

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 Lincoln County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	792	Median	98.02
Total Sales Price	\$102,321,765	Mean	98.76
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$102,156,765	Wgt. Mean	96.64
Total Assessed Value	\$98,727,290	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$89,109
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$128,986	Avg. Assessed Value	\$124,656

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.62 to 98.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.03 to 97.26
95% Mean C.I	97.51 to 100.01
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	44.64
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.33
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.46

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	754	97	97.34
2011	876	96	96
2010	969	96	96
2009	1,182	97	97

2013 Commission Summary for Lincoln County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	51	Median	96.64
Total Sales Price	\$12,808,576	Mean	92.00
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,036,576	Wgt. Mean	86.20
Total Assessed Value	\$11,237,020	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$319,446
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$255,619	Avg. Assessed Value	\$220,334

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.79 to 98.15
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	75.31 to 97.08
95% Mean C.I	86.29 to 97.71
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	15.57
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.53
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.43

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	42	98	97.58
2011	64	96	96
2010	71	98	98
2009	84	95	95

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Lincoln County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Lincoln County

The Lincoln County appraisal staff began their next six year review cycle in 2011. The entire northside of North Platte was re-assessed for 2011 and half of the south side was done for 2012, Lake Maloney and Jeffrey Lake were re-assessed for 2013. For 2014, the remainder of North Platte will be completed and then work will move into the villages of Brady, Maxwell, Hershey, Sutherland, Wallace, Wellfleet and Dickens. If time permits, work will begin on the rural properties with anticipation of being completed by the end of 2015. In addition, the goal is to re-cost all properties that were previously assessed during the last physical inspection and review cycle utilizing the new Orion system. Lake Maloney and Jeffrey Lake have been done in the new system using June 2012 costing, all other properties are on June 2010 costing. The objective is to have all parcels on the June 2012 cost tables by the end of the six year review. A depreciation study found that the current depreciation table still provided an accurate estimate of depreciation for the majority of residential properties in Lincoln County; therefore, no change was made to the current depreciation table for the next six year review.

For 2013 a new Orion CAMA system by Tyler Technologies was implemented; the county went live as of August 2012. The "Go Live" date was supposed to have been in May but several hang-ups occurred as well as conversion issues and therefore the "Go Live" date was pushed back 3 months.

Recreational and accretion land was revalued for 2010 and we continue to see sales of this type occurring in Lincoln County.

Lincoln County reviews and monitors ongoing growth areas in the City of North Platte on a routine basis. The market appears to be steady and in some aspects still improving since 2009. A decreased number of sales have been seen across the board, especially in high-end homes with marketing times of up to two years. However, the moderately priced homes are still selling with minimal foreclosures. Some of the large employers are a positive effect on the housing market in North Platte. Union Pacific Railroad, Great Plains Regional Medical Center and the Wal-Mart Distribution Center are employers that keep the residential market steady and strong.

For sales verification, all sales are reviewed monthly to verify that they are arm's length transactions. An appraiser will physically inspect each property with interior inspections made upon request of the property owner. An attempt will be made to contact the buyer and or seller to verify the information, and in some cases the realtor as well. Only the qualified sales are used to value properties in the specific neighborhoods. Vacant land sales will be used to value land. A review of the sales within the ratio study period will be made each year for each neighborhood. If a neighborhood falls out of the acceptable range, a complete neighborhood review will be done for the following valuation year. This applies to all three classes of property and is written within the office policy and procedures manual.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Lincoln County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Appraisal staff and occasionally will be assisted by the GIS technician.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Within the city limits of North Platte, the Union Pacific Railroad splits the town into two areas namely the north side and the south side of North Platte. The north side of town is more diverse with a mixture of commercial and industrial properties found intermittently within the residential areas. New Growth is restricted on the north side due to the North Platte River cutting off the ability to grow to the north or east, the railroad is to the south. Although there is the possibility for new growth to the west, it has yet to be seen. The quality of homes found on the north side is for the most part of lower quality, smaller homes in addition to more manufactured homes being found on the north side than on the south side. Also, lot sizes for the most part are smaller on the north side than on the south side of town.
	02	Within the city limits of North Platte, the Union Pacific Railroad splits the town into two areas namely the north side and the south side of North Platte. The south side is mainly residential with most of the commercial properties being located in the central business district along Jeffers Street & Dewey Street. There is new growth found to the west on the south side with several new subdivisions currently being developed. Better quality homes are found on the south side, especially to the southwest. Also, lot sizes for the most part are larger on the south side than on the north side of town.
	03	Suburban areas around the parameters of North Platte and Villages.
	04	Rural Residential include the acreages not within a legal boundary of a Village or City.
	05	Lake Maloney includes Prairie Lake, Mill Isle and Frontier Resort Boat Clubs. Jeffrey Lake south of the Village of Brady is also included in this grouping. These are residential properties on Lake Maloney that sit on leased land.
	06	Sutherland is the second village west of North Platte on I-80 and the market is different within its own amenities.

	07	Hershey is the first village west of North Platte on I-80 and serves as housing for some work force in the North Platte area.
	08	Maxwell, located east of North Platte on I-80 has separate amenities and physical characteristics.
	09	Wallace is located southwest of North Platte on Hwy 25 and is not attractive for commuting into the city due to proximity.
	10	Brady serves its own Village owners with a small town atmosphere.
	11	Wellfleet is the smallest Village in Lincoln County without a school, located south on Highway 83 between North Platte and Maywood in Frontier County.
	12	Rural parcels are not included in the rural residential groupings and are recreational around the Lakes and Rivers and are not rural acreages away from urban suburbs.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost Approach to Value is the most commonly used approach which takes into account the Land Value and Improvement Value to estimate Total Market Value. With the new Orion program, it does have capabilities to do the Sales Comparison and Income Approaches to value but the MRA has not been set up to use the Sales Comparison yet. We also have very limited data to develop an accurate Gross Rent Multiplier for an Income Approach to Value on Duplexes. Due to statutes stating that anything with 3 or more families should be considered commercial, any triplexes will be revalued as commercial for 2013.	
4	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	All Valuation Groupings are on the same costing of 6/1/2012.	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Our depreciation table was developed for our county based on local market information in 2005 and is still in place today. We reviewed it prior to beginning our 2011 review and are still working for our area so no change was made. With the new Orion program, it still seems to be working for the most part but a depreciation study will be conducted in 2013 and any adjustments will be applied.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No, all valuation groupings use the same depreciation tables.	

7.	<p>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</p> <p>2005 was the last depreciation study performed, a check was performed in 2010 to see if a change was needed with our new six year review. No change was necessary. With the new Orion program, it still seems to be working for the most part but a depreciation study will be conducted in 2013 and any adjustments will be applied.</p>
8.	<p>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</p> <p>The last lot value study was completed for 2012 on the south side of town to be done in conjunction with the south side residential review.</p>
9.	<p>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</p> <p>The Sales Comparison Approach was used as much as possible as this is the best indicator of market value. In areas where it is mostly built-up, the county also used the extraction method to aid in determining market value of the land.</p>

**56 Lincoln
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 : 792
 Total Sales Price : 102,321,765
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 102,156,765
 Total Assessed Value : 98,727,290
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 128,986
 Avg. Assessed Value : 124,656

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 97
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 06.51
 PRD : 102.19

COV : 18.11
 STD : 17.89
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 06.38
 MAX Sales Ratio : 303.46
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.90

95% Median C.I. : 97.62 to 98.33
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.03 to 97.26
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.51 to 100.01

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:27PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	71	98.01	99.71	96.41	07.23	103.42	84.24	297.07	95.89 to 98.67	139,756	134,742
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	60	98.29	97.47	96.70	05.31	100.80	62.76	124.62	96.92 to 99.52	118,777	114,854
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	126	97.44	95.74	95.35	05.72	100.41	60.39	144.34	96.39 to 98.20	139,953	133,444
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	108	96.84	96.66	95.40	06.35	101.32	63.99	169.60	95.79 to 97.55	127,397	121,539
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	97	96.31	96.37	94.49	06.28	101.99	60.94	147.53	95.47 to 98.55	127,767	120,721
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	87	98.79	104.61	98.50	11.69	106.20	55.90	303.46	98.02 to 99.52	115,521	113,789
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	120	98.54	99.36	98.66	04.08	100.71	70.49	173.73	98.09 to 99.22	129,304	127,567
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	123	98.51	100.91	97.82	06.02	103.16	68.31	280.42	97.97 to 98.86	128,085	125,299
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	365	97.41	97.07	95.78	06.17	101.35	60.39	297.07	96.91 to 97.90	132,718	127,118
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	427	98.47	100.20	97.42	06.73	102.85	55.90	303.46	98.04 to 98.71	125,795	122,551
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	391	97.17	96.42	95.34	06.00	101.13	60.39	169.60	96.56 to 97.68	130,212	124,146
<u>ALL</u>	792	98.02	98.76	96.64	06.51	102.19	55.90	303.46	97.62 to 98.33	128,986	124,656

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	86	98.21	108.82	101.01	15.06	107.73	81.81	297.07	96.61 to 99.63	61,058	61,673
02	450	98.33	98.53	97.87	04.19	100.67	55.90	303.46	98.02 to 98.66	125,362	122,696
03	31	95.56	93.54	93.82	05.25	99.70	60.39	104.38	92.66 to 98.09	179,415	168,328
04	114	95.51	93.07	92.28	08.56	100.86	60.94	147.53	93.08 to 97.02	184,090	169,882
05	31	99.52	102.67	99.94	08.13	102.73	78.48	173.73	96.01 to 101.89	178,913	178,812
06	28	98.32	98.46	97.73	03.35	100.75	89.45	119.73	96.56 to 98.81	122,189	119,410
07	25	96.65	94.66	94.16	04.46	100.53	81.49	101.38	92.06 to 98.51	124,612	117,333
08	2	90.49	90.49	97.88	09.58	92.45	81.82	99.15	N/A	37,500	36,705
09	9	97.23	90.75	91.16	08.05	99.55	67.40	100.18	71.89 to 99.80	52,300	47,678
10	8	98.71	97.39	96.83	02.68	100.58	90.17	101.71	90.17 to 101.71	67,750	65,601
11	3	100.40	142.09	121.30	52.17	117.14	84.36	241.50	N/A	26,333	31,943
12	5	98.74	99.94	98.16	06.11	101.81	89.53	116.45	N/A	139,000	136,448
<u>ALL</u>	792	98.02	98.76	96.64	06.51	102.19	55.90	303.46	97.62 to 98.33	128,986	124,656

**56 Lincoln
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 : 792
 Total Sales Price : 102,321,765
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 102,156,765
 Total Assessed Value : 98,727,290
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 128,986
 Avg. Assessed Value : 124,656

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 97
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 06.51
 PRD : 102.19

COV : 18.11
 STD : 17.89
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 06.38
 MAX Sales Ratio : 303.46
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.90

95% Median C.I. : 97.62 to 98.33
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.03 to 97.26
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.51 to 100.01

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:27PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	772	97.98	98.67	96.57	06.38	102.17	55.90	303.46	97.60 to 98.29	128,701	124,287
06	19	99.55	103.75	99.67	09.93	104.09	78.48	173.73	94.89 to 106.34	145,221	144,736
07	1	67.40	67.40	67.40	00.00	100.00	67.40	67.40	N/A	40,700	27,430
<u>ALL</u>	792	98.02	98.76	96.64	06.51	102.19	55.90	303.46	97.62 to 98.33	128,986	124,656

