

# 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 Wayne County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	179	Median	96.83
Total Sales Price	\$16,418,583	Mean	105.24
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$16,418,583	Wgt. Mean	96.57
Total Assessed Value	\$15,855,055	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$78,031
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$91,724	Avg. Assessed Value	\$88,576

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.90 to 99.38
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.38 to 98.75
95% Mean C.I	100.53 to 109.95
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	15.33
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.40
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.40

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	167	95	95.44
2011	195	95	95
2010	192	96	96
2009	192	96	96

## 2013 Commission Summary for Wayne County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	21	Median	96.32
Total Sales Price	\$7,528,500	Mean	108.68
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,528,500	Wgt. Mean	64.07
Total Assessed Value	\$4,823,510	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$150,705
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$358,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$229,691

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	62.64 to 103.76
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	53.60 to 74.54
95% Mean C.I	77.53 to 139.83
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.77
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.45
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.78

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	24		94.48
2011	24	97	97
2010	26	95	95
2009	21	93	93



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	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 Wayne County**

No major changes to residential properties for 2013. We continue to update properties based on our review work.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	All in the office help but coordinated by Dawn Duffy with the help of road men from one of the road districts.	
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	Beverly Hills – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	02	Carroll
	03	Hoskins
	04	Muhs Acres – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	05	Rural and Sholes
	06	Wakefield – adjoins Dixon County
	07	Wayne – County seat, college, retail, schools, hospital
	08	Winside
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost approach and sales comparison approach	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2006	
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 develop the depreciations based on the local market.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	They are looked at each year	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2012 – Wakefield – others as needed	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	Sales Comparison Approach	

**90 Wayne  
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 : 179  
 Total Sales Price : 16,418,583  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,418,583  
 Total Assessed Value : 15,855,055  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 91,724  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 88,576

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 105  
 COD : 18.07  
 PRD : 108.98

COV : 30.54  
 STD : 32.14  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.50  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 295.79  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 65.24

95% Median C.I. : 94.90 to 99.38  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.38 to 98.75  
 95% Mean C.I. : 100.53 to 109.95

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:43PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	19	101.68	106.40	99.99	14.06	106.41	83.92	199.70	91.55 to 110.05	86,759	86,754
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	97.08	99.29	96.40	12.43	103.00	72.14	124.53	87.37 to 119.41	98,620	95,065
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	22	92.18	105.33	92.75	19.00	113.56	84.52	253.73	88.45 to 107.31	95,611	88,680
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	30	98.25	112.64	99.56	23.79	113.14	75.39	295.79	94.02 to 105.45	87,303	86,923
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	21	97.71	106.25	100.26	15.87	105.97	82.02	184.10	90.07 to 109.86	75,102	75,300
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	14	101.83	107.24	99.19	17.66	108.12	79.30	206.59	87.23 to 117.33	99,000	98,199
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	34	93.71	97.82	93.39	14.24	104.74	74.71	158.35	87.84 to 99.14	102,997	96,192
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	28	98.78	106.04	95.12	19.96	111.48	65.24	226.12	89.60 to 111.95	89,205	84,849
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	82	97.25	107.44	97.28	19.12	110.44	72.14	295.79	94.02 to 101.68	90,924	88,447
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	97	96.11	103.38	95.98	17.22	107.71	65.24	226.12	93.90 to 99.83	92,400	88,684
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	84	96.94	107.38	97.31	19.27	110.35	72.14	295.79	93.15 to 101.11	87,911	85,543
<u>ALL</u>	179	96.83	105.24	96.57	18.07	108.98	65.24	295.79	94.90 to 99.38	91,724	88,576

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
02	6	129.55	148.04	115.63	33.89	128.03	95.17	253.73	95.17 to 253.73	34,900	40,356
03	13	94.28	113.94	96.07	31.88	118.60	75.39	199.70	82.75 to 157.96	70,131	67,374
05	2	99.82	99.82	96.30	15.31	103.66	84.54	115.10	N/A	149,500	143,965
06	6	129.60	151.01	114.59	35.33	131.78	92.24	295.79	92.24 to 295.79	64,250	73,627
07	142	96.03	98.15	95.39	11.48	102.89	65.24	151.49	93.25 to 98.19	100,677	96,037
08	10	108.93	142.55	116.84	42.73	122.00	79.30	276.00	96.33 to 226.12	31,681	37,016
<u>ALL</u>	179	96.83	105.24	96.57	18.07	108.98	65.24	295.79	94.90 to 99.38	91,724	88,576

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	178	96.82	105.06	96.55	17.94	108.81	65.24	295.79	94.90 to 99.23	92,194	89,011
06											
07	1	138.00	138.00	138.00	00.00	100.00	138.00	138.00	N/A	8,000	11,040
<u>ALL</u>	179	96.83	105.24	96.57	18.07	108.98	65.24	295.79	94.90 to 99.38	91,724	88,576

