

# 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 Nuckolls County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	103	Median	97.61
Total Sales Price	\$4,256,534	Mean	105.87
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,256,534	Wgt. Mean	98.32
Total Assessed Value	\$4,185,130	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$28,324
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$41,326	Avg. Assessed Value	\$40,632

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.77 to 98.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.56 to 102.08
95% Mean C.I	98.07 to 113.67
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	7.81
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.30

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	95	97	97.18
2011	120	97	97
2010	136	97	97
2009	147	98	98

## 2013 Commission Summary for Nuckolls County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	Median	99.81
Total Sales Price	\$596,756	Mean	99.92
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$596,756	Wgt. Mean	96.83
Total Assessed Value	\$577,860	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$82,447
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$37,297	Avg. Assessed Value	\$36,116

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	88.79 to 111.35
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.16 to 103.51
95% Mean C.I	90.06 to 109.78
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.39
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.79

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	16		103.25
2011	14		97
2010	13	96	96
2009	16	93	93



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>73</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

The Assessor and her staff are working toward finalizing boundary lines in the Land-use layer in GIS for all residential properties.

All sales are reviewed by the Assessor, her staff and Stanard Appraisal.

The Assessor and her staff, along with assistance from contract appraiser, complete on-sight inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction.

The County has a contract with Stanard Appraisal Services to reappraise residential properties in the County. A complete reappraisal of Nelson and Lawrence were completed for 2013 tax year. All field and data entry for reappraisal was completed in a timely manner.

All pick up work was completed timely.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, staff & Stanard Appraisal	
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>
	01	Nelson-County seat, located on highway, post office, churches, bank & a high school.
	02	Hardy-No schools. Has limited infrastructure, post office & churches.
	03	Lawrence-Has elementary school, bank, church, post office & some economic development.
	04	Nora-No schools, churches, post office or bank.
	05	Oak-No school, post office or bank. Has a church & limited infrastructure.
	06	Ruskin-No school. Has churches, post office, bank & limited infrastructure. Located on main highway.
	07	Superior-Largest community, K-12 school, multiple banks, churches, post office and active economy.
	08	Rural Acreages-Located throughout county, own market area.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost Approach-is entered in to the CAMA system and depreciation tables are developed Sales Comparison/Market Anaylisis-Sales are verified, reviewed for accuracy, statistics are run and comparable properties are identified.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	We are using Marshall & Swift costing for 06-2007	
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>	
	We use tables that are developed for Nuckolls County.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are developed for each valuation grouping as a revaluation is completed for that grouping.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Rural Acreages-West ½ of County-2007-2008 -East ½ of County-2008-2009 Superior-2009-2010 Hardy, Nora, Oak & Ruskin-2011-2012 Nelson and Lawrence-2012-2013	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Same as #7	

9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	Front Footage

**65 Nuckolls**

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

**RESIDENTIAL**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 103  
 Total Sales Price : 4,256,534  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,256,534  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,185,130  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 41,326  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 40,632

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 16.20  
 PRD : 107.68

COV : 38.13  
 STD : 40.37  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.81  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 398.08  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 51.93

95% Median C.I. : 96.77 to 98.50  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.56 to 102.08  
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.07 to 113.67

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:44PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qrtrs</b>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	96.72	96.17	97.30	01.84	98.84	90.08	98.73	93.16 to 98.29	47,833	46,543
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	98.85	101.52	100.61	07.74	100.90	86.08	127.44	86.59 to 121.29	32,837	33,039
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	94.42	99.74	95.17	06.48	104.80	93.08	117.06	N/A	47,475	45,183
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	18	97.69	125.72	98.70	36.45	127.38	72.73	398.08	92.63 to 107.01	36,539	36,063
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	16	98.42	101.91	95.84	07.73	106.33	79.22	164.25	96.30 to 102.85	52,311	50,133
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	21	94.86	97.84	94.53	14.18	103.50	51.93	170.60	93.30 to 99.38	31,507	29,783
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	8	100.08	103.71	105.22	19.78	98.56	55.19	151.58	55.19 to 151.58	49,938	52,544
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	16	98.41	109.08	100.83	17.51	108.18	81.06	210.96	92.63 to 124.10	44,944	45,315
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	42	97.68	110.57	98.34	18.96	112.44	72.73	398.08	96.63 to 98.80	39,031	38,385
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	61	97.55	102.62	98.31	14.29	104.38	51.93	210.96	96.24 to 98.99	42,905	42,180
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	49	98.33	110.39	97.54	18.30	113.17	72.73	398.08	97.07 to 99.16	41,751	40,723
<b>ALL</b>	103	97.61	105.87	98.32	16.20	107.68	51.93	398.08	96.77 to 98.50	41,326	40,632

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	20	97.65	97.85	97.94	03.26	99.91	81.06	117.06	96.50 to 98.66	29,734	29,120
02	7	97.55	102.15	95.55	25.98	106.91	55.19	145.17	55.19 to 145.17	9,414	8,995
03	9	97.43	98.64	100.22	02.39	98.42	95.05	111.74	96.30 to 98.44	47,444	47,551
04	1	102.85	102.85	102.85	00.00	100.00	102.85	102.85	N/A	13,000	13,370
05	1	86.59	86.59	86.59	00.00	100.00	86.59	86.59	N/A	18,750	16,235
06	8	93.65	96.84	93.54	07.62	103.53	86.01	124.10	86.01 to 124.10	24,988	23,373
07	49	98.29	112.30	99.22	23.85	113.18	51.93	398.08	94.35 to 99.38	46,762	46,396
08	8	100.32	109.71	96.26	16.58	113.97	79.22	170.60	79.22 to 170.60	80,750	77,726
<b>ALL</b>	103	97.61	105.87	98.32	16.20	107.68	51.93	398.08	96.77 to 98.50	41,326	40,632

