayne
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 : 167
 Total Sales Price : 15,940,520
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,940,520
 Total Assessed Value : 15,088,485
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 95,452
 Avg. Assessed Value : 90,350

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 12.32
 PRD : 104.47

COV : 17.73
 STD : 17.53
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.76
 MAX Sales Ratio : 199.70
 MIN Sales Ratio : 62.12

95% Median C.I. : 93.98 to 98.23
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.49 to 96.82
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.22 to 101.54

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:27PM

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-09 To 30-SEP-09	29	93.98	97.14	95.73	07.03	101.47	87.42	143.53	91.31 to 97.07	92,687	88,728
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	28	101.23	100.02	98.09	10.20	101.97	77.14	135.32	91.27 to 106.93	83,857	82,256
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	96.38	94.82	94.46	06.39	100.38	81.72	104.41	81.72 to 104.41	110,256	104,149
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	34	95.16	98.54	92.90	13.90	106.07	66.95	160.36	89.69 to 103.25	98,872	91,854
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	15	99.90	102.61	97.62	14.97	105.11	74.01	159.33	86.17 to 113.02	84,169	82,165
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	20	100.61	105.30	99.19	13.88	106.16	83.92	199.70	91.55 to 107.13	90,680	89,943
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	87.81	92.82	90.41	19.10	102.67	62.12	124.53	72.12 to 119.41	94,900	85,800
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	24	90.92	96.04	89.81	10.80	106.94	73.38	149.93	87.23 to 98.73	113,777	102,185
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	99	95.44	98.25	95.18	10.72	103.23	66.95	160.36	93.98 to 98.23	93,734	89,217
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	68	95.87	99.79	93.92	14.59	106.25	62.12	199.70	90.28 to 100.00	97,954	92,000
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	77	97.54	100.70	95.46	13.65	105.49	66.95	199.70	94.43 to 100.27	95,063	90,748
<u>ALL</u>	167	95.44	98.88	94.65	12.32	104.47	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.23	95,452	90,350

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	6	97.82	97.34	98.72	11.26	98.60	74.01	120.92	74.01 to 120.92	57,267	56,534
03	12	92.24	100.51	91.55	21.52	109.79	62.12	199.70	83.92 to 113.90	84,384	77,256
04	2	88.98	88.98	88.96	05.00	100.02	84.53	93.42	N/A	128,500	114,315
05	16	92.88	96.66	88.52	15.64	109.20	66.95	160.36	83.24 to 108.70	134,864	119,380
06	4	89.98	91.67	90.43	05.40	101.37	85.91	100.81	N/A	112,975	102,161
07	120	97.07	99.03	96.21	10.25	102.93	72.12	149.93	94.43 to 99.50	94,647	91,056
08	7	93.50	106.74	96.71	27.58	110.37	76.70	159.33	76.70 to 159.33	51,429	49,739
<u>ALL</u>	167	95.44	98.88	94.65	12.32	104.47	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.23	95,452	90,350

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	166	95.46	98.93	94.66	12.36	104.51	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.73	95,847	90,731
06											
07	1	90.20	90.20	90.20	00.00	100.00	90.20	90.20	N/A	30,000	27,060
<u>ALL</u>	167	95.44	98.88	94.65	12.32	104.47	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.23	95,452	90,350

**90 Wayne
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 : 167
 Total Sales Price : 15,940,520
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,940,520
 Total Assessed Value : 15,088,485
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 95,452
 Avg. Assessed Value : 90,350

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 12.32
 PRD : 104.47

COV : 17.73
 STD : 17.53
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.76
 MAX Sales Ratio : 199.70
 MIN Sales Ratio : 62.12

95% Median C.I. : 93.98 to 98.23
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.49 to 96.82
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.22 to 101.54

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:27PM

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												
Less Than 30,000	4	131.74	141.41	134.71	28.92	104.97	102.47	199.70	N/A	18,201	24,519	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	167	95.44	98.88	94.65	12.32	104.47	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.23	95,452	90,350	
Greater Than 14,999	167	95.44	98.88	94.65	12.32	104.47	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.23	95,452	90,350	
Greater Than 29,999	163	95.31	97.83	94.47	11.46	103.56	62.12	160.36	93.42 to 97.95	97,348	91,966	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	4	131.74	141.41	134.71	28.92	104.97	102.47	199.70	N/A	18,201	24,519	
30,000 TO 59,999	37	106.17	107.59	107.16	15.32	100.40	74.01	160.36	99.35 to 111.52	46,258	49,571	
60,000 TO 99,999	61	98.73	99.93	99.82	09.03	100.11	76.35	132.31	95.01 to 102.60	78,395	78,256	
100,000 TO 149,999	43	91.27	91.50	91.29	08.21	100.23	62.12	115.01	88.11 to 94.96	119,635	109,209	
150,000 TO 249,999	19	89.91	89.05	89.01	05.97	100.04	66.95	101.43	85.02 to 94.61	175,697	156,385	
250,000 TO 499,999	3	84.70	81.13	80.24	04.70	101.11	73.38	85.31	N/A	297,167	238,455	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	167	95.44	98.88	94.65	12.32	104.47	62.12	199.70	93.98 to 98.23	95,452	90,350	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Wayne County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sales file for Wayne County consists of 167 qualified arm's length sales. The sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The relationship between all three measures of central tendency is relatively close and the calculated median is 95%. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are acceptable.