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	98.50	98.50	98.50	00.00	100.00	98.50	98.50	N/A	4,000	3,940
Less Than 15,000	18	109.94	144.30	147.67	49.91	97.72	55.90	303.46	93.86 to 145.21	8,456	12,487
Less Than 30,000	46	101.24	122.42	115.34	30.99	106.14	55.90	303.46	96.32 to 112.58	16,625	19,176
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	791	98.01	98.76	96.64	06.51	102.19	55.90	303.46	97.62 to 98.30	129,144	124,808
Greater Than 14,999	774	97.96	97.70	96.57	05.32	101.17	60.39	241.50	97.59 to 98.26	131,789	127,264
Greater Than 29,999	746	97.94	97.30	96.50	04.91	100.83	60.39	173.73	97.58 to 98.24	135,914	131,160
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	98.50	98.50	98.50	00.00	100.00	98.50	98.50	N/A	4,000	3,940
5,000 TO 14,999	17	112.58	146.99	149.00	50.87	98.65	55.90	303.46	84.24 to 280.42	8,718	12,989
15,000 TO 29,999	28	99.43	108.36	107.31	15.82	100.98	82.06	241.50	96.05 to 106.46	21,877	23,476
30,000 TO 59,999	78	98.18	101.96	102.02	09.11	99.94	67.40	173.73	97.12 to 100.17	45,192	46,103
60,000 TO 99,999	188	98.32	98.06	97.90	04.57	100.16	60.39	136.96	97.48 to 98.66	79,983	78,307
100,000 TO 149,999	205	98.08	96.79	96.68	03.59	100.11	63.99	124.62	97.37 to 98.55	123,516	119,414
150,000 TO 249,999	225	97.70	96.07	96.04	04.84	100.03	60.94	144.34	96.97 to 98.19	185,595	178,251
250,000 TO 499,999	49	96.63	94.78	94.90	05.28	99.87	62.76	111.93	94.57 to 98.48	310,215	294,392
500,000 TO 999,999	1	93.79	93.79	93.79	00.00	100.00	93.79	93.79	N/A	550,000	515,840
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	792	98.02	98.76	96.64	06.51	102.19	55.90	303.46	97.62 to 98.33	128,986	124,656

2013 Correlation Section for Lincoln County

A. Residential Real Property

Lincoln County is located in the southwestern part of Nebraska; the countywide population is approximately 36,200 and would be considered one of the regional retail centers across the state. North Platte (pop. 24,733) is the county seat and maintains a strong residential market with ample employment opportunities in various retail and professional business fields. The presence of the Union Pacific Railroad does a great deal to enhance the residential market as well. Many of the jobs and services support the strong agricultural economy of the area. The surrounding towns of Brady, Hershey, Maxwell, Sutherland, Wallace and Wellfleet offer less services and employment but are supported by the economics of the agricultural sector and North Platte.

The statistical sampling of 792 residential sales is an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Lincoln County. The county has a very thorough sales verification process, a sampling of non-qualified sales was reviewed and there is confidence that as many sales as possible are being utilized. Overall there is a close relationship between all three measures of central tendency, and the qualitative measures meet the prescribed parameters of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards. The coefficient of dispersion is somewhat lower than would normally be expected. However, an analysis of the sold properties and the abstract shows similar movement of sold and unsold properties, as well the calculated median of the residential class has been stable over the past several years with small annual valuation increases. These factors suggest that there has been uniform and proportionate treatment within the class and support the use of the statistics in determining the level of value.

A new six year physical inspection and review began in 2011. All of the north side of the City of North Platte was re-assessed for 2011, half of the south side was done for 2012, and Lake Maloney and Jeffrey Lake were re-assessed for 2013. For 2014, the remainder of North Platte will be completed and then work will move into the villages of Brady, Maxwell, Hershey, Sutherland, Wallace, Wellfleet and Dickens. If time permits, work will begin on the rural properties with anticipation of being completed by the end of 2015. In addition, the goal is to re-cost all properties that were previously assessed during the last physical inspection and review cycle utilizing the new Orion system. Lake Maloney and Jeffrey Lake have been done in the new system using June 2012 costing, all other properties are on June 2010 costing. The objective is to have all parcels on the June 2012 cost tables by the end of the six year review.

Based on all available information, the level of value of the residential class of real property in Lincoln County is 98%.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln County

A commercial review was completed in 2010. The Lincoln County appraisal staff continues to monitor sales of commercial and industrial properties and makes changes as necessary. The commercial market has been hindered somewhat due to the economic status of the country but an increase of commercial sales has been observed in the later portion of 2010 and continuing through 2013. New construction and building permits were timely inspected for current assessment information. Commercial growth for 2013 is substantial and shows that the commercial market is improving significantly.

For 2014 a commercial land review will be conducted in the central business districts of North Platte and the Village of Wallace.

For 2013 a new Orion CAMA system by Tyler Technologies was implemented; the county went live as of August 2012. The “Go Live” date was supposed to have been in May but several hang-ups occurred as well as conversion issues and therefore the “Go Live” date was pushed back 3 months.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Lincoln County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Appraisal staff and occasionally will be assisted by the GIS technician.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Within the City of North Platte the commercial market is considerable in size and shows a large decline in the small Villages.
	02	The suburban corridors connect the traffic into the City and along each highway and Interstate
	03	The rural areas where they are not within urban jurisdictions.
	04	Sutherland Village limits with small village commercial parcels.
	05	Hershey Village limits with amenities close to North Platte.
	06	Brady Village limits with different amenities.
	07	Maxwell Village limits with different amenities.
	08	Wallace Village commercial parcels located approximately 45 miles from North Platte.
	09	Wellfleet commercials which are very limited due to size of Village.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The Cost Approach is the most commonly used method of valuing commercial properties however, when available we also use the Income Approach. Sales Comparison Approach is used to help value unsold properties with the Cost Approach.	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	Unique commercial properties usually do not have comparable sales so a cost approach is performed as well as an income approach if income producing. Then a correlation of value using both the cost and income approaches to value is determined. There are times when it is necessary to go outside of the county and sometimes statewide to find comparable properties or sales to aid in valuing these types of properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	07/01/2012	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	

	The county studied the Marshall & Swift tables and found that they were compatible to use.
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	No
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	The Marshall & Swift depreciation tables are being used currently for each valuation grouping.
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	The last lot value study was conducted in 2008. There were some small areas reviewed for 2009.
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	The Sales Comparison Approach was used as much as possible however in areas where it is mostly built-up the extraction method was used by the county to aid in determining market value of the land.

**56 Lincoln
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 : 51
 Total Sales Price : 12,808,576
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,036,576
 Total Assessed Value : 11,237,020
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,619
 Avg. Assessed Value : 220,334

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 86
 MEAN : 92
 COD : 11.14
 PRD : 106.73

COV : 22.62
 STD : 20.81
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.77
 MAX Sales Ratio : 181.58
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.57

95% Median C.I. : 93.79 to 98.15
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 75.31 to 97.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.29 to 97.71

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:28PM

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	1	93.79	93.79	93.79	00.00	100.00	93.79	93.79	N/A	300,000	281,360
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	97.06	95.62	92.60	03.86	103.26	88.56	99.80	N/A	290,625	269,133
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	88.59	87.29	75.05	14.92	116.31	53.38	108.15	N/A	123,200	92,467
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	98.67	98.67	98.52	00.26	100.15	98.41	98.93	N/A	83,500	82,265
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	98.38	85.71	85.33	14.59	100.45	45.36	100.73	N/A	185,000	157,858
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	96.33	96.08	95.05	02.08	101.08	93.50	98.15	N/A	142,500	135,440
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	90.19	76.35	44.35	18.89	172.15	29.57	95.44	N/A	325,475	144,359
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	8	95.05	95.47	95.27	03.59	100.21	89.32	105.58	89.32 to 105.58	453,038	431,616
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	99.49	97.34	97.45	02.50	99.89	92.53	100.00	N/A	104,268	101,607
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	81.65	80.84	89.89	23.18	89.93	60.11	99.94	N/A	190,250	171,021
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	11	97.55	100.35	88.19	14.77	113.79	49.04	181.58	86.19 to 103.91	312,234	275,356
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	66.44	66.44	66.44	00.00	100.00	66.44	66.44	N/A	46,500	30,895
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	12	96.80	92.51	88.39	08.27	104.66	53.38	108.15	88.56 to 98.94	187,125	165,396
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	20	95.05	89.81	83.44	09.10	107.63	29.57	105.58	91.54 to 97.37	311,810	260,178
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	19	97.55	93.98	88.89	14.82	105.73	49.04	181.58	86.19 to 99.66	239,730	213,090
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	15	98.41	90.61	86.94	10.08	104.22	45.36	108.15	88.56 to 99.39	179,033	155,655
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	19	94.65	91.87	83.95	06.80	109.43	29.57	105.58	91.54 to 98.01	305,737	256,681
<u>ALL</u>	51	96.64	92.00	86.20	11.14	106.73	29.57	181.58	93.79 to 98.15	255,619	220,334

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	43	96.64	91.52	86.72	08.01	105.54	29.57	108.15	93.50 to 98.15	290,530	251,958
04	2	70.01	70.01	47.73	35.21	146.68	45.36	94.65	N/A	104,000	49,635
05	1	63.70	63.70	63.70	00.00	100.00	63.70	63.70	N/A	120,000	76,435
06	3	99.80	101.68	100.76	01.97	100.91	99.66	105.58	N/A	45,833	46,180
08	2	124.01	124.01	113.18	46.42	109.57	66.44	181.58	N/A	39,136	44,293
<u>ALL</u>	51	96.64	92.00	86.20	11.14	106.73	29.57	181.58	93.79 to 98.15	255,619	220,334

56 Lincoln
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 : 51
Total Sales Price : 12,808,576
Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,036,576
Total Assessed Value : 11,237,020
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,619
Avg. Assessed Value : 220,334

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 92
COD : 11.14
PRD : 106.73

COV : 22.62
STD : 20.81
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.77
MAX Sales Ratio : 181.58
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.57

95% Median C.I. : 93.79 to 98.15
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 75.31 to 97.08
95% Mean C.I. : 86.29 to 97.71

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:28PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	2	75.90	75.90	67.63	29.67	112.23	53.38	98.41	N/A	208,500	141,015
03	49	96.64	92.66	86.81	10.65	106.74	29.57	181.58	93.79 to 98.15	257,542	223,571
04											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>96.64</u>	<u>92.00</u>	<u>86.20</u>	<u>11.14</u>	<u>106.73</u>	<u>29.57</u>	<u>181.58</u>	<u>93.79 to 98.15</u>	<u>255,619</u>	<u>220,334</u>

