

Table of Contents

2013 Commission Summary

2013 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 Land Statistics
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- 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

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- County Agricultural Land Detail
- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the Prior Year 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

2013 Commission Summary for Adams County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	758	Median	92.65
Total Sales Price	\$87,642,147	Mean	97.50
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$87,685,147	Wgt. Mean	90.89
Total Assessed Value	\$79,696,905	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$85,419
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$115,680	Avg. Assessed Value	\$105,141

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.18 to 94.26
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.60 to 92.18
95% Mean C.I	94.88 to 100.12
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	39.83
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.59
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.11

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	744	94	93.99
2011	830	94	94
2010	809	93	93
2009	884	92	92

2013 Commission Summary for Adams County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	73	Median	98.66
Total Sales Price	\$23,047,996	Mean	109.20
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$23,047,996	Wgt. Mean	103.43
Total Assessed Value	\$23,837,990	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$247,075
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$315,726	Avg. Assessed Value	\$326,548

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.23 to 102.01
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	80.97 to 125.88
95% Mean C.I	96.95 to 121.45
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	16.25
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.50
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.95

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	74	96	96.28
2011	89	96	96
2010	98	97	97
2009	107	99	99

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Adams 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	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	75	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 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Adams County

Physically reviewed 400 parcels in the city of Hastings.

All mobile homes in mobile home parks were physically reviewed.

Revalued rural homesite land values.

Increased improvement values in Southern Hills by 5%.

Spreadsheet analysis was completed on the sales.

All pickup work was completed.

Sales verifications were completed on the sales with questionnaires being mailed out to each buyer. If a discrepancy in the information was received, then the parcel was physically inspected.

Market analysis was completed for each valuation grouping and values were adjusted to reflect the market if necessary.

New software training and learning and cleaning things up from transfer.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Adams County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Appraiser and Appraiser Associates	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Hastings – Large City, 3 high schools, very active economic district
	5	Juniata – Small community located just west of Hastings, bedroom community for Hastings, some residential activity
	6	Kenesaw – Small community, on busy highway, school, some residential activity, school, active economic district
	10	Suburban – Residences located within the 2 mile jurisdiction of Hastings
	15	Rural – All rural residences not in an identified subdivision and located outside of any city limits
	20	Small towns, including Ayr, Hansen, Holstein, Pauline, and Prosser
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Sales Comparison and Cost	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
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 uses mainly the tables provided by the CAMA vendor but one neighborhood has their own depreciation table	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Mainly yes, but some depreciation tables are combined	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Majority are square foot, some are per lot or acre	

01 Adams
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 758
 Total Sales Price : 87,642,147
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 87,685,147
 Total Assessed Value : 79,696,905
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 115,680
 Avg. Assessed Value : 105,141

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 91
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 20.86
 PRD : 107.27

COV : 37.78
 STD : 36.84
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 490.21
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.70

95% Median C.I. : 91.18 to 94.26
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.60 to 92.18
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.88 to 100.12

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:27PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	78	90.71	97.12	90.85	22.91	106.90	37.27	312.02	82.34 to 99.08	108,168	98,275
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	70	98.10	103.46	93.62	19.87	110.51	52.43	238.06	92.69 to 100.58	116,194	108,784
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	90	92.21	96.89	90.95	19.37	106.53	55.33	204.09	87.84 to 97.78	121,990	110,955
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	122	92.49	95.64	90.78	19.50	105.35	50.25	490.21	89.32 to 96.99	121,556	110,343
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	109	92.51	100.36	91.49	22.98	109.70	50.92	411.69	89.49 to 97.22	103,884	95,048
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	78	89.97	89.32	89.82	16.91	99.44	36.70	165.11	84.62 to 95.62	102,656	92,208
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	113	93.99	98.60	89.93	20.57	109.64	54.84	467.00	91.35 to 96.27	118,214	106,315
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	98	89.32	98.47	90.38	23.63	108.95	55.76	276.06	85.16 to 95.32	128,744	116,355
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	360	92.98	97.80	91.38	20.48	107.03	37.27	490.21	91.02 to 96.54	117,721	107,578
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	398	92.48	97.23	90.43	21.19	107.52	36.70	467.00	89.96 to 94.12	113,833	102,937
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	391	92.99	98.64	91.51	20.75	107.79	50.25	490.21	91.55 to 95.92	115,769	105,941
<u>ALL</u>	758	92.65	97.50	90.89	20.86	107.27	36.70	490.21	91.18 to 94.26	115,680	105,141

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	641	92.57	96.32	90.94	19.26	105.92	37.27	467.00	91.02 to 94.10	114,548	104,167
05	5	98.83	101.21	93.04	37.62	108.78	50.92	169.03	N/A	58,900	54,799
06	28	92.52	98.87	92.63	17.67	106.74	71.47	219.23	86.53 to 97.50	87,475	81,025
10	33	92.58	94.43	90.08	15.56	104.83	65.66	165.11	84.08 to 100.00	197,806	178,187
15	28	92.46	92.38	89.32	20.08	103.43	52.26	204.09	80.59 to 98.70	134,821	120,429
20	23	100.00	138.50	93.18	67.29	148.64	36.70	490.21	73.56 to 114.20	52,763	49,163
<u>ALL</u>	758	92.65	97.50	90.89	20.86	107.27	36.70	490.21	91.18 to 94.26	115,680	105,141

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	758	92.65	97.50	90.89	20.86	107.27	36.70	490.21	91.18 to 94.26	115,680	105,141
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	758	92.65	97.50	90.89	20.86	107.27	36.70	490.21	91.18 to 94.26	115,680	105,141

01 Adams
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 758
 Total Sales Price : 87,642,147
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 87,685,147
 Total Assessed Value : 79,696,905
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 115,680
 Avg. Assessed Value : 105,141

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 91
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 20.86
 PRD : 107.27

COV : 37.78
 STD : 36.84
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 490.21
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.70

