

# 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 Box Butte County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	244	Median	94.34
Total Sales Price	\$24,212,164	Mean	98.93
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$24,176,664	Wgt. Mean	93.57
Total Assessed Value	\$22,621,650	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$66,175
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$99,085	Avg. Assessed Value	\$92,712

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.26 to 97.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.36 to 95.78
95% Mean C.I	92.93 to 104.93
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	34.58
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.44
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.63

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	177	96	95.63
2011	205	96	96
2010	305	97	97
2009	385	99	99

## 2013 Commission Summary for Box Butte County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	23	Median	97.62
Total Sales Price	\$3,654,500	Mean	104.54
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,634,500	Wgt. Mean	100.59
Total Assessed Value	\$3,655,904	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$146,864
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$158,022	Avg. Assessed Value	\$158,952

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.49 to 99.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.99 to 106.19
95% Mean C.I	92.76 to 116.32
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.76
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.10

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	21	93	92.57
2011	15	93	93
2010	48	95	95
2009	48	95	95



## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Box Butte 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>94</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>69</b>	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  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Box Butte County**

The Assessor and her staff continued reviewing Alliance residential properties where they already had made appointments. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, the residential review will not be completed until assessment year 2014.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Stanard Appraisal, the Assessor and her staff.	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Alliance—includes residential properties within the city of Alliance and what would technically be classified as suburban (since there is no separate suburban market within the County).
	20	Hemingford—residential properties within the town of Hemingford and its environs.
	81	Rural Res 1—all rural residential properties that are close in proximity and have ready access to the paved roads within the County (Hwy 385, Hwy 2, Hwy 87, Hwy 71, 10 <sup>th</sup> Street West, and County Road 70).
	82	Rural Res 2—rural residential properties that do not meet the criteria of Area 1, nor are in any of the Rainbow Acres subdivisions.
	83	Rainbow Acres—only those rural residential properties that are within the Rainbow subdivisions.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Replacement cost new—minus depreciation based on market.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Grp 10 (Alliance) 2006; Grp 20 (Hemingford) 2009; All 81, 82 and 83 (rural residential) 2008	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	The County uses both, but adjusts the CAMA tables with local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The CAMA depreciation tables show 2011 for Alliance (Grp 10); 2001 for Hemingford (Grp 20); and Rural (Grps 81, 82 & 83) show 2008.	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	When the valuation grouping was last physically reviewed (see #4 above).	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	The methodology used is the market approach, and the lots are then value by square foot.	

**07 Box Butte**

**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 : 244  
 Total Sales Price : 24,212,164  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,176,664  
 Total Assessed Value : 22,621,650  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 99,085  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 92,712

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 94  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 19.56  
 PRD : 105.73

COV : 48.33  
 STD : 47.81  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.45  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 746.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.24

95% Median C.I. : 92.26 to 97.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.36 to 95.78  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.93 to 104.93

Printed:3/26/2013 2:53:24PM

**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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	29	89.40	90.63	90.86	17.00	99.75	50.61	138.05	82.51 to 99.49	127,978	116,275
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	17	94.32	89.82	93.08	11.13	96.50	35.24	107.20	82.06 to 98.58	99,059	92,202
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	31	94.38	118.84	96.42	36.05	123.25	71.00	746.53	89.49 to 102.09	97,726	94,225
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	31	95.62	99.63	95.73	15.46	104.07	67.86	156.32	91.89 to 103.39	91,042	87,158
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	33	100.72	102.68	95.72	18.31	107.27	58.26	205.40	89.44 to 107.99	94,147	90,115
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	31	98.02	102.41	95.95	20.03	106.73	64.70	211.06	89.44 to 102.54	106,548	102,234
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	40	95.00	95.01	94.13	17.94	100.93	44.61	146.50	88.81 to 102.02	80,466	75,745
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	32	90.01	89.02	87.44	14.08	101.81	57.85	170.00	81.23 to 94.57	103,157	90,205
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	108	94.34	101.18	93.91	21.03	107.74	35.24	746.53	91.89 to 97.50	104,140	97,799
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	136	94.13	97.15	93.27	18.43	104.16	44.61	211.06	90.99 to 98.03	95,070	88,672
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	112	96.25	104.36	95.50	21.54	109.28	35.24	746.53	93.14 to 98.70	95,024	90,751
<u>ALL</u>	244	94.34	98.93	93.57	19.56	105.73	35.24	746.53	92.26 to 97.40	99,085	92,712

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
10	198	93.82	95.20	92.80	15.35	102.59	35.24	170.00	91.30 to 95.62	96,248	89,319
20	24	99.95	135.39	102.13	54.70	132.57	44.61	746.53	87.09 to 111.17	76,510	78,136
81	6	94.73	93.89	91.98	15.72	102.08	58.26	118.59	58.26 to 118.59	136,317	125,381
82	15	98.02	93.14	94.01	13.62	99.07	65.79	115.21	71.98 to 104.63	160,023	150,443
83	1	80.40	80.40	80.40	00.00	100.00	80.40	80.40	N/A	65,000	52,262
<u>ALL</u>	244	94.34	98.93	93.57	19.56	105.73	35.24	746.53	92.26 to 97.40	99,085	92,712

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	241	94.35	99.10	93.61	19.65	105.86	35.24	746.53	92.26 to 97.45	99,463	93,103
06											
07	3	80.40	85.74	89.24	08.32	96.08	78.37	98.45	N/A	68,667	61,281
<u>ALL</u>	244	94.34	98.93	93.57	19.56	105.73	35.24	746.53	92.26 to 97.40	99,085	92,712

**07 Box Butte  
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 : 244  
 Total Sales Price : 24,212,164  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,176,664  
 Total Assessed Value : 22,621,650  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 99,085  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 92,712

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 94  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 19.56  
 PRD : 105.73

COV : 48.33  
 STD : 47.81  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.45  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 746.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.24

95% Median C.I. : 92.26 to 97.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.36 to 95.78  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.93 to 104.93

