

# 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 Nemaha County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	209	Median	97.17
Total Sales Price	\$15,235,839	Mean	108.19
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$15,235,839	Wgt. Mean	92.90
Total Assessed Value	\$14,153,785	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$58,713
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$72,899	Avg. Assessed Value	\$67,721

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.72 to 99.67
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.69 to 96.10
95% Mean C.I	101.09 to 115.29
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	22.84
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.69
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.71

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	202	97	96.59
2011	211	97	97
2010	247	97	97
2009	253	94	94

## 2013 Commission Summary for Nemaha County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	36	Median	96.96
Total Sales Price	\$4,407,210	Mean	101.60
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,407,210	Wgt. Mean	87.23
Total Assessed Value	\$3,844,440	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$59,403
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$122,423	Avg. Assessed Value	\$106,790

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	81.64 to 103.92
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	62.01 to 112.45
95% Mean C.I	88.31 to 114.89
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.39
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	14.13

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	28		99.74
2011	34		96
2010	37	95	95
2009	39	95	95



## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nemaha County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	74	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Nemaha County**

The county completed a sales analysis for the current study period. They increased the sub-class of the average and better rural residential by 7%. The county reviewed the town of Brownville where the contract appraiser completed a physical review of the property, updating photos, verifying measurements, and updating the condition of the improvements. Rural residential land values were adjusted.

The county also completed the pickup and permit work for the residential class of property.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Ron Elliot contract appraiser	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
		The valuation groups in Nemaha County are more of a reflection of the appraisal review cycle as much as differences in the market. The county conducts a market analysis for each group and develops depreciation table from that market.
	01	Auburn- County seat and the major trade area of the county.
	02	Brock- Small village with little economic development but located within commuting distance to both Auburn and Nebraska City
	03	Brownville- Unique as a historical river town that attracts tourism
	04	Johnson- Village that is between two trade and employment centers and maintains a unique market for residential properties
	06	Nemaha- Small village more isolated from larger towns with very little economic development
	07	Peru- Small town that is home to a state college of the same name.
	08	Rural- rural residential
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The county uses a market approach based on appreciation or depreciation to the cost approach	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county uses depreciation developed from the local market of each valuation group.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The county updates the tables at the time of the review of the valuation group	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Auburn was completed in 2008	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	During the review of the valuation group the county conducts a review of the lot values by using vacant lot sales and also by doing an allocation of value on improved sales.	

**64 Nemaha  
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 : 209  
 Total Sales Price : 15,235,839  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,235,839  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,153,785  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,899  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 67,721

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 108  
 COD : 27.67  
 PRD : 116.46

COV : 48.40  
 STD : 52.36  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 448.69  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.79

95% Median C.I. : 95.72 to 99.67  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.69 to 96.10  
 95% Mean C.I. : 101.09 to 115.29

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:37AM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	29	100.49	97.79	95.07	16.59	102.86	31.79	136.27	85.92 to 110.42	69,831	66,391
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	16	98.20	96.57	89.12	16.03	108.36	45.55	121.87	87.07 to 114.38	45,948	40,948
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	36	95.09	112.69	90.24	33.72	124.88	37.93	385.00	89.08 to 106.66	87,292	78,776
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	30	112.73	143.09	102.57	50.07	139.50	49.00	448.69	96.01 to 143.45	62,378	63,983
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	29	97.10	113.51	89.03	32.65	127.50	52.35	350.00	87.83 to 105.53	84,181	74,946
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	24	96.24	94.77	96.21	15.19	98.50	56.50	145.32	86.70 to 105.48	69,378	66,746
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	21	92.08	93.68	89.10	17.14	105.14	48.65	139.65	81.72 to 101.37	76,762	68,394
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	24	97.14	97.85	92.13	15.87	106.21	62.62	163.58	84.82 to 102.08	72,642	66,927
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	111	99.50	114.69	94.36	32.81	121.55	31.79	448.69	96.01 to 106.08	70,037	66,090
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	98	96.54	100.84	91.37	20.97	110.36	48.65	350.00	91.11 to 98.22	76,140	69,570
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	111	97.18	118.80	92.60	37.57	128.29	37.93	448.69	93.84 to 103.25	73,786	68,324
<u>ALL</u>	209	97.17	108.19	92.90	27.67	116.46	31.79	448.69	95.72 to 99.67	72,899	67,721

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	130	99.76	115.31	97.23	28.22	118.60	37.93	448.69	96.89 to 103.36	78,363	76,189
02	9	97.31	115.12	102.21	32.97	112.63	65.67	215.96	83.20 to 173.06	28,689	29,323
03	2	38.67	38.67	38.14	17.79	101.39	31.79	45.55	N/A	91,000	34,710
04	11	96.42	89.91	88.09	15.19	102.07	56.50	114.20	57.75 to 111.69	64,909	57,179
05	1	115.93	115.93	115.93	00.00	100.00	115.93	115.93	N/A	70,000	81,150
06	12	94.06	109.00	94.59	39.66	115.23	55.15	336.00	70.00 to 110.10	26,908	25,453
07	16	92.08	92.76	90.88	25.58	102.07	48.65	156.36	67.75 to 110.42	38,688	35,158
08	28	92.57	93.28	81.10	19.36	115.02	52.35	201.20	78.22 to 97.17	102,950	83,494
<u>ALL</u>	209	97.17	108.19	92.90	27.67	116.46	31.79	448.69	95.72 to 99.67	72,899	67,721