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	103	97.61	105.87	98.32	16.20	107.68	51.93	398.08	96.77 to 98.50	41,326	40,632
06											
07											
<b>ALL</b>	103	97.61	105.87	98.32	16.20	107.68	51.93	398.08	96.77 to 98.50	41,326	40,632

**65 Nuckolls  
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 : 103  
 Total Sales Price : 4,256,534  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,256,534  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,185,130  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 41,326  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 40,632

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 16.20  
 PRD : 107.68

COV : 38.13  
 STD : 40.37  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.81  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 398.08  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 51.93

95% Median C.I. : 96.77 to 98.50  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.56 to 102.08  
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.07 to 113.67

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:44PM

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	9	106.00	137.76	120.12	37.02	114.69	94.11	292.50	98.33 to 170.60	2,678	3,217	
Less Than 15,000	33	98.50	120.72	119.87	32.95	100.71	51.93	398.08	95.75 to 117.05	7,480	8,966	
Less Than 30,000	51	97.55	112.92	107.53	24.47	105.01	51.93	398.08	96.50 to 99.30	12,026	12,932	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	94	97.51	102.81	98.20	13.74	104.69	51.93	398.08	96.50 to 98.29	45,026	44,215	
Greater Than 14,999	70	97.45	98.86	97.00	08.11	101.92	65.01	164.25	96.50 to 98.16	57,281	55,561	
Greater Than 29,999	52	97.68	98.95	96.77	08.09	102.25	65.01	164.25	96.30 to 98.73	70,062	67,800	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	9	106.00	137.76	120.12	37.02	114.69	94.11	292.50	98.33 to 170.60	2,678	3,217	
5,000 TO 14,999	24	97.55	114.33	119.84	30.17	95.40	51.93	398.08	93.16 to 117.05	9,280	11,121	
15,000 TO 29,999	18	97.12	98.62	99.23	08.08	99.39	81.06	151.58	91.35 to 98.44	20,360	20,203	
30,000 TO 59,999	23	97.75	101.96	101.33	10.96	100.62	65.01	164.25	95.05 to 101.95	36,275	36,758	
60,000 TO 99,999	19	97.95	98.22	98.14	05.70	100.08	72.73	125.10	94.84 to 99.86	74,126	72,749	
100,000 TO 149,999	7	96.24	93.50	93.50	04.93	100.00	79.78	98.85	79.78 to 98.85	120,357	112,531	
150,000 TO 249,999	3	97.61	93.17	91.44	08.01	101.89	79.22	102.68	N/A	186,000	170,073	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	103	97.61	105.87	98.32	16.20	107.68	51.93	398.08	96.77 to 98.50	41,326	40,632	



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The largest town is Superior and the county seat is Nelson. The county has two high schools; one in Superior and one consolidated high school, Lawrence-Nelson. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population.

The statistical sampling of 103 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Nuckolls County. The measures of central tendency offer some support for each other. Outliers are occurring in the lower priced residential sales. The calculated median is 97.61%. All, but two, valuation groupings are within the acceptable range. The two valuation groupings that are below the acceptable range represent the assessor locations of Nora and Oak but a reliable statistical inference would be difficult with only one sale in each of these two locations. The statistics reflect an influence on the COD and PRD due to low dollar sales. Thirty-three of the one hundred and three sales are under \$15,000.

Nuckolls County has in place a procedure with their sales verification. When a sale occurs, the information on the 521 is checked against the records for accuracy and a sales verification questionnaire is started. The contract appraiser completes the form with telephone calls to the knowledgeable parties and a physical inspection of the property. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified residential sales within the county. It does not appear that any excessive trimming is being done in the sales file.

Nuckolls County employs a four-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. A complete reappraisal of Nelson and Lawrence were completed for 2013. Nuckolls County has met their statutory six-year inspection requirement.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Nuckolls County was one of those selected for review in 2012 and it has been confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and are being applied consistently. Therefore, it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the residential class of property.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 98% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County**

All new sales are reviewed by the Assessor, her staff and Stanard Appraisal.

Nuckolls County contracts with Stanard Appraisal Services for their commercial properties. All commercial properties were reappraised in 2009.

On-sight inspections of commercial properties are performed if there is a new sale, any remodeling or any new construction occurs.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, staff and Stanard Appraisal	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Nelson-County seat, located on highway, post office, churches, bank & a high school.
	02	Hardy-No schools or bank. Has limited infrastructure, post office and churches.
	03	Lawrence-Has elementary school, bank, church, post office and limited infrastructure.
	04	Nora-No schools, churches, post office or bank, very limited infrastructure.
	05	Oak-No school, post office or bank, Has a church & limited infrastructure.
	06	Ruskin-No school. Has churches, post office, bank & limited infrastructure. Located on a main highway.
	07	Superior-Largest community, K-12 school, multiple banks, churches, post office & active economy.
	08	Rural Acreages-Located throughout county, own market area.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	<p>Cost Approach-is entered into the CAMA system and depreciation tables are developed.</p> <p>Sales Comparison/Market Analysis-Sales are verified, reviewed for accuracy, statistics are run and comparable properties are identified.</p> <p>Income Approach-If there is sufficient information available the contract appraiser will use the income approach to value a property.</p>	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	We will gather any information available to us and along with our contract appraiser, we will determine the best approach to use for each property.	
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 develops their own depreciation tables with the aid of the contract appraiser.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	They are developed as needed by the contract appraiser.	