Printed:3/26/2013 2:53:24PM

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	1	746.53	746.53	746.53	00.00	100.00	746.53	746.53	N/A	3,600	26,875	
Less Than 15,000	6	98.22	206.91	152.47	155.92	135.71	44.61	746.53	44.61 to 746.53	8,405	12,815	
Less Than 30,000	17	125.43	160.62	137.19	56.42	117.08	44.61	746.53	85.14 to 170.00	17,349	23,800	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	243	94.33	96.27	93.47	16.79	103.00	35.24	211.06	92.20 to 97.40	99,478	92,983	
Greater Than 14,999	238	94.34	96.21	93.45	15.96	102.95	35.24	211.06	92.26 to 97.40	101,371	94,726	
Greater Than 29,999	227	93.77	94.31	93.03	14.61	101.38	35.24	205.40	91.78 to 95.62	105,206	97,872	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	746.53	746.53	746.53	00.00	100.00	746.53	746.53	N/A	3,600	26,875	
5,000 TO 14,999	5	71.00	98.98	106.80	68.54	92.68	44.61	208.18	N/A	9,366	10,003	
15,000 TO 29,999	11	127.56	135.38	134.04	20.11	101.00	85.14	211.06	101.61 to 170.00	22,227	29,792	
30,000 TO 59,999	30	100.67	105.69	103.98	21.88	101.64	35.24	205.40	93.60 to 111.17	41,728	43,391	
60,000 TO 99,999	85	93.87	95.48	95.33	14.63	100.16	50.61	150.14	89.35 to 97.73	81,304	77,505	
100,000 TO 149,999	73	89.49	89.44	89.25	12.39	100.21	58.26	116.40	84.36 to 94.35	118,825	106,049	
150,000 TO 249,999	37	93.77	91.41	91.80	10.82	99.58	61.44	116.74	89.44 to 98.57	170,266	156,311	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	105.61	105.61	107.70	07.19	98.06	98.02	113.20	N/A	372,500	401,179	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	244	94.34	98.93	93.57	19.56	105.73	35.24	746.53	92.26 to 97.40	99,085	92,712	



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Box Butte County as of 2010 had a population of 11,308, and the major occupations are found in transportation (BNSF railroad), education, finance and agriculture. Alliance as the County seat probably has a realistic competitive residential market--but can be influenced by the financial health of the railroad. Hemingford residential value constitutes only about 7% of the entire County, and would not exhibit a viable competitive residential market. Homes owned comprise 63.51% of the residences in the County; homes rented are 27.06% and vacant homes are 9.43%. The price to rent ratio for Box Butte County is low--in other words it is less expensive to own than to rent a home in this area, depending on factors such as length of time of ownership.

Regarding the six-year physical review cycle, the Assessor and her staff continue with the residential review, but valuation group 10 (Alliance) will not be completed until assessment year 2014. In 2012 the Department conducted a review of each county's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as each county's sales verification documentation. The review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for all three property classes.

The Department also utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Box Butte County was selected for review in 2012. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

The statistical profile indicates 244 qualified residential sales that occurred during the time period of the sales study. Overall, all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could be used to act as point estimate for the level of value. Further review of the individual valuation groupings reveals that no grouping with a statistically significant sample of sales is outside of prescribed range for the calculated median.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 94% of market value for all residential property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte County**

For assessment year 2013, the reappraisal of Alliance commercial property was completed. A new cost index (2012) was implemented.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Stanard Appraisal	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Alliance—includes all commercial properties within the city of Alliance and those that would technically be classified as suburban—since there is no separate commercial market within the County.
	20	Hemingford—all commercial properties within the town of Hemingford (and the immediate area surrounding the town—since there is no suburban commercial market).
	80	Rural Comm—all rural commercial properties.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	The County uses all three approaches to estimate the value of commercial property (cost, market and income).	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	Currently, the County has no unique commercial properties.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Grp 10 (Alliance) = 2006; Grp 20 (Hemingford) = 2012; Grp 80 (Rural) = 2008.	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	The County relies on the tables provided by the CAMA vendor.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	When the valuation grouping was last physically reviewed (see #4 above).	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The same as the appraisal date: 10 = 2005; 20 = 2009; 80 = 2008.	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	The methodology involves the market approach to determine commercial lot values, and the lots are then valued by the square foot method.	

**07 Box Butte**

**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 : 23  
 Total Sales Price : 3,654,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,634,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,655,904  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 158,022  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 158,952

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 101  
 MEAN : 105  
 COD : 12.56  
 PRD : 103.93

COV : 26.06  
 STD : 27.24  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 205.18  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 73.08

95% Median C.I. : 95.49 to 99.23  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.99 to 106.19  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.76 to 116.32

Printed:3/26/2013 2:53:25PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											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-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	94.57	94.57	94.57	00.00	100.00	94.57	94.57	N/A	150,000	141,848	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	96.75	96.75	96.75	00.00	100.00	96.75	96.75	N/A	150,000	145,120	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10												
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	99.23	108.58	103.28	10.12	105.13	97.62	147.63	N/A	400,200	413,341	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	113.75	113.75	122.48	28.70	92.87	81.10	146.39	N/A	35,500	43,481	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	93.61	93.61	93.63	01.43	99.98	92.27	94.95	N/A	75,750	70,929	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	97.30	97.30	98.03	01.86	99.26	95.49	99.10	N/A	89,000	87,244	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11												
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	96.13	96.13	96.13	00.00	100.00	96.13	96.13	N/A	35,000	33,647	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	100.65	126.00	102.51	27.25	122.91	97.52	205.18	N/A	104,500	107,120	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	94.11	94.11	94.11	00.00	100.00	94.11	94.11	N/A	70,000	65,876	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	97.38	91.67	90.47	07.07	101.33	73.08	98.85	N/A	102,500	92,731	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	7	99.13	104.89	102.29	08.25	102.54	94.57	147.63	94.57 to 147.63	328,714	336,239	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	6	95.22	101.55	100.70	12.72	100.84	81.10	146.39	81.10 to 146.39	66,750	67,218	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	10	97.88	106.09	96.35	14.94	110.11	73.08	205.18	94.11 to 101.67	93,300	89,893	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	99.18	108.40	103.46	14.87	104.77	81.10	147.63	81.10 to 147.63	277,750	287,348	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	95.49	95.59	96.02	01.68	99.55	92.27	99.10	N/A	72,900	69,998	
<u>ALL</u>	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
10	20	97.93	102.25	101.18	06.80	101.06	92.27	147.63	96.13 to 99.23	173,275	175,327	
20	3	81.10	119.79	88.38	54.29	135.54	73.08	205.18	N/A	56,333	49,788	
<u>ALL</u>	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
02	2	123.63	123.63	140.43	19.42	88.04	99.62	147.63	N/A	100,000	140,432	
03	21	97.52	102.72	98.27	11.22	104.53	73.08	205.18	94.95 to 99.13	163,548	160,716	
04												
<u>ALL</u>	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	

