

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 Valley County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	104	Median	98.96
Total Sales Price	\$8,063,060	Mean	99.19
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,025,440	Wgt. Mean	96.46
Total Assessed Value	\$7,741,115	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$52,775
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$77,168	Avg. Assessed Value	\$74,434

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.01 to 100.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.07 to 99.84
95% Mean C.I	95.54 to 102.84
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	15.37
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.96
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.41

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	101	99	98.88
2011	108	97	97
2010	114	98	98
2009	120	93	93

2013 Commission Summary for Valley County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	Median	96.33
Total Sales Price	\$843,595	Mean	91.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$843,595	Wgt. Mean	100.11
Total Assessed Value	\$844,505	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$88,108
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$70,300	Avg. Assessed Value	\$70,375

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	74.04 to 107.80
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	86.87 to 113.35
95% Mean C.I	77.99 to 105.57
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.33
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.31
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.65

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	12		97.26
2011	17		93
2010	15	94	94
2009	15	97	97

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Valley County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Valley County

The only action performed this year is the ongoing physical review/inspection of all properties in the valuation grouping of Ord.

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all residential sales. Questionnaires were sent out to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2013 assessment roll.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Valley County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Deputy Assessor	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Arcadia – is located in the southwest corner of the county and has a population of approximately 360. The town consists of a public school system, grocery store, post office, bank, lumber yard store, welding shop, public library, and bar/grill.
	02	Elyria- is located on HWY 11 in the northern part of the county and has a population of approximately 54. The town consists of a bar/grill, grade school that is affiliated with Ord Public, and a greenhouse with restaurant.
	03	North Loup- is located on HWY 22 in the southeast part of the county and has a population of approximately 340. The town consists of a convenience store/gas station, bar/grill, crop insurance business, lumberyard and the grade school.
	04	Ord- is located in the center of the county on junction of HWY's 11 and 70. The population is approximately 2,270. K-12 Public School system. The town is a very progressive town with a variety of jobs, services, and goods that make living in it desirable.
	05	Rural- The rural area in Valley County consists of all properties not located within any of the towns/villages.
	06	Suburban- The suburban valuation grouping consists of all properties located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
4	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2011	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county develops depreciation studies based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	

7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	2012
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	2008 for all residential valuation groupings.
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.

88 Valley
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 : 104
 Total Sales Price : 8,063,060
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,025,440
 Total Assessed Value : 7,741,115
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,168
 Avg. Assessed Value : 74,434

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 11.43
 PRD : 102.83

COV : 19.12
 STD : 18.97
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.31
 MAX Sales Ratio : 202.90
 MIN Sales Ratio : 47.55

95% Median C.I. : 97.01 to 100.57
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.07 to 99.84
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.54 to 102.84

Printed:3/21/2013 4:59:50PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	98.18	95.74	91.04	05.01	105.16	83.47	102.74	87.51 to 101.75	93,022	84,686	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	10	100.14	101.17	101.32	11.00	99.85	72.42	121.91	84.06 to 118.59	74,800	75,789	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	14	102.92	112.13	108.10	14.55	103.73	91.63	202.90	94.05 to 119.21	85,700	92,644	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	12	101.63	106.38	94.73	15.77	112.30	52.98	175.50	96.71 to 114.54	70,346	66,641	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	15	95.55	99.57	95.86	08.05	103.87	82.34	127.36	93.52 to 100.57	57,853	55,459	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	15	94.23	93.53	90.99	08.71	102.79	80.23	109.40	81.69 to 101.26	70,533	64,176	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	16	96.07	89.95	90.31	15.93	99.60	47.55	126.20	74.13 to 103.10	84,034	75,889	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	13	99.91	96.91	99.08	06.81	97.81	73.50	109.05	89.17 to 105.00	86,612	85,816	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	45	101.33	104.89	99.66	12.47	105.25	52.98	202.90	98.34 to 103.77	80,648	80,373	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	59	97.01	94.84	93.81	10.24	101.10	47.55	127.36	93.69 to 99.89	74,513	69,904	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	51	100.37	104.94	100.73	12.68	104.18	52.98	202.90	98.34 to 103.77	71,760	72,284	
<u>ALL</u>	104	98.96	99.19	96.46	11.43	102.83	47.55	202.90	97.01 to 100.57	77,168	74,434	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	15	94.23	93.71	90.76	12.98	103.25	47.55	127.36	84.06 to 102.74	39,480	35,831	
03	9	101.26	102.14	98.21	09.28	104.00	85.00	126.20	87.51 to 109.50	50,528	49,621	
04	66	99.67	101.60	99.07	11.77	102.55	64.63	202.90	97.54 to 101.44	81,065	80,308	
05	8	95.27	89.41	86.19	10.95	103.74	52.98	103.77	52.98 to 103.77	128,775	110,995	
06	6	98.43	94.99	95.12	04.89	99.86	81.36	101.88	81.36 to 101.88	99,667	94,800	
<u>ALL</u>	104	98.96	99.19	96.46	11.43	102.83	47.55	202.90	97.01 to 100.57	77,168	74,434	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	99	98.94	99.50	96.61	11.51	102.99	47.55	202.90	97.01 to 100.56	78,643	75,978	
06												
07	5	100.57	92.99	91.46	09.28	101.67	64.63	103.77	N/A	47,950	43,854	
<u>ALL</u>	104	98.96	99.19	96.46	11.43	102.83	47.55	202.90	97.01 to 100.57	77,168	74,434	

88 Valley
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 : 104
Total Sales Price : 8,063,060
Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,025,440
Total Assessed Value : 7,741,115
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,168
Avg. Assessed Value : 74,434