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	2	96.10	96.10	96.10	01.51	100.00	94.65	97.55	N/A	10,000	9,610
Less Than 30,000	5	97.55	97.32	97.53	04.45	99.78	89.04	105.58	N/A	17,500	17,068
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	51	96.64	92.00	86.20	11.14	106.73	29.57	181.58	93.79 to 98.15	255,619	220,334
Greater Than 14,999	49	96.64	91.83	86.18	11.54	106.56	29.57	181.58	93.50 to 98.41	265,644	228,935
Greater Than 29,999	46	96.29	91.42	86.12	11.89	106.15	29.57	181.58	93.22 to 98.41	281,502	242,428
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	96.10	96.10	96.10	01.51	100.00	94.65	97.55	N/A	10,000	9,610
15,000 TO 29,999	3	99.80	98.14	97.96	05.52	100.18	89.04	105.58	N/A	22,500	22,040
30,000 TO 59,999	9	97.25	102.98	100.17	14.76	102.81	66.44	181.58	91.54 to 100.00	42,320	42,389
60,000 TO 99,999	8	98.29	94.16	94.17	07.24	99.99	60.11	108.15	60.11 to 108.15	84,850	79,899
100,000 TO 149,999	9	94.94	91.75	91.73	08.03	100.02	63.70	103.91	87.50 to 99.39	115,989	106,394
150,000 TO 249,999	7	95.44	94.33	94.29	04.11	100.04	86.19	99.94	86.19 to 99.94	196,786	185,540
250,000 TO 499,999	9	93.79	80.94	80.41	18.03	100.66	45.36	100.73	49.04 to 99.60	363,111	291,961
500,000 TO 999,999	1	88.56	88.56	88.56	00.00	100.00	88.56	88.56	N/A	700,000	619,920
1,000,000 +	3	95.94	74.05	84.13	23.31	88.02	29.57	96.64	N/A	1,833,333	1,542,363
<u>ALL</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>96.64</u>	<u>92.00</u>	<u>86.20</u>	<u>11.14</u>	<u>106.73</u>	<u>29.57</u>	<u>181.58</u>	<u>93.79 to 98.15</u>	<u>255,619</u>	<u>220,334</u>

**56 Lincoln
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 : 51
 Total Sales Price : 12,808,576
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,036,576
 Total Assessed Value : 11,237,020
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,619
 Avg. Assessed Value : 220,334

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 86
 MEAN : 92
 COD : 11.14
 PRD : 106.73

COV : 22.62
 STD : 20.81
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.77
 MAX Sales Ratio : 181.58
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.57

95% Median C.I. : 93.79 to 98.15
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 75.31 to 97.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.29 to 97.71

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:28PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	3	98.42	85.80	86.03	13.13	99.73	60.11	98.86	N/A	81,600	70,203
304	1	49.04	49.04	49.04	00.00	100.00	49.04	49.04	N/A	650,000	318,745
311	1	96.64	96.64	96.64	00.00	100.00	96.64	96.64	N/A	2,000,000	1,932,885
341	1	93.50	93.50	93.50	00.00	100.00	93.50	93.50	N/A	370,000	345,955
343	3	93.22	91.45	90.71	03.13	100.82	86.19	94.94	N/A	158,333	143,630
344	5	98.01	95.86	96.74	03.22	99.09	88.59	99.60	N/A	268,000	259,263
349	1	88.56	88.56	88.56	00.00	100.00	88.56	88.56	N/A	700,000	619,920
350	1	66.44	66.44	66.44	00.00	100.00	66.44	66.44	N/A	46,500	30,895
352	5	97.37	88.11	79.96	12.62	110.19	53.38	103.91	N/A	144,800	115,785
353	3	97.55	123.89	113.58	30.43	109.08	92.53	181.58	N/A	45,590	51,782
384	1	91.54	91.54	91.54	00.00	100.00	91.54	91.54	N/A	54,900	50,255
386	1	63.70	63.70	63.70	00.00	100.00	63.70	63.70	N/A	120,000	76,435
391	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	45,805	45,805
406	12	96.91	96.17	95.52	03.81	100.68	89.04	105.58	91.33 to 99.49	125,200	119,587
413	1	95.94	95.94	95.94	00.00	100.00	95.94	95.94	N/A	2,500,000	2,398,510
426	1	108.15	108.15	108.15	00.00	100.00	108.15	108.15	N/A	72,000	77,865
444	1	99.39	99.39	99.39	00.00	100.00	99.39	99.39	N/A	105,000	104,360
528	5	95.44	87.30	84.86	12.57	102.88	45.36	100.73	N/A	151,100	128,218
531	2	64.62	64.62	35.65	54.24	181.26	29.57	99.66	N/A	547,500	195,188
532	1	97.25	97.25	97.25	00.00	100.00	97.25	97.25	N/A	59,900	58,250
555	1	98.83	98.83	98.83	00.00	100.00	98.83	98.83	N/A	39,000	38,545
<u>ALL</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>96.64</u>	<u>92.00</u>	<u>86.20</u>	<u>11.14</u>	<u>106.73</u>	<u>29.57</u>	<u>181.58</u>	<u>93.79 to 98.15</u>	<u>255,619</u>	<u>220,334</u>

**2013 Correlation Section
for Lincoln County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Lincoln County is located in the southwestern part of Nebraska; North Platte (pop. 24,733) is the county seat and is a strong retail center that draws retail customers from fairly large trade areas and with the Wal-Mart Distribution Center serves as a secondary whole-sale-retailer. The Union Pacific Railroad also impacts the commercial market. North Platte is along the I-80/Highway 30 corridor and there is good demand for commercial properties in the area; the market has remained stable over the last several years with ample employment opportunities in various retail and professional business fields. Many of the jobs and services also support the strong agricultural economy of the area. In the rural areas there is not an organized market for commercial properties, the market in these areas is heavily influenced by the small local population.

The statistical sampling of 51 commercial sales will be used in the measurement of the commercial class of real property in Lincoln County. The county has a very thorough sales verification process, a sample of non-qualified sales has been reviewed and there is confidence that as many sales as possible are being utilized in the analysis and valuation of the commercial class of real property. An acceptable level of value has been attained. There are 5 valuation groupings and 20 different occupancy codes. The sample may not be representative of the commercial class as a whole but the statistical measures are demonstrating consistency in what has occurred. The movement in the sales file compared to the movement in the population is somewhat similar and gives indication that the sold and unsold properties are being treated uniformly.

All appraisal work is done in-house; the staff is detail oriented and very thorough in tracking market activity, reviewing sales, addressing areas of concern, and implementing a six-year physical inspection and review cycle. For 2013 a new Orion CAMA system by Tyler Technologies will be implemented and all commercial parcels will be re-valued in it.

Based on all available information, the level of value of the commercial class of real property in Lincoln County is 97%.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln County

Agricultural land is reviewed by the staff appraisers during their sales review process and through the pickup work process. Land use and all changes are noted and adjustments made on the property record cards for the current year. A listing of new irrigation registered wells with the Nebraska Department of Water Resources is obtained every year and cross referenced with the land use on the parcel. FSA certified maps provided by the taxpayer are also documents used to determine land use. The numeric soil classification within the GIS system is used as well. In October, 2012 the GIS imagery was updated to late May and early June, 2012 aeriels. This new imagery has been helpful in finding irrigated pivots and unreported improvements. On-site inspections as well as letters to property owners have been employed to verify this newly found information. The new imagery and soil data has also been advantageous to more accurately determine and define market area boundaries; there were slight modifications to some of the lines thus causing a few parcels to exchange areas based on the topography and soil types. Most of the adjustments and changes occurred within 2012. However, a GIS technician works in-house and maintaining the system is a continual work in progress, if further changes and updates occur with newer imagery the new data will be verified before the property record card(s) are changed. Currently, as part of the six-year physical inspection and review cycle, the GIS technician is reviewing every agricultural parcel utilizing the 2012 GIS imagery. If it appears land use changes need to be made or structures or improvements have been added to a parcel, the staff appraisers will verify and change it for 2014. All improved rural parcels, agricultural and rural residential, will be reviewed in 2015 and 2016 and put in the new Orion system using June, 2012 costing.

Land use permits are required by the County Planning & Zoning regulations for new construction of residential and/or agricultural nature. These permits are sent to the appraisers after the approval by the planner. The improvements are inspected and measured with interviews of the owner or contractor, in person, by telephone, or door hang tags for a return call. The improvements are valued using the identical Marshall & Swift Costing tables as in the Urban or Suburban valuation groupings.

The market value of agricultural land is established as of the statutory January 1st assessment date. The sales within the three year study period (10-01-09 to 09-30-12) were analyzed to determine if the agricultural land class was at an acceptable level of value; 75% of market value. Each land use (irrigated, dry and grass) in each of the five market areas was also analyzed. Based on the detailed review of the agricultural market within and around Lincoln County, new values were set accordingly for the 2013 assessment year.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Lincoln County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Appraisal staff and occasionally will be assisted by the GIS technician.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	Market Area 1	<p>Market Area 1 is along the North Platte, South Platte and Platte rivers and stretches the full width of the county from west to east 54 miles as the crow flies. Soils in this area are somewhat poorly to very poorly drained soils on bottom lands, and well-drained to somewhat poorly drained soils on stream terraces, foot slopes and high bottom lands. Some loamy and sandy soils on uplands run between the North Platte and South Platte Rivers from the Keith County line easterly to their confluence east of North Platte. Good irrigated and dry land farms make up in excess of one half of this area; more than a third is wet hay meadows and pasture along with accretion and waste land. The LCG's in this market area may occur in the other areas but are not as productive as those located here due to the lack of sub irrigation from the rivers and are not in the large quantities. The location of I-80 through this market also adds to its desirability.</p>
	Market Area 2	<p>Market Area 2 consists of a little more than one-fourth of the county north of the rivers. This area was established nearly 25 years ago since it coincided well with soils of Logan and McPherson Counties as defined in Title 350 Chapter 14 Reg 003.01B. The major portion of this area is pasture land of sandy soils on uplands. Silty and sandy soils on uplands, loamy and sandy soils on uplands and silty soils on smooth uplands exist on the eastern and northern borders of the county as well as along the Birdwood Creek north of the North Platte River between Hershey and Sutherland. Small areas of loamy and sandy soils on uplands, well-to excessively drained and silty soils on tableland broad ridges can be found on our borders with Custer and Logan Counties. These areas are farmed or used to harvest forage for livestock. There are many large ranches of thousands of acres that have been in families for generations.</p>
	Market Area 3	<p>Market Area 3 is three-quarters sandy soils of the Valentine association on uplands, excessively drained and used as pasture for livestock. There are small pockets of loamy and sandy soils on uplands which are well- to excessively drained and are cultivated. There are approximately 175 pivot irrigation systems. This area lies</p>