**07 Box Butte**

**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 : 23  
 Total Sales Price : 3,654,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,634,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,655,904  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 158,022  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 158,952

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 101  
 MEAN : 105  
 COD : 12.56  
 PRD : 103.93

COV : 26.06  
 STD : 27.24  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 205.18  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 73.08

95% Median C.I. : 95.49 to 99.23  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.99 to 106.19  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.76 to 116.32

Printed:3/26/2013 2:53:25PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000												
Less Than 30,000	3	101.67	129.32	122.42	40.68	105.64	81.10	205.18	N/A	21,333	26,117	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	
Greater Than 14,999	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	
Greater Than 29,999	20	97.57	100.83	100.20	07.88	100.63	73.08	147.63	95.49 to 99.13	178,525	178,878	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	3	101.67	129.32	122.42	40.68	105.64	81.10	205.18	N/A	21,333	26,117	
30,000 TO 59,999	6	97.82	105.55	105.74	09.71	99.82	95.49	146.39	95.49 to 146.39	43,167	45,646	
60,000 TO 99,999	5	94.95	95.56	95.58	02.13	99.98	92.27	98.85	N/A	74,300	71,016	
100,000 TO 149,999	3	99.10	90.50	90.13	08.82	100.41	73.08	99.31	N/A	120,000	108,155	
150,000 TO 249,999	4	97.50	109.30	110.34	13.99	99.06	94.57	147.63	N/A	157,500	173,783	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	97.52	97.52	97.52	00.00	100.00	97.52	97.52	N/A	350,000	341,327	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	1	99.23	99.23	99.23	00.00	100.00	99.23	99.23	N/A	1,600,000	1,587,675	
___ ALL ___	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
303	1	96.75	96.75	96.75	00.00	100.00	96.75	96.75	N/A	150,000	145,120	
343	1	97.52	97.52	97.52	00.00	100.00	97.52	97.52	N/A	350,000	341,327	
344	8	96.32	108.72	99.91	17.55	108.82	81.10	205.18	81.10 to 205.18	59,625	59,574	
349	1	146.39	146.39	146.39	00.00	100.00	146.39	146.39	N/A	45,000	65,876	
350	1	94.11	94.11	94.11	00.00	100.00	94.11	94.11	N/A	70,000	65,876	
352	2	123.63	123.63	140.43	19.42	88.04	99.62	147.63	N/A	100,000	140,432	
353	3	99.13	99.10	99.12	00.15	99.98	98.85	99.31	N/A	77,000	76,324	
386	1	94.95	94.95	94.95	00.00	100.00	94.95	94.95	N/A	77,000	73,115	
406	1	98.24	98.24	98.24	00.00	100.00	98.24	98.24	N/A	160,000	157,186	
470	1	73.08	73.08	73.08	00.00	100.00	73.08	73.08	N/A	125,000	91,348	
528	2	94.95	94.95	94.95	02.82	100.00	92.27	97.62	N/A	74,750	70,978	
851	1	99.23	99.23	99.23	00.00	100.00	99.23	99.23	N/A	1,600,000	1,587,675	
___ ALL ___	23	97.62	104.54	100.59	12.56	103.93	73.08	205.18	95.49 to 99.23	158,022	158,952	



## **2013 Correlation Section for Box Butte County**

---

### **A. Commercial Real Property**

Box Butte County with an indicated population of 11,308 has as the County seat the city of Alliance that is the primary center of commercial activity within the County. It is the western Nebraska hub of the BNSF railroad and has retail trade and other commercial activity. The village of Hemingford has a limited amount of commercial activity and does not exhibit a viable, competitive commercial market. The remainder of the county is agricultural in nature.

Regarding the six-year inspection cycle, Box Butte County has completed the physical review of all three valuation groupings--20 (Hemingford), 80 (Rural commercial) and as of assessment year 2013 valuation grouping 10 (Alliance). Assessment actions also included the implementation of an updated cost index for this valuation grouping (2012).

In 2012 the Department conducted a review of each county's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as each county's sales verification documentation. The review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for all three property classes.

The Department also utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Box Butte County was selected for review in 2012. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that commercial property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

As indicated in the 2013 commercial statistical profile, twenty-three sales were deemed to be qualified by the Assessor. Not surprisingly, twenty of these occurred within valuation grouping 10--Alliance. The overall and valuation grouping 10 medians are virtually identical (98 rounded) and are supported by a coefficient of dispersion within prescribed parameters. The mean and weighted mean are being skewed by three sales (bk 98, pg 227; bk 98, pg 329; and bk 99, pg 349).

Based on an analysis of all available information the level of value for commercial property in Box Butte County is 98%, and with the knowledge of the County's assessment practices, it is further believed that commercial property is assessed in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte County**

The Assessor completed the GIS land use study until the next flyover update. Other assessment actions taken to address the agricultural class of property included: In market area one, an increase to the irrigated, dry, almost all of the grass subclasses (with one exception) and the CRP subclass. Market area two received raises in all dry capability groups, the three lowest grass subclasses, and all sub-irrigated (one well, two-pivot) subclasses. In market area three, two irrigated subclasses (2A1 and 2A) were raised, as well as two dry subclasses (1D and 2D); with the exception of the two highest grass subclasses, all grass land was increased.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The Assessor	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	This agricultural market area consists of land primarily in the southern part of the County that consists mostly of sandhills and the majority use is for grazing cattle.
	2	This market area contains the agricultural land in the central portion of the County that has richer soils and fairly level to slightly rolling topography.
	3	Market area three has more rolling to steep hilly land, and irrigation wells found in this northern area are deeper than those in Market Area 2.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The process used by the Assessor is a review of comparable sales within each market area, with special attention paid to those that border an adjacent agricultural market area. Land use is also monitored in each agricultural market area.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Primary use of the land is the major factor utilized to identify rural residential versus recreational land within Box Butte County. Land that has no primary residential use would be considered recreational. Recreational use shall be considered when land use is primarily for the preservation of the land for purposes of recreation and/or hunting.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes, but within their respective market areas. There are also differences in well depth that are taken into account when the sites in these areas are valued.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The process used is the systematic review of returned agricultural questionnaires that when examined would indicate a possible non-agricultural use.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	No.	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	There are no parcels currently enrolled in the WRP in Box Butte County.	