7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>
	The last time depreciation tables would have been updated would have been in 2009-2010 as there was a complete revaluation of all the commercial properties in Nuckolls County done at that time.
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2009-2010
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>
	Lot values are determined using square footage.

**65 Nuckolls**  
**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 : 16  
Total Sales Price : 596,756  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 596,756  
Total Assessed Value : 577,860  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 37,297  
Avg. Assessed Value : 36,116

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 13.49  
PRD : 103.19

COV : 18.51  
STD : 18.50  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.46  
MAX Sales Ratio : 131.16  
MIN Sales Ratio : 57.67

95% Median C.I. : 88.79 to 111.35  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.16 to 103.51  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.06 to 109.78

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:45PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	98.56	98.56	98.56	00.00	100.00	98.56	98.56	N/A	5,200	5,125
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	102.71	102.71	102.71	00.00	100.00	102.71	102.71	N/A	17,500	17,975
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	57.67	57.67	57.67	00.00	100.00	57.67	57.67	N/A	1,500	865
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	96.43	96.43	104.86	14.07	91.96	82.86	110.00	N/A	18,500	19,400
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	131.16	131.16	131.16	00.00	100.00	131.16	131.16	N/A	10,903	14,300
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	90.82	90.82	90.82	00.00	100.00	90.82	90.82	N/A	110,000	99,900
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	98.79	98.79	99.63	02.29	99.16	96.53	101.05	N/A	43,750	43,588
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	79.38	79.38	79.38	00.00	100.00	79.38	79.38	N/A	64,750	51,400
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	88.79	88.79	88.79	00.00	100.00	88.79	88.79	N/A	76,000	67,480
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	111.35	107.15	102.83	04.80	104.20	97.03	113.07	N/A	57,833	59,470
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	4	100.64	91.36	99.60	13.17	91.73	57.67	106.50	N/A	6,550	6,524
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	5	110.00	109.20	99.11	16.12	110.18	82.86	131.16	N/A	33,761	33,460
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	7	97.03	98.17	95.70	08.95	102.58	79.38	113.07	79.38 to 113.07	57,393	54,924
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	98.56	90.36	102.56	14.65	88.10	57.67	110.00	N/A	12,240	12,553
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	101.05	110.14	98.34	14.83	112.00	90.82	131.16	N/A	43,861	43,135
<u>ALL</u>	16	99.81	99.92	96.83	13.49	103.19	57.67	131.16	88.79 to 111.35	37,297	36,116

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	2	80.19	80.19	99.16	28.08	80.87	57.67	102.71	N/A	9,500	9,420
03	1	82.86	82.86	82.86	00.00	100.00	82.86	82.86	N/A	7,000	5,800
05	3	131.16	125.13	123.78	04.60	101.09	113.07	131.16	N/A	12,269	15,187
06	2	99.81	99.81	100.85	01.25	98.97	98.56	101.05	N/A	32,600	32,878
07	7	97.03	100.15	96.66	07.62	103.61	88.79	111.35	88.79 to 111.35	57,714	55,786
08	1	79.38	79.38	79.38	00.00	100.00	79.38	79.38	N/A	64,750	51,400
<u>ALL</u>	16	99.81	99.92	96.83	13.49	103.19	57.67	131.16	88.79 to 111.35	37,297	36,116

**65 Nuckolls  
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 : 16  
Total Sales Price : 596,756  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 596,756  
Total Assessed Value : 577,860  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 37,297  
Avg. Assessed Value : 36,116

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 13.49  
PRD : 103.19

COV : 18.51  
STD : 18.50  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.46  
MAX Sales Ratio : 131.16  
MIN Sales Ratio : 57.67

95% Median C.I. : 88.79 to 111.35  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.16 to 103.51  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.06 to 109.78

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:45PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	3	90.82	96.99	94.76	08.28	102.35	88.79	111.35	N/A	79,833	75,650
03	13	101.05	100.59	98.22	13.89	102.41	57.67	131.16	82.86 to 113.07	27,481	26,993
04											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>16</u>	99.81	99.92	96.83	13.49	103.19	57.67	131.16	88.79 to 111.35	37,297	36,116

**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	2	82.09	82.09	85.57	29.75	95.93	57.67	106.50	N/A	1,750	1,498
Less Than 15,000	6	102.53	101.32	113.37	21.09	89.37	57.67	131.16	57.67 to 131.16	6,251	7,087
Less Than 30,000	9	102.71	102.25	106.66	15.82	95.87	57.67	131.16	82.86 to 131.16	10,834	11,556
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	14	99.81	102.46	96.90	11.92	105.74	79.38	131.16	88.79 to 113.07	42,375	41,062
Greater Than 14,999	10	99.04	99.07	95.72	08.64	103.50	79.38	113.07	88.79 to 111.35	55,925	53,534
Greater Than 29,999	7	97.03	96.92	94.91	09.34	102.12	79.38	111.35	79.38 to 111.35	71,321	67,694
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	2	82.09	82.09	85.57	29.75	95.93	57.67	106.50	N/A	1,750	1,498
5,000 TO 14,999	4	114.86	110.94	116.23	17.61	95.45	82.86	131.16	N/A	8,502	9,881
15,000 TO 29,999	3	102.71	104.10	102.47	05.36	101.59	96.53	113.07	N/A	20,000	20,493
30,000 TO 59,999	2	110.68	110.68	110.86	00.61	99.84	110.00	111.35	N/A	41,750	46,285
60,000 TO 99,999	3	88.79	89.74	89.42	08.13	100.36	79.38	101.05	N/A	66,917	59,837
100,000 TO 149,999	2	93.93	93.93	93.85	03.31	100.09	90.82	97.03	N/A	107,500	100,890
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>16</u>	99.81	99.92	96.83	13.49	103.19	57.67	131.16	88.79 to 111.35	37,297	36,116