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	205	97.09	107.80	92.70	27.61	116.29	31.79	448.69	94.50 to 99.36	73,916	68,518
06											
07	4	129.29	128.09	129.75	10.50	98.72	110.10	143.67	N/A	20,750	26,923
<u>ALL</u>	209	97.17	108.19	92.90	27.67	116.46	31.79	448.69	95.72 to 99.67	72,899	67,721

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 209  
Total Sales Price : 15,235,839  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,235,839  
Total Assessed Value : 14,153,785  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,899  
Avg. Assessed Value : 67,721

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 93  
MEAN : 108  
COD : 27.67  
PRD : 116.46

COV : 48.40  
STD : 52.36  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.89  
MAX Sales Ratio : 448.69  
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.79

95% Median C.I. : 95.72 to 99.67  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.69 to 96.10  
95% Mean C.I. : 101.09 to 115.29

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:37AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	6	169.46	184.64	223.86	56.98	82.48	49.00	448.69	49.00 to 448.69	2,783	6,231	
Less Than 15,000	39	115.06	156.11	149.29	58.20	104.57	49.00	448.69	98.66 to 156.36	8,221	12,272	
Less Than 30,000	71	114.52	137.40	125.69	40.98	109.32	37.93	448.69	105.54 to 125.51	14,266	17,932	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	203	97.10	105.93	92.75	25.09	114.21	31.79	385.00	95.72 to 99.36	74,971	69,539	
Greater Than 14,999	170	96.43	97.20	91.69	17.33	106.01	31.79	212.39	92.54 to 97.71	87,737	80,442	
Greater Than 29,999	138	93.82	93.16	90.56	15.23	102.87	31.79	212.39	90.15 to 96.92	103,065	93,338	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	6	169.46	184.64	223.86	56.98	82.48	49.00	448.69	49.00 to 448.69	2,783	6,231	
5,000 TO 14,999	33	114.38	150.92	145.19	52.23	103.95	53.90	385.00	98.66 to 143.45	9,209	13,371	
15,000 TO 29,999	32	112.99	114.60	114.76	19.90	99.86	37.93	173.06	99.50 to 125.51	21,635	24,829	
30,000 TO 59,999	43	97.20	100.71	101.44	17.44	99.28	55.15	212.39	91.11 to 104.17	43,669	44,297	
60,000 TO 99,999	40	94.22	91.27	90.84	15.92	100.47	31.79	131.69	89.56 to 98.94	74,679	67,839	
100,000 TO 149,999	24	88.84	87.85	87.97	10.61	99.86	63.18	105.90	79.89 to 96.39	127,396	112,075	
150,000 TO 249,999	24	92.47	91.18	91.11	12.43	100.08	69.05	136.27	80.52 to 99.13	182,938	166,679	
250,000 TO 499,999	7	85.01	82.64	82.31	10.79	100.40	52.35	95.72	52.35 to 95.72	272,857	224,602	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	209	97.17	108.19	92.90	27.67	116.46	31.79	448.69	95.72 to 99.67	72,899	67,721	



## 2013 Correlation Section for Nemaha County

---

### A. Residential Real Property

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County has seen a slight decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The sales file consists of 209 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with only the mean being outside the range. The mean no doubt is affected by wide range of sale prices represented in the file. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for a median.

The qualitative statistics overall are outside the recommended range but when analyzing the sales with a sale price of greater than 29,999 both come within the acceptable range. As can be seen in the statistics there are outliers remaining in the file, along with the low dollar sales that are having an impact. The counties valuation groups represent the assessor locations in the county and the appraisal cycle of the county more than unique markets.

Nemaha County has had a consistent procedure for sales verification. The contract appraiser completes a statistical review of all sales in the file. A physical inspection is completed on any sales with a perceived discrepancy and on all sales in conjunction with a review of a valuation group. The county utilizes a higher portion of available sales when compared to other area counties. In reviewing the assessor comments there is an adequate explanation for the sales that are not qualified. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

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

The Counties assessment plan states that an analysis of the residential sales will be conducted and areas outside the range will be reviewed or adjusted. This review revealed the necessity of adjusting values by percentage in the rural residential sub-class. They also physically reviewed the town of Brownville. The County has a consistent approach to valuing and reviewing the property in Nemaha County. They utilize a contract appraiser who is familiar with the local market. The County has a web site for parcel searches and is implementing GIS capabilities for mapping.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County**

The County conducted an analysis of the sales and concluded that no adjustments were necessary for the commercial class of property. The contract appraiser continually reviews and verifies sales for the commercial class.