	<p>Market Area 4</p> <p>Market Area 5</p>	<p>south of the South Platte River, from the Keith County line, south to the Middle Republican Natural Resource District boundary and east to Market Area 4.</p> <p>Market Area 4, situated south of the Platte River in eastern Lincoln County is comprised of nearly four-fifths rough broken land, loess association. This soil type is fine grained material dominantly of silt-sized particles deposited by wind on dissected uplands, suitable only for pasture of narrow valleys and steep canyon walls supporting major infestations of volunteer red cedar trees. The remaining one fifth consists of silty soils on smooth uplands occurring along the Frontier County line as well as extending northwesterly from the corner of the Dawson County line into the area. These areas are more conducive to cultivation.</p> <p>Market Area 5, formerly included in Area 3, was established for the 2007 tax year. This area is in the Middle Republican Natural Resource District where there are legal and litigation issues due to excessive irrigation uses. A moratorium since July, 2004 on new well drilling and a limit on the amount of water allowed to each well per year had caused the number of sales and prices paid to drop in 2006. Nearly two thirds of this area is used as pasture for livestock and is of sandy soils on uplands. On the eastern edge next to Market Area 4, loamy and sandy soils on uplands in small areas allow for some farming as well as the silty soils on smooth uplands along our southwest borders next to Perkins and Hayes County.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.	<p>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</p>
	<p>Class or subclass includes, but not limited to, the classifications of agricultural land defined in sections 77-1359 and 77-1363, parcel use, parcel type, location, geographic characteristics, zoning, city size, parcel size and market characteristics. Also a good understanding of Title 350 Chapter 14 Agricultural and Horticultural Land Assessment Regulations; specifically REG-14-002.01 and 14-002.07 through 14-002.56 definitions of soil types and their uses and REG-14-003 Areas defining the 8 land areas outlining the geographical formations, soils parent materials, topographic regions, growing seasons, frost-free days, average rainfall, predominant land uses, typical farming and ranching practices and typical crops located in each Land Area.</p>
4.	<p>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</p>
	<p>Generally rural residential acreages are those parcels that do not meet the definition or criteria for agricultural and horticultural land. These acreages are found scattered intermittently throughout Lincoln County. However, most of the parcels are located closer to urban areas and the land use was primarily grass or pasture. The demand for these acreages has been and continues to be high. Many people are attracted to these rural sites that afford them the opportunity to build a home and/or appropriate</p>

	<p>outbuildings and live the “country” lifestyle of their choosing. This generally involves livestock which is predominately horses. These parcels may have some agricultural uses, however they are not considered to be viable commercial agricultural or horticultural operations. Thus the value at their highest and best use is as rural residential acreages. The method of value is the sales comparison approach. The majority of these acreages are easily defined but some are not and require considerable thought and discussion with others and one’s self. Educated judgment is the basis for all appraisals and the appraiser’s judgment is paramount in the decision making process for valuing these parcels.</p> <p>Recreational land as defined in Regulation Chapter 10 001.05E means all parcels of real property predominately used or intended to be used for diversion, entertainment and relaxation on an occasional basis. This would include, but is not limited to, fishing, hunting, camping, boating, hiking, picnicking and the access or view that simply allows relaxation, diversion and entertainment. This class is zoned A-1 Agricultural by Lincoln County zoning laws and is generally located in the flood plain. Recreational lands have capability class VIII soils that preclude their use as agricultural land and restrict their use to recreation, wildlife, water supply or to esthetic purposes. The highest and best use for recreational lands is its current use, recreational and wildlife habitat.</p>
5.	<p>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</p>
	<p>Farm home sites are usually not more than 1 acre and rural residential home sites are more than 10 acres which complies with the zoning regulations of Lincoln County Zoning Regulations. 11 rural neighborhoods have been established by the county appraisers based on sales of improved land in the county. Either site is valued according to the per acre rate established using sales of unimproved land in each neighborhood and adjustments made for + or – base acres.</p> <p>Farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued according to size and location in each of 11 rural neighborhoods. The farther from urban areas the parcel is located, the lower the value per acre. The reason being; longer commutes to work, shopping, schools, entertainment, and medical care and gravel roads just to name a few.</p>
6.	<p>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</p>
	<p>All sales throughout the county are reviewed monthly. During this sales verification process, there are several factors that are examined which include, but are not limited to, sale price and price per acre, size of parcel, how the property was advertised, manner of sale, use of the property and intent of purchase. We speak with both buyers and sellers or any other related party to verify information as well as a physical inspection of the property is done if possible. Anything out of the ordinary will cause further examination of the sale as well as review of other sales in the same area for major differences. When differences are found, this would usually indicate</p>

	non-agricultural influences of which we would watch for other similar situations to see if it becomes a major influence within that market area.
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.
	Yes, there is a value difference for special valuation parcels.
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.
	Lincoln County currently only has 4 parcels that contain WRP land. We have it valued the same as our Recreational land at this time, but have had a sale containing WRP land & will be looking at a sales comparison approach for possibly changing the WRP land value for 2013.

56 Lincoln
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 : 122
Total Sales Price : 45,974,958
Total Adj. Sales Price : 45,833,693
Total Assessed Value : 30,813,614
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 375,686
Avg. Assessed Value : 252,571

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 73
COD : 22.46
PRD : 108.51

COV : 28.01
STD : 20.43
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.17
MAX Sales Ratio : 139.06
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.88

95% Median C.I. : 67.00 to 76.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.51 to 71.95
95% Mean C.I. : 69.32 to 76.58

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:29PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	72.82	74.04	73.33	10.85	100.97	61.79	102.25	64.24 to 83.35	455,589	334,062
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	77.67	78.97	79.25	10.36	99.65	63.27	99.82	71.42 to 92.42	210,802	167,053
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	15	86.98	82.14	83.97	12.19	97.82	54.79	96.72	70.97 to 93.83	234,366	196,799
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	7	102.75	97.46	94.75	07.84	102.86	76.27	111.27	76.27 to 111.27	287,371	272,291
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	15	78.67	76.49	77.02	17.26	99.31	48.56	100.53	60.58 to 91.02	281,751	216,998
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	67.00	68.80	67.72	16.37	101.59	40.10	100.00	60.17 to 81.66	642,649	435,190
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	9	71.87	73.00	68.01	18.03	107.34	55.24	91.52	56.90 to 90.05	275,503	187,379
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	5	70.84	79.18	71.46	30.29	110.80	44.76	139.06	N/A	354,474	253,320
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	16	67.59	71.80	64.67	18.27	111.03	55.83	110.79	56.13 to 80.81	548,832	354,938
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	15	51.02	57.97	52.12	30.87	111.22	35.32	106.52	40.42 to 63.53	327,089	170,464
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	8	52.51	63.04	53.92	48.58	116.91	35.18	116.93	35.18 to 116.93	394,194	212,533
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	45.69	48.06	38.20	32.61	125.81	29.88	70.97	N/A	687,575	262,648
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	41	82.50	82.08	80.98	14.59	101.36	54.79	111.27	73.83 to 90.42	292,200	236,637
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	38	72.09	74.19	70.99	19.99	104.51	40.10	139.06	63.21 to 81.85	375,316	266,439
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	43	61.64	63.14	56.08	28.29	112.59	29.88	116.93	54.93 to 69.06	455,616	255,507
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	46	82.76	82.01	82.54	15.10	99.36	48.56	111.27	74.78 to 91.02	253,273	209,053
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	39	69.06	72.33	66.69	19.56	108.46	40.10	139.06	63.21 to 74.25	482,488	321,762
<u>ALL</u>	122	71.99	72.95	67.23	22.46	108.51	29.88	139.06	67.00 to 76.09	375,686	252,571

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	24	71.99	77.49	74.95	22.07	103.39	49.39	116.93	63.38 to 96.72	283,276	212,327
2	29	74.25	78.38	70.03	25.59	111.92	40.10	139.06	59.02 to 94.17	398,752	279,247
3	12	68.99	69.11	63.98	28.06	108.02	35.32	111.27	38.86 to 86.20	668,493	427,724
4	27	71.47	71.88	71.43	16.40	100.63	35.94	95.80	63.27 to 81.85	297,709	212,660
5	30	71.81	66.56	59.11	22.57	112.60	29.88	93.83	60.17 to 78.67	380,373	224,836
<u>ALL</u>	122	71.99	72.95	67.23	22.46	108.51	29.88	139.06	67.00 to 76.09	375,686	252,571

56 Lincoln
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 : 122
 Total Sales Price : 45,974,958
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 45,833,693
 Total Assessed Value : 30,813,614
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 375,686
 Avg. Assessed Value : 252,571

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 22.46
 PRD : 108.51

COV : 28.01
 STD : 20.43
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.17
 MAX Sales Ratio : 139.06
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.88

95% Median C.I. : 67.00 to 76.09
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.51 to 71.95
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.32 to 76.58

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:29PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	11	99.28	92.25	92.00	11.47	100.27	71.42	111.27	72.10 to 106.52	230,797	212,332
1	9	99.28	92.36	89.01	09.66	103.76	71.42	106.52	72.10 to 102.25	222,692	198,217
2	1	72.31	72.31	72.31	00.00	100.00	72.31	72.31	N/A	110,538	79,927
3	1	111.27	111.27	111.27	00.00	100.00	111.27	111.27	N/A	424,000	471,775
_____Dry_____											
County	13	48.56	56.15	53.15	34.86	105.64	35.18	99.05	35.94 to 86.98	217,202	115,442
3	3	57.86	64.08	60.84	36.71	105.33	35.32	99.05	N/A	320,467	194,971
4	3	48.56	46.43	45.05	12.93	103.06	35.94	54.79	N/A	151,846	68,410
5	7	43.37	56.92	50.52	40.51	112.67	35.18	91.90	35.18 to 91.90	200,955	101,514
_____Grass_____											
County	65	74.25	75.73	71.31	17.74	106.20	36.44	139.06	71.31 to 78.67	346,309	246,960
1	3	71.31	66.39	63.76	07.43	104.12	55.98	71.87	N/A	160,000	102,010
2	27	74.78	79.32	70.36	26.41	112.73	40.10	139.06	57.51 to 95.36	411,047	289,212
3	4	81.66	80.12	81.12	05.18	98.77	70.97	86.20	N/A	187,380	152,001
4	19	72.80	72.90	70.85	12.14	102.89	54.93	91.52	63.27 to 81.85	343,701	243,502
5	12	74.17	72.99	74.02	11.11	98.61	36.44	84.93	66.12 to 83.35	304,334	225,259
_____ALL_____	122	71.99	72.95	67.23	22.46	108.51	29.88	139.06	67.00 to 76.09	375,686	252,571

56 Lincoln
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 : 122
Total Sales Price : 45,974,958
Total Adj. Sales Price : 45,833,693
Total Assessed Value : 30,813,614
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 375,686
Avg. Assessed Value : 252,571

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 73
COD : 22.46
PRD : 108.51

COV : 28.01
STD : 20.43
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.17
MAX Sales Ratio : 139.06
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.88

95% Median C.I. : 67.00 to 76.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.51 to 71.95
95% Mean C.I. : 69.32 to 76.58

Printed:3/22/2013 1:30:29PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____ Irrigated _____											
County	30	71.13	73.59	62.24	26.84	118.24	29.88	116.93	63.38 to 90.42	547,020	340,488
1	16	78.38	82.84	76.24	22.63	108.66	50.72	116.93	63.38 to 100.53	286,473	218,414
2	2	65.67	65.67	62.18	10.13	105.61	59.02	72.31	N/A	232,769	144,729
3	5	63.53	63.32	62.43	32.57	101.43	35.95	111.27	N/A	1,262,200	787,955
5	7	69.06	62.06	49.32	29.96	125.83	29.88	93.83	29.88 to 93.83	721,500	355,824
_____ Dry _____											
County	13	48.56	56.15	53.15	34.86	105.64	35.18	99.05	35.94 to 86.98	217,202	115,442
3	3	57.86	64.08	60.84	36.71	105.33	35.32	99.05	N/A	320,467	194,971
4	3	48.56	46.43	45.05	12.93	103.06	35.94	54.79	N/A	151,846	68,410
5	7	43.37	56.92	50.52	40.51	112.67	35.18	91.90	35.18 to 91.90	200,955	101,514
_____ Grass _____											
County	68	74.38	76.14	71.95	17.69	105.82	36.44	139.06	71.31 to 80.81	343,565	247,187
1	3	71.31	66.39	63.76	07.43	104.12	55.98	71.87	N/A	160,000	102,010
2	27	74.78	79.32	70.36	26.41	112.73	40.10	139.06	57.51 to 95.36	411,047	289,212
3	4	81.66	80.12	81.12	05.18	98.77	70.97	86.20	N/A	187,380	152,001
4	22	73.70	74.55	72.91	12.85	102.25	54.93	95.17	64.12 to 82.66	335,574	244,676
5	12	74.17	72.99	74.02	11.11	98.61	36.44	84.93	66.12 to 83.35	304,334	225,259
_____ ALL _____	122	71.99	72.95	67.23	22.46	108.51	29.88	139.06	67.00 to 76.09	375,686	252,571