**07 Box Butte**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 67  
 Total Sales Price : 25,228,825  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,970,725  
 Total Assessed Value : 16,178,747  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 372,697  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 241,474

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 71  
 COD : 16.96  
 PRD : 108.95

COV : 24.15  
 STD : 17.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.77  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 149.90  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.41

95% Median C.I. : 63.99 to 73.37  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.75 to 73.83  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.51 to 74.67

Printed:3/26/2013 2:53:26PM

**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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	88.73	84.35	82.72	13.85	101.97	51.71	107.22	51.71 to 107.22	676,063	559,210
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	70.09	68.46	69.87	03.34	97.98	64.53	71.75	N/A	241,638	168,822
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	69.41	95.91	92.27	39.13	103.94	68.41	149.90	N/A	115,833	106,883
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	7	73.37	78.69	76.09	14.39	103.42	63.75	107.43	63.75 to 107.43	144,850	110,211
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	73.50	70.66	65.04	09.44	108.64	49.94	80.31	56.14 to 79.86	294,081	191,265
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	73.22	68.95	64.68	07.17	106.60	54.57	74.80	N/A	397,623	257,198
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	10	61.75	65.88	63.08	13.89	104.44	50.40	87.72	54.02 to 84.59	230,622	145,472
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	54.49	54.22	47.70	12.13	113.67	44.17	63.99	N/A	1,742,000	830,967
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	6	71.05	67.59	63.73	14.88	106.06	39.41	84.84	39.41 to 84.84	288,278	183,732
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	61.59	64.78	65.18	11.64	99.39	54.51	87.89	54.51 to 87.89	234,447	152,816
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	48.07	49.98	48.99	09.34	102.02	44.20	57.67	N/A	635,000	311,101
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	63.36	65.59	65.15	06.22	100.68	60.80	72.61	N/A	60,600	39,479
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	23	73.37	80.68	80.34	18.67	100.42	51.71	149.90	69.16 to 87.59	346,876	278,692
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	26	68.84	66.66	56.91	14.40	117.13	44.17	87.72	58.90 to 73.60	452,671	257,608
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	18	62.92	63.38	58.80	14.97	107.79	39.41	87.89	57.67 to 72.61	290,175	170,613
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	24	71.64	75.70	70.12	14.04	107.96	49.94	149.90	68.85 to 76.14	217,349	152,401
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	23	63.99	65.34	56.01	15.67	116.66	39.41	87.72	58.90 to 73.59	471,843	264,296
<u>ALL</u>	67	69.41	70.59	64.79	16.96	108.95	39.41	149.90	63.99 to 73.37	372,697	241,474

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	14	68.63	65.79	52.76	15.07	124.70	44.17	84.59	50.40 to 76.14	554,366	292,500
2	35	70.09	71.89	72.58	16.55	99.05	48.07	107.43	63.36 to 73.59	355,321	257,906
3	18	70.47	71.81	64.04	18.62	112.13	39.41	149.90	61.68 to 74.68	265,188	169,836
<u>ALL</u>	67	69.41	70.59	64.79	16.96	108.95	39.41	149.90	63.99 to 73.37	372,697	241,474

**07 Box Butte**  
**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 : 67  
Total Sales Price : 25,228,825  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,970,725  
Total Assessed Value : 16,178,747  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 372,697  
Avg. Assessed Value : 241,474

MEDIAN : 69  
WGT. MEAN : 65  
MEAN : 71  
COD : 16.96  
PRD : 108.95

COV : 24.15  
STD : 17.05  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.77  
MAX Sales Ratio : 149.90  
MIN Sales Ratio : 39.41

95% Median C.I. : 63.99 to 73.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.75 to 73.83  
95% Mean C.I. : 66.51 to 74.67

Printed:3/26/2013 2:53:26PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	68.41	65.94	64.68	06.86	101.95	57.67	71.75	N/A	318,053	205,718
1	1	68.41	68.41	68.41	00.00	100.00	68.41	68.41	N/A	145,000	99,200
2	2	64.71	64.71	64.01	10.88	101.09	57.67	71.75	N/A	404,580	258,977
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	11	65.24	69.33	68.44	11.89	101.30	54.51	87.59	61.50 to 83.91	135,045	92,425
2	5	63.75	63.26	64.17	06.45	98.58	54.51	72.01	N/A	128,876	82,706
3	6	73.94	74.38	71.71	10.20	103.72	61.68	87.59	61.68 to 87.59	140,186	100,525
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	9	76.04	75.77	77.27	07.89	98.06	60.80	84.84	69.16 to 84.59	79,228	61,217
1	5	76.14	75.70	78.65	09.32	96.25	60.80	84.59	N/A	80,250	63,116
2	3	73.37	75.79	75.14	07.13	100.87	69.16	84.84	N/A	63,933	48,042
3	1	76.04	76.04	76.04	00.00	100.00	76.04	76.04	N/A	120,000	91,251
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>69.41</b>	<b>70.59</b>	<b>64.79</b>	<b>16.96</b>	<b>108.95</b>	<b>39.41</b>	<b>149.90</b>	<b>63.99 to 73.37</b>	<b>372,697</b>	<b>241,474</b>

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	16	69.47	69.59	67.42	15.56	103.22	48.07	107.22	56.14 to 74.80	486,493	327,991
1	4	68.63	65.95	66.73	09.54	98.83	50.40	76.14	N/A	361,307	241,088
2	11	70.09	70.74	67.41	18.53	104.94	48.07	107.22	54.57 to 98.08	552,969	372,763
3	1	71.53	71.53	71.53	00.00	100.00	71.53	71.53	N/A	256,000	183,112
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	14	70.71	72.84	71.99	13.99	101.18	54.51	107.43	61.68 to 83.91	131,107	94,383
2	7	64.53	72.01	72.55	17.71	99.26	54.51	107.43	54.51 to 107.43	127,483	92,488
3	7	73.60	73.67	71.46	09.59	103.09	61.68	87.59	61.68 to 87.59	134,730	96,279
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	73.37	72.20	61.30	11.29	117.78	54.49	84.84	57.85 to 84.59	236,485	144,972
1	6	74.38	72.16	59.73	12.81	120.81	54.49	84.59	54.49 to 84.59	308,309	184,163
2	4	71.27	71.31	63.10	10.94	113.01	57.85	84.84	N/A	157,870	99,616
3	1	76.04	76.04	76.04	00.00	100.00	76.04	76.04	N/A	120,000	91,251
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>69.41</b>	<b>70.59</b>	<b>64.79</b>	<b>16.96</b>	<b>108.95</b>	<b>39.41</b>	<b>149.90</b>	<b>63.99 to 73.37</b>	<b>372,697</b>	<b>241,474</b>