95% Median C.I. : 91.18 to 94.26
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.60 to 92.18
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.88 to 100.12

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:27PM

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	2	132.00	132.00	182.91	50.00	72.17	66.00	198.00	N/A	17,500	32,010	
Less Than 15,000	15	189.94	219.28	216.18	55.97	101.43	66.00	490.21	102.50 to 312.02	10,257	22,173	
Less Than 30,000	55	121.25	154.52	138.94	50.66	111.21	36.70	490.21	100.12 to 160.58	19,425	26,990	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	756	92.65	97.41	90.85	20.73	107.22	36.70	490.21	91.18 to 94.26	115,939	105,335	
Greater Than 14,999	743	92.56	95.04	90.67	18.45	104.82	36.70	276.06	90.79 to 93.99	117,808	106,816	
Greater Than 29,999	703	91.58	93.04	90.30	16.88	103.03	37.27	251.92	90.08 to 93.07	123,210	111,255	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	132.00	132.00	182.91	50.00	72.17	66.00	198.00	N/A	17,500	32,010	
5,000 TO 14,999	13	189.94	232.71	225.98	59.22	102.98	87.99	490.21	102.50 to 411.69	9,142	20,660	
15,000 TO 29,999	40	111.84	130.23	125.95	36.06	103.40	36.70	276.06	100.00 to 149.10	22,864	28,796	
30,000 TO 59,999	128	100.11	107.49	105.15	25.08	102.23	50.25	251.92	98.35 to 104.21	46,093	48,469	
60,000 TO 99,999	209	92.13	92.29	91.93	16.23	100.39	37.27	165.11	88.74 to 94.61	78,532	72,192	
100,000 TO 149,999	165	86.87	87.49	87.57	14.21	99.91	52.43	134.58	84.07 to 89.65	121,497	106,393	
150,000 TO 249,999	148	90.22	88.92	88.76	11.78	100.18	53.10	134.78	85.93 to 92.12	189,683	168,364	
250,000 TO 499,999	51	92.58	89.87	89.23	10.12	100.72	62.42	137.81	88.64 to 94.44	296,098	264,202	
500,000 TO 999,999	2	89.85	89.85	89.91	04.62	99.93	85.70	93.99	N/A	541,273	486,660	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	758	92.65	97.50	90.89	20.86	107.27	36.70	490.21	91.18 to 94.26	115,680	105,141	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams County**

A. Residential Real Property

Adams County is located in south central Nebraska, about 15 miles south of Interstate 80. The largest city is Hastings. The City of Hastings is the major economic influence in the county and several of the smaller communities nearby could be termed “bedroom communities”. Hastings makes up one corner of the “Tri-Cities” along with Kearney and Grand Island.

The statistical sampling of 758 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Adams County. The measures of central tendency offer support for each other. All valuation groupings are within the acceptable range. The qualitative measures are above the acceptable range due to the fact that Adams County includes as many sales as possible causing some outliers to remain in the file. The statistics also reflect an influence on the COD due to low dollar sales.

Adams County is diligent in their sales review process. A sales verification document is mailed to the buyer of each parcel sold. If a discrepancy is perceived upon receipt of the verification document, the sale is physically inspected. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified residential sales within the county. It does not appear that any excessive trimming is being done in the sales file.

Adams County employs an appraisal department consisting of two appraisers and two full time assistant appraisers. Adams County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. For 2013 they physically inspected 400 parcels in the City of Hastings and all mobile homes in parks. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. They plan on completing their six year inspection timely.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Adams County will be reviewed in 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 93% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Adams 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Adams 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams County**

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 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.

2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Adams County

Spreadsheet analysis was completed on all sales.

All pickup work was completed.

Sales verifications were completed on the sales with questionnaires being mailed out to each buyer. If a discrepancy in the information was received, then the parcel was physically inspected.

New software training and learning and cleaning things up from transfer.

Updated land values in the NAD

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Adams County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Appraiser and Appraiser Associates	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Hastings – Large City, 3 high schools, very active business district
	2	Navy Ammunition Depot, Industrial and commercial area made up of federally released land that was formerly an ammunition depot, comprised of many concrete and dirt bunkers
	3	Villages and Rural – All commercial and industrial parcels not located inside the city limits of Hastings or located in the area designated as the NAD
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Sales comparison and cost mainly, income is used when available	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	On staff appraisers use costing and sales comparison, possibly from other counties, as well as hiring a contract appraiser to value ethanol plants previously.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
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?	
	CAMA	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	In 2008 all small town commercial lots were revalued using square foot method. The commercial lots on the major thoroughfares in Hastings were revalued for 2011 as studies showed that these areas were the most out of line.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Square foot and by acre	

01 Adams
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 73
Total Sales Price : 23,047,996
Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,047,996
Total Assessed Value : 23,837,990
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 315,726
Avg. Assessed Value : 326,548

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 103
MEAN : 109
COD : 36.57
PRD : 105.58

COV : 48.90
STD : 53.40
Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.08
MAX Sales Ratio : 303.77
MIN Sales Ratio : 36.53

95% Median C.I. : 89.23 to 102.01
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.97 to 125.88
95% Mean C.I. : 96.95 to 121.45