The appraiser also completed the pickup and permit work for the commercial class of property.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Ron Elliot the contract appraiser for the County	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Auburn- County seat and trade center for the area
	02	Remainder of the assessor locations in the county
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Market value based on either a depreciated or appreciated cost approach	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	The county relies on the appraisers experience and opinion as well as researching similar sales from other counties in the state and adjusting to the local market.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007 is the costing year for the entire class of commercial properties	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county uses depreciation tables based on the local market	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	During the review of the class in 2007	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales comparison based on local sales. The majority are calculated on a square foot basis while the larger on based on an acre value.	

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 36  
Total Sales Price : 4,407,210  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,407,210  
Total Assessed Value : 3,844,440  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 122,423  
Avg. Assessed Value : 106,790

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 102  
COD : 27.11  
PRD : 116.47

COV : 40.05  
STD : 40.69  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93  
MIN Sales Ratio : 56.85

95% Median C.I. : 81.64 to 103.92  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.01 to 112.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.31 to 114.89

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:38AM

**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	174.97	174.97	174.97	00.00	100.00	174.97	174.97	N/A	30,000	52,490
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	11,515	11,515
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	118.22	128.86	131.21	45.55	98.21	58.14	266.93	N/A	174,160	228,517
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	81.64	83.84	79.77	16.35	105.10	64.92	104.97	N/A	52,500	41,877
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	111.19	107.47	81.15	24.01	132.43	59.40	148.09	N/A	46,250	37,531
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	97.26	97.26	97.26	00.00	100.00	97.26	97.26	N/A	4,200	4,085
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	85.29	86.59	90.75	07.36	95.42	77.82	96.66	N/A	70,667	64,133
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	93.55	91.00	92.10	12.53	98.81	72.95	110.99	72.95 to 110.99	98,205	90,446
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	94.22	87.22	60.63	15.64	143.86	56.85	103.59	N/A	424,165	257,155
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	82.13	92.33	88.10	27.26	104.80	66.66	132.88	N/A	72,220	63,628
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	126.24	126.24	97.24	39.53	129.82	76.34	176.14	N/A	95,500	92,865
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	10	102.49	117.08	124.53	41.06	94.02	58.14	266.93	64.92 to 174.97	106,982	133,222
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	8	96.96	98.36	86.39	19.15	113.86	59.40	148.09	59.40 to 148.09	50,150	43,326
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	18	90.84	94.45	73.76	22.27	128.05	56.85	176.14	75.62 to 103.92	163,122	120,312
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	13	102.13	109.67	116.74	34.25	93.94	58.14	266.93	64.92 to 130.73	94,217	109,989
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	11	93.55	90.37	91.81	10.97	98.43	72.95	110.99	75.62 to 103.92	82,149	75,419
<u>ALL</u>	36	96.96	101.60	87.23	27.11	116.47	56.85	266.93	81.64 to 103.92	122,423	106,790

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	29	93.55	101.02	86.57	28.64	116.69	56.85	266.93	76.34 to 103.92	143,738	124,435
02	7	102.13	104.02	98.76	22.32	105.33	58.14	174.97	58.14 to 174.97	34,114	33,690
<u>ALL</u>	36	96.96	101.60	87.23	27.11	116.47	56.85	266.93	81.64 to 103.92	122,423	106,790

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	4	112.08	118.31	100.47	26.66	117.76	72.95	176.14	N/A	80,000	80,376
03	32	95.11	99.52	86.19	26.70	115.47	56.85	266.93	77.82 to 103.59	127,725	110,092
04											
<u>ALL</u>	36	96.96	101.60	87.23	27.11	116.47	56.85	266.93	81.64 to 103.92	122,423	106,790

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 36  
Total Sales Price : 4,407,210  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,407,210  
Total Assessed Value : 3,844,440  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 122,423  
Avg. Assessed Value : 106,790

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 102  
COD : 27.11  
PRD : 116.47

COV : 40.05  
STD : 40.69  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93  
MIN Sales Ratio : 56.85

95% Median C.I. : 81.64 to 103.92  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.01 to 112.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.31 to 114.89