Wayne County has completed the cyclical review and continues to monitor the sale activity in the county.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% for the residential class of property. All subclasses with sufficient sales information are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County

Wayne County completed an analysis and reassessment of the lots on the east and west sides of Wayne.

Wayne County has completed the physical review and inspection of the commercial class of property as stated in the 3 year plan of assessment as of 11/17/2011.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	All in the office	
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>
	01	Beverly Hills – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	02	Carroll
	03	Hoskins
	04	Muhs Acres – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	05	Rural and Sholes
	06	Wakefield – adjoins Dixon County
	07	Wayne – County seat, college, retail, schools, hospital
	08	Winside
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Cost approach and sales comparison. We do not use income approach except on Section 42's	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Cost approach	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	1988 with percentage adjustments	
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 depreciation is developed based on the local market.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Yearly	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2012 – Completed a lot study on properties east and west of Wayne.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	We studied the sales and made adjustments to the first acre, etc.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	When the parcel has changed enough that it does not represent what was there at the time of the sale.	

90 Wayne
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 : 24
Total Sales Price : 4,873,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,873,000
Total Assessed Value : 4,501,995
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 203,042
Avg. Assessed Value : 187,583

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 92
MEAN : 102
COD : 31.90
PRD : 110.54

COV : 58.75
STD : 60.00
Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 346.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 35.19

95% Median C.I. : 80.17 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 52.38 to 132.40
95% Mean C.I. : 76.79 to 127.47

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:28PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	81.62	81.62	81.62	00.00	100.00	81.62	81.62	N/A	200,000	163,235
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	137.74	137.74	137.74	00.00	100.00	137.74	137.74	N/A	162,000	223,140
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	80.17	78.79	82.86	15.83	95.09	59.07	97.14	N/A	57,667	47,783
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	215.97	215.97	97.86	60.44	220.69	85.43	346.50	N/A	105,000	102,755
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	78.32	78.32	85.80	16.93	91.28	65.06	91.58	N/A	166,250	142,643
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	96.54	93.58	92.57	03.50	101.09	84.12	97.10	N/A	94,250	87,248
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	105.94	105.94	130.26	29.24	81.33	74.96	136.91	N/A	815,000	1,061,595
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	95.04	95.04	95.30	01.95	99.73	93.19	96.89	N/A	157,500	150,105
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	65.48	65.48	41.48	46.26	157.86	35.19	95.76	N/A	633,250	262,663
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	107.74	128.72	124.02	25.41	103.79	98.14	180.27	N/A	32,333	40,098
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	56.77	56.77	57.70	03.01	98.39	55.06	58.47	N/A	55,000	31,733
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	85.43	126.81	98.69	60.28	128.49	59.07	346.50	59.07 to 346.50	106,429	105,034
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	8	93.93	92.85	117.87	14.82	78.77	65.06	136.91	65.06 to 136.91	292,438	344,683
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	9	95.76	91.19	56.43	27.98	161.60	35.19	180.27	55.06 to 107.74	198,722	112,144
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	91.58	109.02	89.99	35.73	121.15	59.07	346.50	65.06 to 97.14	99,318	89,376
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	94.48	88.82	91.82	22.27	96.73	35.19	136.91	35.19 to 136.91	535,250	491,454
<u>ALL</u>	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
05	1	35.19	35.19	35.19	00.00	100.00	35.19	35.19	N/A	1,135,000	399,400
07	19	95.76	93.43	109.35	13.75	85.44	58.47	137.74	81.62 to 97.14	192,105	210,072
08	4	119.67	160.23	126.40	86.20	126.76	55.06	346.50	N/A	22,000	27,809
<u>ALL</u>	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583
04											
<u>ALL</u>	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583

**90 Wayne
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 : 24
 Total Sales Price : 4,873,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,873,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,501,995
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 203,042
 Avg. Assessed Value : 187,583

MEDIAN : 94
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 102
 COD : 31.90
 PRD : 110.54

COV : 58.75
 STD : 60.00
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.14
 MAX Sales Ratio : 346.50
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.19

95% Median C.I. : 80.17 to 97.14
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 52.38 to 132.40
 95% Mean C.I. : 76.79 to 127.47