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:28PM

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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	118.13	144.85	124.50	34.96	116.35	99.80	207.69	N/A	357,100	444,591	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	84.94	100.34	164.98	32.86	60.82	68.41	198.94	68.41 to 198.94	532,000	877,670	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	86.47	90.69	71.44	24.84	126.95	65.49	124.34	N/A	351,250	250,938	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	113.72	108.47	108.45	09.77	100.02	75.56	121.23	N/A	118,146	128,125	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	78.99	86.86	95.73	31.99	90.73	42.52	156.75	42.52 to 156.75	551,250	527,694	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	88.30	88.30	86.49	15.54	102.09	74.58	102.01	N/A	190,000	164,330	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	13	90.53	101.97	85.39	31.85	119.42	49.59	303.77	70.42 to 100.02	116,093	99,134	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	7	97.67	91.11	52.34	37.04	174.07	36.53	188.50	36.53 to 188.50	365,714	191,421	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	123.39	137.27	88.11	44.78	155.79	63.22	239.10	N/A	359,764	316,996	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	111.47	121.30	109.08	47.57	111.20	43.56	200.15	43.56 to 200.15	117,000	127,619	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	6	96.63	112.09	96.52	41.28	116.13	60.87	193.09	60.87 to 193.09	415,250	400,818	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	7	115.43	136.56	119.52	39.95	114.26	68.11	252.95	68.11 to 252.95	369,000	441,019	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	20	100.00	111.57	130.98	29.88	85.18	65.49	207.69	79.48 to 120.87	348,662	456,668	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	30	90.05	94.50	81.03	32.14	116.62	36.53	303.77	70.42 to 98.91	295,307	239,297	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	23	105.98	126.32	104.30	45.90	121.11	43.56	252.95	84.76 to 160.95	313,720	327,206	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	23	90.39	95.74	115.99	27.83	82.54	42.52	198.94	69.42 to 110.99	417,293	483,998	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	26	96.94	103.43	71.76	35.42	144.13	36.53	303.77	74.58 to 100.82	226,472	162,513	
<u>ALL</u>	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	59	98.66	112.21	109.52	38.33	102.46	42.52	303.77	88.81 to 102.01	287,335	314,684	
03	14	98.59	96.51	86.49	29.17	111.59	36.53	212.30	63.22 to 118.13	435,374	376,547	
<u>ALL</u>	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
02	4	94.68	90.24	90.43	16.00	99.79	60.62	110.99	N/A	134,000	121,180	
03	67	98.91	111.60	106.12	37.87	105.16	42.52	303.77	88.81 to 105.98	277,045	293,988	
04	2	66.85	66.85	92.56	45.36	72.22	36.53	97.16	N/A	1,975,000	1,828,025	
<u>ALL</u>	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548	

01 Adams
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 73
 Total Sales Price : 23,047,996
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,047,996
 Total Assessed Value : 23,837,990
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 315,726
 Avg. Assessed Value : 326,548

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 103
 MEAN : 109
 COD : 36.57
 PRD : 105.58

COV : 48.90
 STD : 53.40
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.08
 MAX Sales Ratio : 303.77
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.53

95% Median C.I. : 89.23 to 102.01
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.97 to 125.88
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.95 to 121.45

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:28PM

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												
Less Than 30,000	6	169.52	177.82	172.29	34.55	103.21	105.80	303.77	105.80 to 303.77	21,750	37,473	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548	
Greater Than 14,999	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548	
Greater Than 29,999	67	96.21	103.06	103.04	33.37	100.02	36.53	252.95	79.79 to 100.02	342,052	352,435	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	6	169.52	177.82	172.29	34.55	103.21	105.80	303.77	105.80 to 303.77	21,750	37,473	
30,000 TO 59,999	9	100.00	108.83	110.66	20.34	98.35	68.11	188.50	89.56 to 118.13	44,167	48,874	
60,000 TO 99,999	19	97.67	105.21	104.19	31.49	100.98	49.59	198.63	68.41 to 121.23	79,275	82,600	
100,000 TO 149,999	14	84.30	99.53	98.31	43.57	101.24	42.52	252.95	60.62 to 124.34	120,444	118,413	
150,000 TO 249,999	10	98.79	111.68	107.57	30.79	103.82	72.03	239.10	74.58 to 156.75	189,906	204,276	
250,000 TO 499,999	7	70.42	89.67	89.13	43.95	100.61	36.53	207.69	36.53 to 207.69	319,143	284,439	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	8	98.58	98.55	104.72	30.96	94.11	46.28	198.94	46.28 to 198.94	1,899,313	1,989,036	
<u>ALL</u>	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548	

01 Adams
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 73
 Total Sales Price : 23,047,996
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,047,996
 Total Assessed Value : 23,837,990
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 315,726
 Avg. Assessed Value : 326,548

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 103
 MEAN : 109
 COD : 36.57
 PRD : 105.58

COV : 48.90
 STD : 53.40
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.08
 MAX Sales Ratio : 303.77
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.53

95% Median C.I. : 89.23 to 102.01
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.97 to 125.88
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.95 to 121.45

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:28PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	8	98.74	104.84	129.63	22.32	80.88	68.41	207.69	68.41 to 207.69	123,000	159,443
304	1	100.82	100.82	100.82	00.00	100.00	100.82	100.82	N/A	145,000	146,185
319	1	107.36	107.36	107.36	00.00	100.00	107.36	107.36	N/A	68,000	73,005
326	7	102.01	124.49	101.67	40.97	122.45	68.11	303.77	68.11 to 303.77	323,176	328,587
341	3	79.79	132.74	81.25	78.32	163.37	65.49	252.95	N/A	460,237	373,923
343	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	1,075,000	1,075,000
344	8	93.74	97.50	85.34	25.42	114.25	60.87	145.95	60.87 to 145.95	137,500	117,345
349	2	96.60	96.60	94.43	17.72	102.30	79.48	113.72	N/A	246,250	232,528
350	2	112.96	112.96	119.00	38.77	94.92	69.16	156.75	N/A	145,000	172,545
351	1	89.23	89.23	89.23	00.00	100.00	89.23	89.23	N/A	70,000	62,460
352	6	72.85	103.46	91.01	53.07	113.68	60.62	239.10	60.62 to 239.10	225,759	205,474
353	5	90.53	102.94	99.65	43.28	103.30	49.59	189.15	N/A	67,400	67,162
391	1	98.91	98.91	98.91	00.00	100.00	98.91	98.91	N/A	195,000	192,875
396	1	63.22	63.22	63.22	00.00	100.00	63.22	63.22	N/A	1,106,000	699,175
406	9	105.80	117.51	93.85	41.72	125.21	36.53	212.30	43.56 to 193.09	480,944	451,377
419	1	188.50	188.50	188.50	00.00	100.00	188.50	188.50	N/A	50,000	94,250
446	1	198.63	198.63	198.63	00.00	100.00	198.63	198.63	N/A	80,000	158,900
455	2	157.79	157.79	119.81	26.85	131.70	115.43	200.15	N/A	1,160,000	1,389,833
459	1	96.21	96.21	96.21	00.00	100.00	96.21	96.21	N/A	78,000	75,045
470	1	72.03	72.03	72.03	00.00	100.00	72.03	72.03	N/A	245,000	176,485
494	3	90.39	111.87	129.23	56.30	86.57	46.28	198.94	N/A	1,425,167	1,841,677
499	1	133.70	133.70	133.70	00.00	100.00	133.70	133.70	N/A	92,000	123,005
528	6	78.85	75.54	77.80	18.99	97.10	42.52	95.41	42.52 to 95.41	111,500	86,745
558	1	118.13	118.13	118.13	00.00	100.00	118.13	118.13	N/A	50,000	59,065
<u> </u> ALL <u> </u>	73	98.66	109.20	103.43	36.57	105.58	36.53	303.77	89.23 to 102.01	315,726	326,548