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:38AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	2	99.70	99.70	99.63	02.45	100.07	97.26	102.13	N/A	4,100	4,085	
Less Than 15,000	6	100.16	99.48	98.86	02.54	100.63	93.55	103.59	93.55 to 103.59	8,819	8,718	
Less Than 30,000	9	100.00	101.38	99.85	10.65	101.53	82.16	148.09	85.29 to 103.59	12,546	12,528	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	34	95.11	101.72	87.21	29.08	116.64	56.85	266.93	77.82 to 104.97	129,383	112,831	
Greater Than 14,999	30	86.71	102.03	87.09	34.84	117.15	56.85	266.93	76.34 to 110.99	145,143	126,404	
Greater Than 29,999	27	88.12	101.68	86.90	35.20	117.01	56.85	266.93	72.95 to 112.87	159,048	138,211	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	99.70	99.70	99.63	02.45	100.07	97.26	102.13	N/A	4,100	4,085	
5,000 TO 14,999	4	100.16	99.37	98.71	02.59	100.67	93.55	103.59	N/A	11,179	11,035	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	85.29	105.18	100.73	25.77	104.42	82.16	148.09	N/A	20,000	20,147	
30,000 TO 59,999	13	112.87	120.14	118.52	36.11	101.37	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 174.97	45,877	54,372	
60,000 TO 99,999	4	82.48	83.45	86.22	21.13	96.79	64.92	103.92	N/A	79,500	68,549	
100,000 TO 149,999	3	75.62	77.23	77.88	16.42	99.17	59.40	96.66	N/A	129,333	100,725	
150,000 TO 249,999	5	82.13	86.11	87.32	12.13	98.61	72.95	110.99	N/A	163,379	142,660	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999	1	130.73	130.73	130.73	00.00	100.00	130.73	130.73	N/A	675,000	882,440	
1,000,000 +	1	56.85	56.85	56.85	00.00	100.00	56.85	56.85	N/A	1,500,000	852,750	
<u>ALL</u>	36	96.96	101.60	87.23	27.11	116.47	56.85	266.93	81.64 to 103.92	122,423	106,790	

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 36  
Total Sales Price : 4,407,210  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,407,210  
Total Assessed Value : 3,844,440  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 122,423  
Avg. Assessed Value : 106,790

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 102  
COD : 27.11  
PRD : 116.47

COV : 40.05  
STD : 40.69  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93  
MIN Sales Ratio : 56.85

95% Median C.I. : 81.64 to 103.92  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.01 to 112.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.31 to 114.89

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:38AM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	4	112.08	118.31	100.47	26.66	117.76	72.95	176.14	N/A	80,000	80,376
309	1	174.97	174.97	174.97	00.00	100.00	174.97	174.97	N/A	30,000	52,490
344	5	100.32	99.91	94.66	14.69	105.55	64.92	132.88	N/A	45,340	42,917
346	1	102.13	102.13	102.13	00.00	100.00	102.13	102.13	N/A	4,000	4,085
350	4	107.98	101.66	105.19	09.51	96.64	77.82	112.87	N/A	83,884	88,236
353	10	89.42	92.82	81.24	20.81	114.25	66.66	148.09	67.12 to 118.22	49,352	40,095
387	1	58.14	58.14	58.14	00.00	100.00	58.14	58.14	N/A	53,000	30,815
391	1	81.64	81.64	81.64	00.00	100.00	81.64	81.64	N/A	50,000	40,820
406	2	64.85	64.85	62.40	08.40	103.93	59.40	70.29	N/A	86,250	53,820
407	1	96.66	96.66	96.66	00.00	100.00	96.66	96.66	N/A	138,000	133,395
455	2	198.83	198.83	141.17	34.25	140.84	130.73	266.93	N/A	365,500	515,960
458	1	56.85	56.85	56.85	00.00	100.00	56.85	56.85	N/A	1,500,000	852,750
528	3	82.16	84.14	85.15	02.43	98.81	82.13	88.12	N/A	117,653	100,182
<u>ALL</u>	<u>36</u>	96.96	101.60	87.23	27.11	116.47	56.85	266.93	81.64 to 103.92	122,423	106,790



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County has seen a slight decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The 2012 Nemaha County commercial statistical profile reveals a total of 36 qualified commercial sales to be used as a sample for the three-year study period. The calculated median is 97. The profile indicates that of the three measures of central tendency only the median is within the acceptable range.

Regarding the qualitative statistical measures, both the COD and the PRD are outside the recommended range. Valuation group 01, which represents Auburn, is the only group with a large enough sample for any meaningful analysis. In this group of 29 sales, 10 occupancies appear and are representative of the class. The COD for valuation group 01 is above the recommended range but provides for some confidence in the median. The county tries to use as many of the available sales as possible and this may be reflected in the higher COD. The presence of low dollar sales in the file, also skew the qualitative statistics.

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

The contract appraiser reviews and verifies all commercial sales in the County. The appraiser conducts a physical inspection in conjunction with the sales verification. The appraiser has worked in Nemaha County for a number of years and is familiar with the commercial market in the county. A review of the nonqualified sales shows that the assessor has documented the exclusion by adding comments for the reasoning of the qualification.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the commercial class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County**

The County completed an analysis of the sales to aid in determining values for the agricultural class of property. The county reviewed the market area determination and concluded that for the current year Nemaha County would continue with one market area, 8300 as displayed in the abstract. The county updated the schedule of values that now corresponds with the LCG structure. The county continually verifies sales and updates land use as discovered.