Lincoln County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Lincoln	1	2,450	2,448	2,449	2,446	2,328	2,297	2,306	2,252	2,386
Keith	3	2,320	2,316	2,210	2,209	2,140	2,139	2,090	2,073	2,248
Dawson	1	N/A	2,975	2,900	2,680	2,425	2,062	2,021	1,945	2,778
Lincoln	2	1,350	1,350	1,335	1,350	1,350	1,330	1,345	1,344	1,344
Keith	1	N/A	1,000	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	1,000	1,000	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Logan	1	N/A	1,950	1,790	1,790	1,365	1,365	1,260	1,260	1,558
Custer	4	N/A	2,351	2,154	1,793	1,646	1,550	1,523	1,431	1,922
Dawson	1	N/A	2,975	2,900	2,680	2,425	2,062	2,021	1,945	2,778
Lincoln	3	N/A	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,094	2,094	2,038	2,094
Keith	3	2,320	2,316	2,210	2,209	2,140	2,139	2,090	2,073	2,248
Perkins	1	N/A	2,579	2,143	2,103	2,108	2,059	2,068	2,079	2,246
Lincoln	4	1,700	1,688	1,542	1,700	1,582	1,625	1,475	1,538	1,625
Dawson	2	N/A	2,225	2,160	1,855	1,274	N/A	960	960	2,039
Frontier	1	1,950	1,947	1,817	1,868	1,800	1,800	1,722	1,673	1,907
Lincoln	5	N/A	1,993	2,000	2,000	1,995	1,979	1,987	1,990	1,989
Hayes	1	1,900	1,900	1,750	1,750	1,625	1,625	1,500	1,500	1,748
Perkins	1	N/A	2,579	2,143	2,103	2,108	2,059	2,068	2,079	2,246

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Lincoln	1	935	935	935	935	935	935	935	934	935
Keith	3	1,000	916	800	715	655	655	620	620	825
Dawson	1	N/A	1,485	1,390	1,310	1,215	1,124	935	935	1,214
Lincoln	2	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480
Keith	1	N/A	450	N/A	450	400	400	375	375	405
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	375	N/A	375	375	375	375
Logan	1	N/A	770	730	730	670	540	525	525	643
Custer	4	N/A	925	875	865	805	650	630	625	799
Dawson	1	N/A	1,485	1,390	1,310	1,215	1,124	935	935	1,214
Lincoln	3	N/A	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725
Keith	3	1,000	916	800	715	655	655	620	620	825
Perkins	1	N/A	780	780	680	680	680	600	600	727
Lincoln	4	625	625	625	625	625	625	625	625	625
Dawson	2	N/A	985	920	770	705	N/A	570	530	759
Frontier	1	910	910	850	850	795	795	740	740	876
Lincoln	5	640	640	640	640	640	640	640	640	640
Hayes	1	890	890	800	800	750	750	600	600	826
Perkins	1	N/A	780	780	680	680	680	600	600	727

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Lincoln	1	880	880	880	880	880	850	850	831	850
Keith	3	365	374	362	355	354	334	327	307	329
Dawson	1	N/A	915	775	720	685	625	625	620	641
Lincoln	2	320	320	320	320	320	290	290	290	290
Keith	1	N/A	323	N/A	291	281	270	257	256	256
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	250	250	N/A	250	250	250	250
Logan	1	N/A	315	315	315	315	315	315	315	315
Custer	4	N/A	500	496	495	491	490	464	440	451
Dawson	1	N/A	915	775	720	685	625	625	620	641
Lincoln	3	N/A	410	410	410	410	330	330	328	332
Keith	3	365	374	362	355	354	334	327	307	329
Perkins	1	N/A	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
Lincoln	4	420	420	420	420	420	380	380	380	383
Dawson	2	N/A	695	605	515	515	N/A	395	395	433
Frontier	1	390	390	390	390	390	390	390	390	390
Lincoln	5	410	410	410	410	410	295	295	291	300
Hayes	1	310	310	310	310	310	310	310	310	310
Perkins	1	N/A	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350

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

Methodology for Special Valuation
Lincoln County
March 1, 2013

At the present time there is one parcel that has been approved for special valuation near the city of North Platte. The parcel in question is land adjoining the Wal-Mart Super Center. Sales of unimproved commercial land in this area have been very active and through the sales verification and ratio study processes a value was established. Commercial development is the highest and best use of this parcel. Sales of unimproved agricultural land in Market Area 1 are analyzed and the value for dry crop land applied as the special value. This land is being used to harvest alfalfa as feed for livestock.

There are also 317 approved special valuation applications that contain accretion ground in Market Area 1 running along the North & South Platte Rivers and running the length of the county from West to East. An extensive sales comparison study was done in this area to determine the actual value of the highest & best use of these accretions as recreational parcels. This study was also used to determine the uninfluenced agricultural value these parcels would have if approved as Special Value parcels. We applied the lowest class soil grassland value as the special value in this area. An in depth copy of this study is kept in the Lincoln County Policy & Procedures Manual for review.

There are other applications on file, which upon review or inspection, have been disapproved. Some of these parcels may have small acres of agricultural land present. We feel these agricultural acres are NOT the primary use of these parcels. Most of these acres would actually be considered food plots. Putting a few head of horses or a few cows on these parcels for 1-2 months out of the year, do not qualify a parcel to be used primarily for agricultural purposes. There are also some applications pending a review and physical inspection for 2013 approval or denial.

Julie Stenger
Lincoln County Assessor

2013 Correlation Section for Lincoln County

A. Agricultural Land

Lincoln County is located in the southwestern part of Nebraska; the North and South Platte rivers come in from the western part of the county and converge to form the Platte River just east of North Platte. Major highways serving the county are interstate 80 and highway 30 from east to west, highway 83 from north to south, highway 92 northwest to Tryon, highway 25 south of Sutherland, and highway 23 running through Dickens. These highways together with the local sale barn, numerous grain elevators, the world's largest rail yard (Union Pacific's Bailey Yard), and a Wal-Mart distribution center are all attributes that have an economic impact on Lincoln County and effect the agricultural market.

Four Major Land Resource Areas (MLRA) cross Lincoln County. In the far northeastern corner is a sliver of MLRA 71 (Central Nebraska Loess Hills), which is more apparent in Custer and Dawson counties, and is comprised of cropland and grassland with an average precipitation of 21 to 29 inches. Most of the northern part of Lincoln County however, lies in MLRA 65 (Nebraska Sand Hills) with an average annual precipitation of 15 to 26 inches. In the southeast corner of the county is MLRA 73 (Rolling Plains and Breaks). The North Platte River forms the northern boundary of this region, which consists of dissected plains that have broad, undulating to rolling ridge tops and hilly to steep valley sides. These valleys are generally narrow. The average precipitation is 19 to 30 inches. The southwestern part of the county lies in MLRA 72 (Central High Tableland), most of this area is used for farm crops, and the rest is for grazing. Average precipitation is 14 to 25 inches. The market areas will somewhat mirror these major land resource areas. Market Area 5 was later created to account for the market effects present in the Republican Natural Resource District due to litigation issues.

Market Area 1 is along and including the North Platte, South Platte and Platte rivers. It stretches the full width of the county from east to west. Irrigated and dry land farms make up in excess of one half of this area; there is also sub irrigated hay meadows and pasture along with accretion and waste land. The accretion and adjoining lands often times are purchased for recreational purposes. The presence of Interstate 80 also adds to the desirability of this area. The Twin Platte Natural Resource District (NRD) manages this area.

Market Area 2, north of market area 1, consists of a little more than one fourth of the county and is regarded as part of the Nebraska Sand Hills and is predominantly pasture land. Along the borders of Custer and Logan counties some tableland can be found that is farmed or used to harvest forage for livestock. The Twin Platte NRD also manages this area.

Market Area 3, part of the Twin Platte NRD, lies south of the South Platte River, abuts Keith and Perkins counties on the west, goes south to the Middle Republican Natural Resource District boundary and east to Market Area 4. Market Area 3 consists of sandy soils that are excessively drained and used for pasture as well as small pockets of loamy and sandy soils which are well to excessively drained and cultivated. There are numerous pivot irrigation systems.

Market Area 4, situated south of the Platte River in the southeastern corner of Lincoln County

2013 Correlation Section for Lincoln County

is comprised of nearly four-fifths rough broken land. Because of the narrow valleys and steep canyon walls, that support major infestations of volunteer red cedar trees, the area is only suitable for pasture. The remaining land along the Frontier County line on the south and the Dawson County line on the east is more conducive to cultivation. Most of this area will be in the Middle Republican Natural Resource District.

Market Area 5, which was formerly included in Market Area 3, was established in 2007 as a result of a moratorium issued by the Middle Republican Natural Resource District on new well drilling and a limit on the amount of water allotted to each well per year which seemed to be impacting the market. There were also litigated issues due to excessive irrigation. With the marketing of irrigated land today (if the land has an irrigated base, if water rights can be moved, etc.) these issues may no longer be a major criteria to the purchaser; this area is being studied and may result in merging back into market area 3 in the future.

The overall sample of agricultural sales over the three year study period is statistically sufficient and proportionate over the study years. However, when stratified by market areas this pattern is not consistent. An analysis of the breakdown of each market area reveals that in market area one the sales are skewed towards the third year of the study period, and the sample is heavily weighted with irrigated sales. Market area two appears to demonstrate a somewhat proportionate and representative sample. Market area three is clearly not proportionate or representative and the sample is heavily weighted with irrigated sales. Market area four depicts a skew towards the second and third year of the study period which creates a time bias. Market area five is somewhat proportionate but heavily weighted with grassland sales.

The ability of Lincoln County to locate comparable sales is somewhat hindered by its location, even though eight counties (McPherson, Logan, Custer, Dawson, Frontier, Chase, Hayes, Perkins, Keith) adjoin it, with the presence of four Major Land Resource Areas (MLRA), and five different market areas, it all adds to the complexity of the position.

Keith and Dawson counties were considered for comparable sales to bring into the analysis of market area one which comprises the river area. Dry and grass sales were not plentiful to mitigate the effects of the over-representation of irrigated sales; however, the irrigated market and the movement across counties should not be ignored.

Comparable sales were identified for inclusion in market area two (sand hills); a proportionate distribution of sales throughout the study years was maintained and the land use of the sample remained representative of market area two as a whole.

Because market area three is surrounded by three other Lincoln County market areas the only option is to look to the western counties of Perkins and Keith (market area 1) in search of comparable sales. With so few available for inclusion the sample is still not proportionate or representative of the area, thus weakening the reliability of the statistics. The irrigated market in this area does appear to have increased over the past year based on analysis of limited sales

2013 Correlation Section for Lincoln County

data, and in consideration of general market trends; insufficient data exists making it difficult to precisely identify the increase.