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Adams County is located in south central Nebraska, about 15 miles south of Interstate 80. The largest city is Hastings. The City of Hastings is the major economic influence in the county and several of the smaller communities nearby could be called “bedroom communities”. Hastings makes up one corner of the “Tri-Cities” along with Kearney and Grand Island.

The statistical sampling of 73 qualified commercial sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the commercial class of real property in Adams County. The calculated median is 99%. Two valuation groupings and twenty-four different occupancy codes are represented in the statistical profile providing sufficient information to determine a level of value.

Adams County is diligent in their sales review process. A sales verification document is mailed to the buyer of each parcel sold. If a discrepancy is perceived upon receipt of the verification document, the sale is physically inspected. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified commercial sales with the county. It does not appear that any excessive trimming is being done in the sales file.

Adams County employs an appraisal department consisting of two appraisers and two full time assistant appraisers. Adams County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Mini storage units were reviewed and they are currently in the process of doing the Hastings Downtown properties. They plan on completing their six year inspection timely.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Adams County will be reviewed in 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% of market value for the commercial class of real property. There is no information available to believe that the commercial class of property is not being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Adams 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.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams County**

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 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.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Adams County

All sales were plotted and potential market areas reviewed.

All pickup work was completed.

Reviewed ag land usage for the south 4 townships.

Sales verifications were completed on the sales with questionnaires being mailed out to each buyer. If a discrepancy in the information was received, then the parcel was physically inspected.

As a result of spreadsheet analysis, irrigated land was increased for all LCGs by 25%, all dryland acres were increased by 45%, and some grassland LCGs were increased. Shelterbelt values were also updated, as well as WRP values.

New software training and learning and cleaning things up from transfer.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Adams County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Head appraiser and appraisal staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Similar soils, NRD, and topography, no economic differences have been discerned
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Sales are annually plotted and reviewed to determine any differences across the county. Sales are analyzed each year to determine if market areas need to be created or adjusted.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Sales are reviewed for any recreational influence.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Yes, same value	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are reviewed, especially surrounding the city of Hastings and along highways.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	No	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	Sales comparison approach using comparables that have sold with WRP easements (if available).	

01 Adams
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 60
Total Sales Price : 35,796,164
Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,741,164
Total Assessed Value : 23,541,122
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 595,686
Avg. Assessed Value : 392,352

MEDIAN : 75
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 76
COD : 26.68
PRD : 116.03

COV : 32.49
STD : 24.83
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.96
MAX Sales Ratio : 133.54
MIN Sales Ratio : 32.70

95% Median C.I. : 65.14 to 82.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.25 to 77.49
95% Mean C.I. : 70.15 to 82.71

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:29PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	104.48	99.74	100.90	18.07	98.85	68.28	133.54	N/A	267,744	270,151	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	87.47	89.52	96.69	15.61	92.58	62.25	128.25	76.85 to 109.86	618,833	598,324	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	82.88	82.88	82.88	00.00	100.00	82.88	82.88	N/A	730,500	605,460	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	88.40	88.40	88.40	00.00	100.00	88.40	88.40	N/A	646,279	571,290	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	13	90.38	91.58	80.20	21.71	114.19	63.38	129.83	65.65 to 113.49	402,732	322,982	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	64.31	63.70	60.62	16.58	105.08	44.03	79.68	44.03 to 79.68	525,109	318,303	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	67.13	67.13	55.11	26.19	121.81	49.55	84.71	N/A	632,000	348,313	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	70.07	64.29	59.99	08.52	107.17	52.45	70.36	N/A	469,667	281,767	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	51.65	57.39	54.03	22.15	106.22	32.70	108.27	46.85 to 65.14	477,260	257,864	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	50.90	58.21	40.50	27.47	143.73	32.76	89.46	32.76 to 89.46	1,448,656	586,759	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	38.40	38.40	38.40	00.00	100.00	38.40	38.40	N/A	1,594,800	612,375	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	69.97	69.97	69.97	00.00	100.00	69.97	69.97	N/A	100,000	69,970	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	18	87.87	91.93	95.66	16.89	96.10	62.25	133.54	77.12 to 104.48	529,037	506,060	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	24	72.06	79.16	69.18	25.22	114.43	44.03	129.83	64.16 to 90.38	460,798	318,771	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	18	50.90	57.31	44.74	25.09	128.10	32.70	108.27	49.27 to 65.14	842,185	376,752	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	26	87.87	90.25	89.10	18.11	101.29	62.25	129.83	77.12 to 103.16	516,133	459,888	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	21	56.12	61.10	56.91	21.92	107.36	32.70	108.27	50.37 to 70.07	504,583	287,161	
<u>ALL</u>	60	74.80	76.43	65.87	26.68	116.03	32.70	133.54	65.14 to 82.32	595,686	392,352	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
4000	60	74.80	76.43	65.87	26.68	116.03	32.70	133.54	65.14 to 82.32	595,686	392,352	
<u>ALL</u>	60	74.80	76.43	65.87	26.68	116.03	32.70	133.54	65.14 to 82.32	595,686	392,352	