The county completed all pickup, and permit work for the class.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Ron Elliot	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	The county considers the entire county as one market area
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The county completes an analysis with all of the sales and also reviews by geo code to determine if different factors attribute to different market values. These studies are done to see if they can achieve a reasonable level of value while maintaining the quality of assessment without market areas.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	The county determines highest and best use and compares that to current use of the parcel.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	The county has the same values for both property types.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The county relies on a sales verification process to determine if any non-agricultural characteristics influence the sale price for properties.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	No	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	The county completed a sales analysis of similar parcels to arrive at market value for the parcels enrolled in the program.	

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 76  
Total Sales Price : 26,199,072  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,195,117  
Total Assessed Value : 18,739,053  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 344,673  
Avg. Assessed Value : 246,566

MEDIAN : 74  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 25.08  
PRD : 105.07

COV : 33.07  
STD : 24.86  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.46  
MAX Sales Ratio : 172.03  
MIN Sales Ratio : 41.71

95% Median C.I. : 62.73 to 79.79  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.58 to 80.76

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:39AM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	84.45	93.54	85.10	22.90	109.92	62.24	145.51	62.24 to 145.51	309,563	263,444
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	85.15	87.89	84.20	14.53	104.38	61.79	127.00	73.84 to 101.48	338,139	284,717
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	77.84	76.00	75.78	10.08	100.29	62.73	90.93	N/A	192,330	145,750
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	65.57	65.57	65.57	00.00	100.00	65.57	65.57	N/A	203,700	133,570
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	79.75	86.75	85.72	19.94	101.20	52.00	172.03	73.57 to 88.82	342,643	293,704
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	58.78	65.50	60.86	21.21	107.62	48.54	104.58	51.85 to 82.92	473,499	288,155
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	98.82	98.82	107.66	23.91	91.79	75.19	122.45	N/A	335,400	361,075
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	73.05	75.78	79.64	06.46	95.15	70.07	84.23	N/A	259,854	206,957
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	8	52.11	56.44	54.67	22.53	103.24	42.35	87.20	42.35 to 87.20	234,041	127,940
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	12	50.19	54.81	48.76	19.94	112.41	41.71	105.11	44.05 to 56.50	401,599	195,810
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	54.62	54.62	54.62	00.00	100.00	54.62	54.62	N/A	706,368	385,795
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	80.79	80.79	88.46	23.43	91.33	61.86	99.71	N/A	459,000	406,009
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	23	82.28	86.30	82.76	17.78	104.28	61.79	145.51	73.84 to 90.93	290,656	240,536
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	30	76.25	80.08	77.14	21.38	103.81	48.54	172.03	71.34 to 82.92	373,138	287,856
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	23	53.01	57.62	54.97	22.30	104.82	41.71	105.11	46.16 to 56.90	361,560	198,741
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	31	79.79	84.66	83.83	17.42	100.99	52.00	172.03	76.16 to 85.15	312,609	262,066
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	22	60.72	66.64	65.40	26.10	101.90	42.35	122.45	51.85 to 75.19	344,736	225,452
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.60	75.17	71.54	25.08	105.07	41.71	172.03	62.73 to 79.79	344,673	246,566

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
8300	76	73.60	75.17	71.54	25.08	105.07	41.71	172.03	62.73 to 79.79	344,673	246,566
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.60	75.17	71.54	25.08	105.07	41.71	172.03	62.73 to 79.79	344,673	246,566

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Dry</u>											
County	28	77.02	78.51	78.76	25.36	99.68	43.62	172.03	58.78 to 84.19	306,981	241,767
8300	28	77.02	78.51	78.76	25.36	99.68	43.62	172.03	58.78 to 84.19	306,981	241,767
<u>Grass</u>											
County	1	75.19	75.19	75.19	00.00	100.00	75.19	75.19	N/A	210,000	157,905
8300	1	75.19	75.19	75.19	00.00	100.00	75.19	75.19	N/A	210,000	157,905
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.60	75.17	71.54	25.08	105.07	41.71	172.03	62.73 to 79.79	344,673	246,566

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 76  
 Total Sales Price : 26,199,072  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,195,117  
 Total Assessed Value : 18,739,053  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 344,673  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 246,566

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 72  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 25.08  
 PRD : 105.07

COV : 33.07  
 STD : 24.86  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.46  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 172.03  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.71

95% Median C.I. : 62.73 to 79.79  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.58 to 80.76

Printed:3/26/2013 9:48:39AM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	50	72.13	74.17	70.21	25.99	105.64	41.71	172.03	61.75 to 79.79	348,343	244,567
8300	50	72.13	74.17	70.21	25.99	105.64	41.71	172.03	61.75 to 79.79	348,343	244,567
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	75.19	75.19	75.19	00.00	100.00	75.19	75.19	N/A	210,000	157,905
8300	1	75.19	75.19	75.19	00.00	100.00	75.19	75.19	N/A	210,000	157,905
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>73.60</b>	<b>75.17</b>	<b>71.54</b>	<b>25.08</b>	<b>105.07</b>	<b>41.71</b>	<b>172.03</b>	<b>62.73 to 79.79</b>	<b>344,673</b>	<b>246,566</b>