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 99
COD : 11.43
PRD : 102.83

COV : 19.12
STD : 18.97
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.31
MAX Sales Ratio : 202.90
MIN Sales Ratio : 47.55

95% Median C.I. : 97.01 to 100.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.07 to 99.84
95% Mean C.I. : 95.54 to 102.84

Printed:3/21/2013 4:59:50PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	109.50	109.50	109.50	00.00	100.00	109.50	109.50	N/A	3,000	3,285	
Less Than 15,000	8	114.15	118.16	121.57	13.50	97.20	93.24	175.50	93.24 to 175.50	9,208	11,194	
Less Than 30,000	23	100.56	106.61	104.96	19.29	101.57	47.55	202.90	92.89 to 113.75	16,844	17,680	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	103	98.94	99.09	96.45	11.44	102.74	47.55	202.90	97.01 to 100.56	77,888	75,125	
Greater Than 14,999	96	98.47	97.61	96.22	10.59	101.44	47.55	202.90	96.71 to 100.41	82,831	79,704	
Greater Than 29,999	81	98.94	97.08	96.03	09.09	101.09	52.98	140.23	97.03 to 100.41	94,297	90,549	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	109.50	109.50	109.50	00.00	100.00	109.50	109.50	N/A	3,000	3,285	
5,000 TO 14,999	7	114.54	119.39	122.08	14.75	97.80	93.24	175.50	93.24 to 175.50	10,094	12,324	
15,000 TO 29,999	15	93.69	100.45	101.06	18.44	99.40	47.55	202.90	86.56 to 102.74	20,917	21,139	
30,000 TO 59,999	22	101.29	98.89	99.07	07.89	99.82	72.42	118.59	96.71 to 106.51	46,222	45,793	
60,000 TO 99,999	30	98.58	97.67	97.91	10.07	99.75	64.63	121.91	95.55 to 102.07	77,123	75,512	
100,000 TO 149,999	18	97.64	95.79	95.75	04.69	100.04	81.36	105.00	90.07 to 99.89	122,258	117,060	
150,000 TO 249,999	10	96.50	95.01	94.36	14.85	100.69	52.98	140.23	80.23 to 103.82	180,010	169,861	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	83.47	83.47	83.47	00.00	100.00	83.47	83.47	N/A	306,700	256,005	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	104	98.96	99.19	96.46	11.43	102.83	47.55	202.90	97.01 to 100.57	77,168	74,434	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Valley County**

A. Residential Real Property

Valley County is located in central Nebraska along Hwy's 11 and 70. Ord is the largest town as well as the county seat with a population of 2,112 based on the 2010 census. Arcadia, North Loup and Elyria are the other smaller towns in the county. Ord, Arcadia and North Loup all have K-12 public schools located in there respective towns.

The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and review cycle of residential properties in the county and is on track to have this statutory requirement completed. In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. Valley County was one of those selected for review in 2012. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the residential class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

The Valley County Assessor reviews all residential sales. Questionnaires are sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible. Telephone contact is made to the buyer or seller if they have additional questions concerning the sale. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

The residential sales file for Valley County consists of 104 qualified sales. This sample will be considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. There is a close relationship between all three measures of central tendency, and the qualitative measures are within the recommended parameters.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% 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 Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley County

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2013 assessment roll.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Valley County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Deputy Assessor	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Arcadia – is located in the southwest corner of the county and has a population of approximately 360. The town consists of a public school system, grocery store, post office, bank, lumber yard store, welding shop, public library, and bar/grill.
	02	Elyria- is located on HWY 11 in the northern part of the county and has a population of approximately 54. The town consists of a bar/grill, grade school, and greenhouse with restaurant.
	03	North Loup- is located on HWY 22 in the southeast part of the county and has a population of approximately 340. The town consists of a convenience store/gas station, bar/grill, crop insurance business, lumberyard and the grade school.
	04	Ord- is located in the center of the county on junction of HWY's 11 and 70. The population is approximately 2,270. K-12 Public school system. The town is a very progressive town with a variety of jobs, services, and goods that make living in it desirable.
	05	Rural- The rural area in Valley County consists of all properties not located within any of the towns/villages.
	06	Suburban- The suburban valuation grouping consists of all properties located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	Unique properties are valued by the contract appraiser.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2011	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county develops the depreciation studies based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	

7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	2012
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	2010
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.

88 Valley
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 : 12
Total Sales Price : 843,595
Total Adj. Sales Price : 843,595
Total Assessed Value : 844,505
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,300
Avg. Assessed Value : 70,375

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 100
MEAN : 92
COD : 14.63
PRD : 91.68

COV : 23.65
STD : 21.71
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.09
MAX Sales Ratio : 121.84
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.13

95% Median C.I. : 74.04 to 107.80
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.87 to 113.35
95% Mean C.I. : 77.99 to 105.57