The sample for market area four (SE corner of county) was representative of the land use makeup of the area. However, the sample was skewed toward the second and third years of the study period. Comparable sales were sought from Frontier and Dawson counties to make the sample proportionate throughout the study years; the sample was not distorted with the inclusion of sales.

The sample for market area five (SW corner) was proportionate throughout the study years. However, because of the disparity in relatively small samples, comparable sales from Hayes and Perkins counties were brought into the study to strengthen the reliability of the statistics. With the inclusion of these sales, the resulting sample was more representative of the land use of the area and produced a viable measurement.

The analysis, based on a sample of 122 sales, demonstrated the overall median for Lincoln County to be 72% with a coefficient of dispersion of 22.46; as well each market area is demonstrating that an acceptable level of value has been attained.

The Majority Land Use > 95% and >80% categories by market area rarely contain a sufficient number of sales for Lincoln County. Such would be in the case for Market Area 1 subclass MLU >95% strata irrigated with 9 sales and a median of 99.28 and subclass MLU >80% strata irrigated with 16 sales and a median of 78.38%. In place of the statistical measurement on a small sample, the dispersion in the ratios and the potential influence of small tracts, consideration of assessment actions relative to the market, and the resulting uniform and proportionate treatment within and across county lines was observed. For 2013, Dawson County (market area 1) to the east increased their irrigated values approximately 30% (approximate average value - 2435), Keith County (market area 3) to the west increased their irrigated values approximately 30% (approximate average value - 2190), and Perkins County to the west increased their irrigated values approximately 27% (approximate average value - 2186). After consideration of surrounding counties' value and researching general market data, Lincoln County increased irrigated values 15% in market area one (approximate average value - 2390).

Many factors were considered in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Lincoln County. The sales data, as provided by the assessor, in the State's sales file was examined and tested. The resulting statistics were indicators of assessment actions and uniform and proportionate treatment within the class and most subclasses. While certain subclasses may appear to be outside the acceptable range the analysis of the general economics of the area indicates that the use of those calculations would not represent what is really happening with land values. To strengthen the confidence in the data further observations were made of the actions of adjoining counties and the economics across the region. In particular for irrigated land, the market for irrigated land has continued to increase across the state of Nebraska. This is evidenced in the real estate market in the Lincoln County

**2013 Correlation Section
for Lincoln County**

region and is supported in documents such as those published by Bruce Johnson of the Department of Agricultural Economics/University of Nebraska Lincoln.

Based on knowledge of the assessment practices in Lincoln County and after consideration of surrounding counties' value and researching general market data it is determined that uniform and proportionate treatment exists within and across county lines. The overall median of 72% will be used in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Lincoln County.

There are no non-binding recommendations for adjustment made for the agricultural class of property in Lincoln County.

A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

A review of the agricultural land values in Lincoln County in areas that have other non-agricultural influence, in particular market area 1, indicates the assessed values used are similar to other areas in the County where no non-agricultural influences exist. Therefore, it is the opinion of Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land in Lincoln County, market area 1, is 72%; which is the same as the overall level of value for the agricultural class of property.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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 : 22,427	Value : 2,964,675,515	Growth 23,258,785	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	1,214	10,753,725	194	2,803,980	650	9,977,550	2,058	23,535,255	
02. Res Improve Land	9,320	110,444,155	512	9,129,170	1,657	34,548,420	11,489	154,121,745	
03. Res Improvements	10,037	770,624,945	552	57,714,370	1,868	266,074,005	12,457	1,094,413,320	
04. Res Total	11,251	891,822,825	746	69,647,520	2,518	310,599,975	14,515	1,272,070,320	9,439,985
% of Res Total	77.51	70.11	5.14	5.48	17.35	24.42	64.72	42.91	40.59
05. Com UnImp Land	199	17,606,100	30	1,532,330	20	249,325	249	19,387,755	
06. Com Improve Land	1,008	75,557,645	50	1,839,640	48	1,149,370	1,106	78,546,655	
07. Com Improvements	1,062	337,183,385	54	8,214,485	67	15,369,725	1,183	360,767,595	
08. Com Total	1,261	430,347,130	84	11,586,455	87	16,768,420	1,432	458,702,005	9,405,925
% of Com Total	88.06	93.82	5.87	2.53	6.08	3.66	6.39	15.47	40.44
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	71,770	0	0	6	503,960	7	575,730	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	132,425	0	0	3	255,165	6	387,590	
11. Ind Improvements	3	1,804,085	0	0	3	130,465	6	1,934,550	
12. Ind Total	4	2,008,280	0	0	9	889,590	13	2,897,870	0
% of Ind Total	30.77	69.30	0.00	0.00	69.23	30.70	0.06	0.10	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	14	97,755	34	2,833,475	48	2,931,230	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	11	1,732,825	11	1,732,825	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	289	46,718,270	289	46,718,270	
16. Rec Total	0	0	14	97,755	323	51,284,570	337	51,382,325	1,794,140
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	4.15	0.19	95.85	99.81	1.50	1.73	7.71
Res & Rec Total	11,251	891,822,825	760	69,745,275	2,841	361,884,545	14,852	1,323,452,645	11,234,125
% of Res & Rec Total	75.75	67.39	5.12	5.27	19.13	27.34	66.22	44.64	48.30
Com & Ind Total	1,265	432,355,410	84	11,586,455	96	17,658,010	1,445	461,599,875	9,405,925
% of Com & Ind Total	87.54	93.66	5.81	2.51	6.64	3.83	6.44	15.57	40.44
17. Taxable Total	12,516	1,324,178,235	844	81,331,730	2,937	379,542,555	16,297	1,785,052,520	20,640,050
% of Taxable Total	76.80	74.18	5.18	4.56	18.02	21.26	72.67	60.21	88.74

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	22	101,200	3,073,945	0	0	0
19. Commercial	14	6,659,385	39,059,700	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	1,340,040	2,909,235	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	22	101,200	3,073,945
19. Commercial	0	0	0	14	6,659,385	39,059,700
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	1,340,040	2,909,235
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				37	8,100,625	45,042,880

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	11	69,120	11	69,120	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	15	69,120	15	69,120	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	724	139	676	1,539

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	4,683	769,958,285	4,683	769,958,285
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,337	282,097,800	1,337	282,097,800
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,432	127,497,790	1,432	127,497,790
30. Ag Total							6,115	1,179,553,875

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	34	33.96	164,630	34	33.96	164,630	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,005	1,156.47	5,876,220	1,005	1,156.47	5,876,220	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,014	0.00	93,006,105	1,014	0.00	93,006,105	1,139,765
34. HomeSite Total				1,048	1,190.43	99,046,955	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	132	228.38	135,785	132	228.38	135,785	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,268	3,650.43	1,862,635	1,268	3,650.43	1,862,635	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,259	0.00	34,491,685	1,259	0.00	34,491,685	1,478,970
38. FarmSite Total				1,391	3,878.81	36,490,105	
39. Road & Ditches	0	14,684.73	0	0	14,684.73	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,439	19,753.97	135,537,060	2,618,735

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	14	4,008.61	2,113,145	14	4,008.61	2,113,145

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	14	115.00	97,755
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	14	115.00	310,500
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	324	55,986.41	67,419,590	338	56,101.41	67,517,345
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	5,512.26	5.36%	13,504,000	5.50%	2,449.81
46. 1A	31,055.75	30.18%	76,022,755	30.97%	2,447.94
47. 2A1	7,258.47	7.05%	17,772,755	7.24%	2,448.55
48. 2A	14,666.39	14.25%	35,881,005	14.62%	2,446.48
49. 3A1	9,655.27	9.38%	22,477,025	9.16%	2,327.95
50. 3A	18,131.78	17.62%	41,650,990	16.97%	2,297.13
51. 4A1	13,867.65	13.48%	31,974,610	13.02%	2,305.70
52. 4A	2,760.76	2.68%	6,218,310	2.53%	2,252.39
53. Total	102,908.33	100.00%	245,501,450	100.00%	2,385.63
Dry					
54. 1D1	47.14	0.17%	44,075	0.17%	934.98
55. 1D	7,535.67	27.50%	7,045,920	27.50%	935.01
56. 2D1	2,051.07	7.48%	1,917,765	7.49%	935.01
57. 2D	3,710.91	13.54%	3,469,740	13.54%	935.01
58. 3D1	2,933.53	10.71%	2,742,855	10.71%	935.00
59. 3D	5,061.24	18.47%	4,732,255	18.47%	935.00
60. 4D1	5,130.58	18.72%	4,797,145	18.72%	935.01
61. 4D	933.21	3.41%	871,510	3.40%	933.88
62. Total	27,403.35	100.00%	25,621,265	100.00%	934.97
Grass					
63. 1G1	188.78	0.27%	166,110	0.28%	879.91
64. 1G	1,691.36	2.41%	1,488,440	2.50%	880.03
65. 2G1	1,515.24	2.16%	1,333,435	2.24%	880.02
66. 2G	3,814.95	5.45%	3,357,180	5.64%	880.01
67. 3G1	1,179.72	1.68%	1,038,150	1.74%	880.00
68. 3G	30,982.39	44.23%	26,335,405	44.25%	850.01
69. 4G1	16,183.71	23.10%	13,756,420	23.11%	850.02
70. 4G	14,497.21	20.69%	12,045,905	20.24%	830.91
71. Total	70,053.36	100.00%	59,521,045	100.00%	849.65
Irrigated Total					
	102,908.33	45.42%	245,501,450	68.38%	2,385.63
Dry Total					
	27,403.35	12.09%	25,621,265	7.14%	934.97
Grass Total					
	70,053.36	30.92%	59,521,045	16.58%	849.65
72. Waste	309.05	0.14%	66,460	0.02%	215.05
73. Other	25,896.97	11.43%	28,294,355	7.88%	1,092.57
74. Exempt	15,563.95	6.87%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	226,571.06	100.00%	359,004,575	100.00%	1,584.51

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	464.53	1.38%	627,120	1.38%	1,350.01
46. 1A	6,397.32	18.96%	8,636,450	19.04%	1,350.01
47. 2A1	3,553.20	10.53%	4,744,060	10.46%	1,335.15
48. 2A	4,663.14	13.82%	6,295,300	13.88%	1,350.01
49. 3A1	2,161.82	6.41%	2,918,485	6.43%	1,350.01
50. 3A	3,042.48	9.02%	4,045,840	8.92%	1,329.78
51. 4A1	2,147.64	6.37%	2,888,220	6.37%	1,344.83
52. 4A	11,310.78	33.52%	15,201,515	33.52%	1,343.98
53. Total	33,740.91	100.00%	45,356,990	100.00%	1,344.27
Dry					
54. 1D1	182.35	1.09%	87,525	1.09%	479.98
55. 1D	3,889.20	23.28%	1,866,825	23.28%	480.00
56. 2D1	1,673.99	10.02%	803,540	10.02%	480.01
57. 2D	2,354.54	14.10%	1,130,155	14.10%	479.99
58. 3D1	2,239.86	13.41%	1,075,140	13.41%	480.00
59. 3D	1,680.48	10.06%	806,630	10.06%	480.00
60. 4D1	1,704.62	10.20%	818,245	10.21%	480.02
61. 4D	2,979.08	17.83%	1,429,980	17.83%	480.01
62. Total	16,704.12	100.00%	8,018,040	100.00%	480.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	30.70	0.01%	9,825	0.01%	320.03
64. 1G	1,342.35	0.26%	429,535	0.28%	319.99
65. 2G1	2,604.97	0.50%	833,565	0.55%	319.99
66. 2G	3,678.78	0.70%	1,177,190	0.77%	319.99
67. 3G1	774.66	0.15%	247,885	0.16%	319.99
68. 3G	20,232.82	3.86%	5,867,515	3.86%	290.00
69. 4G1	6,732.33	1.28%	1,952,370	1.28%	290.00
70. 4G	488,691.77	93.25%	141,563,805	93.08%	289.68
71. Total	524,088.38	100.00%	152,081,690	100.00%	290.18
Irrigated Total					
	33,740.91	5.87%	45,356,990	22.02%	1,344.27
Dry Total					
	16,704.12	2.90%	8,018,040	3.89%	480.00
Grass Total					
	524,088.38	91.14%	152,081,690	73.83%	290.18
72. Waste	277.29	0.05%	59,625	0.03%	215.03
73. Other	252.04	0.04%	479,310	0.23%	1,901.72
74. Exempt	417.88	0.07%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	575,062.74	100.00%	205,995,655	100.00%	358.21