**90 Wayne**  
**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 : 179  
 Total Sales Price : 16,418,583  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,418,583  
 Total Assessed Value : 15,855,055  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 91,724  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 88,576

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 105  
 COD : 18.07  
 PRD : 108.98

COV : 30.54  
 STD : 32.14  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.50  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 295.79  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 65.24

95% Median C.I. : 94.90 to 99.38  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.38 to 98.75  
 95% Mean C.I. : 100.53 to 109.95

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:43PM

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	6	206.04	204.87	201.34	34.12	101.75	107.32	295.79	107.32 to 295.79	9,317	18,758	
Less Than 30,000	16	150.10	174.60	161.37	33.61	108.20	97.64	295.79	126.26 to 226.12	15,841	25,563	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	179	96.83	105.24	96.57	18.07	108.98	65.24	295.79	94.90 to 99.38	91,724	88,576	
Greater Than 14,999	173	96.33	101.79	96.21	14.91	105.80	65.24	226.12	94.28 to 98.73	94,582	90,997	
Greater Than 29,999	163	95.94	98.43	95.55	12.03	103.01	65.24	157.96	93.35 to 97.71	99,173	94,761	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	6	206.04	204.87	201.34	34.12	101.75	107.32	295.79	107.32 to 295.79	9,317	18,758	
15,000 TO 29,999	10	141.53	156.44	150.06	24.89	104.25	97.64	226.12	110.54 to 206.59	19,756	29,646	
30,000 TO 59,999	33	109.60	110.55	109.72	13.36	100.76	76.04	157.96	99.83 to 114.35	47,033	51,604	
60,000 TO 99,999	65	96.32	98.93	99.20	11.14	99.73	75.39	151.49	94.12 to 99.54	78,655	78,023	
100,000 TO 149,999	43	90.35	92.53	92.26	09.36	100.29	65.24	117.33	88.74 to 96.80	120,663	111,322	
150,000 TO 249,999	19	89.91	90.62	90.48	06.23	100.15	74.71	107.01	87.23 to 95.10	184,340	166,788	
250,000 TO 499,999	3	84.79	88.52	88.43	04.52	100.10	84.65	96.13	N/A	269,833	238,607	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	179	96.83	105.24	96.57	18.07	108.98	65.24	295.79	94.90 to 99.38	91,724	88,576	



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

The city of Wayne (Valuation Group 7), located in Northeastern Nebraska is approximately 32 miles northeasterly on Highway 35 from the city of Norfolk. Wayne is the largest city in Wayne County with a population of near 5,600 persons. There are several smaller communities in Wayne County including the village of Carroll (Valuation Group 2), Hoskins (Valuation Group 3), Winside (Valuation Group 8) and the village of Wakefield (Valuation Group 6) which is split between Wayne and Dixon Counties. The Wayne County portion of Wakefield is the location of the public school, and newer constructed housing.

The former County Assessor retired in the fall of 2012. Dawn Duffy was appointed the County Assessor to complete the term vacated by Joyce (Reeg) Lindau. Dawn has been in the process of hiring additional staff and going through this phase of the assessment process for the first time.

The residential sales file for Wayne County consists of 179 qualified arm's length sales. The sample is represented with 79% of the sold properties in the city of Wayne. The market activity continues to be strong in Wayne. The sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The relationship between all three measures of central tendency is relatively close; coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are acceptable.

The Division conducted an expanded review in 2012 of Wayne County and confirmed the inspection and review process for the six year cycle is being completed. Additionally, the Division conducted a review of each county's sales verification and documentation. The conclusion is that there was no bias in the sales verification and that the Wayne County Assessor utilized all arm's length transactions available.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County**

Began updating several types of commercial properties in the city of Wayne. These included all convenience stores, service garages, hotel/motels, and mini storage buildings. We also continue to update properties based on our review work.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	All in the office	
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	Beverly Hills – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	02	Carroll
	03	Hoskins
	04	Muhs Acres – Subdivision located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	05	Rural and Sholes
	06	Wakefield – adjoins Dixon County
	07	Wayne – County seat, college, retail, schools, hospital
	08	Winside
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Cost approach and sales comparison. We do not use income approach except on Section 42's	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	Cost approach	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	1988 with percentage adjustments	
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 depreciation is developed based on the local market.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yearly	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	We studied the sales as they occurred.	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales Comparison Approach	

**90 Wayne  
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 : 21  
 Total Sales Price : 7,528,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,528,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,823,510  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 358,500  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 229,691

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 109  
 COD : 44.00  
 PRD : 169.63

COV : 62.96  
 STD : 68.43  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 42.38  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 279.30  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 46.02