## Box Butte County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Box Butte	1	N/A	1,272	1,128	1,280	1,275	1,270	1,271	1,274	1,273
Box Butte	2	N/A	1,602	1,608	1,594	1,230	1,211	1,191	1,219	1,536
Box Butte	3	N/A	1,265	1,300	1,213	850	816	820	845	1,210
Dawes	4	N/A	1,350	N/A	1,350	1,000	1,000	950	950	1,174
Sioux	1	N/A	640	600	560	560	560	470	470	548
Sheridan	1	N/A	1,195	1,170	975	950	925	875	850	1,019
Morrill	2	N/A	1,350	1,275	1,250	N/A	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,141
ScottsBluff	3	N/A	N/A	1,950	1,575	1,575	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,609

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Box Butte	1	N/A	380	N/A	350	230	230	230	230	310
Box Butte	2	N/A	500	500	500	325	325	325	325	470
Box Butte	3	N/A	500	470	470	300	300	300	300	465
Dawes	4	N/A	500	N/A	450	400	400	375	375	463
Sioux	1	N/A	360	275	265	260	260	250	235	267
Sheridan	1	N/A	550	525	460	410	405	355	355	448
Morrill	2	N/A	380	N/A	340	N/A	340	340	340	346
ScottsBluff	3	N/A	N/A	330	310	260	230	230	210	275

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Box Butte	1	N/A	276	250	260	234	234	231	230	234
Box Butte	2	N/A	297	263	250	250	229	227	230	243
Box Butte	3	N/A	336	327	323	319	324	300	300	311
Dawes	4	N/A	400	375	375	325	325	300	300	320
Sioux	1	N/A	260	260	260	225	225	200	208	212
Sheridan	1	N/A	375	295	285	250	250	230	220	234
Morrill	2	N/A	220	220	220	N/A	220	220	220	220
ScottsBluff	3	N/A	N/A	250	240	235	215	215	200	214

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Box Butte County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Box Butte County encompasses a total of 1,078 square miles of land, and agricultural land consists of approximately 47% grass 28% dry land and about 23% irrigated. The remaining two percent is classified as waste and other. The County currently has three clearly defined agricultural market areas based on topography, soil type and availability of water. Agricultural Market Area One is located primarily in the southern part of the County and consists mostly sandhills and the majority use of the land is grass for grazing cattle. Market Area Two agricultural land comprises the central portion of the County that has richer soils and a fairly level to slightly rolling topography. Agricultural Market Area Three has more rolling to steep, hilly land, and irrigation wells found in this northern area are necessarily deeper than those in Market Area 2.

Box Butte County lies within the Upper Niobrara White NRD. "In 2003, the UNWNRD [Upper Niobrara White NRD] established a stay on new high capacity wells to prevent the over-appropriation of the water supply. Working with Nebraska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the UNWNRD strives to maintain a balance of supply and demand for ground and surface water. Currently, DNR has determined that the majority of the UNWNRD is fully appropriated. Fully appropriated means the balance between the water supply and demand has been reached...no new high capacity wells or surface water rights are allowed in this area" (taken from the UNWNRD website).

Counties contiguous to Box Butte are Dawes to the north, Sheridan to the east, Morrill to the south with a very small portion of Scotts Bluff on the southwest, and Sioux to the west. Of the neighboring counties, only Sheridan lacks defined agricultural market areas.

Preliminary analysis of the agricultural sales sample indicated that there was time non-proportionality countywide and by agricultural market area (with the exception of Market Area Three). Further analysis revealed that there was no feasible way that time uniformity (countywide and for Market Area Two) was going to be obtained by merely identifying and utilizing comparable sales. There were simply not enough comparable sales from contiguous counties that fit the time requirements for Market Area Two. Four comparable sales were identified that could be utilized for Area One and only two for Area Two. Since the 10% minimum threshold of variance of total sales per year as part of Department policy could not be met in Area Two, six sales from the original sample were randomly eliminated from the second year of the study period. This action left eleven sales in the first year, fourteen in the second and ten in the third (keeping the 10% variance threshold--rounded).

These actions produced a statistical profile of sixty-seven sales with an overall median of 69%, a mean of 71% and a weighted mean of 65%. The median is further supported by an overall COD of 17%. A breakdown by market area reveals: Area One has a median of 69% and is supported by a coefficient of dispersion at 15%; Area Two has all three measures of central tendency within acceptable range, and both qualitative statistics are within their respective parameters; in Area Three two of the three measures of central tendency are acceptable (the median and the mean, and an in-range COD confirms the median. Breakdown of the MLU = 95% by market area indicates no statistically significant sample numbers to

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte County**

---

make a pronouncement by land class.

Review of comparable neighboring counties (from a soil type perspective they are in descending order: Sheridan, Dawes, Morrill and Sioux) indicates that the 2013 values applied in Box Butte County on average are for Area Three's irrigated and dry land comparable to northern neighbor Dawes' Area Four. Grass values for this same area are on average slightly lower than Dawes' Area Four. Box Butte Areas One and Two's irrigated land is significantly higher than comparable neighbor Sheridan (neighboring Sioux Area One irrigated is only 1.39% of all acres found in this area). Box Butte dry is similar in Area Three when compared with Dawes Area Four. Area Two is higher than neighboring Sioux (only 3% dry in Sioux's Area One) and similar to Sheridan county. Box Butte Areas One and Two grass are similar to Sheridan County, and Area Three grass is also similar to neighboring Dawes Area Four.

Actions taken to address the increasing agricultural market found in Box Butte and comparable counties include (by Area): Area One—the irrigated class was raised on average by 4%; dry land received an average increase of 8%; grass received an average raise of 9%, and three subclasses of CRP land were increased. Area Two—irrigated land remained untouched (due to only three MLU = 95% sales, and the fact that in 2012 irrigated land was raised overall by 48% compared to 2011 in order to reflect the changing irrigated market); dry land was raised on average by 14%; the three lowest grass subclasses received an increase; sub-irrigated land (one well, two pivots) subclasses were increased to closer match 75% of market value; CRP remained the same; Area Three—two irrigated and two dry subclasses were increased (18% and 4%, respectively); four grass subclasses and all of the sub-irrigated subclasses were raised to closer match the current market. It is believed that Box Butte County has achieved both inter- and intra- county equalization.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 : 8,125**