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:28PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	1	346.50	346.50	346.50	00.00	100.00	346.50	346.50	N/A	10,000	34,650	
Less Than 30,000	4	119.67	160.23	126.40	86.20	126.76	55.06	346.50	N/A	22,000	27,809	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583	
Greater Than 14,999	23	93.19	91.51	91.86	21.93	99.62	35.19	180.27	80.17 to 97.10	211,435	194,232	
Greater Than 29,999	20	94.48	90.51	91.76	16.45	98.64	35.19	137.74	81.62 to 97.10	239,250	219,538	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	346.50	346.50	346.50	00.00	100.00	346.50	346.50	N/A	10,000	34,650	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	59.07	98.13	98.19	70.66	99.94	55.06	180.27	N/A	26,000	25,528	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	97.62	99.82	99.66	03.21	100.16	96.28	107.74	N/A	40,250	40,111	
60,000 TO 99,999	4	72.62	75.21	73.89	18.52	101.79	58.47	97.14	N/A	75,875	56,068	
100,000 TO 149,999	3	93.19	91.02	91.16	04.16	99.85	84.12	95.76	N/A	130,500	118,958	
150,000 TO 249,999	6	91.12	95.57	94.50	16.35	101.13	74.96	137.74	74.96 to 137.74	179,833	169,940	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	91.58	91.58	91.58	00.00	100.00	91.58	91.58	N/A	260,000	238,115	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	2	86.05	86.05	92.33	59.11	93.20	35.19	136.91	N/A	1,295,000	1,195,708	
<u>ALL</u>	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583	

90 Wayne
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 : 24
Total Sales Price : 4,873,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,873,000
Total Assessed Value : 4,501,995
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 203,042
Avg. Assessed Value : 187,583

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 92
MEAN : 102
COD : 31.90
PRD : 110.54

COV : 58.75
STD : 60.00
Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 346.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 35.19

95% Median C.I. : 80.17 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 52.38 to 132.40
95% Mean C.I. : 76.79 to 127.47

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:28PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	2	94.19	94.19	93.59	02.77	100.64	91.58	96.80	N/A	211,000	197,468
304	1	85.43	85.43	85.43	00.00	100.00	85.43	85.43	N/A	200,000	170,860
313	1	136.91	136.91	136.91	00.00	100.00	136.91	136.91	N/A	1,455,000	1,992,015
325	1	74.96	74.96	74.96	00.00	100.00	74.96	74.96	N/A	175,000	131,175
326	2	78.09	78.09	82.84	24.36	94.27	59.07	97.10	N/A	36,000	29,823
344	3	97.14	100.21	98.14	04.11	102.11	95.76	107.74	N/A	77,167	75,733
349	1	81.62	81.62	81.62	00.00	100.00	81.62	81.62	N/A	200,000	163,235
350	2	88.66	88.66	88.83	05.12	99.81	84.12	93.19	N/A	130,000	115,475
352	1	180.27	180.27	180.27	00.00	100.00	180.27	180.27	N/A	26,000	46,870
353	3	96.28	83.88	86.27	13.30	97.23	58.47	96.89	N/A	103,333	89,145
381	1	346.50	346.50	346.50	00.00	100.00	346.50	346.50	N/A	10,000	34,650
384	1	80.17	80.17	80.17	00.00	100.00	80.17	80.17	N/A	85,000	68,145
406	3	98.14	100.31	113.21	24.69	88.61	65.06	137.74	N/A	88,833	100,572
420	1	35.19	35.19	35.19	00.00	100.00	35.19	35.19	N/A	1,135,000	399,400
442	1	55.06	55.06	55.06	00.00	100.00	55.06	55.06	N/A	25,000	13,765
<u>ALL</u>	24	94.48	102.13	92.39	31.90	110.54	35.19	346.50	80.17 to 97.14	203,042	187,583

**2012 Correlation Section
for Wayne County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Wayne County has utilized as many sales as possible to represent the commercial market in the county. The commercial property represented in the statistical analysis consists of 24 sales. There are only three valuation groups represented. The valuation group of 07(Wayne) is the county seat and has 19 of the 24 sales. There are 15 occupancy codes represented and sale prices ranging from \$10,000 to \$1,455,000.

The county reported for the 2012 assessment year that the lot values on the east and west side of Wayne were reviewed. The county has completed the cyclical review and inspection of the commercial properties.

The assessment practices of the county have been determined to be acceptable. However, the large coefficient of dispersion and high price related differential are results of the diverse occupancy codes represented in the analysis. There is not enough information available with this limited market to determine the level of value for the commercial class of property.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County

Wayne County completed a sales study and concluded that an 11% increase was applied to the irrigated, dryland and grassland for the 2012 assessment year.