Printed:3/21/2013 4:59:51PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	99.61	99.61	99.61	00.00	100.00	99.61	99.61	N/A	24,095	24,000
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	93.36	93.36	93.36	00.00	100.00	93.36	93.36	N/A	165,000	154,045
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	115,000	115,320
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	95.20	95.20	95.20	00.00	100.00	95.20	95.20	N/A	25,000	23,800
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	95.52	88.90	91.90	08.06	96.74	74.04	97.14	N/A	57,833	53,152
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	121.84	121.84	121.84	00.00	100.00	121.84	121.84	N/A	195,000	237,595
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	87.84	87.84	89.65	22.72	97.98	67.88	107.80	N/A	27,500	24,655
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	74.33	74.33	88.99	46.01	83.53	40.13	108.53	N/A	45,500	40,490
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	3	99.61	97.75	96.47	02.32	101.33	93.36	100.28	N/A	101,365	97,788
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	5	95.52	96.75	106.95	10.42	90.46	74.04	121.84	N/A	78,700	84,170
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	4	87.84	81.09	89.24	30.83	90.87	40.13	108.53	N/A	36,500	32,573
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	99.61	97.75	96.47	02.32	101.33	93.36	100.28	N/A	101,365	97,788
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	95.52	94.20	104.83	13.41	89.86	67.88	121.84	67.88 to 121.84	64,071	67,166
<u>ALL</u>	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
03	1	40.13	40.13	40.13	00.00	100.00	40.13	40.13	N/A	26,000	10,435
04	10	96.33	96.09	102.30	11.30	93.93	67.88	121.84	74.04 to 108.53	70,260	71,875
05	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	115,000	115,320
<u>ALL</u>	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375
04											
<u>ALL</u>	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375

88 Valley
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 : 12
Total Sales Price : 843,595
Total Adj. Sales Price : 843,595
Total Assessed Value : 844,505
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,300
Avg. Assessed Value : 70,375

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 100
MEAN : 92
COD : 14.63
PRD : 91.68

COV : 23.65
STD : 21.71
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.09
MAX Sales Ratio : 121.84
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.13

95% Median C.I. : 74.04 to 107.80
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.87 to 113.35
95% Mean C.I. : 77.99 to 105.57

Printed:3/21/2013 4:59:51PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000												
Less Than 30,000	4	81.54	75.71	75.13	26.61	100.77	40.13	99.61	N/A	25,024	18,801	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375	
Greater Than 14,999	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375	
Greater Than 29,999	8	98.71	99.81	103.47	09.93	96.46	74.04	121.84	74.04 to 121.84	92,938	96,163	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	4	81.54	75.71	75.13	26.61	100.77	40.13	99.61	N/A	25,024	18,801	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	90.92	90.92	89.74	18.57	101.31	74.04	107.80	N/A	32,250	28,943	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	97.14	100.40	100.22	04.47	100.18	95.52	108.53	N/A	68,000	68,152	
100,000 TO 149,999	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	115,000	115,320	
150,000 TO 249,999	2	107.60	107.60	108.79	13.23	98.91	93.36	121.84	N/A	180,000	195,820	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	2	84.78	84.78	88.36	12.67	95.95	74.04	95.52	N/A	51,750	45,728	
344	1	121.84	121.84	121.84	00.00	100.00	121.84	121.84	N/A	195,000	237,595	
350	1	107.80	107.80	107.80	00.00	100.00	107.80	107.80	N/A	30,000	32,340	
353	2	102.84	102.84	102.63	05.54	100.20	97.14	108.53	N/A	67,500	69,273	
384	1	95.20	95.20	95.20	00.00	100.00	95.20	95.20	N/A	25,000	23,800	
387	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	115,000	115,320	
406	1	67.88	67.88	67.88	00.00	100.00	67.88	67.88	N/A	25,000	16,970	
459	1	93.36	93.36	93.36	00.00	100.00	93.36	93.36	N/A	165,000	154,045	
471	1	99.61	99.61	99.61	00.00	100.00	99.61	99.61	N/A	24,095	24,000	
528	1	40.13	40.13	40.13	00.00	100.00	40.13	40.13	N/A	26,000	10,435	
___ ALL ___	12	96.33	91.78	100.11	14.63	91.68	40.13	121.84	74.04 to 107.80	70,300	70,375	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Valley County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Valley County is located in central Nebraska along Hwy's 11 and 70. Ord is the largest town as well as the county seat with a population of 2,112 based on the 2010 census. Arcadia, North Loup and Elyria are the other smaller towns in the county. The majority of the commercial market is located in Ord.

The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and review cycle of properties in the county and has completed this requirement. All commercial properties were physically reviewed in 2011 by the contract appraiser with new costing and depreciation being put on. In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. Valley County was one of those selected for review in 2012. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the commercial class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

The Valley County Assessor reviews all commercial sales. Questionnaires are sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible. Telephone contact is made to the buyer or seller if they have additional questions concerning the sale. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals 12 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. Further stratification of the sample by valuation grouping displays three different valuation groupings as well as nine different occupancy codes. The measurement of these small samples is unrealistic and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Valley County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley County

For assessment year 2013 new depreciation was implemented on all outbuildings built from 1996 to present based on a depreciation study. The four townships that were on schedule to be reviewed for the six year review and inspection requirement was performed.

GIS is fully implemented for assessment year 2013. The assessor is going with the deeded acres rather than the GIS acres.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2013 assessment roll.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Valley County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Soils, land use and geographic characteristics.
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Each year agricultural sales and characteristics are studied to see if the market is showing any trend that may say a market area or areas are needed.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Residential is land directly associated with a residence, and is defined in Regulation 10.001.05A. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are monitored and studied on a yearly basis to see if there are any non-agricultural characteristics.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	No	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	Sales are verified and values are set by using the value of current class of grass for the soil type and dividing it by the level of value to bring it to full Market value.	