**65 Nuckolls  
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 : 16  
 Total Sales Price : 596,756  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 596,756  
 Total Assessed Value : 577,860  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 37,297  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 36,116

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 13.49  
 PRD : 103.19

COV : 18.51  
 STD : 18.50  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.46  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 131.16  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 57.67

95% Median C.I. : 88.79 to 111.35  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.16 to 103.51  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.06 to 109.78

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:45PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	1	88.79	88.79	88.79	00.00	100.00	88.79	88.79	N/A	76,000	67,480
344	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
350	3	131.16	121.68	118.49	07.23	102.69	102.71	131.16	N/A	13,102	15,525
352	2	101.09	101.09	97.54	10.16	103.64	90.82	111.35	N/A	81,750	79,735
353	1	96.53	96.53	96.53	00.00	100.00	96.53	96.53	N/A	27,500	26,545
406	5	82.86	86.00	91.54	17.63	93.95	57.67	113.07	N/A	38,650	35,381
437	1	98.56	98.56	98.56	00.00	100.00	98.56	98.56	N/A	5,200	5,125
444	1	110.00	110.00	110.00	00.00	100.00	110.00	110.00	N/A	30,000	33,000
477	1	101.05	101.05	101.05	00.00	100.00	101.05	101.05	N/A	60,000	60,630
<u>ALL</u>	16	99.81	99.92	96.83	13.49	103.19	57.67	131.16	88.79 to 111.35	37,297	36,116



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The largest town is Superior and the county seat is Nelson. The county has two high schools; one in Superior and one consolidated high school, Lawrence-Nelson. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 16 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 99.81%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Nuckolls County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Services), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class; there is just not an active commercial market in Nuckolls County.

The 16 commercial sales can be further examined to reveal that six different valuation groupings and nine different occupancy codes are contained within the statistical profile. This diversity further gives credence that the market is unorganized and the statistics are not a reliable indicator of the level of value.

Nuckolls County has in place a procedure with their sales verification. When a sale occurs, the information on the 521 is checked against the records for accuracy and a sales verification questionnaire is started. The contract appraiser completes the form with telephone calls to the knowledgeable parties and a physical inspection of the property. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified commercial sales within the county. It does not appear that any excessive trimming is being done in the sales file.

Nuckolls County employs a four-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. All commercial properties were reappraised in 2009. Nuckolls County has met their statutory six-year inspection requirement.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Nuckolls County was one of those selected for review in 2012 and it has been confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and are being applied consistently. Therefore, it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the commercial class of property.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls County**

---

in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County**

The Assessor and her staff are working towards finalizing the agland use layer in their GIS system. They have found some issues with boundary lines and are working towards getting them corrected and to complete the land-use layer. Once completed, they are planning on converting to GIS deeded acres.

The County is continuing to audit the acres of land and the uses through GIS imagery. Several parcels have been identified as being reported incorrectly on land use. Ongoing updates to parcels are made as ground is being converted from grassland to either dry or irrigated. The changes are being made and the new values are being applied for the 2013 tax year. On-sight inspections of properties are being made, along with reviews of current aerial imagery

All sales were plotted and geographic and economic characteristics were reviewed and a determination was made to have one market area across all of Nuckolls County.

A spreadsheet analysis was completed using current sales from Nuckolls County and surrounding comparable counties.

The County completed on-sight inspections and measurement of new construction (bins, buildings and any structures). The County contracts with Stanard Appraisal Services for assistance with this.

All sales are reviewed by Assessor and her staff.

All pick up work was completed timely.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, staff & Stanard Appraisal	
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	Nuckolls County has one market area for ag, no real economic differences countywide have been determined.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Sales are plotted annually; NRD restrictions are reviewed, as well as all sales are reviewed.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	No differences have been determined in Nuckolls county. Will review land usage annually. Will review hunting leases if available.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	They carry the same value. Sales are reviewed to determine if there is a premium being paid due to location of rural homes or acreages.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The county monitors and reviews all sales, paying attention to any outside influences, such as investors and also location of the sales.	
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>	
	n/a	

**65 Nuckolls**  
**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 : 53  
Total Sales Price : 21,526,118  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,122,518  
Total Assessed Value : 12,884,127  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 417,406  
Avg. Assessed Value : 243,097

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 58  
MEAN : 71  
COD : 24.80  
PRD : 122.10

COV : 32.39  
STD : 23.03  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.99  
MAX Sales Ratio : 138.45  
MIN Sales Ratio : 26.21

95% Median C.I. : 61.80 to 81.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.34 to 66.14  
95% Mean C.I. : 64.91 to 77.31