**Value : 858,011,738**

**Growth 2,809,281**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	291	1,635,625	25	235,360	120	780,208	436	2,651,193	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	3,104	18,629,739	68	1,064,702	398	6,096,843	3,570	25,791,284	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	3,491	224,464,630	80	6,721,768	474	36,983,006	4,045	268,169,404	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,782	244,729,994	105	8,021,830	594	43,860,057	4,481	296,611,881	1,296,948
<b>% of Res Total</b>	84.40	82.51	2.34	2.70	13.26	14.79	55.15	34.57	46.17
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	135	2,497,274	6	507,455	27	220,186	168	3,224,915	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	498	10,235,409	20	642,163	32	1,945,652	550	12,823,224	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	523	71,533,102	22	8,869,216	85	10,017,427	630	90,419,745	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	658	84,265,785	28	10,018,834	112	12,183,265	798	106,467,884	718,878
<b>% of Com Total</b>	82.46	79.15	3.51	9.41	14.04	11.44	9.82	12.41	25.59
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	14,622	0	0	1	14,622	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	28,986	4	638,072	5	667,058	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	1	3,532,792	4	7,396,392	5	10,929,184	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	2	3,576,400	4	8,034,464	6	11,610,864	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	33.33	30.80	66.67	69.20	0.07	1.35	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	1	15,275	0	0	1	11,483	2	26,758	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	1	600	0	0	1	22,741	2	23,341	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	1	15,875	0	0	1	34,224	2	50,099	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	50.00	31.69	0.00	0.00	50.00	68.31	0.02	0.01	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,783	244,745,869	105	8,021,830	595	43,894,281	4,483	296,661,980	1,296,948
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	84.39	82.50	2.34	2.70	13.27	14.80	55.18	34.58	46.17
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	658	84,265,785	30	13,595,234	116	20,217,729	804	118,078,748	718,878
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	81.84	71.36	3.73	11.51	14.43	17.12	9.90	13.76	25.59
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	4,441	329,011,654	135	21,617,064	711	64,112,010	5,287	414,740,728	2,015,826
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	84.00	79.33	2.55	5.21	13.45	15.46	65.07	48.34	71.76

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	2	24,066	3,383,292	1	400,555	4,921,661
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	3	424,621	8,304,953
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	424,621	8,304,953

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	371	27	119	517

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	2	27,521	56	9,583,295	2,127	272,230,698	2,185	281,841,514
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	49	11,843,745	554	100,503,874	603	112,347,619
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	52	5,374,131	601	43,707,746	653	49,081,877
30. Ag Total							2,838	443,271,010

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	3,275	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	46	51.00	378,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	39	43.00	4,265,843	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.02	3,081	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	46	172.40	340,948	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	49	0.00	1,108,288	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	306.47	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	66	66.00	100,500	68	68.00	103,775	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	491	503.82	3,458,960	537	554.82	3,836,960	
33. HomeSite Improvements	353	358.00	29,591,164	392	401.00	33,857,007	793,455
34. HomeSite Total				<b>460</b>	<b>622.82</b>	<b>37,797,742</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	45	123.29	96,493	46	125.31	99,574	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	483	2,333.89	4,067,823	529	2,506.29	4,408,771	
37. FarmSite Improvements	574	0.00	14,116,582	623	0.00	15,224,870	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>669</b>	<b>2,631.60</b>	<b>19,733,215</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,645.10	0	0	5,951.57	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,129</b>	<b>9,205.99</b>	<b>57,530,957</b>	<b>793,455</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	5,272.97	15.05%	6,709,159	15.05%	1,272.37
47. 2A1	67.18	0.19%	75,751	0.17%	1,127.58
48. 2A	5,937.27	16.95%	7,602,539	17.05%	1,280.48
49. 3A1	65.51	0.19%	83,526	0.19%	1,275.01
50. 3A	8,811.67	25.15%	11,186,639	25.09%	1,269.53
51. 4A1	10,534.44	30.07%	13,391,773	30.04%	1,271.24
52. 4A	4,343.50	12.40%	5,532,077	12.41%	1,273.64
53. Total	35,032.54	100.00%	44,581,464	100.00%	1,272.57
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	2,735.83	28.32%	1,039,618	34.68%	380.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	3,045.32	31.53%	1,065,909	35.56%	350.02
58. 3D1	24.71	0.26%	5,683	0.19%	229.99
59. 3D	1,241.98	12.86%	285,660	9.53%	230.00
60. 4D1	1,937.48	20.06%	445,629	14.87%	230.00
61. 4D	673.64	6.97%	154,944	5.17%	230.01
62. Total	9,658.96	100.00%	2,997,443	100.00%	310.33
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,802.56	2.98%	1,048,605	3.51%	275.76
65. 2G1	61.56	0.05%	15,392	0.05%	250.03
66. 2G	7,265.15	5.69%	1,886,802	6.31%	259.71
67. 3G1	121.13	0.09%	28,381	0.09%	234.30
68. 3G	16,480.68	12.91%	3,854,318	12.90%	233.87
69. 4G1	59,883.59	46.90%	13,818,573	46.25%	230.76
70. 4G	40,081.27	31.39%	9,227,860	30.88%	230.23
71. Total	127,695.94	100.00%	29,879,931	100.00%	233.99
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	35,032.54	20.04%	44,581,464	57.35%	1,272.57
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	9,658.96	5.52%	2,997,443	3.86%	310.33
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	127,695.94	73.04%	29,879,931	38.44%	233.99
72. Waste	1,515.99	0.87%	45,487	0.06%	30.00
73. Other	932.44	0.53%	231,726	0.30%	248.52
74. Exempt	5,603.18	3.20%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	174,835.87	100.00%	77,736,051	100.00%	444.62