88 Valley
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 : 52
Total Sales Price : 24,678,220
Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,553,220
Total Assessed Value : 16,313,603
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 472,177
Avg. Assessed Value : 313,723

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 71
COD : 25.08
PRD : 107.07

COV : 31.94
STD : 22.72
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.00
MAX Sales Ratio : 140.44
MIN Sales Ratio : 38.28

95% Median C.I. : 57.36 to 78.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.21 to 73.67
95% Mean C.I. : 64.96 to 77.32

Printed:3/21/2013 4:59:52PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	114.89	114.89	114.89	00.00	100.00	114.89	114.89	N/A	217,525	249,920
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	95.29	93.31	95.21	09.57	98.00	78.64	106.00	N/A	540,347	514,472
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	9	79.67	89.74	93.36	17.79	96.12	72.95	140.44	73.70 to 100.77	372,111	347,402
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	59.67	59.67	59.67	00.00	100.00	59.67	59.67	N/A	520,000	310,300
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	14	74.32	72.48	68.79	21.34	105.36	39.88	106.86	49.75 to 89.59	418,328	287,774
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	64.05	68.47	60.13	24.22	113.87	46.36	100.57	46.36 to 100.57	515,987	310,280
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	72.88	74.72	76.15	19.20	98.12	54.66	96.63	N/A	445,000	338,847
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	59.91	56.68	55.36	13.99	102.38	39.44	67.48	N/A	345,627	191,347
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	45.26	52.89	48.71	22.29	108.58	38.28	74.68	41.98 to 72.18	649,128	316,184
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	42.53	42.53	42.53	00.00	100.00	42.53	42.53	N/A	709,472	301,732
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	42.23	42.23	42.23	00.00	100.00	42.23	42.23	N/A	624,000	263,526
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	14	85.88	90.15	91.64	18.78	98.37	59.67	140.44	73.70 to 106.00	407,684	373,590
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	23	71.34	71.73	67.14	21.85	106.84	39.88	106.86	56.75 to 80.02	447,283	300,306
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	15	45.26	52.50	48.80	22.67	107.58	38.28	74.68	42.23 to 62.65	570,542	278,420
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	27	78.58	80.07	79.40	19.57	100.84	39.88	140.44	70.70 to 92.09	420,246	333,673
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	13	62.65	66.29	62.68	21.95	105.76	39.44	100.57	54.66 to 80.02	447,187	280,278
<u>ALL</u>	52	71.76	71.14	66.44	25.08	107.07	38.28	140.44	57.36 to 78.45	472,177	313,723

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
1	52	71.76	71.14	66.44	25.08	107.07	38.28	140.44	57.36 to 78.45	472,177	313,723
<u>ALL</u>	52	71.76	71.14	66.44	25.08	107.07	38.28	140.44	57.36 to 78.45	472,177	313,723

95%MLU By Market Area										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	8	73.01	78.82	64.12	29.12	122.93	45.26	114.89	45.26 to 114.89	611,809	392,294
1	8	73.01	78.82	64.12	29.12	122.93	45.26	114.89	45.26 to 114.89	611,809	392,294
<u>Grass</u>											
County	14	72.57	68.44	68.10	12.07	100.50	39.88	81.57	54.66 to 78.64	291,599	198,570
1	14	72.57	68.44	68.10	12.07	100.50	39.88	81.57	54.66 to 78.64	291,599	198,570
<u>ALL</u>	52	71.76	71.14	66.44	25.08	107.07	38.28	140.44	57.36 to 78.45	472,177	313,723

88 Valley
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 : 52
 Total Sales Price : 24,678,220
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,553,220
 Total Assessed Value : 16,313,603
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 472,177
 Avg. Assessed Value : 313,723

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 25.08
 PRD : 107.07

COV : 31.94
 STD : 22.72
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.00
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.44
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.28

95% Median C.I. : 57.36 to 78.45
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.21 to 73.67
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.96 to 77.32

Printed:3/21/2013 4:59:52PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	24	72.11	74.88	67.37	32.84	111.15	38.28	140.44	55.79 to 95.29	619,903	417,628
1	24	72.11	74.88	67.37	32.84	111.15	38.28	140.44	55.79 to 95.29	619,903	417,628
_____Grass_____											
County	19	72.18	68.73	67.39	15.06	101.99	39.88	100.57	56.56 to 78.64	266,683	179,710
1	19	72.18	68.73	67.39	15.06	101.99	39.88	100.57	56.56 to 78.64	266,683	179,710
_____ALL_____	52	71.76	71.14	66.44	25.08	107.07	38.28	140.44	57.36 to 78.45	472,177	313,723

Valley County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Valley	1	N/A	3,200	3,200	2,400	2,100	2,100	1,500	1,500	2,528
Sherman	1	N/A	2,700	2,610	2,610	2,520	2,520	2,460	2,459	2,549
Custer	1	N/A	3,199	2,823	2,682	2,521	2,309	2,294	2,290	2,765
Greeley	2	N/A	3,225	2,945	2,755	2,610	2,555	2,555	2,390	2,766
Howard	7200	3,100	2,900	2,725	2,700	2,550	2,550	2,525	2,400	2,747
Wheeler	1	2,705	2,700	2,430	2,300	2,220	2,135	2,015	1,885	2,050
Garfield	1	N/A	2,750	2,390	2,080	2,040	1,955	1,235	1,195	1,844

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Valley	1	N/A	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,050	1,224
Sherman	1	N/A	1,210	1,150	1,150	1,085	1,085	1,020	1,019	1,076
Custer	1	N/A	1,365	1,275	1,265	1,185	925	915	910	1,140
Greeley	2	N/A	1,675	1,650	1,640	1,435	1,370	950	780	1,221
Howard	7200	970	950	810	800	770	750	740	700	788
Wheeler	1	1,295	1,285	1,050	1,040	1,025	840	690	525	828
Garfield	1	N/A	1,070	950	910	820	740	660	580	799