95% Median C.I. : 62.64 to 103.76  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.60 to 74.54  
 95% Mean C.I. : 77.53 to 139.83

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:44PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											
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											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	74.96	74.96	74.96	00.00	100.00	74.96	74.96	N/A	175,000	131,175
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	50.78	50.78	50.78	00.00	100.00	50.78	50.78	N/A	1,135,000	576,300
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	107.74	122.60	119.10	19.73	102.94	98.14	161.92	N/A	32,333	38,508
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	58.07	58.07	58.29	00.71	99.62	57.66	58.47	N/A	55,000	32,058
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	74.68	79.14	63.23	16.72	125.16	62.64	100.11	N/A	1,101,000	696,163
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	96.32	134.85	97.21	40.97	138.72	94.92	213.30	N/A	261,000	253,715
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	2	279.30	279.30	279.30	00.00	100.00	279.30	279.30	N/A	5,000	13,965
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	71.45	71.45	47.88	35.59	149.23	46.02	96.87	N/A	778,500	372,743
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	82.20	82.28	87.40	22.36	94.14	60.94	103.76	N/A	89,625	78,336
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	1	74.96	74.96	74.96	00.00	100.00	74.96	74.96	N/A	175,000	131,175
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	9	74.68	85.79	61.24	35.46	140.09	50.78	161.92	57.66 to 107.74	516,111	316,048
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	11	96.87	130.47	68.23	57.08	191.22	46.02	279.30	60.94 to 279.30	246,227	167,991
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	62.87	62.87	54.01	19.23	116.40	50.78	74.96	N/A	655,000	353,738
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	11	96.32	102.35	70.56	31.42	145.05	57.66	213.30	58.47 to 161.92	390,273	275,389
<u>ALL</u>	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
03	3	66.86	77.19	74.76	21.34	103.25	60.94	103.76	N/A	53,167	39,748
05	1	50.78	50.78	50.78	00.00	100.00	50.78	50.78	N/A	1,135,000	576,300
07	14	96.60	111.93	65.61	40.75	170.60	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 107.74	440,929	289,294
08	3	161.92	144.29	127.61	32.04	113.07	57.66	213.30	N/A	20,333	25,948
<u>ALL</u>	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691
04											
<u>ALL</u>	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691

**90 Wayne  
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 : 21  
 Total Sales Price : 7,528,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,528,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,823,510  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 358,500  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 229,691

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 109  
 COD : 44.00  
 PRD : 169.63

COV : 62.96  
 STD : 68.43  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 42.38  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 279.30  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 46.02

95% Median C.I. : 62.64 to 103.76  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.60 to 74.54  
 95% Mean C.I. : 77.53 to 139.83

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:44PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											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												
Less Than 15,000	3	279.30	257.30	246.30	07.88	104.47	213.30	279.30	N/A	6,667	16,420	
Less Than 30,000	6	187.61	181.93	137.02	40.17	132.78	57.66	279.30	57.66 to 279.30	15,667	21,467	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691	
Greater Than 14,999	18	84.94	83.91	63.58	26.44	131.98	46.02	161.92	60.94 to 98.14	417,139	265,236	
Greater Than 29,999	15	74.96	79.38	63.15	24.45	125.70	46.02	107.74	60.94 to 97.54	495,633	312,981	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	3	279.30	257.30	246.30	07.88	104.47	213.30	279.30	N/A	6,667	16,420	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	100.11	106.56	107.49	34.71	99.13	57.66	161.92	N/A	24,667	26,513	
30,000 TO 59,999	5	98.14	94.67	95.97	09.73	98.65	66.86	107.74	N/A	41,500	39,827	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	60.94	64.70	64.97	08.86	99.58	58.47	74.68	N/A	85,000	55,222	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999	2	86.25	86.25	86.97	13.09	99.17	74.96	97.54	N/A	187,000	162,638	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	95.62	95.62	95.71	00.73	99.91	94.92	96.32	N/A	386,500	369,908	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	3	50.78	53.15	56.05	10.91	94.83	46.02	62.64	N/A	1,941,667	1,088,273	
<u>ALL</u>	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691	

**90 Wayne**  
**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 : 21  
Total Sales Price : 7,528,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,528,500  
Total Assessed Value : 4,823,510  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 358,500  
Avg. Assessed Value : 229,691

MEDIAN : 96  
WGT. MEAN : 64  
MEAN : 109  
COD : 44.00  
PRD : 169.63

COV : 62.96  
STD : 68.43  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 42.38  
MAX Sales Ratio : 279.30  
MIN Sales Ratio : 46.02

95% Median C.I. : 62.64 to 103.76  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.60 to 74.54  
95% Mean C.I. : 77.53 to 139.83