01 Adams
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 60
Total Sales Price : 35,796,164
Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,741,164
Total Assessed Value : 23,541,122
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 595,686
Avg. Assessed Value : 392,352

MEDIAN : 75
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 76
COD : 26.68
PRD : 116.03

COV : 32.49
STD : 24.83
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.96
MAX Sales Ratio : 133.54
MIN Sales Ratio : 32.70

95% Median C.I. : 65.14 to 82.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.25 to 77.49
95% Mean C.I. : 70.15 to 82.71

Printed:3/25/2013 2:47:29PM

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
Irrigated											
County	16	75.35	74.67	69.93	22.68	106.78	46.85	128.25	51.27 to 88.40	554,750	387,931
4000	16	75.35	74.67	69.93	22.68	106.78	46.85	128.25	51.27 to 88.40	554,750	387,931
Dry											
County	3	76.85	78.96	78.84	26.68	100.15	49.27	110.76	N/A	168,067	132,503
4000	3	76.85	78.96	78.84	26.68	100.15	49.27	110.76	N/A	168,067	132,503
Grass											
County	3	89.46	90.64	86.28	21.60	105.05	62.25	120.20	N/A	200,000	172,569
4000	3	89.46	90.64	86.28	21.60	105.05	62.25	120.20	N/A	200,000	172,569
ALL	60	74.80	76.43	65.87	26.68	116.03	32.70	133.54	65.14 to 82.32	595,686	392,352

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	38	72.06	74.05	65.30	25.33	113.40	32.76	133.54	63.38 to 82.32	786,176	513,338
4000	38	72.06	74.05	65.30	25.33	113.40	32.76	133.54	63.38 to 82.32	786,176	513,338
Dry											
County	4	63.06	67.40	64.89	41.88	103.87	32.70	110.76	N/A	180,650	117,231
4000	4	63.06	67.40	64.89	41.88	103.87	32.70	110.76	N/A	180,650	117,231
Grass											
County	3	89.46	90.64	86.28	21.60	105.05	62.25	120.20	N/A	200,000	172,569
4000	3	89.46	90.64	86.28	21.60	105.05	62.25	120.20	N/A	200,000	172,569
ALL	60	74.80	76.43	65.87	26.68	116.03	32.70	133.54	65.14 to 82.32	595,686	392,352

Adams County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Adams	4000	4,190	4,090	3,625	3,190	2,595	2,570	2,370	2,130	3,787
Hall	1	4,096	4,099	3,512	3,498	2,553	2,551	2,420	2,420	3,631
Hamilton	1	5,000	5,000	4,700	4,400	4,200	4,100	3,900	3,900	4,822
Clay	1	4,210	4,200	3,650	3,500	2,720	N/A	2,520	2,350	3,853
Nuckolls	1	4,100	4,100	2,850	2,585	2,450	1,950	1,900	1,900	3,577
Webster	1	2,475	2,475	2,475	2,475	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,453
Franklin	2	3,040	3,049	2,898	2,883	2,362	2,133	2,337	2,293	2,866
Kearney	1	N/A	3,585	2,930	2,675	1,780	1,210	1,210	910	2,932

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Adams	4000	2,075	2,075	1,755	1,595	1,595	1,595	1,450	1,450	1,902
Hall	1	2,047	2,046	1,809	1,802	1,365	1,347	1,205	1,204	1,763
Hamilton	1	2,500	2,500	2,200	2,100	2,000	1,900	1,900	1,800	2,315
Clay	1	2,750	2,600	2,290	2,055	1,900	N/A	1,750	1,750	2,379
Nuckolls	1	1,775	1,775	1,447	1,449	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,631
Webster	1	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,450	1,450	1,545
Franklin	2	1,485	1,485	1,255	1,255	1,130	1,020	975	975	1,343
Kearney	1	N/A	1,600	1,500	1,400	850	650	650	500	1,348

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Adams	4000	945	945	945	885	760	760	760	760	818
Hall	1	1,555	1,556	1,221	1,224	896	896	892	897	1,002
Hamilton	1	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	900	900	956
Clay	1	1,000	1,000	950	950	900	N/A	850	825	880
Nuckolls	1	730	743	639	743	750	270	748	706	719
Webster	1	765	765	765	765	765	765	765	765	765
Franklin	2	815	805	725	710	700	700	650	650	670
Kearney	1	N/A	600	600	600	600	600	600	550	592

Source: 2013 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

2013 Correlation Section for Adams County

A. Agricultural Land

Adams County is comprised of approximately 69% irrigated land, 17% dry crop land and 14% grass/pasture land. Adams County is part of the Central Loess Plains Major Land Resource Area. The average annual precipitation in this area is 23 to 36 inches. The dominant soil order in this MLRA is Mollisols. Adams County is included in both the Upper Big Blue Natural Resource District and the Little Blue Natural Resource District. Adams County has one market area. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination.

A statistical sampling of sixty qualified sales was used to determine the level of value in Adams County. Comparable sales were selected from the same general agricultural market all within six miles of the subject county. The inclusion of the comparable sales ensured that the acceptable thresholds for adequacy, time and majority land use were met. The calculated median for the county is 74.8%. The statistical sample is comprised of 66% irrigated sales, 15% dry sales and 18% grass sales.

The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. The 80% MLU provides the more representative sampling. The 80% MLU reveals that the irrigated subclass falls within the acceptable range but with so few sales of dry and grass in Adams County, these two subclasses are unreliable for statistical inference.