## Nemaha County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Nemaha	8300	4,750	4,750	3,750	3,000	2,625	3,735	2,000	2,000	3,406
Richardson	50	3,735	3,670	3,146	3,310	2,877	2,455	1,920	1,870	3,113
Pawnee	1	3,010	3,360	N/A	2,880	2,630	N/A	1,975	1,975	2,875
Johnson	1	3,958	3,558	3,650	3,121	2,950	N/A	2,021	1,700	3,168
Otoe	8000	4,750	4,750	4,500	4,000	3,100	3,100	2,900	2,500	3,808

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Nemaha	8300	3,789	3,800	2,994	2,400	2,100	2,909	1,600	1,600	2,610
Richardson	50	3,277	3,064	2,805	2,847	2,806	2,777	2,433	1,920	2,826
Pawnee	1	2,510	2,800	2,567	2,400	2,190	1,900	1,645	1,645	2,219
Johnson	1	2,981	2,693	2,650	2,255	2,300	2,308	1,600	1,300	2,224
Otoe	8000	3,800	3,800	3,600	3,200	2,500	3,046	2,300	1,998	3,024

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Nemaha	8300	1,719	2,021	1,906	1,160	1,200	1,157	982	830	1,161
Richardson	50	1,089	1,216	913	1,064	1,030	976	932	774	950
Pawnee	1	1,430	1,587	1,077	1,383	1,272	1,134	1,196	1,031	1,254
Johnson	1	1,436	1,761	1,380	1,337	1,388	1,300	1,168	883	1,233
Otoe	8000	1,468	1,494	1,411	1,557	1,408	1,373	1,274	870	1,323

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Nemaha County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County is comprised of approximately 3% irrigated land, 77% dry crop land and 19% grass/pasture land. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. For 2013 the county determined that the agricultural market did not necessitate the use of market areas for Nemaha County.

The calculated statistics for the agricultural land show that the measures of central tendency are all within the required range. The qualitative statistics are both above the recommended range. The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years, this is influencing the COD. There are 76 qualified sales being used in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. This was met by including comparable sales from the same general market all within six miles of the subject county. Comparable sales were added to make up for the deficiency of sales to the first year of the study. The 80% majority land use dry shows a median in the middle of the range.

Nemaha County for 2013 values agricultural land by the LCG structure. In the past the county made adjustments for different soil types within the LCG structure. With the changes in the agricultural market the county could no longer demonstrate a correlation between soil makeup and market value. A comparison of average values by LCG demonstrates that Nemaha is in the same relative range between Otoe, Johnson, and Richardson counties. All indications support that Nemaha County has achieved equalization both within the county as well as with adjoining counties.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 6,146</b>	<b>Value : 803,721,785</b>	<b>Growth 4,094,720</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	384	1,392,340	42	288,280	53	175,300	479	1,855,920	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,038	10,732,440	118	1,460,105	376	5,402,785	2,532	17,595,330	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,077	115,904,310	123	10,068,880	394	35,697,845	2,594	161,671,035	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,461	128,029,090	165	11,817,265	447	41,275,930	3,073	181,122,285	1,417,155
<b>% of Res Total</b>	80.08	70.69	5.37	6.52	14.55	22.79	50.00	22.54	34.61
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	78	398,385	1	8,760	2	14,335	81	421,480	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	326	2,416,750	15	203,335	14	133,230	355	2,753,315	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	336	17,334,590	21	1,191,485	15	677,705	372	19,203,780	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	414	20,149,725	22	1,403,580	17	825,270	453	22,378,575	91,530
<b>% of Com Total</b>	91.39	90.04	4.86	6.27	3.75	3.69	7.37	2.78	2.24
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	26,650	4	107,285	0	0	5	133,935	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	1,605,670	4	3,088,380	0	0	5	4,694,050	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	1	1,632,320	4	3,195,665	0	0	5	4,827,985	301,455
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	20.00	33.81	80.00	66.19	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.60	7.36
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	7	412,000	42	1,764,170	49	2,176,170	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	2	27,030	2	173,905	4	200,935	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	2	33,130	2	4,040	4	37,170	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	9	472,160	44	1,942,115	53	2,414,275	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	16.98	19.56	83.02	80.44	0.86	0.30	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,461	128,029,090	174	12,289,425	491	43,218,045	3,126	183,536,560	1,417,155
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	78.73	69.76	5.57	6.70	15.71	23.55	50.86	22.84	34.61
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	415	21,782,045	26	4,599,245	17	825,270	458	27,206,560	392,985
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	90.61	80.06	5.68	16.90	3.71	3.03	7.45	3.39	9.60
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,876	149,811,135	200	16,888,670	508	44,043,315	3,584	210,743,120	1,810,140
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	80.25	71.09	5.58	8.01	14.17	20.90	58.31	26.22	44.21