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:44PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	97.54	97.54	97.54	00.00	100.00	97.54	97.54	N/A	199,000	194,100
313	1	62.64	62.64	62.64	00.00	100.00	62.64	62.64	N/A	3,190,000	1,998,250
325	1	74.96	74.96	74.96	00.00	100.00	74.96	74.96	N/A	175,000	131,175
340	1	213.30	213.30	213.30	00.00	100.00	213.30	213.30	N/A	10,000	21,330
344	1	107.74	107.74	107.74	00.00	100.00	107.74	107.74	N/A	39,000	42,020
350	1	74.68	74.68	74.68	00.00	100.00	74.68	74.68	N/A	90,000	67,215
352	1	161.92	161.92	161.92	00.00	100.00	161.92	161.92	N/A	26,000	42,100
353	5	96.32	79.56	58.91	19.21	135.05	46.02	100.11	N/A	420,000	247,441
406	3	279.30	218.91	141.27	21.62	154.96	98.14	279.30	N/A	14,000	19,778
420	2	72.85	72.85	60.90	30.30	119.62	50.78	94.92	N/A	736,500	448,560
421	1	66.86	66.86	66.86	00.00	100.00	66.86	66.86	N/A	32,500	21,730
442	2	59.30	59.30	60.16	02.77	98.57	57.66	60.94	N/A	52,500	31,583
528	1	103.76	103.76	103.76	00.00	100.00	103.76	103.76	N/A	47,000	48,765
<u>ALL</u>	21	96.32	108.68	64.07	44.00	169.63	46.02	279.30	62.64 to 103.76	358,500	229,691



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

The majority of the active commercial population is in the City of Wayne. The downtown main street commercial properties tend to be stable while the commercial parcels along Highway 35 tend to be expanding. Each of the smaller communities has the basic commercial services characteristic of their population size.

The commercial sales file consists of 21 sold properties. There are 14 of those sales located in the city of Wayne. The sold properties range in sale price from 10,000 to over 3,000,000.

Review of the information provided in the statistical profile indicates a coefficient of dispersion in the city of Wayne at 40.75 and a price related differential of over 170. These two measures are not considered reliable.

The county reported in the assessment actions portion of the survey that the updating of properties beginning with specific occupancy codes for the 2013 assessment year.

The Division conducted an expanded review in 2012 of Wayne County and confirmed the inspection and review process for the six year cycle is being completed. Additionally, the Division conducted a review of each county's sales verification and documentation. The conclusion is that there was no bias in the sales verification and that the Wayne County Assessor utilized all arm's length transactions available.

The level of value is determined to be acceptable based on the assessment practices of the county. However, the large coefficient of dispersion and high price related differential are results of the diverse occupancy codes represented in the analysis. There is not enough information available with this limited market to determine the level of value for the commercial class of property.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County**

Based on the information gathered from the sales, we increased values by 20% across the board as needed.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Dawn Duffy and all of staff with the help of road men.	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The county is one market area
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Study of sales	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	We have no recreational land. Nor rivers and no gravel pits.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes, rural residential are all valued alike 12,000 for the first acre and 2,000 for all other site acres	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	N/A	
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	

**90 Wayne**  
**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 : 23,353,169  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,269,669  
Total Assessed Value : 14,883,666  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 447,494  
Avg. Assessed Value : 286,224

MEDIAN : 72  
WGT. MEAN : 64  
MEAN : 74  
COD : 32.47  
PRD : 115.31

COV : 37.83  
STD : 27.90  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.30  
MAX Sales Ratio : 129.47  
MIN Sales Ratio : 37.32

95% Median C.I. : 51.41 to 84.62  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.93 to 72.00  
95% Mean C.I. : 66.17 to 81.33

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:45PM

**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>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	104.04	104.83	102.85	12.49	101.93	85.74	124.70	N/A	312,893	321,820
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	10	86.90	90.43	96.50	19.22	93.71	49.14	124.51	71.26 to 121.66	224,674	216,815
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	108.27	109.73	111.06	14.96	98.80	92.92	129.47	N/A	191,405	212,570
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	84.62	82.34	82.22	08.33	100.15	70.63	91.78	N/A	552,000	453,862
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	77.48	77.82	73.78	20.13	105.48	39.50	129.03	39.50 to 129.03	416,286	307,133
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	53.19	59.02	54.70	18.10	107.90	47.49	76.39	N/A	389,398	212,982
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	80.10	80.10	80.10	00.00	100.00	80.10	80.10	N/A	625,361	500,900
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	68.44	78.30	52.02	42.86	150.52	48.91	127.42	N/A	384,975	200,265
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	11	47.07	48.22	45.86	09.09	105.15	41.03	68.22	41.40 to 51.64	624,725	286,486
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	49.09	48.60	48.53	04.14	100.14	44.82	51.41	N/A	489,231	237,435
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	45.29	45.29	52.05	17.60	87.01	37.32	53.25	N/A	1,293,135	673,138
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	20	92.35	95.24	95.33	17.62	99.91	49.14	129.47	85.32 to 106.91	280,352	267,274
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	15	76.39	74.34	65.48	24.74	113.53	39.50	129.03	49.03 to 81.05	416,497	272,722
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	17	47.58	47.96	47.72	09.04	100.50	37.32	68.22	44.71 to 51.41	671,481	320,433
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	24	85.44	88.96	86.12	20.82	103.30	39.50	129.47	77.38 to 94.35	315,932	272,081
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	19	48.91	57.93	49.90	25.21	116.09	41.03	127.42	45.95 to 68.22	537,128	268,013
<u>ALL</u>	52	71.76	73.75	63.96	32.47	115.31	37.32	129.47	51.41 to 84.62	447,494	286,224