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:46PM

**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	3	88.84	99.90	78.08	24.77	127.95	72.42	138.45	N/A	298,817	233,318
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	10	79.43	81.79	80.25	12.59	101.92	60.22	112.90	71.91 to 95.43	302,860	243,052
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	81.22	81.22	77.05	11.78	105.41	71.65	90.78	N/A	413,000	318,203
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	81.52	81.52	81.52	00.00	100.00	81.52	81.52	N/A	216,000	176,075
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	72.14	71.91	59.94	19.79	119.97	42.95	110.26	42.95 to 110.26	527,592	316,254
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	74.15	69.66	60.84	18.56	114.50	37.97	98.57	37.97 to 98.57	253,548	154,269
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	77.88	74.56	66.78	24.95	111.65	48.46	94.02	N/A	180,075	120,258
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	67.84	67.84	52.08	33.14	130.26	45.36	90.32	N/A	449,750	234,240
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	6	56.11	55.22	45.80	26.86	120.57	28.99	81.23	28.99 to 81.23	292,850	134,128
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	57.18	63.90	60.67	30.97	105.32	37.15	95.11	37.15 to 95.11	457,000	277,250
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	41.99	56.49	40.50	46.32	139.48	34.56	92.91	N/A	1,381,667	559,553
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	26.21	26.21	26.21	00.00	100.00	26.21	26.21	N/A	896,000	234,815
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	16	81.54	85.10	79.38	14.75	107.21	60.22	138.45	72.42 to 90.78	310,441	246,435
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	21	72.54	71.28	59.87	21.97	119.06	37.97	110.26	53.32 to 89.27	362,637	217,116
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	16	53.02	56.90	45.93	35.04	123.88	26.21	95.11	37.15 to 81.23	596,256	273,859
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	21	74.78	77.96	69.63	16.17	111.96	42.95	112.90	71.74 to 85.01	394,825	274,906
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	19	67.28	65.94	55.01	25.67	119.87	28.99	98.57	48.46 to 81.23	271,144	149,167
<u>ALL</u>	53	72.54	71.11	58.24	24.80	122.10	26.21	138.45	61.80 to 81.23	417,406	243,097

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	53	72.54	71.11	58.24	24.80	122.10	26.21	138.45	61.80 to 81.23	417,406	243,097
<u>ALL</u>	53	72.54	71.11	58.24	24.80	122.10	26.21	138.45	61.80 to 81.23	417,406	243,097

**65 Nuckolls**  
**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 : 53  
Total Sales Price : 21,526,118  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,122,518  
Total Assessed Value : 12,884,127  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 417,406  
Avg. Assessed Value : 243,097

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 58  
MEAN : 71  
COD : 24.80  
PRD : 122.10

COV : 32.39  
STD : 23.03  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.99  
MAX Sales Ratio : 138.45  
MIN Sales Ratio : 26.21

95% Median C.I. : 61.80 to 81.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.34 to 66.14  
95% Mean C.I. : 64.91 to 77.31

Printed:3/27/2013 3:13:46PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	2	73.59	73.59	73.32	01.59	100.37	72.42	74.75	N/A	619,750	454,418
1	2	73.59	73.59	73.32	01.59	100.37	72.42	74.75	N/A	619,750	454,418
<b>Dry</b>											
County	7	75.43	69.36	65.16	22.88	106.45	45.36	95.11	45.36 to 95.11	325,429	212,060
1	7	75.43	69.36	65.16	22.88	106.45	45.36	95.11	45.36 to 95.11	325,429	212,060
<b>Grass</b>											
County	5	72.66	78.83	73.45	15.76	107.32	60.22	95.43	N/A	132,080	97,013
1	5	72.66	78.83	73.45	15.76	107.32	60.22	95.43	N/A	132,080	97,013
<b>ALL</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>72.54</b>	<b>71.11</b>	<b>58.24</b>	<b>24.80</b>	<b>122.10</b>	<b>26.21</b>	<b>138.45</b>	<b>61.80 to 81.23</b>	<b>417,406</b>	<b>243,097</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	7	72.42	71.19	65.45	16.54	108.77	50.04	98.57	50.04 to 98.57	579,225	379,103
1	7	72.42	71.19	65.45	16.54	108.77	50.04	98.57	50.04 to 98.57	579,225	379,103
<b>Dry</b>											
County	9	81.52	74.05	68.87	19.73	107.52	45.36	95.11	48.46 to 90.57	296,500	204,196
1	9	81.52	74.05	68.87	19.73	107.52	45.36	95.11	48.46 to 90.57	296,500	204,196
<b>Grass</b>											
County	5	72.66	78.83	73.45	15.76	107.32	60.22	95.43	N/A	132,080	97,013
1	5	72.66	78.83	73.45	15.76	107.32	60.22	95.43	N/A	132,080	97,013
<b>ALL</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>72.54</b>	<b>71.11</b>	<b>58.24</b>	<b>24.80</b>	<b>122.10</b>	<b>26.21</b>	<b>138.45</b>	<b>61.80 to 81.23</b>	<b>417,406</b>	<b>243,097</b>

## Nuckolls County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Nuckolls	1	4,100	4,100	2,850	2,585	2,450	1,950	1,900	1,900	3,577
Thayer	1	4,025	4,025	3,930	3,450	3,270	3,120	3,085	3,060	3,757
Webster	1	2,475	2,475	2,475	2,475	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,453
Adams	4000	4,190	4,090	3,625	3,190	2,595	2,570	2,370	2,130	3,787
Clay	1	4,210	4,200	3,650	3,500	2,720	N/A	2,520	2,350	3,853
Fillmore	1	4,900	4,800	4,700	4,600	4,300	N/A	3,900	3,750	4,677

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Nuckolls	1	1,775	1,775	1,447	1,449	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,631
Thayer	1	2,490	2,490	2,280	2,130	1,980	1,830	1,830	1,800	2,257
Webster	1	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,450	1,450	1,545
Adams	4000	2,075	2,075	1,755	1,595	1,595	1,595	1,450	1,450	1,902
Clay	1	2,750	2,600	2,290	2,055	1,900	N/A	1,750	1,750	2,379
Fillmore	1	2,655	2,615	2,515	2,465	2,303	N/A	2,021	1,955	2,504