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Valley	1	N/A	751	751	747	750	741	566	548	574
Sherman	1	N/A	631	613	610	583	582	571	570	574
Custer	1	N/A	561	555	556	550	550	528	534	536
Greeley	2	N/A	703	668	633	622	604	576	555	569
Howard	7200	760	740	713	713	675	666	611	610	629
Wheeler	1	915	900	745	675	660	603	494	423	478
Garfield	1	N/A	535	535	535	495	470	417	343	370

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

2013 Correlation Section for Valley County

A. Agricultural Land

Valley County is located in central Nebraska with Ord being the county seat. The county is comprised of 29% irrigated, 10% dry crop and 60% grass/pasture land. The Lower Loup Natural Resource District governs this county. The county currently has no defined market areas, however sales are reviewed and plotted annually to verify accuracy of the one market area determination. The comparable neighboring counties are Custer, southern Garfield, southwest Greeley, northwest Howard and Sherman counties. All these areas share similar characteristics with Valley County that are comparable in soils and topography.

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Valley County the land use of the sales generally matched the County as a whole. However, the sales were not proportionately distributed among the study years. To make the sample reliable and proportionate the agricultural land analysis was expanded using sales from the comparable areas as described above. In total 52 sales were used in the analysis. The statistical profile that is now proportionately distributed and representative of the land uses suggests that values are within the acceptable range and is adequate for measurement purposes. The calculated median is 72%. The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. The 80% MLU provides the more representative sampling. The 80% MLU shows that both the irrigated and grass subclasses fall within the acceptable range.

In comparison with adjoining counties the irrigated values are very comparable to Sherman, Custer, Greeley and Howard. The assessor also recognized the movement of dry land as indicated in the average acre value comparison chart. These values compare nicely to Sherman, Custer and Greeley. There was very little change to the grass land values; however they still correlate closely between the comparable neighboring counties. When comparing the three classes across county lines the indication is relatively similar movement in the market and the values appear fairly equalized across county lines. From the assessor's analysis of the agricultural market irrigated and dry land values increased 40%, while grass land had very minimal changes for assessment year 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley 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 Valley County**

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 4,228	Value : 598,948,045	Growth 5,122,180	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	213	1,094,775	12	192,295	8	111,560	233	1,398,630	
02. Res Improve Land	1,319	7,129,610	51	951,985	106	2,682,005	1,476	10,763,600	
03. Res Improvements	1,341	63,629,895	52	4,713,940	118	11,533,050	1,511	79,876,885	
04. Res Total	1,554	71,854,280	64	5,858,220	126	14,326,615	1,744	92,039,115	1,312,625
% of Res Total	89.11	78.07	3.67	6.36	7.22	15.57	41.25	15.37	25.63
05. Com UnImp Land	74	326,555	7	44,550	12	332,735	93	703,840	
06. Com Improve Land	237	2,040,900	7	93,040	9	226,160	253	2,360,100	
07. Com Improvements	246	25,262,995	8	1,116,430	15	2,451,575	269	28,831,000	
08. Com Total	320	27,630,450	15	1,254,020	27	3,010,470	362	31,894,940	1,901,240
% of Com Total	88.40	86.63	4.14	3.93	7.46	9.44	8.56	5.33	37.12
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,554	71,854,280	64	5,858,220	126	14,326,615	1,744	92,039,115	1,312,625
% of Res & Rec Total	89.11	78.07	3.67	6.36	7.22	15.57	41.25	15.37	25.63
Com & Ind Total	320	27,630,450	15	1,254,020	27	3,010,470	362	31,894,940	1,901,240
% of Com & Ind Total	88.40	86.63	4.14	3.93	7.46	9.44	8.56	5.33	37.12
17. Taxable Total	1,874	99,484,730	79	7,112,240	153	17,337,085	2,106	123,934,055	3,213,865
% of Taxable Total	88.98	80.27	3.75	5.74	7.26	13.99	49.81	20.69	62.74

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	2	10,905	352,320	0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	27,110	3,040,685	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	2	10,905	352,320
19. Commercial	1	198,460	19,953,245	3	225,570	22,993,930
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				5	236,475	23,346,250

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	217	34	236	487

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	88	11,853,325	1,272	223,472,440	1,360	235,325,765
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	73	9,288,625	638	182,112,075	711	191,400,700
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	75	5,487,565	687	42,799,960	762	48,287,525
30. Ag Total							2,122	475,013,990

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	55	56.00	448,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	54	55.00	3,912,880	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	0.50	1,500	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	69	207.87	544,365	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	71	0.00	1,574,685	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	245.39	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.04	5	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	5	5.00	40,000	5	5.00	40,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	415	438.00	3,504,000	470	494.00	3,952,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	415	424.00	28,362,885	469	479.00	32,275,765	1,908,315
34. HomeSite Total				474	499.00	36,267,765	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	11	34.00	109,000	12	34.50	110,500	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	613	1,324.46	4,474,475	682	1,532.33	5,018,840	
37. FarmSite Improvements	659	0.00	14,437,075	730	0.00	16,011,760	0
38. FarmSite Total				742	1,566.83	21,141,100	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,771.23	0	0	5,016.62	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	40.87	4,090	0	40.91	4,095	
41. Total Section VI				1,216	7,123.36	57,412,960	1,908,315