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	52	71.76	73.75	63.96	32.47	115.31	37.32	129.47	51.41 to 84.62	447,494	286,224
<u>ALL</u>	52	71.76	73.75	63.96	32.47	115.31	37.32	129.47	51.41 to 84.62	447,494	286,224

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Dry</u>											
County	39	71.26	70.06	66.17	28.78	105.88	37.32	129.03	49.14 to 81.05	405,293	268,185
01	39	71.26	70.06	66.17	28.78	105.88	37.32	129.03	49.14 to 81.05	405,293	268,185
<u>Grass</u>											
County	3	127.42	121.27	114.41	05.90	106.00	106.91	129.47	N/A	40,206	45,998
01	3	127.42	121.27	114.41	05.90	106.00	106.91	129.47	N/A	40,206	45,998
<u>ALL</u>	52	71.76	73.75	63.96	32.47	115.31	37.32	129.47	51.41 to 84.62	447,494	286,224

**90 Wayne**  
**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 : 23,353,169  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,269,669  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,883,666  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 447,494  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 286,224

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 32.47  
 PRD : 115.31

COV : 37.83  
 STD : 27.90  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.30  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 129.47  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 37.32

95% Median C.I. : 51.41 to 84.62  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.93 to 72.00  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.17 to 81.33

Printed:3/27/2013 1:02:45PM

**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	3	53.25	72.22	56.59	50.93	127.62	41.03	122.39	N/A	1,355,000	766,752
01	3	53.25	72.22	56.59	50.93	127.62	41.03	122.39	N/A	1,355,000	766,752
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	40	69.74	69.63	65.38	29.32	106.50	37.32	129.03	49.19 to 80.10	420,615	275,019
01	40	69.74	69.63	65.38	29.32	106.50	37.32	129.03	49.19 to 80.10	420,615	275,019
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	3	127.42	121.27	114.41	05.90	106.00	106.91	129.47	N/A	40,206	45,998
01	3	127.42	121.27	114.41	05.90	106.00	106.91	129.47	N/A	40,206	45,998
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>71.76</b>	<b>73.75</b>	<b>63.96</b>	<b>32.47</b>	<b>115.31</b>	<b>37.32</b>	<b>129.47</b>	<b>51.41 to 84.62</b>	<b>447,494</b>	<b>286,224</b>

## Wayne County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Wayne	10	4,660	4,660	4,620	4,620	3,530	2,825	2,680	2,530	3,691
Cedar	2	5,410	5,410	5,215	5,215	5,140	5,140	4,160	4,160	4,930
Cuming	3	4,043	4,043	3,799	3,794	3,393	3,403	2,857	2,876	3,646
Dixon	1	4,015	3,940	3,750	3,625	3,375	3,310	3,065	2,940	3,602
Pierce	1	3,892	3,753	3,518	3,459	3,391	3,291	2,622	2,485	3,387
Stanton	1	3,570	3,570	3,505	3,505	3,505	3,305	2,775	2,200	3,379
Thurston	1	3,750	3,735	3,450	3,380	3,305	3,300	3,020	2,730	3,514

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Wayne	10	4,165	3,955	3,670	3,385	3,090	2,800	2,510	2,225	3,262
Cedar	2	4,780	4,780	4,625	4,623	4,510	4,510	3,530	3,530	4,343
Cuming	3	3,735	3,735	3,383	3,462	3,058	3,009	2,473	2,355	3,293
Dixon	1	3,490	3,260	3,145	3,025	2,849	2,675	2,560	2,339	2,892
Pierce	1	3,130	3,030	2,855	2,724	2,580	2,510	1,595	1,395	2,702
Stanton	1	3,105	3,105	3,050	3,050	2,785	2,596	2,406	2,000	2,718
Thurston	1	3,625	3,565	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,125	2,875	2,500	3,226

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Wayne	10	2,457	2,433	2,145	2,044	2,086	1,766	1,591	1,270	2,016
Cedar	2	1,700	1,697	1,547	1,545	1,402	1,395	1,250	1,255	1,424
Cuming	3	1,926	1,897	1,601	1,595	1,458	1,371	1,239	784	1,429
Dixon	1	1,945	1,840	1,580	N/A	1,383	1,150	1,065	980	1,399
Pierce	1	1,486	1,749	1,457	1,367	1,394	1,276	1,010	859	1,186
Stanton	1	1,400	1,400	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,030	960	906	1,081
Thurston	1	892	869	812	820	711	706	694	638	775

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



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

**A. Agricultural Land**

Wayne County is considered one market area. The land use as reported on the county abstract indicates approximately 18% is irrigated, 72% dry and the remainder is grass and waste.