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	284	9,470,975	3,904,380	0	0	0
19. Commercial	209	9,810,610	7,190,460	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	284	9,470,975	3,904,380
19. Commercial	0	0	0	209	9,810,610	7,190,460
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				493	19,281,585	11,094,840

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	254	56	98	408

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	54	863,235	143	20,277,085	1,471	306,763,665	1,668	327,903,985
28. Ag-Improved Land	6	392,585	76	15,691,480	786	215,235,085	868	231,319,150
29. Ag Improvements	6	577,905	78	2,951,210	810	30,226,415	894	33,755,530
30. Ag Total							2,562	592,978,665

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	3	2.07	12,060	
33. HomeSite Improvements	4	0.00	549,545	50	2.00	2,266,655	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	3.06	6,400	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	5	5.07	26,040	68	159.64	545,535	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	28,360	74	0.00	684,555	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	5.07	0	0	265.18	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	7	7.00	42,000	10	9.07	54,060	
33. HomeSite Improvements	465	7.00	21,410,485	519	9.00	24,226,685	2,284,580
34. HomeSite Total				519	9.07	24,280,745	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	25	320.59	131,070	26	323.65	137,470	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	667	1,677.08	5,956,240	740	1,841.79	6,527,815	
37. FarmSite Improvements	781	0.00	8,815,930	858	0.00	9,528,845	0
38. FarmSite Total				884	2,165.44	16,194,130	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,442.72	0	0	4,712.97	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,403	6,887.48	40,474,875	2,284,580

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	3	272.74	230,575
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	728.46	740,085	13	1,001.20	970,660

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 8300

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	351.47	4.66%	1,669,505	6.50%	4,750.06
46. 1A	601.08	7.97%	2,855,200	11.11%	4,750.12
47. 2A1	2,930.21	38.83%	10,988,480	42.75%	3,750.07
48. 2A	935.73	12.40%	2,807,190	10.92%	3,000.00
49. 3A1	1,796.94	23.81%	4,717,010	18.35%	2,625.02
50. 3A	464.70	6.16%	1,735,535	6.75%	3,734.74
51. 4A1	412.36	5.47%	824,720	3.21%	2,000.00
52. 4A	52.95	0.70%	105,900	0.41%	2,000.00
53. Total	7,545.44	100.00%	25,703,540	100.00%	3,406.50
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,324.78	1.28%	8,809,060	1.85%	3,789.20
55. 1D	16,490.53	9.05%	62,660,840	13.17%	3,799.81
56. 2D1	38,972.03	21.38%	116,677,705	24.53%	2,993.88
57. 2D	16,330.71	8.96%	39,193,680	8.24%	2,400.00
58. 3D1	37,038.67	20.32%	77,766,945	16.35%	2,099.61
59. 3D	43,377.64	23.80%	126,181,420	26.53%	2,908.90
60. 4D1	23,753.95	13.03%	38,003,865	7.99%	1,599.90
61. 4D	3,955.04	2.17%	6,327,265	1.33%	1,599.80
62. Total	182,243.35	100.00%	475,620,780	100.00%	2,609.81
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	285.35	0.65%	490,635	0.96%	1,719.41
64. 1G	2,385.91	5.45%	4,822,810	9.48%	2,021.37
65. 2G1	6,018.90	13.74%	11,473,830	22.56%	1,906.30
66. 2G	4,033.31	9.21%	4,679,510	9.20%	1,160.22
67. 3G1	2,522.12	5.76%	3,027,715	5.95%	1,200.46
68. 3G	4,116.93	9.40%	4,763,895	9.37%	1,157.15
69. 4G1	8,684.99	19.83%	8,527,435	16.76%	981.86
70. 4G	15,757.66	35.97%	13,079,375	25.71%	830.03
71. Total	43,805.17	100.00%	50,865,205	100.00%	1,161.17
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	7,545.44	3.18%	25,703,540	4.65%	3,406.50
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	182,243.35	76.90%	475,620,780	86.08%	2,609.81
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	43,805.17	18.48%	50,865,205	9.21%	1,161.17
72. Waste	3,049.76	1.29%	295,330	0.05%	96.84
73. Other	343.66	0.15%	18,935	0.00%	55.10
74. Exempt	231.81	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	236,987.38	100.00%	552,503,790	100.00%	2,331.36