A review of the neighboring counties shows that the 2013 values in Adams County appear to be a transitional point. They are in between the higher values to the east and the lower values to the west. All three classes contain values that average between Clay and Kearney Counties. North to south the irrigated values relate closely to Hall County's values while the dry and grass values average between Hall and Webster Counties. In response to the increasing agricultural market trends in Adams and comparable counties, irrigated values were increased 25%, dry values were increased 45% and grass values were increased 5%. It is believed that Adams County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization. Although the COD and PRD are above the acceptable range, the quality statistics support the level of value and give confidence to the reported assessment actions.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 75% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams 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.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Adams 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Adams County**

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 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 : 16,110	Value : 2,466,689,880	Growth 17,094,008	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	841	6,090,335	89	1,375,840	42	443,285	972	7,909,460	
02. Res Improve Land	9,267	95,629,500	655	16,393,275	601	12,224,725	10,523	124,247,500	
03. Res Improvements	9,267	667,333,950	655	114,748,300	601	67,859,260	10,523	849,941,510	
04. Res Total	10,108	769,053,785	744	132,517,415	643	80,527,270	11,495	982,098,470	10,906,995
% of Res Total	87.93	78.31	6.47	13.49	5.59	8.20	71.35	39.81	63.81
05. Com UnImp Land	243	6,839,925	54	932,810	43	918,305	340	8,691,040	
06. Com Improve Land	1,035	48,056,845	87	5,399,295	87	2,790,375	1,209	56,246,515	
07. Com Improvements	1,035	222,576,465	87	24,773,095	87	18,241,555	1,209	265,591,115	
08. Com Total	1,278	277,473,235	141	31,105,200	130	21,950,235	1,549	330,528,670	3,142,410
% of Com Total	82.50	83.95	9.10	9.41	8.39	6.64	9.62	13.40	18.38
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	112,000	13	537,970	6	131,455	20	781,425	
10. Ind Improve Land	13	1,283,010	27	2,400,660	13	507,360	53	4,191,030	
11. Ind Improvements	13	9,935,955	27	49,294,190	13	6,024,000	53	65,254,145	
12. Ind Total	14	11,330,965	40	52,232,820	19	6,662,815	73	70,226,600	484,000
% of Ind Total	19.18	16.13	54.79	74.38	26.03	9.49	0.45	2.85	2.83
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	5	248,845	5	248,845	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	41,010	1	41,010	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	9,965	1	9,965	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	6	299,820	6	299,820	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.04	0.01	0.00
Res & Rec Total	10,108	769,053,785	744	132,517,415	649	80,827,090	11,501	982,398,290	10,906,995
% of Res & Rec Total	87.89	78.28	6.47	13.49	5.64	8.23	71.39	39.83	63.81
Com & Ind Total	1,292	288,804,200	181	83,338,020	149	28,613,050	1,622	400,755,270	3,626,410
% of Com & Ind Total	79.65	72.06	11.16	20.80	9.19	7.14	10.07	16.25	21.21
17. Taxable Total	11,400	1,057,857,985	925	215,855,435	798	109,440,140	13,123	1,383,153,560	14,533,405
% of Taxable Total	86.87	76.48	7.05	15.61	6.08	7.91	81.46	56.07	85.02

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	64	349,085	5,895,030	0	0	0
19. Commercial	33	3,132,445	14,023,865	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	1	36,075	14,500	65	385,160	5,909,530
19. Commercial	1	1,485	3,085	34	3,133,930	14,026,950
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				99	3,519,090	19,936,480

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
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	832	59	582	1,473

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	26	1,869,525	280	88,900,880	1,835	609,506,000	2,141	700,276,405
28. Ag-Improved Land	8	658,115	80	25,417,975	729	283,806,935	817	309,883,025
29. Ag Improvements	8	916,775	82	8,742,285	756	63,717,830	846	73,376,890
30. Ag Total							2,987	1,083,536,320

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	4	4.50	73,435	52	56.00	953,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	4	0.00	780,130	52	0.00	6,024,495	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	26.27	61,540	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	7	21.66	81,820	71	170.99	683,060	
37. FarmSite Improvements	7	0.00	136,645	73	0.00	2,717,790	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	10.26	0	0	657.47	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	8.33	2,040	0	122.89	30,115	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	464	519.74	6,646,385	520	580.24	7,672,820	
33. HomeSite Improvements	464	0.00	39,474,950	520	0.00	46,279,575	1,837,598
34. HomeSite Total				520	580.24	53,952,395	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	22	44.83	195,895	25	71.10	257,435	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	683	1,650.14	5,979,645	761	1,842.79	6,744,525	
37. FarmSite Improvements	710	0.00	24,242,880	790	0.00	27,097,315	723,005
38. FarmSite Total				815	1,913.89	34,099,275	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,289.63	0	0	6,957.36	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	542.09	130,730	0	673.31	162,885	
41. Total Section VI				1,335	10,124.80	88,214,555	2,560,603