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	54,942.03	54.80%	88,015,969	57.15%	1,601.98
47. 2A1	4,140.40	4.13%	6,657,493	4.32%	1,607.93
48. 2A	25,210.30	25.15%	40,184,309	26.09%	1,593.96
49. 3A1	87.47	0.09%	107,589	0.07%	1,230.01
50. 3A	4,530.23	4.52%	5,484,756	3.56%	1,210.70
51. 4A1	9,478.97	9.45%	11,285,526	7.33%	1,190.59
52. 4A	1,867.66	1.86%	2,277,412	1.48%	1,219.39
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>100,257.06</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>154,013,054</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,536.18</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	48,980.55	51.72%	24,490,275	55.03%	500.00
56. 2D1	3,290.83	3.47%	1,645,415	3.70%	500.00
57. 2D	26,141.96	27.60%	13,070,980	29.37%	500.00
58. 3D1	118.14	0.12%	38,396	0.09%	325.00
59. 3D	2,625.48	2.77%	853,315	1.92%	325.01
60. 4D1	12,376.35	13.07%	4,022,431	9.04%	325.01
61. 4D	1,179.08	1.24%	383,224	0.86%	325.02
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>94,712.39</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>44,504,036</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>469.89</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	12,453.88	14.57%	3,698,423	17.77%	296.97
65. 2G1	431.93	0.51%	113,567	0.55%	262.93
66. 2G	19,022.78	22.25%	4,763,262	22.89%	250.40
67. 3G1	151.81	0.18%	37,958	0.18%	250.04
68. 3G	8,247.30	9.65%	1,890,115	9.08%	229.18
69. 4G1	29,491.27	34.49%	6,701,755	32.20%	227.25
70. 4G	15,701.36	18.36%	3,605,641	17.33%	229.64
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>85,500.33</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>20,810,721</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>243.40</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>100,257.06</b>	<b>34.90%</b>	<b>154,013,054</b>	<b>69.82%</b>	<b>1,536.18</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>94,712.39</b>	<b>32.97%</b>	<b>44,504,036</b>	<b>20.18%</b>	<b>469.89</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>85,500.33</b>	<b>29.77%</b>	<b>20,810,721</b>	<b>9.43%</b>	<b>243.40</b>
72. Waste	1,275.06	0.44%	38,258	0.02%	30.00
73. Other	5,496.58	1.91%	1,213,506	0.55%	220.77
74. Exempt	376.06	0.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>287,241.42</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>220,579,575</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>767.92</b>

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	9,799.21	63.19%	12,395,762	66.06%	1,264.98
47. 2A1	68.25	0.44%	88,725	0.47%	1,300.00
48. 2A	4,207.29	27.13%	5,104,244	27.20%	1,213.19
49. 3A1	4.37	0.03%	3,715	0.02%	850.11
50. 3A	456.79	2.95%	372,649	1.99%	815.80
51. 4A1	896.36	5.78%	735,288	3.92%	820.30
52. 4A	76.46	0.49%	64,590	0.34%	844.76
53. Total	15,508.73	100.00%	18,764,973	100.00%	1,209.96
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	50,094.81	60.61%	25,047,405	65.13%	500.00
56. 2D1	176.32	0.21%	82,870	0.22%	470.00
57. 2D	21,241.36	25.70%	9,983,521	25.96%	470.00
58. 3D1	141.75	0.17%	42,525	0.11%	300.00
59. 3D	3,420.93	4.14%	1,026,279	2.67%	300.00
60. 4D1	6,949.07	8.41%	2,084,721	5.42%	300.00
61. 4D	629.18	0.76%	188,754	0.49%	300.00
62. Total	82,653.42	100.00%	38,456,075	100.00%	465.27
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	11,249.87	11.87%	3,782,124	12.84%	336.19
65. 2G1	127.65	0.13%	41,788	0.14%	327.36
66. 2G	16,497.89	17.41%	5,324,325	18.08%	322.73
67. 3G1	114.55	0.12%	36,563	0.12%	319.19
68. 3G	9,309.87	9.82%	3,020,514	10.25%	324.44
69. 4G1	21,618.85	22.81%	6,487,587	22.02%	300.09
70. 4G	35,858.50	37.83%	10,763,646	36.54%	300.17
71. Total	94,777.18	100.00%	29,456,547	100.00%	310.80
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	15,508.73	7.86%	18,764,973	21.46%	1,209.96
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	82,653.42	41.90%	38,456,075	43.99%	465.27
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	94,777.18	48.05%	29,456,547	33.69%	310.80
72. Waste	1,210.68	0.61%	36,334	0.04%	30.01
73. Other	3,112.95	1.58%	710,498	0.81%	228.24
74. Exempt	287.32	0.15%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	197,262.96	100.00%	87,424,427	100.00%	443.19

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	12,048.82	18,032,726	138,749.51	199,326,765	150,798.33	217,359,491
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	44.33	21,702	4,720.89	2,101,879	182,259.55	83,833,973	187,024.77	85,957,554
<b>78. Grass</b>	21.47	5,141	2,251.95	537,373	305,700.03	79,604,685	307,973.45	80,147,199
<b>79. Waste</b>	3.04	91	96.21	2,886	3,902.48	117,102	4,001.73	120,079
<b>80. Other</b>	3.91	587	136.72	26,872	9,401.34	2,128,271	9,541.97	2,155,730
<b>81. Exempt</b>	6.38	0	800.39	0	5,459.79	0	6,266.56	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>72.75</b>	<b>27,521</b>	<b>19,254.59</b>	<b>20,701,736</b>	<b>640,012.91</b>	<b>365,010,796</b>	<b>659,340.25</b>	<b>385,740,053</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	150,798.33	22.87%	217,359,491	56.35%	1,441.39
<b>Dry Land</b>	187,024.77	28.37%	85,957,554	22.28%	459.61
<b>Grass</b>	307,973.45	46.71%	80,147,199	20.78%	260.24
<b>Waste</b>	4,001.73	0.61%	120,079	0.03%	30.01
<b>Other</b>	9,541.97	1.45%	2,155,730	0.56%	225.92
<b>Exempt</b>	6,266.56	0.95%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>659,340.25</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>385,740,053</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>585.04</b>

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

### 07 Box Butte

	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	295,047,745	296,611,881	1,564,136	0.53%	1,296,948	0.09%
02. Recreational	49,582	50,099	517	1.04%	0	1.04%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	38,273,433	37,797,742	-475,691	-1.24%	793,455	-3.32%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>333,370,760</b>	<b>334,459,722</b>	<b>1,088,962</b>	<b>0.33%</b>	<b>2,090,403</b>	<b>-0.30%</b>
05. Commercial	95,838,808	106,467,884	10,629,076	11.09%	718,878	10.34%
06. Industrial	11,490,806	11,610,864	120,058	1.04%	0	1.04%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	18,687,435	19,733,215	1,045,780	5.60%	0	5.60%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>126,017,049</b>	<b>137,811,963</b>	<b>11,794,914</b>	<b>9.36%</b>	<b>718,878</b>	<b>8.79%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>459,387,809</b>	<b>472,271,685</b>	<b>12,883,876</b>	<b>2.80%</b>	<b>2,809,281</b>	<b>2.19%</b>
11. Irrigated	213,004,710	217,359,491	4,354,781	2.04%		
12. Dryland	80,502,789	85,957,554	5,454,765	6.78%		
13. Grassland	72,282,613	80,147,199	7,864,586	10.88%		
14. Wasteland	120,332	120,079	-253	-0.21%		
15. Other Agland	2,189,810	2,155,730	-34,080	-1.56%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>368,100,254</b>	<b>385,740,053</b>	<b>17,639,799</b>	<b>4.79%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>827,488,063</b>	<b>858,011,738</b>	<b>30,523,675</b>	<b>3.69%</b>	<b>2,809,281</b>	<b>3.35%</b>