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	44,120.85	43.62%	141,186,745	55.21%	3,200.00
47. 2A1	6,479.26	6.41%	20,733,640	8.11%	3,200.00
48. 2A	11,359.64	11.23%	27,263,135	10.66%	2,400.00
49. 3A1	9,005.20	8.90%	18,910,915	7.39%	2,100.00
50. 3A	3,935.31	3.89%	8,264,150	3.23%	2,100.00
51. 4A1	13,120.62	12.97%	19,680,925	7.70%	1,500.00
52. 4A	13,131.57	12.98%	19,697,355	7.70%	1,500.00
53. Total	101,152.45	100.00%	255,736,865	100.00%	2,528.23
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	8,325.81	24.22%	11,656,120	27.70%	1,400.00
56. 2D1	1,955.91	5.69%	2,738,270	6.51%	1,400.00
57. 2D	4,657.12	13.55%	6,519,965	15.50%	1,400.00
58. 3D1	3,111.70	9.05%	3,485,120	8.28%	1,120.01
59. 3D	434.70	1.26%	486,855	1.16%	1,119.98
60. 4D1	7,287.67	21.20%	8,162,135	19.40%	1,119.99
61. 4D	8,596.21	25.01%	9,026,020	21.45%	1,050.00
62. Total	34,369.12	100.00%	42,074,485	100.00%	1,224.19
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	7,355.74	3.55%	5,523,415	4.64%	750.90
65. 2G1	2,537.94	1.23%	1,906,050	1.60%	751.02
66. 2G	7,151.31	3.45%	5,340,655	4.49%	746.81
67. 3G1	3,685.54	1.78%	2,764,180	2.32%	750.01
68. 3G	3,973.37	1.92%	2,946,105	2.48%	741.46
69. 4G1	32,505.68	15.70%	18,388,100	15.46%	565.69
70. 4G	149,860.00	72.37%	82,051,685	69.00%	547.52
71. Total	207,069.58	100.00%	118,920,190	100.00%	574.30
Irrigated Total					
	101,152.45	29.21%	255,736,865	61.24%	2,528.23
Dry Total					
	34,369.12	9.93%	42,074,485	10.08%	1,224.19
Grass Total					
	207,069.58	59.81%	118,920,190	28.48%	574.30
72. Waste	2,963.95	0.86%	741,965	0.18%	250.33
73. Other	682.45	0.20%	127,525	0.03%	186.86
74. Exempt	6,769.22	1.96%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	346,237.55	100.00%	417,601,030	100.00%	1,206.11

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	6,246.25	15,620,520	94,906.20	240,116,345	101,152.45	255,736,865
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	889.47	1,091,325	33,479.65	40,983,160	34,369.12	42,074,485
78. Grass	0.00	0	5,534.78	3,351,920	201,534.80	115,568,270	207,069.58	118,920,190
79. Waste	0.00	0	301.17	75,310	2,662.78	666,655	2,963.95	741,965
80. Other	0.00	0	109.96	9,005	572.49	118,520	682.45	127,525
81. Exempt	0.00	0	361.86	0	6,407.36	0	6,769.22	0
82. Total	0.00	0	13,081.63	20,148,080	333,155.92	397,452,950	346,237.55	417,601,030

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	101,152.45	29.21%	255,736,865	61.24%	2,528.23
Dry Land	34,369.12	9.93%	42,074,485	10.08%	1,224.19
Grass	207,069.58	59.81%	118,920,190	28.48%	574.30
Waste	2,963.95	0.86%	741,965	0.18%	250.33
Other	682.45	0.20%	127,525	0.03%	186.86
Exempt	6,769.22	1.96%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	346,237.55	100.00%	417,601,030	100.00%	1,206.11

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

88 Valley

	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	90,200,080	92,039,115	1,839,035	2.04%	1,312,625	0.58%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	35,857,070	36,267,765	410,695	1.15%	1,908,315	-4.18%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	126,057,150	128,306,880	2,249,730	1.78%	3,220,940	-0.77%
05. Commercial	29,975,965	31,894,940	1,918,975	6.40%	1,901,240	0.06%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	18,748,105	21,141,100	2,392,995	12.76%	0	12.76%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	48,724,070	53,036,040	4,311,970	8.85%	1,901,240	4.95%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	174,781,220	181,347,015	6,565,795	3.76%	5,122,180	0.83%
11. Irrigated	185,330,205	255,736,865	70,406,660	37.99%		
12. Dryland	30,231,195	42,074,485	11,843,290	39.18%		
13. Grassland	115,556,830	118,920,190	3,363,360	2.91%		
14. Wasteland	742,115	741,965	-150	-0.02%		
15. Other Agland	125,875	127,525	1,650	1.31%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	331,986,220	417,601,030	85,614,810	25.79%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	506,767,440	598,948,045	92,180,605	18.19%	5,122,180	17.18%

Pamella K. Arnold
Valley County Assessor
125 S. 15th
Ord, NE 68862
(308) 728-5081
Fax: (308) 728-7725

2012
Amended
Plan of Assessment
October 31, 2012

Introduction:

Required by Law. Pursuant to Section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, the assessor shall submit a 3 Year Plan of Assessment to the County Board of Equalization on or before June 15, 2006, and every year thereafter. The Plan of Assessment shall be updated each year, on or before June 15th. This plan and any update is to examine the level of value, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county and include any proposed actions to be taken for the following year for the purpose of assuring uniform and proportionate assessments of real property.

Personnel Policy:

Valley County has a Personnel Policy last revised in April 2009.

Personnel Count:

The office is comprised of the County Assessor, the Deputy Assessor and one full-time clerk. One hourly clerk is employed to certain assigned duties to help ease the work burden.

Responsibilities:

Record Maintenance / Mapping – Reg. 10-004.03:

The County Assessor maintains the cadastral maps. Ownership and description are kept current and updated as each real estate transfer is processed. The Cadastral Maps are circa 1965. The condition of the four books would best be described as Poor. New maps would be beneficial; however, I do not foresee such changes occurring due to financial restraints. We are in the process of implementing a GIS system. Hopefully it will be completed by the end of 2010.