Wayne County has completed the physical review and inspection utilizing the GIS and the oblique photos of the agricultural class of property as stated in the 3 year plan of assessment as of 11/17/2011.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Dawn Duffy and all of staff with the help of road men.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The county is one market area.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Study of sales	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	We have no recreational land. Nor rivers and no gravel pits.	
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, rural residential are all valued alike 12,000 for the first acre and 2,000 for all other site acres	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Percentage adjustments base on GIS, personal property, NRD information, legal filings, physical inspections, aerial photos.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Home site and building sites are determined by house and buildings. GIS is utilized to measure the sites.	
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?	
	When the parcel has changed enough that it does not represent what was there at the time of the sale.	

90 Wayne
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 : 76
Total Sales Price : 31,999,543
Total Adj. Sales Price : 31,996,043
Total Assessed Value : 22,480,594
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 421,001
Avg. Assessed Value : 295,797

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 70
MEAN : 76
COD : 16.98
PRD : 107.69

COV : 20.41
STD : 15.44
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.53
MAX Sales Ratio : 113.53
MIN Sales Ratio : 46.25

95% Median C.I. : 68.61 to 79.18
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.91 to 74.61
95% Mean C.I. : 72.19 to 79.13

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:29PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qtrts											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	73.36	75.67	74.83	16.45	101.12	61.75	94.22	N/A	423,053	316,571
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	85.54	80.04	84.09	17.56	95.18	53.22	106.59	57.58 to 100.56	283,366	238,274
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	11	78.35	78.23	74.57	11.37	104.91	50.46	99.52	65.79 to 96.01	352,620	262,948
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	80.29	80.13	79.46	07.47	100.84	65.98	93.07	N/A	334,005	265,411
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	71.46	74.04	75.66	10.17	97.86	64.43	86.23	N/A	350,829	265,450
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	13	73.54	77.15	76.62	13.38	100.69	59.36	103.81	65.03 to 89.09	375,074	287,365
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	83.51	82.62	74.14	14.80	111.44	54.72	107.27	54.72 to 107.27	250,785	185,929
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	4	90.64	91.31	85.76	18.79	106.47	70.42	113.53	N/A	427,750	366,819
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	13	64.50	64.61	57.64	13.35	112.09	46.25	98.88	55.84 to 71.06	720,786	415,433
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	58.92	59.57	56.96	11.18	104.58	51.84	68.61	N/A	619,371	352,767
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	68.75	73.92	73.75	11.26	100.23	64.90	88.11	N/A	309,821	228,480
Study Yrs											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	30	80.13	78.81	78.10	13.99	100.91	50.46	106.59	74.02 to 84.32	335,824	262,284
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	22	76.52	78.22	75.98	14.24	102.95	54.72	107.27	69.43 to 88.37	337,871	256,712
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	24	67.19	69.38	61.87	16.70	112.14	46.25	113.53	60.20 to 71.06	603,674	373,517
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	79.18	78.07	75.98	10.61	102.75	50.46	99.52	71.46 to 84.32	347,438	263,991
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	36	71.24	75.11	67.11	17.78	111.92	46.25	113.53	67.05 to 78.61	485,053	325,534
ALL	76	73.78	75.66	70.26	16.98	107.69	46.25	113.53	68.61 to 79.18	421,001	295,797

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	76	73.78	75.66	70.26	16.98	107.69	46.25	113.53	68.61 to 79.18	421,001	295,797
ALL	76	73.78	75.66	70.26	16.98	107.69	46.25	113.53	68.61 to 79.18	421,001	295,797

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
Dry											
County	54	73.78	74.64	73.10	13.39	102.11	54.72	103.81	67.54 to 78.61	366,123	267,632
Blank	54	73.78	74.64	73.10	13.39	102.11	54.72	103.81	67.54 to 78.61	366,123	267,632
Grass											
County	1	53.22	53.22	53.22	00.00	100.00	53.22	53.22	N/A	112,000	59,605
Blank	1	53.22	53.22	53.22	00.00	100.00	53.22	53.22	N/A	112,000	59,605
ALL	76	73.78	75.66	70.26	16.98	107.69	46.25	113.53	68.61 to 79.18	421,001	295,797

90 Wayne
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 : 76
 Total Sales Price : 31,999,543
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 31,996,043
 Total Assessed Value : 22,480,594
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 421,001
 Avg. Assessed Value : 295,797

MEDIAN : 74
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 16.98
 PRD : 107.69

COV : 20.41
 STD : 15.44
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.53
 MAX Sales Ratio : 113.53
 MIN Sales Ratio : 46.25

95% Median C.I. : 68.61 to 79.18
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.91 to 74.61
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.19 to 79.13