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	2,078.80	5.31%	4,365,470	5.33%	2,100.00
47. 2A1	2,034.47	5.20%	4,272,375	5.21%	2,099.99
48. 2A	1,950.29	4.98%	4,095,610	5.00%	2,100.00
49. 3A1	1,017.98	2.60%	2,137,765	2.61%	2,100.01
50. 3A	4,154.01	10.61%	8,696,720	10.61%	2,093.57
51. 4A1	27,045.78	69.09%	56,641,620	69.10%	2,094.29
52. 4A	865.30	2.21%	1,763,560	2.15%	2,038.09
53. Total	39,146.63	100.00%	81,973,120	100.00%	2,094.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,997.28	20.43%	1,448,040	20.43%	725.01
56. 2D1	1,050.45	10.74%	761,605	10.74%	725.03
57. 2D	1,323.21	13.53%	959,350	13.53%	725.02
58. 3D1	1,150.61	11.77%	834,210	11.77%	725.02
59. 3D	1,400.30	14.32%	1,015,240	14.32%	725.02
60. 4D1	2,599.20	26.58%	1,884,450	26.58%	725.01
61. 4D	256.54	2.62%	186,005	2.62%	725.05
62. Total	9,777.59	100.00%	7,088,900	100.00%	725.02
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	776.24	0.57%	318,275	0.71%	410.02
65. 2G1	1,053.09	0.78%	431,775	0.96%	410.01
66. 2G	1,273.39	0.94%	522,120	1.16%	410.02
67. 3G1	718.11	0.53%	294,425	0.65%	410.00
68. 3G	7,872.05	5.81%	2,597,840	5.77%	330.01
69. 4G1	118,201.36	87.22%	39,006,485	86.65%	330.00
70. 4G	5,631.98	4.16%	1,847,585	4.10%	328.05
71. Total	135,526.22	100.00%	45,018,505	100.00%	332.18
Irrigated Total					
	39,146.63	21.06%	81,973,120	61.14%	2,094.00
Dry Total					
	9,777.59	5.26%	7,088,900	5.29%	725.02
Grass Total					
	135,526.22	72.90%	45,018,505	33.58%	332.18
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	1,455.36	0.78%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	3,540.91	1.90%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	185,905.80	100.00%	134,080,525	100.00%	721.23

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	105.63	1.23%	179,560	1.29%	1,699.90
46. 1A	4,165.49	48.50%	7,031,805	50.37%	1,688.11
47. 2A1	654.84	7.62%	1,009,510	7.23%	1,541.61
48. 2A	672.59	7.83%	1,143,400	8.19%	1,700.00
49. 3A1	1,384.34	16.12%	2,189,410	15.68%	1,581.56
50. 3A	69.99	0.81%	113,740	0.81%	1,625.09
51. 4A1	1,090.68	12.70%	1,608,745	11.52%	1,474.99
52. 4A	445.18	5.18%	684,790	4.91%	1,538.23
53. Total	8,588.74	100.00%	13,960,960	100.00%	1,625.50
Dry					
54. 1D1	238.98	1.11%	149,375	1.11%	625.05
55. 1D	9,764.07	45.50%	6,102,750	45.49%	625.02
56. 2D1	1,580.45	7.36%	987,850	7.36%	625.04
57. 2D	518.65	2.42%	324,210	2.42%	625.10
58. 3D1	5,512.11	25.68%	3,445,215	25.68%	625.03
59. 3D	50.68	0.24%	31,675	0.24%	625.00
60. 4D1	2,145.94	10.00%	1,341,345	10.00%	625.06
61. 4D	1,650.66	7.69%	1,031,900	7.69%	625.14
62. Total	21,461.54	100.00%	13,414,320	100.00%	625.04
Grass					
63. 1G1	108.87	0.04%	45,715	0.04%	419.90
64. 1G	6,831.21	2.38%	2,869,135	2.61%	420.00
65. 2G1	9,256.12	3.23%	3,887,570	3.54%	420.00
66. 2G	2,041.55	0.71%	857,435	0.78%	419.99
67. 3G1	7,230.74	2.52%	3,036,900	2.76%	420.00
68. 3G	478.45	0.17%	181,815	0.17%	380.01
69. 4G1	9,638.23	3.36%	3,662,490	3.33%	380.00
70. 4G	251,037.66	87.58%	95,369,525	86.77%	379.90
71. Total	286,622.83	100.00%	109,910,585	100.00%	383.47
Irrigated Total					
	8,588.74	2.71%	13,960,960	10.16%	1,625.50
Dry Total					
	21,461.54	6.77%	13,414,320	9.76%	625.04
Grass Total					
	286,622.83	90.48%	109,910,585	79.97%	383.47
72. Waste	19.87	0.01%	4,275	0.00%	215.15
73. Other	98.58	0.03%	147,870	0.11%	1,500.00
74. Exempt	2,643.93	0.83%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	316,791.56	100.00%	137,438,010	100.00%	433.84

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	7,411.44	10.50%	14,768,890	10.52%	1,992.72
47. 2A1	4,771.19	6.76%	9,542,380	6.80%	2,000.00
48. 2A	5,187.52	7.35%	10,375,040	7.39%	2,000.00
49. 3A1	3,783.98	5.36%	7,548,825	5.38%	1,994.94
50. 3A	7,018.57	9.95%	13,891,905	9.90%	1,979.31
51. 4A1	40,737.68	57.74%	80,964,975	57.68%	1,987.47
52. 4A	1,648.09	2.34%	3,279,630	2.34%	1,989.96
53. Total	70,558.47	100.00%	140,371,645	100.00%	1,989.44
Dry					
54. 1D1	27.52	0.11%	17,610	0.11%	639.90
55. 1D	6,809.55	26.73%	4,358,115	26.73%	640.00
56. 2D1	3,076.45	12.07%	1,968,905	12.07%	639.99
57. 2D	3,192.07	12.53%	2,042,940	12.53%	640.00
58. 3D1	4,725.51	18.55%	3,024,320	18.55%	640.00
59. 3D	1,110.84	4.36%	710,965	4.36%	640.02
60. 4D1	5,359.97	21.04%	3,430,350	21.04%	639.99
61. 4D	1,176.76	4.62%	753,115	4.62%	639.99
62. Total	25,478.67	100.00%	16,306,320	100.00%	640.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	12.17	0.01%	4,995	0.01%	410.44
64. 1G	1,012.62	0.62%	415,170	0.85%	410.00
65. 2G1	2,457.45	1.51%	1,007,545	2.06%	410.00
66. 2G	3,912.96	2.40%	1,604,320	3.27%	410.00
67. 3G1	763.91	0.47%	313,220	0.64%	410.02
68. 3G	10,621.64	6.51%	3,133,460	6.39%	295.01
69. 4G1	129,028.42	79.07%	38,063,460	77.64%	295.00
70. 4G	15,383.60	9.43%	4,483,300	9.14%	291.43
71. Total	163,192.77	100.00%	49,025,470	100.00%	300.41
Irrigated Total					
	70,558.47	27.09%	140,371,645	67.65%	1,989.44
Dry Total					
	25,478.67	9.78%	16,306,320	7.86%	640.00
Grass Total					
	163,192.77	62.66%	49,025,470	23.63%	300.41
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	1,196.41	0.46%	1,794,615	0.86%	1,500.00
74. Exempt	12.59	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	260,426.32	100.00%	207,498,050	100.00%	796.76

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	254,943.08	527,164,165	254,943.08	527,164,165
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	100,825.27	70,448,845	100,825.27	70,448,845
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,179,483.56	415,557,295	1,179,483.56	415,557,295
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	606.21	130,360	606.21	130,360
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	28,899.36	30,716,150	28,899.36	30,716,150
81. Exempt	1.00	0	3,756.60	0	18,421.66	0	22,179.26	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,564,757.48	1,044,016,815	1,564,757.48	1,044,016,815

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	254,943.08	16.29%	527,164,165	50.49%	2,067.77
Dry Land	100,825.27	6.44%	70,448,845	6.75%	698.72
Grass	1,179,483.56	75.38%	415,557,295	39.80%	352.32
Waste	606.21	0.04%	130,360	0.01%	215.04
Other	28,899.36	1.85%	30,716,150	2.94%	1,062.87
Exempt	22,179.26	1.42%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	1,564,757.48	100.00%	1,044,016,815	100.00%	667.21

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

56 Lincoln

	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	1,251,036,065	1,272,070,320	21,034,255	1.68%	9,439,985	0.93%
02. Recreational	37,588,420	51,382,325	13,793,905	36.70%	1,794,140	31.92%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	98,347,930	99,046,955	699,025	0.71%	1,139,765	-0.45%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	1,386,972,415	1,422,499,600	35,527,185	2.56%	12,373,890	1.67%
05. Commercial	448,677,775	458,702,005	10,024,230	2.23%	9,405,925	0.14%
06. Industrial	2,897,870	2,897,870	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	35,022,320	36,490,105	1,467,785	4.19%	1,478,970	-0.03%
08. Minerals	40,060	69,120	29,060	72.54	0	72.54
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	486,638,025	498,159,100	11,521,075	2.37%	10,884,895	0.13%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	1,873,610,440	1,920,658,700	47,048,260	2.51%	23,258,785	1.27%
11. Irrigated	424,005,315	527,164,165	103,158,850	24.33%		
12. Dryland	57,007,225	70,448,845	13,441,620	23.58%		
13. Grassland	401,963,635	415,557,295	13,593,660	3.38%		
14. Wasteland	39,005	130,360	91,355	234.21%		
15. Other Agland	34,704,590	30,716,150	-3,988,440	-11.49%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	917,719,770	1,044,016,815	126,297,045	13.76%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	2,791,330,210	2,964,675,515	173,345,305	6.21%	23,258,785	5.38%

**THREE-YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
UPDATE FOR LINCOLN COUNTY
2012**

SS 77-1311.02 requires the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment that describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall describe the actions necessary to achieve the levels required by state law and the resources needed to complete those actions. This plan should be completed by June 1; presented to the county board by July 31 and a copy and any amendments mailed to the Department of Revenue by October 31 of each year. SS 77-1311.03 states that all parcels of real property in the county will be inspected and reviewed no less than every six years.