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	64,180	1	160.00	64,180

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 4000

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	69,494.03	30.79%	291,180,040	34.07%	4,190.00
46. 1A	98,489.64	43.64%	402,822,910	47.13%	4,090.00
47. 2A1	8,584.82	3.80%	31,120,585	3.64%	3,625.07
48. 2A	16,478.67	7.30%	52,567,050	6.15%	3,190.01
49. 3A1	7,047.22	3.12%	18,287,545	2.14%	2,595.00
50. 3A	1,781.04	0.79%	4,577,270	0.54%	2,570.00
51. 4A1	14,382.07	6.37%	34,085,545	3.99%	2,370.00
52. 4A	9,434.34	4.18%	20,095,245	2.35%	2,130.01
53. Total	225,691.83	100.00%	854,736,190	100.00%	3,787.18
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,924.72	22.00%	24,744,260	24.00%	2,075.04
55. 1D	24,056.18	44.38%	49,917,895	48.42%	2,075.05
56. 2D1	2,197.32	4.05%	3,856,330	3.74%	1,755.02
57. 2D	6,338.58	11.69%	10,110,240	9.81%	1,595.03
58. 3D1	2,544.99	4.70%	4,059,255	3.94%	1,595.00
59. 3D	295.68	0.55%	471,625	0.46%	1,595.05
60. 4D1	4,507.04	8.32%	6,535,450	6.34%	1,450.05
61. 4D	2,337.03	4.31%	3,388,840	3.29%	1,450.06
62. Total	54,201.54	100.00%	103,083,895	100.00%	1,901.86
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,849.89	4.05%	1,748,190	4.68%	945.02
64. 1G	3,672.33	8.05%	3,470,560	9.30%	945.06
65. 2G1	5,401.05	11.84%	5,104,105	13.67%	945.02
66. 2G	5,087.67	11.15%	4,502,740	12.06%	885.03
67. 3G1	1,679.27	3.68%	1,276,215	3.42%	759.98
68. 3G	1,751.94	3.84%	1,331,460	3.57%	759.99
69. 4G1	4,513.48	9.89%	3,430,270	9.19%	760.01
70. 4G	21,676.51	47.50%	16,474,140	44.12%	760.00
71. Total	45,632.14	100.00%	37,337,680	100.00%	818.23
Irrigated Total					
	225,691.83	69.17%	854,736,190	85.88%	3,787.18
Dry Total					
	54,201.54	16.61%	103,083,895	10.36%	1,901.86
Grass Total					
	45,632.14	13.98%	37,337,680	3.75%	818.23
72. Waste	780.91	0.24%	164,000	0.02%	210.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	320.38	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	326,306.42	100.00%	995,321,765	100.00%	3,050.27

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	527.86	2,112,805	25,496.79	100,101,055	199,667.18	752,522,330	225,691.83	854,736,190
77. Dry Land	64.77	131,870	5,766.23	11,301,935	48,370.54	91,650,090	54,201.54	103,083,895
78. Grass	143.11	125,670	1,358.86	1,157,880	44,130.17	36,054,130	45,632.14	37,337,680
79. Waste	0.00	0	144.14	30,270	636.77	133,730	780.91	164,000
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	27.97	0	292.41	0	320.38	0
82. Total	735.74	2,370,345	32,766.02	112,591,140	292,804.66	880,360,280	326,306.42	995,321,765

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	225,691.83	69.17%	854,736,190	85.88%	3,787.18
Dry Land	54,201.54	16.61%	103,083,895	10.36%	1,901.86
Grass	45,632.14	13.98%	37,337,680	3.75%	818.23
Waste	780.91	0.24%	164,000	0.02%	210.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	320.38	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	326,306.42	100.00%	995,321,765	100.00%	3,050.27

2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2012 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

01 Adams

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	967,969,720	982,098,470	14,128,750	1.46%	10,906,995	0.33%
02. Recreational	157,815	299,820	142,005	89.98%	0	89.98%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	51,716,545	53,952,395	2,235,850	4.32%	1,837,598	0.77%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	1,019,844,080	1,036,350,685	16,506,605	1.62%	12,744,593	0.37%
05. Commercial	327,673,065	330,528,670	2,855,605	0.87%	3,142,410	-0.09%
06. Industrial	69,651,235	70,226,600	575,365	0.83%	484,000	0.13%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	35,466,795	34,099,275	-1,367,520	-3.86%	723,005	-5.89%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	432,791,095	434,854,545	2,063,450	0.48%	4,349,415	-0.53%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	1,452,635,175	1,471,368,115	18,732,940	1.29%	17,094,008	0.11%
11. Irrigated	677,652,010	854,736,190	177,084,180	26.13%		
12. Dryland	72,926,640	103,083,895	30,157,255	41.35%		
13. Grassland	36,162,575	37,337,680	1,175,105	3.25%		
14. Wasteland	165,355	164,000	-1,355	-0.82%		
15. Other Agland	222,415	0	-222,415	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	787,128,995	995,321,765	208,192,770	26.45%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	2,239,764,170	2,466,689,880	226,925,710	10.13%	17,094,008	9.37%

Adams County Assessor's Office

Three Year Plan

June 25, 2012

Adams County

Assessor's Office Overview

Introduction:

Required by law- pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9

The Purpose: To submit a plan to the County Board of Equalization and to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before July 31st of each year. The plan describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and the two years thereafter. This plan is required every 3 years and an update to the plan is required between the adoptions of each 3 year plan.

General Description of Office:

There are approximately 16,138 parcels in Adams County. There is an average of 400-500 permits per year. There are approximately 2,500 personal property schedules filed and 1,000 homestead exemptions forms processed per year.

The office staff consists of the assessor, two licensed appraisers, two associate appraisers and three full time office clerks. The assessor supervises all proceedings in the office. The appraisers oversee the valuation process for residential, agricultural and commercial parcels. The associate appraisers help with the valuation for the residential, agricultural and commercial properties and do the pick-up work for the commercial parcels and the urban, suburban and rural residential parcels. The three office clerks handle the everyday occurrences at the front counter; taking personal property schedules and homestead exemptions, one of the office clerks is responsible for personal property and one of the clerks is responsible for the real estate transfer statements.

Budgeting:

The proposed budget for 2012-2013 is \$447,131. The county board accommodates for a GIS technician through the Information & Technology budget.

Responsibilities of Assessment:

Record Maintenance:

Mapping - Cadastral maps are updated weekly as the real estate transfers are processed. The maps are in poor condition, but with the implementation of GIS, the information will be available electronically. All of the books have been redone.

Property Record Cards - Cards contain all improvement information about the property including the required legal description, ownership, and valuation.