Printed:3/29/2012 3:43:29PM

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	2	58.44	58.44	58.14	11.29	100.52	51.84	65.03	N/A	781,450	454,358
Blank	2	58.44	58.44	58.14	11.29	100.52	51.84	65.03	N/A	781,450	454,358
_____Dry_____											
County	63	73.54	75.18	72.52	14.63	103.67	52.03	106.59	68.75 to 78.61	394,233	285,905
Blank	63	73.54	75.18	72.52	14.63	103.67	52.03	106.59	68.75 to 78.61	394,233	285,905
_____Grass_____											
County	2	51.84	51.84	50.96	02.66	101.73	50.46	53.22	N/A	310,000	157,965
Blank	2	51.84	51.84	50.96	02.66	101.73	50.46	53.22	N/A	310,000	157,965
_____ALL_____	76	73.78	75.66	70.26	16.98	107.69	46.25	113.53	68.61 to 79.18	421,001	295,797

Wayne County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
90.10	Wayne	10	3,885	3,885	3,850	3,850	2,940	2,355	2,235	2,110	3,084
26.10	Dixon	1	3,210	3,150	3,000	2,900	2,700	2,650	2,450	2,350	2,885
87.10	Thurston	1	3,000	2,990	2,760	2,705	2,645	2,640	2,415	2,185	2,817
20.30	Cuming	3	3,392	3,392	3,166	3,167	2,831	2,839	2,364	2,370	3,047
84.10	Stanton	1	3,105	3,105	3,050	3,050	3,050	2,875	2,415	1,725	2,938
59.10	Madison	1	3,517	3,345	3,188	3,048	2,893	2,793	2,222	1,825	3,008
70.10	Pierce	1	2,993	2,889	2,702	2,661	2,604	2,528	2,019	1,907	2,604
14.20	Cedar	2	3,865	3,865	3,725	3,725	3,670	3,670	2,970	2,970	3,520

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Wayne	10	3,470	3,295	3,060	2,820	2,575	2,335	2,090	1,855	2,717
	Dixon	1	2,910	2,715	2,620	2,520	2,375	2,230	2,135	1,940	2,411
	Thurston	1	2,900	2,850	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,500	2,300	2,000	2,580
	Cuming	3	3,210	3,208	2,902	2,972	2,624	2,590	2,108	1,988	2,828
	Stanton	1	2,720	2,720	2,610	2,590	2,320	2,162	2,077	1,615	2,322
	Madison	1	3,115	3,017	2,786	2,647	2,519	2,469	1,995	1,675	2,665
	Pierce	1	2,320	2,245	2,115	2,020	1,910	1,860	1,180	1,035	2,002
	Cedar	2	3,415	3,415	3,305	3,305	3,220	3,220	2,520	2,520	3,101

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Wayne	10	2,051	2,013	1,785	1,703	1,708	1,447	1,334	1,060	1,671
	Dixon	1	1,690	1,600	1,375	1,250	1,125	1,000	875	750	1,202
	Thurston	1	714	696	649	656	568	564	555	510	620
	Cuming	3	1,198	1,621	1,376	1,392	1,267	1,197	1,057	638	1,227
	Stanton	1	1,340	1,340	1,250	1,250	1,250	994	950	882	1,047
	Madison	1	1,384	1,263	1,176	1,205	1,140	1,075	940	665	1,035
	Pierce	1	1,281	1,421	1,219	1,152	1,162	1,080	865	742	1,005
	Cedar	2	1,408	1,408	1,278	1,290	1,162	1,154	1,040	1,038	1,182

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

2012 Correlation Section for Wayne County

A. Agricultural Land

Wayne County is considered one market area. All the adjoining counties have land characteristics similar to Wayne County, and are considered to be comparable. The analysis of the sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time. The agricultural land sales sample was expanded by 12 sales and resulted in 76 arm's length sales. All measures were taken to utilize comparable sales and the majority land use thresholds have been met.