All the adjoining counties have land characteristics similar to Wayne County. The analysis of the sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time. The agricultural land sales sample was expanded by two sales and resulted in 52 arm's length sales. All measures were taken to utilize comparable sales and the majority land use thresholds have been met.

The county increased all values by 20% for the 2013 assessment year. The values in Wayne County are reasonably comparable to all adjoining counties.

The Division conducted an expanded review in 2012 of Wayne County and confirmed the inspection and review process for the six year cycle is being completed. Additionally, the Division completed a review of each county's sales verification and documentation. The conclusion is that there was no bias in the sales verification and that the Wayne County Assessor utilized all arm's length transactions available.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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.





Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	29	227,805	2,279,670	0	0	0
19. Commercial	5	37,780	4,116,420	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	29	227,805	2,279,670
19. Commercial	0	0	0	5	37,780	4,116,420
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				34	265,585	6,396,090

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	234	8	119	361

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,618	521,510,165	1,618	521,510,165
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,206	348,508,940	1,206	348,508,940
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,258	102,014,585	1,258	102,014,585
30. Ag Total							2,876	972,033,690

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.23	0	0	9.81	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	3.00	36,000	3	3.00	36,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	911	949.61	11,395,425	911	949.61	11,395,425	
33. HomeSite Improvements	917	0.00	77,789,425	917	0.00	77,789,425	1,734,695
34. HomeSite Total				<b>920</b>	<b>952.61</b>	<b>89,220,850</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	74	217.84	435,680	74	217.84	435,680	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,155	7,548.24	15,096,580	1,155	7,548.24	15,096,580	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,171	0.00	24,225,160	1,171	0.00	24,225,160	978,235
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,245</b>	<b>7,766.08</b>	<b>39,757,420</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,142.34	0	0	6,152.38	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,165</b>	<b>14,871.07</b>	<b>128,978,270</b>	<b>2,712,930</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	1	160.00	312,960	1	160.00	312,960

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 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,735.50	5.63%	12,747,550	7.11%	4,660.04
46. 1A	9,938.03	20.47%	46,311,430	25.84%	4,660.02
47. 2A1	2,931.03	6.04%	13,541,350	7.56%	4,620.00
48. 2A	2,525.43	5.20%	11,667,535	6.51%	4,620.02
49. 3A1	13,774.06	28.37%	48,622,540	27.13%	3,530.01
50. 3A	11,837.22	24.38%	33,440,160	18.66%	2,825.00
51. 4A1	4,768.61	9.82%	12,779,845	7.13%	2,679.99
52. 4A	43.92	0.09%	111,120	0.06%	2,530.05
53. Total	48,553.80	100.00%	179,221,530	100.00%	3,691.19
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	13,010.12	6.88%	54,187,605	8.79%	4,165.03
55. 1D	38,819.65	20.53%	153,532,355	24.89%	3,955.02
56. 2D1	10,481.65	5.54%	38,467,730	6.24%	3,670.01
57. 2D	8,858.23	4.69%	29,985,215	4.86%	3,385.01
58. 3D1	57,824.02	30.58%	178,677,010	28.97%	3,090.01
59. 3D	38,514.04	20.37%	107,839,440	17.48%	2,800.00
60. 4D1	21,473.27	11.36%	53,898,080	8.74%	2,510.01
61. 4D	79.78	0.04%	177,500	0.03%	2,224.87
62. Total	189,060.76	100.00%	616,764,935	100.00%	3,262.26
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	1,110.99	4.89%	2,729,935	5.95%	2,457.21
64. 1G	2,562.00	11.27%	6,234,565	13.60%	2,433.48
65. 2G1	4,984.95	21.92%	10,692,110	23.32%	2,144.88
66. 2G	3,299.78	14.51%	6,745,670	14.71%	2,044.28
67. 3G1	3,636.83	15.99%	7,586,875	16.55%	2,086.12
68. 3G	3,047.90	13.40%	5,382,815	11.74%	1,766.07
69. 4G1	3,970.00	17.46%	6,316,270	13.78%	1,591.00
70. 4G	128.14	0.56%	162,740	0.35%	1,270.02
71. Total	22,740.59	100.00%	45,850,980	100.00%	2,016.26
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	48,553.80	18.48%	179,221,530	21.26%	3,691.19
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	189,060.76	71.94%	616,764,935	73.16%	3,262.26
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	22,740.59	8.65%	45,850,980	5.44%	2,016.26
72. Waste	2,435.90	0.93%	1,217,975	0.14%	500.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	888.49	0.34%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	262,791.05	100.00%	843,055,420	100.00%	3,208.08