Reports Files:

Abstract- Due March 19th
 Certification of Values- August 20th
 School District Taxable Value Report- August 25th
 Generate Tax Roll- November 22nd
 Certificate of Taxes Levied- December 1st

Filing for Homestead Exemptions:

Applications for homestead exemptions are accepted from February 1st – June 30th.

Filing Personal Property:

Applications for personal property are accepted from January 1st – May 1st. After which there is a 10% penalty until August 1st when the penalty changes to 25%.

Real Property:

Adams County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Values	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	11,532	71%	\$970,052,730	43%
Commercial	1,547	9%	\$327,574,455	15%
Industrial	74	1%	\$72,316,605	3%
Recreational	5	0%	\$157,815	0%
Agricultural	2980	19%	\$875,898,560	39%
Total	16138	100%	\$2,246,000,165	100%

Agricultural land is 39% of the real property valuation base and 86 % of that is assessed as irrigated.

The residential parcels in Hastings, the small villages, and the large rural subdivisions were reappraised in 2000. The rural residential and commercial parcels were reappraised in 2001 and the agland and mobile home reappraisal was completed in 2002. Exterior inspections were done at these times. Values were put into the micro solve system.

Pick-up Work:

Pick-up work will be done from November through January of the next year.

Sales File:

The real estate transfer statements (521s) are filed within 45 days of receiving them from the Register of Deeds. They are recorded on the Property Record Cards, in the computer, in the assessment books and in the cadastral maps.

A sales review of residential, commercial and rural properties will be completed for the sales file. A questionnaire is sent to each sold property and an inspection is performed if needed.

2012 Plan of Assessment

Adams County Assessor's Office

Ratio studies are done on all the sales beginning in September of each year. The sales are entered on excel spreadsheets and ratios run on each property type and market area. These studies are used to determine the areas that are out of compliance and need reviewing for the next assessment cycle.

Continual market analysis will be conducted each year in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Adams County is in compliance with state statutes.

Assessment Actions Planned for the 2013 Roll Year:

Implementation of new CAMA software will take place, replacing the two current systems. With the implementation of Tyler (Orion), some neighborhood reviews were moved back in order for the appraisal staff to individually go through every property record card and correct all the information in Tyler (Orion). The two NW Hastings neighborhoods were done.

During the transfer of information from our former Terra Scan system and AS400 system, some values, drawings and other information was found to be incorrect. All properties will be drawn and values will be verified on the property record card as well as in the Tyler (Orion) system. We will also be scanning all property record card information into Tyler (Orion) as well.

Residential:

The south two Hastings neighborhoods (approximately 1890 parcels) will be reviewed. The physical review consists of checking measurements, qualities, conditions, and interior information. If there is no one present at the property, door hangers are left and appointments for a review are set up if needed. The physical reviews will consist of checking measurements, quality, condition and interior information. If there is not anyone home, door hangers are left and appointments for review are set up if needed. Sales reviews and pick-up work for all residential parcels will be completed by March 1, 2013.

Agricultural Land:

An ag-land sales review will be completed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available.

Commercial:

There will be a physical review of the Hastings market areas or occupancy codes most out of compliance. The downtown Hastings neighborhood will be physically reviewed. The physical review will consist of checking measurements, occupancy codes, quality, condition, and interior information. Commercial sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed by March 1, 2013.

GIS:

The GIS system will continue to be maintained, fine-tuned and improved. The ag-land use layer will be started.

Assessment Actions Planned for the 2014 Roll Year:

Residential:

Hastings neighborhoods will be physically reviewed. These neighborhoods will be selected by analyzing the sales data, and reviewing the neighborhoods that are most out of compliance. The physical review consists of checking measurements, qualities, conditions, and interior information. If there is no one present at the property, door hangers are left and appointments for a review are set up if needed. Sales reviews and pick-up work for all residential parcels will be completed by March 1, 2014.

Agricultural Land:

An ag-land sales review will be completed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available. A physical review of the ag-land properties will be completed to verify the land use.

Commercial:

There will be a physical review of the Hastings market areas or occupancy codes most out of compliance. The physical review will consist of checking measurements, occupancy codes, quality, condition, and interior information. Commercial sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed by March 1, 2014.

GIS:

The GIS system will continue to be maintained, fine-tuned and improved. Building the ag-land use layer will continue.

Assessment Actions Planned for the 2015 Roll Year:

Residential:

Hastings neighborhoods will be physically reviewed. These neighborhoods will be selected by analyzing the sales data, and reviewing the neighborhoods that are most out of compliance. The physical review consists of checking measurements, qualities, conditions, and interior information. If there is no one present at the property, door hangers are left and appointments for a review are set up if needed. Sales reviews and pick-up work for all residential parcels will be completed by March 1, 2015.

Agricultural Land:

An ag-land sales review will be completed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available. A physical review of the ag-land properties will be completed to verify the land use.

Commercial:

There will be a physical review of the Hastings market areas or occupancy codes most out of compliance. The physical review will consist of checking measurements, occupancy codes, quality, condition, and interior information. Commercial sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed by March 1, 2015.

GIS:

The GIS system will continue to be maintained, fine-tuned and improved. Building the ag-land use layer will continue.

2013 Assessment Survey for Adams County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	4
3.	Other full-time employees:
	3
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$447,131.00
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$136,080
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	Separate IT Department, however, the assessor does budget \$25,000 for Tyler support, Tyler maintenance, Apex maintenance and GIS maintenance
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$4000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$17,317.27

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Tyler Technologies
2.	CAMA software:
	Tyler Technologies
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Office Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, http://assessor.adamscounty.org/Appraisal/PublicAccess/
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Ron, IT Dept
8.	Personal Property software:
	Tyler Technologies

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All towns
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

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

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Adams County has employed outside contract appraisers in the past for ethanol plants.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Certified General license
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	The appraisals help to establish an assessed value or resolve protested property's value.

2013 Certification for Adams County

This is to certify that the 2013 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 Adams County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