The county increased all agricultural values by 11% for the 2012 assessment year. The statistics for the overall class and the dry land subclass are both at the upper end of the acceptable range; there are very few irrigated and grassland sales in the sample. The Average LCG Value Comparison supports that the values for all land uses are comparable to the adjoining counties. A review of past assessment practices indicates that the county has annually increased all land uses at a similar rate. For these reasons, the land use subclasses are believed to be assessed at uniform portions of market value.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 : 5,733	Value : 1,079,873,035	Growth 6,918,580	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	155	2,610,685	34	289,430	0	0	189	2,900,115	
02. Res Improve Land	1,958	17,012,460	103	1,728,485	0	0	2,061	18,740,945	
03. Res Improvements	2,035	147,453,545	107	10,828,800	21	426,910	2,163	158,709,255	
04. Res Total	2,190	167,076,690	141	12,846,715	21	426,910	2,352	180,350,315	1,548,245
% of Res Total	93.11	92.64	5.99	7.12	0.89	0.24	41.03	16.70	22.38
05. Com UnImp Land	58	812,825	7	80,640	6	173,255	71	1,066,720	
06. Com Improve Land	320	5,308,095	30	813,785	18	552,665	368	6,674,545	
07. Com Improvements	329	36,921,915	31	2,820,115	23	9,563,455	383	49,305,485	
08. Com Total	387	43,042,835	38	3,714,540	29	10,289,375	454	57,046,750	1,766,855
% of Com Total	85.24	75.45	8.37	6.51	6.39	18.04	7.92	5.28	25.54
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	1	51,000	0	0	1	51,000	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	9	493,350	1	57,500	10	550,850	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	9	7,277,110	2	162,325	11	7,439,435	
12. Ind Total	0	0	10	7,821,460	2	219,825	12	8,041,285	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	83.33	97.27	16.67	2.73	0.21	0.74	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,190	167,076,690	141	12,846,715	21	426,910	2,352	180,350,315	1,548,245
% of Res & Rec Total	93.11	92.64	5.99	7.12	0.89	0.24	41.03	16.70	22.38
Com & Ind Total	387	43,042,835	48	11,536,000	31	10,509,200	466	65,088,035	1,766,855
% of Com & Ind Total	83.05	66.13	10.30	17.72	6.65	16.15	8.13	6.03	25.54
17. Taxable Total	2,577	210,119,525	189	24,382,715	52	10,936,110	2,818	245,438,350	3,315,100
% of Taxable Total	91.45	85.61	6.71	9.93	1.85	4.46	49.15	22.73	47.92

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	237	7	119	363

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	3,230	0	0	1,600	427,617,450	1,601	427,620,680
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,263	301,777,790	1,263	301,777,790
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,314	105,036,215	1,314	105,036,215
30. Ag Total							2,915	834,434,685

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.23	0	0	9.87	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	3.00	36,000	3	3.00	36,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	967	1,007.31	12,087,825	967	1,007.31	12,087,825	
33. HomeSite Improvements	970	0.00	80,834,750	970	0.00	80,834,750	1,952,225
34. HomeSite Total				973	1,010.31	92,958,575	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	72	220.54	441,080	72	220.54	441,080	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,208	7,914.92	15,829,940	1,208	7,914.92	15,829,940	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,223	0.00	24,201,465	1,223	0.00	24,201,465	1,651,255
38. FarmSite Total				1,295	8,135.46	40,472,485	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,146.67	0	0	6,156.77	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,268	15,302.54	133,431,060	3,603,480

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	1	160.00	260,890	1	160.00	260,890

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 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,609.60	5.63%	10,138,370	7.10%	3,885.03
46. 1A	9,599.13	20.72%	37,292,825	26.10%	3,885.02
47. 2A1	2,837.11	6.12%	10,922,935	7.64%	3,850.02
48. 2A	2,434.94	5.26%	9,374,585	6.56%	3,850.03
49. 3A1	13,226.09	28.55%	38,884,780	27.21%	2,940.01
50. 3A	11,278.68	24.34%	26,561,285	18.59%	2,355.00
51. 4A1	4,320.61	9.33%	9,656,585	6.76%	2,235.01
52. 4A	23.64	0.05%	49,880	0.03%	2,109.98
53. Total	46,329.80	100.00%	142,881,245	100.00%	3,084.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	13,067.31	6.85%	45,343,955	8.75%	3,470.03
55. 1D	38,964.68	20.44%	128,389,050	24.79%	3,295.01
56. 2D1	10,473.50	5.49%	32,048,965	6.19%	3,060.01
57. 2D	8,921.34	4.68%	25,158,350	4.86%	2,820.02
58. 3D1	58,391.77	30.63%	150,359,780	29.03%	2,575.02
59. 3D	39,009.02	20.46%	91,086,345	17.58%	2,335.01
60. 4D1	21,744.27	11.41%	45,445,690	8.77%	2,090.01
61. 4D	79.79	0.04%	148,015	0.03%	1,855.06
62. Total	190,651.68	100.00%	517,980,150	100.00%	2,716.89
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,191.60	5.11%	2,443,795	6.28%	2,050.85
64. 1G	2,639.30	11.33%	5,314,110	13.65%	2,013.45
65. 2G1	5,102.62	21.90%	9,109,910	23.40%	1,785.34
66. 2G	3,367.97	14.45%	5,736,200	14.73%	1,703.16
67. 3G1	3,611.30	15.50%	6,166,375	15.84%	1,707.52
68. 3G	3,092.40	13.27%	4,474,210	11.49%	1,446.84
69. 4G1	4,146.96	17.80%	5,533,955	14.21%	1,334.46
70. 4G	148.42	0.64%	157,330	0.40%	1,060.03
71. Total	23,300.57	100.00%	38,935,885	100.00%	1,671.03
Irrigated Total					
	46,329.80	17.64%	142,881,245	20.38%	3,084.00
Dry Total					
	190,651.68	72.58%	517,980,150	73.89%	2,716.89
Grass Total					
	23,300.57	8.87%	38,935,885	5.55%	1,671.03
72. Waste	2,412.64	0.92%	1,206,345	0.17%	500.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	884.85	0.34%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	262,694.69	100.00%	701,003,625	100.00%	2,668.51