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Nuckolls	1	730	743	639	743	750	270	748	706	719
Thayer	1	1,141	1,243	1,107	1,084	1,107	1,053	1,080	1,036	1,087
Webster	1	765	765	765	765	765	765	765	765	765
Adams	4000	945	945	945	885	760	760	760	760	818
Clay	1	1,000	1,000	950	950	900	N/A	850	825	880
Fillmore	1	1,060	1,040	980	920	900	N/A	800	800	886

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Nuckolls County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. Nuckolls County is comprised of approximately 19% irrigated land, 46% dry crop land and 35% grass/pasture land. Nuckolls County is part of the Central Loess Plains Major Land Resource Area. The average annual precipitation in this area is 23 to 36 inches. The dominant soil order in this MLRA is Mollisols. Nuckolls County is included in both the Little Blue Natural Resource District and the Lower Republican Natural Resource District. Nuckolls County has one market area. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination. The majority of agricultural land has steadily been increasing in value over the past several years.

A statistical sampling of fifty-three qualified sales was used to determine the level of value in Nuckolls County. Comparable sales were selected from the same general agricultural market all within six miles of the subject county. The inclusion of the comparable sales ensured that the acceptable thresholds for adequacy, time and majority land use were met. The calculated median for the county is 72.54%. The statistical sample is comprised of 19% irrigated sales, 49% dry sales and 30% grass sales. The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. Only one subclass, 80% dry land, is outside of the acceptable range.

A review, of the neighboring counties, shows that the 2013 values in Nuckolls County are higher than their neighbor to the west, Webster County. Thayer County borders on the East and the values in Nuckolls County average in between Thayer and Webster Counties. To the north is Clay County and the irrigated values are similar while the dry and grass values are somewhat lower. Kansas borders to the south. In response to the increasing agricultural market, irrigated LCG values were increased 6% to 11%, dry LCG values were increased 9% to 44% and grass LCG values were increased 5%. Indications support that Nuckolls County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization.

Although the quality statistics are above the acceptable range, they give some support to the level of value and give confidence to the reported assessment actions. The Nuckolls County Assessor has stated they are working toward finalizing the agland use layer in their GIS system and that they continue to audit the acres of land and the land use.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 73% of market value for the agricultural class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 : 5,613</b>	<b>Value : 734,485,405</b>	<b>Growth 3,882,415</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>	282	170,945	0	0	21	2,120	303	173,065	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,691	1,993,415	0	0	13	2,675	1,704	1,996,090	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,700	54,653,815	0	0	22	532,640	1,722	55,186,455	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,982	56,818,175	0	0	43	537,435	2,025	57,355,610	236,270
<b>% of Res Total</b>	97.88	99.06	0.00	0.00	2.12	0.94	36.08	7.81	6.09
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	76	120,280	0	0	8	83,125	84	203,405	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	275	621,830	0	0	13	55,140	288	676,970	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	281	24,235,810	0	0	18	5,832,860	299	30,068,670	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	357	24,977,920	0	0	26	5,971,125	383	30,949,045	481,825
<b>% of Com Total</b>	93.21	80.71	0.00	0.00	6.79	19.29	6.82	4.21	12.41
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	2	47,710	0	0	3	16,295	5	64,005	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	32,030	0	0	2	60,055	3	92,085	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	145,295	0	0	2	986,350	3	1,131,645	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	3	225,035	0	0	5	1,062,700	8	1,287,735	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	37.50	17.48	0.00	0.00	62.50	82.52	0.14	0.18	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,982	56,818,175	0	0	43	537,435	2,025	57,355,610	236,270
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	97.88	99.06	0.00	0.00	2.12	0.94	36.08	7.81	6.09
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	360	25,202,955	0	0	31	7,033,825	391	32,236,780	481,825
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	92.07	78.18	0.00	0.00	7.93	21.82	6.97	4.39	12.41
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,342	82,021,130	0	0	74	7,571,260	2,416	89,592,390	718,095
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	96.94	91.55	0.00	0.00	3.06	8.45	43.04	12.20	18.50

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	240	0	635	875

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	87	968,340	0	0	2,006	393,157,655	2,093	394,125,995
28. Ag-Improved Land	14	269,960	0	0	1,001	193,577,210	1,015	193,847,170
29. Ag Improvements	11	125,710	0	0	1,093	56,794,140	1,104	56,919,850
30. Ag Total							3,197	644,893,015

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	2	3.82	1,910	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	11	0.00	125,710	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	2	4.16	0	0	0.00	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	48	47.46	189,825	48	47.46	189,825	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	621	626.37	2,505,460	621	626.37	2,505,460	
33. HomeSite Improvements	654	0.00	38,190,025	654	0.00	38,190,025	1,246,730
34. HomeSite Total				<b>702</b>	<b>673.83</b>	<b>40,885,310</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	174	416.70	169,375	174	416.70	169,375	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	803	2,664.53	1,290,675	805	2,668.35	1,292,585	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,036	0.00	18,604,115	1,047	0.00	18,729,825	1,917,590
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,221</b>	<b>3,085.05</b>	<b>20,191,785</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,290	7,187.52	0	2,292	7,191.68	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	87	224.75	68,350	87	224.75	68,350	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,923</b>	<b>11,175.31</b>	<b>61,145,445</b>	<b>3,164,320</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	2	118.56	250,945	2	118.56	250,945