For purposes of this report, Lincoln County uses the following definitions of assessments from "Property Appraisal and Assessment Administration"

- Assessment review: the reexamination of assessments by a governmental agency that has the authority to alter individual assessments on its own motion.
- Reappraisal: the mass appraisal of all property within an assessment jurisdiction accomplished within or at the beginning of a reappraisal cycle (revaluation of reassessment).
- Updates: annual adjustments applied to properties between reappraisals.

RESIDENTIAL

North Platte and the surrounding villages are experiencing a decrease in sales although the sales prices are steady. This area has not experienced the major decline in the housing market but there has been some effect with more foreclosures occurring and longer marketing times. Demand for vacant and improved parcels has slowed but remains steady. Land sales and values are and will be monitored and adjusted to reflect market conditions in various neighborhoods of North Platte and throughout the county for 2013.

The north side of North Platte was completely reviewed for 2011 and approximately the west half of the south side of North Platte was reviewed for 2012. The remaining parcels in the west part of the south side and all of the east side and south of the interstate will be reviewed for 2013. Both Lake Maloney and Jeffrey Lake properties will also be reviewed for 2013. The Villages of Brady, Hershey, Maxwell, Sutherland, Wellfleet and Wallace are planned to be re-appraised for 2014. If time permits in 2014, the review of the rural residential and improved agricultural parcels will be started. For 2015 and maybe into 2016, the remaining rural residential and improved agricultural parcels will be reviewed.

The Marshall and Swift Residential Cost Handbook are updated to the 2nd Quarter 2010 or June 2010 for the new re-appraisal period. Sales are reviewed as they occur and any areas that need adjustments warranted will be performed to maintain the proper levels for 2013.

New property record files will be created for this class and will be utilized in a timely manner for all new construction.

Our new Orion appraisal system will be implemented in 2012 and be used for review for 2013 assessments. All assessments previously reviewed for 2011 and 2012 will also be updated

with the new Orion system so that all parcels will be on the same costing program and Marshall & Swift cost once all residential parcels are reviewed. The Marshall & Swift cost tables will be updated to January 1st, 2012 for all new assessments in the Orion system.

COMMERCIAL

The reappraisal of the commercial class of property located in Lincoln County was completed for 2010. Sales are reviewed and adjustments to commercial properties were made as needed for 2012.

The Marshall and Swift Commercial Manual as of February 2007 will be utilized to develop the cost approach. Income and expense statements will be requested from all appropriate commercial property owners to assist in developing the income approach where applicable.

The sales comparison approach will be utilized in an informal manner to provide a check on the cost and income approaches.

New property record files will be created for this class and will be utilized in a timely manner for all new construction.

Sales for vacant and improved parcels are and will continue to be monitored to reflect the market conditions for 2013, 2014 and 2015.

Our new Orion appraisal system will be implemented in 2012 and be used for review for all Commercial assessments. All of the Commercial properties will be re-assessed by desk review for 2013. The Marshall & Swift cost tables will be updated to January 1st, 2012 for all new assessments in the Orion system.

An anticipated physical review of all Commercial properties will be scheduled for 2017 and 2018 if necessary.

RURAL RESIDENTIAL

All residential properties located in the rural areas are planned to be re-appraised beginning in 2014 & 2015. Additional time may be needed in 2016.

All rural residential parcels will continue to be monitored to maintain the level of value and quality of assessment practices for 2013. This sub-class will receive updates and/or reappraisals for 2013 to coincide with the urban and suburban properties. Adjustments will be made to reflect market conditions.

New property record files will be created for this class and will be utilized in a timely manner for all new construction.

UNIMPROVED AGRICULTURAL LAND

Legislation that became effective January 1, 2007 set the percent to market ratio for agricultural land at 75%. The range of value is 69% to 75%.

Sales for the appropriate previous 36 months are studied annually in each of the established market areas. Four market areas were established along natural geographical and

topographical boundaries. Area one along the North Platte, South Platte and Platte Rivers has excellent farm ground and sub-irrigated hay meadows. Area Two is mostly sand hills pasture except for some irrigated farm ground along the Logan County line in the northeast corner and extends south along the east border with Custer County. Area Three is also sand hills but much of it has been converted to pivot irrigation. Area Four is cedar tree and brush covered canyons. More level tillable farm ground is found along our border with Dawson County to the southeast.

For tax year 2007, due to legal issues arising from water use that was affecting sales, a fifth market area was established. This new area divided Area Three along the boundary line between Twin Platte and Middle Republican Natural Resource Districts. It is approximately 7 miles south of Lake Maloney Reservoir then south to the county line and from the west county line east to the Area Four boundary. This area is designated Market Area Five. At that time, this area was restricted with a moratorium on drilling new irrigation wells in their jurisdiction since July 2004 and each existing well was limited to 39 inches of water per acre for 2005, 2006 and 2007. Legislation passed during the 2007 session initiated policies concerning water issues in the Middle Republican NRD but this legislation only exasperated property owners and public officials further and no real solution is in sight.

Since each of these areas have such diverse soils, terrain, elevation, irrigation, length of growing season and legal issues, it is necessary to study the sales in each market area on its own merit. Since the implementation of the new GIS system has taken place and all the soils have been implemented as well, 2012 was also a year of more accurately determining Market Area boundaries based on soil types & topography and we will continue to make these Market Area boundary line corrections for upcoming years if it is deemed necessary.

As in the past, the Assessor and Deputy, working closely with our Field Liaison from the Property Assessment Division, will review the sales of unimproved agricultural land, for the appropriate 36 months by Market Area to derive at a per acre value for each land use category for 2013, 2014 and 2015.

Agricultural land sales with improvements less than 5% of the sale price will also be reviewed at the Division's request as well as borrowing sales from bordering counties where sale numbers are insufficient to determine a fair market value.

Special Valuation was implemented in 2010 due to a large increase in demand for accretion land that is influenced by recreational uses. New applications are being filed every year. When an application is filed on a specific property, a physical inspection is required by an appraiser prior to making a determination on the property. For Special Valuation to be approved, the primary use must be agricultural. Sales of the accretion land are monitored throughout the year and are adjusted as necessary.

We are also starting to see a lot more Conservation Easements being filed on properties. The Easements must be read very carefully to determine the correct way for the parcel to be valued. Some Easements allow the property to still be classified as Ag land, but others do not. WRP (Wetland Reserve Programs) do not allow the property to be classified as Ag land. We currently value WRP at Recreational Land value. We have just recently received a couple of sales on WRP properties. These sales will be reviewed for 2013 and adjustment to value made as necessary.

2012 MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY BY PROPERTY CLASS

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	97.00	6.29	101.32
Commercial/Industrial	98.00	9.34	100.87
Unimproved Agricultural	71.00	18.51	106.64
Special Valuation	71.00	18.51	106.64

NEW CAMA SYSTEM

The New Orion system by Tyler Technologies will be implemented in 2012. The new system and old systems will be ran side-by-side as necessary to ensure the accuracy of the conversion. Once this is verified, the old CAMA programs will be eliminated and we will strictly use just the Orion system. The assessment side or AS-400 may be used longer due to reporting and other assessment duties that are required throughout the year to ensure that the new system will also be able to perform these duties as are needed by our County. Training for this new system is scheduled to begin in late July 2012 or early August 2012.

This new CAMA system will replace the three programs that are currently being used. Those three programs are not integrated and therefore; operations are performed more than once in multiple systems. Efficiency will be increased with this new program as it is completely integrated with the addition of the ability to develop all three approaches to value.

TRAINING

Julie Stenger took office on January 1st, 2011. Her Assessor's Certificate is valid through December 31, 2014. Our new deputy, Pat Collins, received her Assessor's Certificate in the fall of 2010 and is valid through December 31st, 2014. Another staff member successfully completed the assessor's exam in 2004. They all three attend the workshops and classes to receive the required continuing education hours to maintain their Assessor's Certificate. All three of the staff appraisers have Assessor's Certificates as well. The appraisers attend Nebraska Real Estate Appraiser Board approved classes as well as Division classes when available to collect their required continuing education hours. IAAO classes are nearly cost prohibitive for multiple students when living expenses are also paid by the county, thus assessor certified staff rely on division classes offered locally, at workshops and elsewhere to meet the requirements.

BUDGET

Purposed budget for 2012-2013	\$490,135
Salaries	415,895
Education	8,000
Data processing equipment and software	52,240
(Monthly fees for programs paid by IT budget)	
Reappraisal (for one oil well)	150

STAFF

1 Assessor	1 Deputy	3 Clerks
2 CAMA clerks	1 Computer Analyst	3 Staff Appraisers
1 GIS Operator		

CONCLUSION

With the volume of work from all its required duties, the staff of the Lincoln County Assessor's office has continued to work diligently to assess all property in the county in an equal and proportionate manner. Courteous information and assistance is given to taxpayers filing personal property returns with depreciation schedules to review, property valuation protest forms with added requests for comparables, and homestead exemption applications with the accompanying income statements.

The addition of three staff appraisers has made the process of reappraising all classes of property to be done in a more efficient and timely manner. With the amount of classroom hours and over 26 years of experience combined between the three staff appraisers at the local level, this gives property owners confidence in the appraisers abilities, has decreased the number of protests, and eliminated the need for costly contract reappraisals which is a cost-savings to the taxpayers.

The launching of the new Lincoln County GIS website has also decreased the number of phone calls and the foot traffic in the office. We hope to also see added efficiency as well when the new Orion CAMA system is fully implemented and verified for accuracy sometime in 2013. When the new Orion CAMA system is fully implemented, taxpayers will also see added benefits to the GIS website in the form of more photos available to view, sketches will be viewable as well, and possibly more notes on the property itself. These improvements will hopefully be made available to public sometime in 2013 as well. Eventually we will attach copies of the 521 transfer statements with a copy of the deed & the associated buyer/seller letters to parcels and these could be viewable on-line as well if we choose to do so in the future. With the new GIS system & the new Orion system, we have so many more options. Many of these options will be very beneficial to the taxpayers as well, as much of this can be added to the Lincoln County GIS website as it becomes available.

Julie Stenger
Lincoln County Assessor
July 6, 2012

2013 Assessment Survey for Lincoln County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	3
3.	Other full-time employees:
	7
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$491,635
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if <i>different from above</i>:
	\$490,135
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$184,780 (\$150 is paid for the contract with Pritchard & Abbott for mineral appraisal work)
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$50,140
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$5,350
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$249,865
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	All but \$38

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software: Orion & MIPS (MIPS only through March 19 th , 2013 Certification of Values)
2.	CAMA software: Orion
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used? Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps? The map clerk.
5.	Does the county have GIS software? Yes, GIS Workshop (ESRI/Arc View)
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address? Yes- www.lincoln.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps? GIS Technician
8.	Personal Property software: Orion

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning? Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide? Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned? North Platte, Brady, Maxwell, Hershey, Sutherland, Wallace, Wellfleet
4.	When was zoning implemented? 1977

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services: All appraisal work is completed in house.
2.	GIS Services: GIS Workshop
3.	Other services: Orion & MIPS (MIPS only through March 19 th , 2013 Certification of Values) Pritchard & Abbott for mineral appraisal work

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services? No
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract? Not applicable.
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require? Not applicable.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA? Not applicable.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county? Not applicable.

2013 Certification for Lincoln 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 Lincoln 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