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	48,553.80	179,221,530	48,553.80	179,221,530
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	189,060.76	616,764,935	189,060.76	616,764,935
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	22,740.59	45,850,980	22,740.59	45,850,980
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,435.90	1,217,975	2,435.90	1,217,975
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	214.80	0	8.45	0	665.24	0	888.49	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>262,791.05</b>	<b>843,055,420</b>	<b>262,791.05</b>	<b>843,055,420</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	48,553.80	18.48%	179,221,530	21.26%	3,691.19
<b>Dry Land</b>	189,060.76	71.94%	616,764,935	73.16%	3,262.26
<b>Grass</b>	22,740.59	8.65%	45,850,980	5.44%	2,016.26
<b>Waste</b>	2,435.90	0.93%	1,217,975	0.14%	500.01
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	888.49	0.34%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>262,791.05</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>843,055,420</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,208.08</b>

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

90 Wayne

	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	179,981,445	188,835,105	8,853,660	4.92%	2,319,690	3.63%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	92,884,710	89,220,850	-3,663,860	-3.94%	1,734,695	-5.81%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>272,866,155</b>	<b>278,055,955</b>	<b>5,189,800</b>	<b>1.90%</b>	<b>4,054,385</b>	<b>0.42%</b>
05. Commercial	57,327,345	62,579,320	5,251,975	9.16%	4,410,695	1.47%
06. Industrial	8,041,285	8,553,495	512,210	6.37%	0	6.37%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	40,529,705	39,757,420	-772,285	-1.91%	978,235	-4.32%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>105,898,335</b>	<b>110,890,235</b>	<b>4,991,900</b>	<b>4.71%</b>	<b>5,388,930</b>	<b>-0.37%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>378,764,490</b>	<b>388,946,190</b>	<b>10,181,700</b>	<b>2.69%</b>	<b>9,443,315</b>	<b>0.19%</b>
11. Irrigated	143,993,920	179,221,530	35,227,610	24.46%		
12. Dryland	517,627,670	616,764,935	99,137,265	19.15%		
13. Grassland	38,574,505	45,850,980	7,276,475	18.86%		
14. Wasteland	1,206,370	1,217,975	11,605	0.96%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>701,402,465</b>	<b>843,055,420</b>	<b>141,652,955</b>	<b>20.20%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,080,166,955</b>	<b>1,232,001,610</b>	<b>151,834,655</b>	<b>14.06%</b>	<b>9,443,315</b>	<b>13.18%</b>

## **2012 Plan of Assessment for Wayne County**

Interim County Assessor – Dawn Duffy

This plan of assessment is required by law, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, Chapter 77-1311.02. On or before June 15<sup>th</sup> each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and shall present the plan of assessment to the county board of equalization on or before July 31<sup>st</sup>. The plan of assessment prepared each year, shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter.

### **2013**

**Residential** – Review work for 2013 has not yet begun. Notes and building permits are being filed and prepared. We will continue to monitor sales using a market analysis.

**Commercial** – Parcels will be monitored using the sales/assessment ratio, building permits, and drive by reviews. We will continue to enter commercial data into the CAMA system.

**Agricultural** – Land uses will be reviewed using GIS imagery as well as drive by reviews that we do at various times during the year.

The assessor electronically enters sales data into the State's sales file and mails the Form 521's to the State by the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month as required by law.

Our office will continue to monitor the sales file and make changes accordingly.

### **2014**

**Residential** – Parcels will be monitored using the sales file in the county. When needed we will go to the property and list any changes that have taken place. Properties will continue to be physically reviewed and valued in a timely manner.

**Commercial** – Parcels will continue to be monitored and values adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. New construction and changes to parcels will continue to be monitored using building permits, realtor's web sites, and drive by reviews.

**Agricultural** – Land will be adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. We will continue to monitor land use changes using GIS imagery as well as drive by reviews.

The assessor will continue to electronically enter the data into the State's sales file on a monthly basis and forward the Form 521's to the State by the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month.

## 2015

**Residential** – To meet State requirements that every parcel be reviewed at least once every six years, a comprehensive review will be done to all urban and rural residential properties. This will include walk around reviews, drive by reviews, and photos taken of the properties.

**Commercial** – To meet State requirements that every parcel be reviewed at least once every six years, a comprehensive review will be done to all commercial properties in the County.