Property Record Cards – Reg 10-004:

The County Assessor maintains both a computer ATR (Assessment Tax Record) / Appraisal record and a physical file folder. To the best of my knowledge, the rules and regulations are followed and include the required legal description, ownership, classification coding and all other pertinent information.

Report Generation:

This includes the Abstract of Assessment – Reg. 60-004.02 due March 20th, the Certificate of Valuation due August 20th, the School District Value Report due August 25th, the Certificate of Taxes Levied due December 1st, the Tax List Corrections- Reason (Reg. 10-0029A) and the generation of the Tax Roll to be delivered to the Treasurer by November 22nd.

Filing for Homestead Exemption:

All applications for Homestead Exemption and related forms are accepted per §77-3510 through §77-3528.

The full time clerk now oversees the daily administration of this program and provides verbal progress reports to the County Assessor. Courtesy correspondence is mass-mailed to all pre-printed form applicants and other individuals noted on a separate roster. Upon request from the applicant or agent thereof, applicable forms are mailed. Advertisements are posted in the local designated newspaper and other public relations acts may also occur. As a final courtesy, another correspondence is mailed approximately two weeks prior to the deadline to the remaining individuals to encourage their participation. The final weeks often illustrate the staff's diligent attempts to have complete success with the homestead exemption program.

For 2010, the county board did not vote to extend the deadline to July 20th under §77-3512.

The Department of Revenue count for Homestead Exemption for 2011 was 253 applications approved . Form 458S exempted \$10,245,260 in valuation and the tax loss was \$253,985.04.

Filing for Personal Property:

As per Reg. 20 and applicable statutes. Staff oversees the daily administration of personal property and provides County Assessor with verbal progress reports. Local addresses are abstracted from the first mass mailing of personal property forms in January to reduce costs. Schedules that bear out-of-county/state are mailed Advertisements are placed in the local newspaper to attract public awareness. A mass mailing of all remaining schedules / correspondence occurs by April. Due to the high cost of postage we no longer mail courtesy reminders. After May 1st we mail out schedules that haven't been filed with a 10% penalty & encourage them to file prior to August 1st to avoid a 25% penalty. The Personal Property Abstract is generated by June 15th deadline and is based upon all known schedules at this point in time.

Real Estate:

Real Property:

Level of Value:

2012 Level of Value for Residential is 99%; quality of assessment is acceptable. Commercial at 97%, quality of assessment is acceptable. Agricultural Land at 71%, quality of assessment is acceptable.

PA&T 2012 R&O Statistics dated 05/10/2012 read as follows:

Residential:	# Sales	Median	Mean		COD (Median)	COV (Mean)	STD	AAD	PRD	MAX Sales Ratio	MIN Sales Ratio
Qualified	101	99	99		7.37	11.16	11.03	07.22	100.46	140.23	66.91
Commercial											
Qualified	12	97	97		02.16	08.19	08.14	04.19	99.83	118.62	93.36
Agricultural Unimproved											
Qualified	53	71	70		20.06	27.99	19.63	12.98	113.06	142.76	34.37

Residential: The city and villages are driven on an annual basis to review the exterior of the residential housing units and other neighborhood improvements. Data entry of the components is revised upon the discovery with the following year's "pick-up" work. This does not occur as readily in the rural areas because of time, access and budget restraints. All Residential improvements are on M&S pricing for 06/11.

Commercial: Sales properties are reviewed and questionnaire's sent out at the time of sale to get as much information as possible. Commercial properties are also on M & S pricing for 06/11.

Agricultural: The improvements in the rural areas are now all on M & S 06/11 pricing. We have just completed the fourth tier of our rural improvements & land use checks per FSA maps which are obtained with property owner's permission. Appraiser continues to do sales studies to keep depreciation updated. It is to be understood that many maps are obtained from the FSA annually to review land use due to property owner's requests, real estate sales transactions, UCC filings, "drive-by" observances, etc. As we did each tier of the County, we tried to obtain permission from land owners to get FSA maps to check land use & make sure our records are correct. Property owners brought in maps to check their irrigated acres so we could certify them to NRD. We typed labels for all parcels that have irrigated acres so NRD can do a mass mailing to get their irrigated acres certified. Irrigated acres were certified to FSA by January 1, 2008.

No market areas have been defined as I continue to study sales and seek expertise from local representatives regarding this situation.

Computer Review:

The computer system is Terra-Scan, Automated Systems, Inc of Lincoln, NE. GIS system is now being implemented. Ages of all photos range from current back to 1997 on all classes of property. A digital camera, which is compatible, was recently purchased and such photography project is in process as time permits. Sketches regarding residential housing units exist in each respective file folder and the project was completed during 2002. Maintenance as indicated.

Sketches of the commercial properties exist in each respective file folder. The commercial sketches have been entered into the computer system. This is a project intended for further revision / completion as physical review occurs. Sketches of the rural housing exist in each respective file folder. Maintenance as indicated. The rural improvement site sketches are being entered into the computer system. Information is available in each respective physical file folder. Many tools offered by Terra-Scan remain idle due to lack of knowledge and training sessions. Further educational classes should be pursued; however, time and budgetary restraints continue to negatively affect this area also.

Pricing / Depreciation:

New pricing, M&S 6/2011 was implemented for 2012. New depreciation tables were established by appraiser Larry Rexroth based upon his sales study on residential properties in Valley County using the new Replacement Cost New due to the new cost tables. New depreciation tables were implemented for each City & Village & rural residential houses. Some pricing also affected some outbuilding codes.