**2013  
BOX BUTTE COUNTY  
THREE YEAR PLAN  
OF ASSESSMENT**

Requirement

The assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263 Section 9, on or before June 15 each year. The assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 each year. A copy of the plan and any amendments made shall be sent to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

General Description of Real Property in Box Butte County

Per 2012 County Abstract, Box Butte County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total	% of Taxable Value
Residential	4,488	55	35.38
Commercial	800	10	12.31
Industrial	6	<1	1.38
Recreational	2	<1	0
Agricultural	2,823	35	50.93
	-----	-----	-----
Totals	8,119	100	100

Current Resources

- Staff
  - Assessor with current certification and hours of continuing education
  - Deputy with current certification and hours of continuing education
  - Two full-time clerical employees
  - Hired appraiser from Stanard Appraisal
    - Our lister is employed by Stanard Appraisal
      - Part-time, local
- Budget
  - Our fiscal year is July 1-June 30 each year
    - The adopted budget for 2012-2013 yr was \$236,450
      - The budget was frozen from last year, no increases
      - \$65,000 was budgeted for reappraisal
      - \$5,000 was budgeted for pick up work & TERC
        - ◆ Pick up work was completed by Assessor and staff
        - ◆ Budgeted amount was used up for TERC prep fees

- Equipment
  - Leased CAMA program with Terra Scan/Thompson Reuters
  - Microsoft Windows Server 2003
  - Internet access with local provider
  - Four workstations
  - GIS updates contracted with GIS Workshop, Inc.

#### Current Assessment Procedures

- Update ownership by receipt of real estate transfers from register of deeds office
- Maintain sales file with monthly qualified sales
  - Conduct sales study
- Receive building permits monthly from the City's Building and Zoning office
  - Review properties as "pick-up" work annually
- Zoning is county wide, however the county does not enforce building permits for rural improvements
  - Our pick-up work for rural is currently by discovery
  - The Assessor's office promotes rural property owners to complete an Information Statement Form in the office
- Data collection is constant
  - Application for value change from discovery is applied annually between January 1 and March 19 each year
- Approaches to value are used in accordance with IAAO mass appraisal techniques
  - **Income approach** is applied to Alliance commercial properties (due to cycle of reappraisal)
    - Collected income and expense data
    - Analyzed data with market depreciation
  - **Cost approach** is used for all improved parcels
    - Marshall & Swift pricing system is used
    - Market depreciation applied
  - **Market approach** is used on all properties in regard to market depreciation
- Agricultural land sales are studied and valuations adjusted accordingly in their respective market areas
  - Agricultural land has three market areas
- Change of value notices are sent pursuant state statute 77-1315
- Levels of value are published in local newspapers and delivered to local radio station pursuant state statute 77-1315

## Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for 2012 Assessment

	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	96%	15.57	101.83
Commercial	93%	20.10	127.03
Agricultural land	72%	18.39	103.17

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013

- Residential
  - Alliance
    - Implement new cost index and apply reappraisal information to set new values with market depreciation
  - Hemingford
    - Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly if needed
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
  - Rural Residential
    - **Enforce use of Improvement Information Statement in lieu of a building permit**
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
- Commercial
  - Alliance
    - Implement new cost index and apply reappraisal information to set new values with market depreciation
  - Hemingford
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
  - Rural
    - **Enforce use of Improvement Information Statement in lieu of a building permit**
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
- Agricultural land
  - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary
  - GIS land use is complete until next update of fly-over

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014

- Residential
  - Alliance
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust accordingly
  - Rural Residential
    - Start the review process for rural properties
    - Inspect properties through Improvement Information Statement and through discovery
    - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary
  
- Commercial
  - Alliance
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
  - Rural
    - Start the review process for rural properties
    - Inspect properties through Improvement Information Statement and through discovery
    - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary
  
- Agricultural land
  - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015

- Residential
  - Alliance
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  - Rural Residential
    - Continue with review process
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  
- Commercial
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  - Alliance
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  - Rural
    - Continue with review process
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  
- Agricultural land
  - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary

### **AMENDMENT TO PLAN OF ASSESSMENT-OCTOBER 2012**

- Due to unforeseen circumstances, Alliance residential review will not be complete for assessment year 2013 but will be for 2014.
- Alliance commercial review will be complete for assessment year 2013.
- I have tried to employ my staff and I to conduct the review process and also continue with our regular duties and the process has failed. I will be going back to contracting with Stanard Appraisal Services to continue with the review process beginning with rural review as funds are available.
- These changes to the plan will push back completion dates previously mentioned.

- We are under contract currently with Stanard Appraisal Services for Alliance commercial reappraisal and with the budget freeze we will be going over budget.
  - The contract states: The compensation to be paid herein shall be paid in two of the County's fiscal years with the County paying the amount of \$20,000 in the first fiscal year (2011-2012). These will be made in 5 equal payments of \$4,000 beginning February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 and ending with the June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 statement. The remaining balance of \$68,989 shall be paid in 10 monthly installments beginning July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012. The 1<sup>st</sup> 9 months shall be in the amount of \$6,898 with the 10<sup>th</sup> and final month being \$6,907 plus any additional parcels in excess of the original stated parcel counts.
  - As of this month, October, I have \$37,408 left in my review budget with no funds available in pick-up work/TERC due to TERC expenses from July 2011.

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	One
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	Two
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$256,120
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$236,450
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$65,000
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	N/A; this is not part of the Assessor's budget.
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$10,200—but this is not exclusively for education/workshops, but includes travel, dues, meals, etc.
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	None

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters/Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters/Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No—the County uses their GIS
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	N/A
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>

	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes, both property record data and maps. <a href="http://boxbutte.gisworkshop.com">http://boxbutte.gisworkshop.com</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	The Deputy Assessor
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters/Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Alliance and Hemingford
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	Thomson Reuters; GIS Workshop

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	The County occasionally uses Stanard Appraisal for commercial appraisal.
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes, when used.
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Company is General Certified.
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	The Assessor is unsure.
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes—for commercial properties at present.



# 2013 Certification for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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