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	672.81	2,386,070	6,872.63	23,317,470	7,545.44	25,703,540
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	363.63	1,051,945	11,271.26	29,238,135	170,608.46	445,330,700	182,243.35	475,620,780
<b>78. Grass</b>	143.28	177,815	3,554.30	3,751,935	40,107.59	46,935,455	43,805.17	50,865,205
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.19	20	255.89	25,615	2,793.68	269,695	3,049.76	295,330
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	56.23	2,815	287.43	16,120	343.66	18,935
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.07	0	70.31	0	161.50	0	231.88	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>507.10</b>	<b>1,229,780</b>	<b>15,810.49</b>	<b>35,404,570</b>	<b>220,669.79</b>	<b>515,869,440</b>	<b>236,987.38</b>	<b>552,503,790</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	7,545.44	3.18%	25,703,540	4.65%	3,406.50
<b>Dry Land</b>	182,243.35	76.90%	475,620,780	86.08%	2,609.81
<b>Grass</b>	43,805.17	18.48%	50,865,205	9.21%	1,161.17
<b>Waste</b>	3,049.76	1.29%	295,330	0.05%	96.84
<b>Other</b>	343.66	0.15%	18,935	0.00%	55.10
<b>Exempt</b>	231.88	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>236,987.38</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>552,503,790</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,331.36</b>

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

64 Nemaha

	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	178,468,815	181,122,285	2,653,470	1.49%	1,417,155	0.69%
02. Recreational	2,414,315	2,414,275	-40	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	23,309,110	24,280,745	971,635	4.17%	2,284,580	-5.63%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>204,192,240</b>	<b>207,817,305</b>	<b>3,625,065</b>	<b>1.78%</b>	<b>3,701,735</b>	<b>-0.04%</b>
05. Commercial	22,330,285	22,378,575	48,290	0.22%	91,530	-0.19%
06. Industrial	4,526,530	4,827,985	301,455	6.66%	301,455	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	10,356,190	16,194,130	5,837,940	56.37%	0	56.37%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>37,213,005</b>	<b>43,400,690</b>	<b>6,187,685</b>	<b>16.63%</b>	<b>392,985</b>	<b>15.57%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>241,405,245</b>	<b>251,217,995</b>	<b>9,812,750</b>	<b>4.06%</b>	<b>4,094,720</b>	<b>2.37%</b>
11. Irrigated	18,093,400	25,703,540	7,610,140	42.06%		
12. Dryland	390,098,855	475,620,780	85,521,925	21.92%		
13. Grassland	52,721,930	50,865,205	-1,856,725	-3.52%		
14. Wasteland	332,190	295,330	-36,860	-11.10%		
15. Other Agland	15,325	18,935	3,610	23.56%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>461,261,700</b>	<b>552,503,790</b>	<b>91,242,090</b>	<b>19.78%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>702,666,945</b>	<b>803,721,785</b>	<b>101,054,840</b>	<b>14.38%</b>	<b>4,094,720</b>	<b>13.80%</b>

2013-2014-2015  
PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
NEMAHA COUNTY, NE

To: Nemaha County Board of Equalization  
Nebraska Department of Revenue--Property Assessment Division

As required by Sec. 77-1311.02, R.R.S. Nebr. as amended by 2007 Neb. Laws LB334, Section 64, the assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment on or before June 15 of each year, which shall described the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter and submit such plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year, any may amend the plan, if necessary, after a budget is approved by the County Board, and submit a copy of the plan and any amendments of the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law and the resources necessary to complete those actions.

The following is a plan of assessment for:

**Tax Year 2013:**

Residential—

1. Finish review of Brownville and apply new values. Review Nemaha, Brock, and Julian and part of Auburn.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial/Recreational—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. New agricultural land study and value will be applied for 2013.
2. Review remaining rural improvements and preliminary sale statistic developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
4. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified.

**BUDGET REQUEST FOR 2012-2013:**

Requested budget of \$32,345 is needed to:

1. Complete pickup work for new improvements or improvement changes made throughout county in all classes;
2. Review remaining rural improvements to include new pictures of houses and buildings. New value to be applied for 2014 tax roll.
3. Analyze and possible adjustment to class/subclass of residential properties
4. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of commercial/recreational properties.
5. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of agricultural properties.

**TAX YEAR 2014:**

Residential—

1. Reappraisal of all residential property in the towns of Peru, Johnson and finish Auburn This would include all related improvements associated with the main improvement, new photos of property improvement, new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2015.

2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial/Recreational—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural—

1. Place new values agricultural houses and outbuildings for 2014..
3. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measurer as required by law.
4. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
5. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified.

**TAX YEAR 2015:**

Residential—

1. Apply new values of residential property in Brownville, Johnson, & Peru. Finish review of Auburn and apply new values. This would include all related improvements associated with the main improvement, new photos of property development, new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2015.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

PAGE 4  
2013-2015 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR NEMAHA COUNTY, NE

Commercial/Recreational—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, Adjusting by class/subclass to arrive at acceptable levels of value.
2. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified.

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1, The County had a deputy on staff for all of 2012 that employee left in February of 2013.
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1 as of March 2013 to replace the above mentioned deputy
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	113086.61
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget <i>if different from above</i>:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	32,345.04
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	0 It is funded out of the County General budget
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	775
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	0

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	No
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor and staff
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All of the towns are zoned
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	The office is unsure of the date of implementation probably 30 years

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	None
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	No
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	No



# 2013 Certification for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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