**Agricultural** – Land will be reviewed using drive by reviews as well as GIS imagery. We will continue to monitor values using the sales assessment ratio.

We will continue to use building permits, realtor websites, drive by reviews, and GIS to monitor changes. Our review work will continue to be inspected and valued in a timely manner.

The assessor will continue to electronically enter sales data into the State's sales file on a monthly basis and forward Form 521's to the State by the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month.

## **Staff, Budgeting & Training**

There has been a change recently with the staff in the Assessor's Office. Joyce Reeg, who has been the assessor in Wayne County since July 1988, has retired effective August 1<sup>st</sup>. Dawn Duffy was appointed interim assessor. Jo Junck, who has been employed with the assessor's office since September 1991, is the Deputy County Assessor. A third person for the office will be hired in the near future to assist in various duties including review work.

The Deputy Assessor is mainly responsible for making the deed changes, updating the cadastral maps, and many other tasks that occur throughout the year. She has knowledge in almost all aspects of the office including review work, pricing, Homestead Exemptions, and personal property.

The Interim Assessor has been employed by the assessor's office since December 2002. Previous duties included updating and maintaining the GIS records, review work, pricing, personal property, and various other responsibilities as needed.

The Interim and Deputy Assessors will complete the required number of hours to remain certified. We will also try to continue to utilize online classes that are offered. This has been a good way to meet with credit hour requirements in a cost efficient manner.

The budget for the assessor's office has always been adequate to handle our needs. The commissioners have supported the office both financially and through the use of personnel and equipment when needed. The assessor's budget pays for all continuing education that is needed by its employees. Travel to and from workshops and meetings, as well as registration fees, is also paid for by the county.

We have had a GIS system in our office since 2009. It is now completely paid for. The aerial photos we had GIS take for us of the rural houses and buildings in 2011 are also fully paid for. The annual maintenance payments to MIPS and GIS are taken out of the county's general budget.

Wayne County is currently online at [www.nebraskaassessoronline.us](http://www.nebraskaassessoronline.us) where much of the parcel data can be accessed by the public. This data includes ownership, sales price and history, legal descriptions, photos, sketches, square footages and more. Anyone can access this information but appraisers, realtors and insurance representatives have found it the most useful. We have found that the number of phone calls and traffic in the office has decreased due to people having the ability to look up the information they want on their own and from the comfort of their own home or office.

All correspondence received by the assessor will be shared with the office so that we can continue to follow state statutes and property tax directives at all times.

## Definitions

**Review Work** – Physically inspect and walk around the property, take notes, measure improvements and take photos. Basically gather any and all information necessary to make pricing-out possible. Usually an exterior review of property but can be an interior inspection.

**Drive-by** – Drive by the property but do not get out of the vehicle unless a change is visible. Notes are taken of what is seen as to make pricing-out possible. May include the taking of photos to provide visual evidence of what has been noted.

## Conclusion

**Since the assessor reviewed all residential/commercial properties in 2010 and aerial photos were taken of all rural residences/buildings in 2011, the requirement of inspecting every property in the county at least once every six years has been met.**

In **2013, 2014, & 2015** I will work to improve the quality of assessment to stay in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. It is my goal to follow the five subsystems of mass appraisal; data collection and maintenance, market analysis, the development of mass appraisal models and tables, quality control, and defense of values. All five subsystems are in place in Wayne County.

The sales comparison approach to value is used in determining yearly adjustments to individual towns and neighborhoods. Market analysis statistics are used in the sales comparison approach. The cost approach to value is used in arriving at the assessed value of individual properties. The income approach to value is used in the valuation process of the Section 42 properties.

The Marshall & Swift manual's 2006 cost tables are being used for valuing property in the CAMA system that we have in place. Our GIS system is used in assisting in the determination of rural land use, as well as being a tool in problem solving. It has also been key in keeping remarkably more accurate parcel maps.

If Wayne County continues with the plan of assessment that is outlined in this proposal, we should be able to accomplish better quality of value, better uniformity of value and consistency in valuations over the next three years.

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b> 1 (Jo Junck)
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b> 0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b> Will be hiring someone in March/April
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b> 1 (Melissa Rabbass)
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b> 0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b> \$131,000.00
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b> 113,750.00
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b> 0
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b> N/A
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b> 0
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops</b> \$1,400.00
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b> 0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b> \$1,952.29

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b> MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b> CAMA 2000 through MIPS
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b> Yes, but rarely, we keep them updated but use the GIS most of the time.
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b> Office staff (Jo Junck)
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b> Yes

6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	NO
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Office staff (Dawn Duffy & Melissa Rabbass)
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	N/A
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Wayne, Carroll, Winside, Hoskins and Wakefield
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	N/A

### D. Contracted Services

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

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Not currently
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>



# 2013 Certification for Wayne 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 Wayne 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