Pickup Work:

The resources used to collect this data include building permits, zoning permits, owner (or other interested person) reporting, UCC filings, real estate sales transaction reviews, Register of Deed's Miscellaneous Book contents, anonymous leads, the local newspaper, drive-by observances, etc.

All classes of property are monitored for the collection of specific data relative to new construction, remodeling, renovations, additions, alterations and removals of existing improvements / structures, land use changes, etc. See 50-001.06. The field data is ordinary monitored by the full-time clerk throughout the course of the tax year and provides progress reports to the County Assessor. Data collection includes photography of the subject property. The purchase of a video camera occurred June 2002 and will assist with future appraisal maintenance. The County Assessor determines the assessed value and in recent years, expanded the Deputy Assessor duties to provide assistance. The majority of all "pick-up work" is completed by the office and not from outside appraisal services.

Sales Review:

Every attempt to timely file the 521's – Reg. 12-003 does occur on a monthly basis.

The real estate transfers once received from the Register of Deeds are given priority attention. It is a joint venture with contributions from the entire staff. The Assessor mails questionnaires and correspondence out to the Grantor and Grantee. Policy is to allow two weeks response time prior to any follow-up activity. All office records, computer, cadastral maps are updated. Sales book and photo bulletin board on residential transaction is staff-maintained for the benefit of the public sector.

Correspondence is mailed to current property owner to schedule appointment to complete an on-site physical inspection to review accuracy of property record file two to three times annually. The goal this year is to set aside specific dates each month to physically review the real estate transaction prior to mailing such forms and supplements to PA&T. Currently, such inspections are underway to bring the office closer to this goal and then proceed on a regular basis. Another procedure that is being done is to take adjacent

property record files and complete an exterior review of the properties that aren't included with the sales file. Usually, a drive by of the neighborhood will include watching for new construction, renovations, etc. Any changes noted will result in the respective file being tagged for further review.

Office is striving to complete interior/exterior review of each residential and commercial transaction. More focus does need to occur on the rural residential and agricultural transactions. Agricultural properties have a high ratio of FSA section maps and land use reviews occurring. The County Assessor reviews each real estate transfer and ensuing information so collected prior to forwarding Form 521 to P.A.T. for their processing. The worksheets are now sent over the computer to P.A.T. The review includes discussion of the questionnaire responses, interviews that occurred with grantor, grantee, realtors, etc along with land use review, possible zoning use changes, coding changes, data listing, discovery as examples to determine whether transaction is a qualified sale or not. Further research may occur. The Assessor assigns a preliminary use coding and County Assessor assigns a final use coding. It is interesting to note that all the responses received from grantor and grantee may differ to a great extent; the same is true in discussion with information given to this office verses information given to state personnel or what a participating realtor may provide in sharing of information.

Valley County usually averages 100-150 real estate transfer forms on an annual basis. This office has taken great strides to monitor this program with greater accuracy in recent years. The questionnaire response rate is good; averaging at a 50% response overall and has been a good indicator that the majority of our records are accurate in listing data. The majority of the on-site physical reviews have been representative of the data listing of the property file also.

Review of residential properties in Arcadia was completed for 2012. New pricing was implemented for 2012 with 06/11 pricing now being used. My appraiser did new sales studies and created new depreciation tables for residential properties in all areas. Stanard Appraisal finished Commercial properties in the County & new pricing was also implemented on Commercial properties. Started review of Ord City, but due to the hot weather it's a slow process.

2013: Continue to review Residential properties in Ord City, depending on funds required for such a project. Won't be able to get funding for all of Ord City with tight budget restraints. Will take several years to do Ord City as there are between 900 to 1,000 parcels to be reviewed. So far have done interior reviews on most of the homes. My staff & an outside lister are doing the reviews. Complete review of first tier of Rural properties in the County, houses & outbuildings. These would be Ord Township, Noble Township, Eureka Township & Elyria Township.

2014: Try to complete review of Residential properties in Ord City that didn't get reviewed in 2013. Would strive to review the second tier of rural properties in the County, houses & outbuildings. These would be Geranium Township, Michigan Township, Springdale Township & Liberty Township.

2015: Review rural properties in the County, houses & outbuildings. These Townships would be Enterprise Township, Vinton Township, North Loup Township, Arcadia Township, Yale Township, Davis Creek Township & Independent Township.

Property record files reflect a computer code for tax districts. The real estate cards also show school district codes. New cards are being made for all the parcels in the County.

Ord City is the last to have digital pictures taken & entered in the computer.

We have completed entering information in the GIS mapping program & will use deeded acres.

Budget:

The fiscal budget submitted by the Assessor for 2012/2013 was \$140,461. Of the 140,461 submitted, 109,261 is associated with salaries & 9,600 is associated with office services, expenses and supplies, 10,000 for appraisal fees & 11,600 for data processing costs.

The County Board had me add my appraisal fees to my budget. I no longer have a separate appraisal budget. Now that we have GIS mapping and a web site, we have to pay maintenance on those.

Pamella K. Arnold
Valley County Assessor

Date

2013 Assessment Survey for Valley County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	One
4.	Other part-time employees:
	One
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$141,461
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$140,461
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$10,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$11,600
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$3,700
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$2,669.54

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Once in a while
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes – valley.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Deputy and Clerk
8.	Personal Property software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Ord, North Loup, Arcadia and Elyria
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal for commercial properties when needed.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	None

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Only on an as needed basis.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Meet the qualifications of the NE Real Property Appraiser Board.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	N/A
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	When they're used they provide a value subject to assessor's opinion.

2013 Certification for Valley 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 Valley 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