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	13,366.05	20.26%	54,800,825	23.23%	4,100.00
46. 1A	30,966.23	46.94%	126,961,540	53.81%	4,100.00
47. 2A1	6,315.82	9.57%	18,000,090	7.63%	2,850.00
48. 2A	9,017.66	13.67%	23,311,105	9.88%	2,585.05
49. 3A1	1,554.25	2.36%	3,807,915	1.61%	2,450.00
50. 3A	660.30	1.00%	1,287,585	0.55%	1,950.00
51. 4A1	1,668.21	2.53%	3,169,590	1.34%	1,899.99
52. 4A	2,420.11	3.67%	4,598,215	1.95%	1,900.00
53. Total	65,968.63	100.00%	235,936,865	100.00%	3,576.50
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	23,742.70	14.95%	42,144,125	16.27%	1,775.04
55. 1D	70,895.69	44.65%	125,842,895	48.58%	1,775.04
56. 2D1	5,501.48	3.46%	7,961,960	3.07%	1,447.24
57. 2D	39,457.80	24.85%	57,170,060	22.07%	1,448.89
58. 3D1	3,266.71	2.06%	4,410,075	1.70%	1,350.01
59. 3D	604.38	0.38%	815,915	0.31%	1,350.00
60. 4D1	10,598.06	6.67%	14,307,390	5.52%	1,350.00
61. 4D	4,721.90	2.97%	6,374,610	2.46%	1,350.01
62. Total	158,788.72	100.00%	259,027,030	100.00%	1,631.27
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	3,247.41	2.63%	2,369,700	2.67%	729.72
64. 1G	11,994.88	9.72%	8,906,265	10.04%	742.51
65. 2G1	6,468.40	5.24%	4,131,010	4.66%	638.64
66. 2G	32,875.74	26.64%	24,440,045	27.55%	743.41
67. 3G1	1,207.89	0.98%	905,610	1.02%	749.75
68. 3G	826.71	0.67%	223,565	0.25%	270.43
69. 4G1	14,064.96	11.40%	10,523,390	11.86%	748.20
70. 4G	52,740.22	42.73%	37,222,080	41.95%	705.76
71. Total	123,426.21	100.00%	88,721,665	100.00%	718.82
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	65,968.63	18.92%	235,936,865	40.42%	3,576.50
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	158,788.72	45.53%	259,027,030	44.37%	1,631.27
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	123,426.21	35.39%	88,721,665	15.20%	718.82
72. Waste	538.81	0.15%	62,010	0.01%	115.09
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	42.65	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	348,722.37	100.00%	583,747,570	100.00%	1,673.96

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	122.40	401,615	0.00	0	65,846.23	235,535,250	65,968.63	235,936,865
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	352.17	588,135	0.00	0	158,436.55	258,438,895	158,788.72	259,027,030
<b>78. Grass</b>	328.18	246,165	0.00	0	123,098.03	88,475,500	123,426.21	88,721,665
<b>79. Waste</b>	4.13	475	0.00	0	534.68	61,535	538.81	62,010
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	42.65	0	42.65	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>806.88</b>	<b>1,236,390</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>347,915.49</b>	<b>582,511,180</b>	<b>348,722.37</b>	<b>583,747,570</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	65,968.63	18.92%	235,936,865	40.42%	3,576.50
<b>Dry Land</b>	158,788.72	45.53%	259,027,030	44.37%	1,631.27
<b>Grass</b>	123,426.21	35.39%	88,721,665	15.20%	718.82
<b>Waste</b>	538.81	0.15%	62,010	0.01%	115.09
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	42.65	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>348,722.37</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>583,747,570</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,673.96</b>

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

### 65 Nuckolls

	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	55,862,360	57,355,610	1,493,250	2.67%	236,270	2.25%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	39,454,570	40,885,310	1,430,740	3.63%	1,246,730	0.47%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>95,316,930</b>	<b>98,240,920</b>	<b>2,923,990</b>	<b>3.07%</b>	<b>1,483,000</b>	<b>1.51%</b>
05. Commercial	30,475,680	30,949,045	473,365	1.55%	481,825	-0.03%
06. Industrial	1,234,645	1,287,735	53,090	4.30%	0	4.30%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	18,263,885	20,191,785	1,927,900	10.56%	1,917,590	0.06%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>49,974,210</b>	<b>52,428,565</b>	<b>2,454,355</b>	<b>4.91%</b>	<b>2,399,415</b>	<b>0.11%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>145,291,140</b>	<b>150,737,835</b>	<b>5,446,695</b>	<b>3.75%</b>	<b>3,882,415</b>	<b>1.08%</b>
11. Irrigated	205,953,335	235,936,865	29,983,530	14.56%		
12. Dryland	224,755,060	259,027,030	34,271,970	15.25%		
13. Grassland	86,157,625	88,721,665	2,564,040	2.98%		
14. Wasteland	56,550	62,010	5,460	9.66%		
15. Other Agland	65,525	0	-65,525	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>516,988,095</b>	<b>583,747,570</b>	<b>66,759,475</b>	<b>12.91%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>662,279,235</b>	<b>734,485,405</b>	<b>72,206,170</b>	<b>10.90%</b>	<b>3,882,415</b>	<b>10.32%</b>

June 15, 2012  
September 15, 2012  
Nuckolls County

### 3 Year Plan of Assessment- Nuckolls County

Pursuant to section 77-1311.02 as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB263, section 9 and LB 334, section 64. Operative date July 1, 2007

The purpose of three-year plan is to inform the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 each year and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year, and every three years to update the plan between the adoption of each three-year plan.

Nuckolls County population base is 4,500 per the 2010 Census. This is a decline from the previous Census which indicated the Counties population base at 5,057.