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	46,329.80	142,881,245	46,329.80	142,881,245
77. Dry Land	0.98	3,230	0.00	0	190,650.70	517,976,920	190,651.68	517,980,150
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	23,300.57	38,935,885	23,300.57	38,935,885
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,412.64	1,206,345	2,412.64	1,206,345
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	214.49	0	5.28	0	665.08	0	884.85	0
82. Total	0.98	3,230	0.00	0	262,693.71	701,000,395	262,694.69	701,003,625

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	46,329.80	17.64%	142,881,245	20.38%	3,084.00
Dry Land	190,651.68	72.58%	517,980,150	73.89%	2,716.89
Grass	23,300.57	8.87%	38,935,885	5.55%	1,671.03
Waste	2,412.64	0.92%	1,206,345	0.17%	500.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	884.85	0.34%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	262,694.69	100.00%	701,003,625	100.00%	2,668.51

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

90 Wayne

	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	177,675,415	180,350,315	2,674,900	1.51%	1,548,245	0.63%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	92,017,420	92,958,575	941,155	1.02%	1,952,225	-1.10%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	269,692,835	273,308,890	3,616,055	1.34%	3,500,470	0.04%
05. Commercial	54,850,410	57,046,750	2,196,340	4.00%	1,766,855	0.78%
06. Industrial	7,873,295	8,041,285	167,990	2.13%	0	2.13%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	40,714,400	40,472,485	-241,915	-0.59%	1,651,255	-4.65%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	103,438,105	105,560,520	2,122,415	2.05%	3,418,110	-1.25%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	373,130,940	378,869,410	5,738,470	1.54%	6,918,580	-0.32%
11. Irrigated	126,375,960	142,881,245	16,505,285	13.06%		
12. Dryland	466,495,195	517,980,150	51,484,955	11.04%		
13. Grassland	37,458,470	38,935,885	1,477,415	3.94%		
14. Wasteland	870,315	1,206,345	336,030	38.61%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	631,199,940	701,003,625	69,803,685	11.06%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,004,330,880	1,079,873,035	75,542,155	7.52%	6,918,580	6.83%

2011 Plan of Assessment for Wayne County

County Assessor – Joyce Reeg

JUNE 22, 2011

This plan of assessment is required by law, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, Chapter 77-1311.02. On or before June 15 each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and shall present the plan of assessment to the county board of equalization on or before July 31. The plan of assessment prepared each year, shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter.

2012

Residential parcels were reviewed by the assessor in Wakefield, Winside, Carroll, Hoskins and Wayne. All changes were implemented for 2011.

Physical review work for 2012 has not yet begun. We are working on updating parcel cards.

Of course we will monitor the sales using a market analysis.

Rural Residential parcels have been photographed by GIS aerial photos. We have printed off the pictures and put them into the parcel cards. At this time we are reviewing and comparing the photos for changes. Those changes will be implemented in 2012. The assessor's office will have at least double the amount of pick up work to do in the summer and the fall due to the aerial photos that were taken.

Commercial parcels will be monitored using the sales/assessment ratio, building permits and drive by reviews. As I reviewed the residential properties in Wakefield, Winside, Carroll, Hoskins and Wayne I also reviewed the commercial properties.

Our office will monitor the sales file and make changes accordingly.

Agricultural land uses are being reviewed with the GIS program. The GIS system updates the aerial photos yearly therefore allowing us to review land use on a yearly basis. At this time the 2010 aerial maps are installed on the GIS and the oblique photos have been reviewed and priced out. This completes the visitation at least once every six year requirement.

The Assessor electronically enters the data into the State's sales file and mails the Form 521's to the State as required by law by the 15th of each month.

Our office scanned the tax lot book into the computer so changes made to tax lots are now much easier than in the past.

2013

Residential parcels will be monitored by using the sales file in the county. When necessary we will go to the property and list the changes. Pick up work will be physically inspected and valued in a timely manner.

Commercials will continue to be monitored and values adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. New construction will be monitored using building permits and realtor's web sites.

Agriculture land will be adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. Land use will be updated as it is every year using the GIS system and drive by review.

The assessor will continue to electronically enter the data into the State's sales file on a monthly basis and forward the 521's to the State by the 15th of each month.