The Assessor's office staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor and a part-time clerk who works two days a week. All the staff works in every area, real estate, personal property, homesteads exemptions and GIS mapping. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor attend continuing education classes as required to remain certified.

The assessor is responsible for filing the reports as follows:

Abstract- due on or before March 19

Notice of Valuation Change- June 1

Certification of Values- due on or before August 20

School District Taxable Value Report- due on or before August 25

Three-year Plan of Assessment- July 31 and October 31

Generate Tax Roll and deliver to Treasurer on or before November 22

Certificate of Taxes Levied- due on or before December 1

Tax list corrections- reasons

The Assessor's office staff maintains the Cadastral and GIS maps as needed due to any recorded property splits, etc. They are in good condition, kept current with ownership changes and descriptions. The property record cards are in good condition; include the required legal, ownership, classification codes, and valuation by year as required by regulation.

The assessor also completes the 521's as they are brought from the Clerk's Office. Procedure is to change name owner on property record cards, lots and lands books, plat books, computer generated records, treasurers books, sales file and to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. The City of Superior and the NRD's serving Nuckolls County requested data as changes are made, now we can do this with computer generated information from the MIPS PC and CAMA programs. The assessor and/or contract appraiser verifies sales by telephone or questionnaire. Also the information that is provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation's reviewer is helpful.

Computers- 3-Dell T3500 PC's

Current programing used-MIPS PC Administration System/CAMA/GIS Arcview

Software vendors-Mips/County Solutions LLC, GIS Workshop and ESRI

### **Assessment Actions Year 2012-**

CAMA system data has been entered on all improvements.

Digital pictures are being taken as a review is done and added to the CAMA system.

The assessor, staff and Stanard Appraisal Services do all the pick-up work, usually in September through February, so entry of data and pricing can be completed before March deadline. The Cities of Superior and Nelson submit building permits to the Assessor's office on a regular basis.

Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity

County-wide in all classes and subclasses of property. Nuckolls County has a maintenance contract with Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. GIS Workshop developed a web site for Nuckolls County, data updated once a day by GIS Workshop. Aerial photography for Nuckolls County rural sites has been completed. Complete revaluations were completed for the residential properties in Hardy, Ruskin, Oak and Nora.

### **Residential**

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services inc. and staff completed all pick-up work in a timely manner. The Assessor and Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc are in the continuing process of verifying all residential sales. Stanard Appraisal has completed a complete revaluation of Hardy, Ruskin, Oak and Nora residential properties. Continue with reappraisal of residential properties in the towns of Hardy, Ruskin, Oak and Nora and new values set for the 2012 tax year.

### **Commercial**

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and staff assessed, priced and entered. Reappraisal of all Commercial property completed for 2010 tax year. MIPS CAMA Commercial software data has been entered by Nuckolls County staff and Stanard Appraisal. Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and the Assessor are in the continuing process of verifying all the sales.

### **Agricultural**

Nuckolls County Assessor and staff reviewed some rural property, listing any new construction. All pick-up work was completed. After spreadsheet analysis and plotting sales on a map, no potential market areas were identified. After market analysis, all irrigated values were increased an overall average of 39%, dry land values increased 13% on average and grassland values saw no increase for 2012 and other increased 37%. Continuous updates are being made to the rural property record cards. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide. Nuckolls County staff continues to work and update GIS Data. Parcels entered, working on land use. The aerial photography was done by GIS Workshop, Inc. New soil conversion is in place.

### **2013**

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with contract appraisal service. Request County Board to budget for reappraisal contract. This is to ensure that all properties are reappraised within the required six year cycle. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. The County Board has a fund for GIS, continue to add to fund for maintenance of the GIS program. GIS data is being entered, aerial photography is complete. Do an analysis based on the RCN and sales to determine the valuation of residential properties. Utilize the CAMA system for sales analysis; continue to update programs each year. Review commercial sales, analysis for acceptable levels of quality and uniformity. Continue to correlate information for sales comparison of all properties. Utilize GIS deeded acres for future. Utilize FSA or NRD's information. Do all pick-up work to be implemented by March 19, deadline. Continue to do sales analysis of commercial sales. Take new digital photos, list and measure as necessary. Continue to do an analysis of the RCN and sales to determine the valuations and if any need for location factors to be applied. Continue with the review and pick-up work. Continue work on GIS mapping. Analysis of the ag-land sales.

### **2014**

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with a contract appraisal service. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide

in all classes and subclasses of property. Complete all pick-up work, data entry in timely manner. Continue to request to add to fund for GIS maintenance. Continue to review all property as required by statute. Request County Board to budget for reappraisal contract. This is to ensure that all properties are reappraised within the required six year cycle. Continue with the revaluation of all properties in the County.

**2015**

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with a contract appraisal service. Request County Board to budget for reappraisal contract. This is to ensure that all properties are reappraised within the required six year cycle. Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. Complete all pick-up work, data entry in a timely manner. Continue to fund GIS maintenance.

Nuckolls County Assessor

Susan M Rogers

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1 (2/5's time)
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$142,893.00
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget <i>if different from above</i>:</b>
	Same
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$21,360.00
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$49,875.00
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$4,000.00 the rest comes out of County General
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,500.00
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$19,987.00

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS-County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS-County Solutions
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Office Staff

5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes-nuckolls.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Office Staff maintains the maps and GIS Workshop assists with the software
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS-County Solutions

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Superior and Nelson
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	Unknown

### D. Contracted Services

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

### 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>
	Yes
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	Must be licensed and approved by State Appraisal Board
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes



# 2013 Certification for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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