2014

Residential and Commercial: We have spent a lot of money on the aerial photos taken in 2010. To meet the requirements of the State in visiting each property in the County at least once every six years the next visit of the entire residential and commercial properties will not take place until 2015. We will continue completing our pick up work in a timely fashion and monitoring our sales file.

Agriculture land will be reviewed for use changes using GIS and drive by. New aerial photos will be taken in 2015.

The Assessor will continue to electronically enter the data into the State's sales file on a monthly basis and forward the 521's to the State by the 15th of each month.

Staff, Budgeting and Training

The staff of the Wayne County Assessor's office consists of the assessor, who is a registered appraiser, the deputy and one clerk. The Deputy Clerk of the District Court works in our office 2 hours a day. At this time neither the assessor nor the deputy assessor are planning to upgrade their appraiser's license. The clerk/lister has become the GIS specialist.

An update to the staff: the deputy clerk of the district court no longer works in the office. We now have 3 total full time staff that includes the assessor. 11/17/11

The deputy has been in the office about 19 years. The deeds and cadastral maps are her primary concern as well as making sure we meet deadlines throughout the year. The GIS specialist is a December 2002 graduate of WSC and has been employed in the office since January 2003. Dawn can do anything on GIS and she also does all the listing and pricing.

The assessor and deputy assessor will complete the required number of hours to remain certified. We have tried using the on line classes offered through the real estate commission. This is a very cost efficient way of updating our certification.

The budget for the assessor's office has always been adequate to handle our needs. The Commissioners have supported the office both financially and through the use of their personnel and equipment. The Commissioners bought a new Ford Escape for use by everyone at the courthouse. When it is available we use it for pick up work.

The GIS system is installed in the office. Two of the three years have already been paid for. The maintenance payments to MIPS and GIS are taken out of the county's general budget.

Wayne County is on line at nto.com. All the CAMA information and photos and drawings are on the internet for appraisers, realtors, insurance reps and all to use. MIPS is not charging Wayne County at this time. There is a glitch in the program that is caused by the treasurer entering the mortgage company in the address line. They talked to Karen about this three years ago but she did not change the way she was doing her data entry. This is something that needs to be address in the treasurer's office.

The assessor's budget pays for all continuing ed. The two employees in the office have taken advantage of the classes held in Wayne as have I. I would like the GIS specialist to have her certificate but because of the added cost of continuing ed. I will ask her to wait to become certified. My appraiser's license is renewed and paid for out of the assessor's budget. Travel to and from workshops and meetings as well as the registration fees are also paid for by the County.

All emails received by the assessor are shared with the office so that we can continue to follow state statutes and property tax directives at all times.

Definitions

Review – physically walking around the property. Taking notes on various aspects of the property so as to make pricing-out possible. Not necessarily an interior inspection.

Drive-by – We do not get out of the car unless we see a change. We take adequate notes so it is possible to price out the property. It is best to have a driver and a passenger but that is not always the case.

Conclusion

The requirement has been met to visit every property in the county at least once every six years. The assessor visited all the residential and commercials and oblique photos were taken by GIS Workshop. In addition to reviewing all the properties the pricing out has been completed. 11/17/11

In **2012, 2013 & 2014** I will work to improve the quality of assessment to stay in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. It is my goal to follow the five subsystems of mass appraisal; data collection and maintenance, market analysis, the development of mass appraisal models and tables, quality control, and defense of values. All five subsystems are in place in Wayne County

The sales comparison approach to value is used in determining yearly adjustments to individual towns and neighborhoods. The cost approach to value is used in arriving at the assessed value of the individual properties and the income approach in the valuation system is used in the valuation process of the Section 42 properties. The Marshall & Swift manual's 2006 costing is used for valuing property on the CAMA system we have in place on four computers and the market analysis statistics are used in the sales comparison approach. GIS is used in determining land use in the rural area but it is also used as a tool in problem solving.

If Wayne County continues with the plan of assessment that is outlined in this proposal, we should be able to accomplish better quality of value, better uniformity of value and consistency in valuations over the next three years.

2012 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$126,300
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$124,500, \$1,800 put into misc. general for capital outlay which needs commissioner approval.
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	None
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$50,000 (\$25,000 to hire a full time person and \$25,000 was carried over)
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	This would be in misc. general (MIPS-\$11,500/yr. and GIS Workshop \$8,500/yr. \$14,700 to pay for GIS oblique photos)
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,300
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$1,706.88

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	CAMA 2000 through MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes, but rarely, we keep them updated but use the GIS most of the time.
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Deputy

5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Dawn Duffy
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	No
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	N/A
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Wayne, Carroll, Winside, Hoskins and Wakefield
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	N/A

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	Other services:
	None

2012 Certification for Wayne 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 Wayne 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

