

# 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 Burt County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	157	Median	98.28
Total Sales Price	\$13,896,358	Mean	110.83
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,896,358	Wgt. Mean	93.52
Total Assessed Value	\$12,995,190	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,843
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$88,512	Avg. Assessed Value	\$82,772

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.89 to 101.30
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.24 to 97.79
95% Mean C.I	102.75 to 118.91
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	14.60
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.95

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	145	97	96.94
2011	159	96	96
2010	205	96	96
2009	228	95	95

## 2013 Commission Summary for Burt County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	20	Median	99.53
Total Sales Price	\$2,019,900	Mean	103.45
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,900,900	Wgt. Mean	86.46
Total Assessed Value	\$1,643,515	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$110,805
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$95,045	Avg. Assessed Value	\$82,176

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	82.74 to 111.61
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	55.16 to 117.76
95% Mean C.I	86.35 to 120.55
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.01
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.32
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.20

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	27		99.61
2011	39	97	97
2010	38	97	97
2009	35	98	98



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>71</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

Annually, the county conducts a review and market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick up) is completed in a timely fashion.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. In 2011, Decatur Township's rural residential and agricultural residential improvements, plus the town of Oakland was completed. In 2012, the rural residential in Bell Creek and Pershing Townships plus the village of Craig was completed. Flooded properties along the river were also reviewed in 2012, with changes made depending on the current condition. Many of these will need to be reviewed and updated again in 2013 as repairs are done or demolition completed. In 2013, the rural residential in Arizona, Riverside, and Quinnebaugh Townships plus the village of Decatur will be inspected as part of the 6 year cycle.

The county has conducted an extensive review of the rural properties of the county over the last few years. All twelve townships are now completed. During the inspection process, the records were reviewed for listing accuracy, property characteristics, and to note the current condition of all improvements. Listers are going on-site for a close up examination of the improvements, photos, and if necessary a measurement of the improvements. Every effort is made to conduct interior inspections of the residences. When property owners are not home, the listers leave questionnaires and make return trips to contact them. If possible, phone appointments are arranged following the return of the questionnaires.

The Decatur Village review for 2013 will include an off-site (drive-by) inspection, new photos, and if necessary an on-site inspection to verify the listing or correct any errors discovered.



## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Burt County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and staff	
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>
	1	Tekamah
	5	Oakland
	10	Lyons
	15	Decatur
	20	Craig
	25	Rural
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost approach and sales study to determine market and depreciation analysis.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	9/2003	
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>	
	Costing tables, multipliers, etc. are from the vendor but depreciation based on our own local market information (Economic)	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes, they have different economic depreciations.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The economic depreciations are reviewed and updated as each area is revalued. We also look at the market and sales in each grouping every year to see if changes are necessary.	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Craig Village was reviewed in 2012 with changes to be applied in 2013. Oakland City was reviewed in 2011 with the new values applied in 2012, Tekamah City was reviewed for 2011; Lyons City was reviewed for 2009; others completed with the last reappraisal.	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	Sales study from the market w/adjustments for poor accessibility, etc.	

**11 Burt**  
**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 : 157  
 Total Sales Price : 13,896,358  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,896,358  
 Total Assessed Value : 12,995,190  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,512  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 82,772

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 94  
 MEAN : 111  
 COD : 25.35  
 PRD : 118.51

COV : 46.58  
 STD : 51.63  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.91  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 392.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.14

95% Median C.I. : 95.89 to 101.30  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.24 to 97.79  
 95% Mean C.I. : 102.75 to 118.91

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:12AM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	17	103.08	118.13	99.42	27.93	118.82	71.91	251.45	89.96 to 133.59	72,941	72,516
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	15	94.14	96.43	97.25	15.76	99.16	56.50	139.02	87.05 to 110.38	68,910	67,014
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	28	96.66	95.18	89.76	13.04	106.04	57.34	129.96	93.62 to 102.20	103,457	92,858
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	20	98.66	123.25	95.31	36.07	129.31	79.30	392.00	88.06 to 109.23	86,180	82,141
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	16	104.27	129.41	104.70	34.62	123.60	78.36	318.18	92.26 to 136.01	71,359	74,710
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	25	96.66	100.04	92.60	12.32	108.03	61.78	203.97	91.45 to 101.80	93,498	86,577
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	24	100.95	129.17	100.56	39.88	128.45	66.60	377.40	94.99 to 112.26	66,146	66,519
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	12	94.35	95.33	80.50	19.57	118.42	50.14	151.95	74.03 to 111.10	161,300	129,841
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	80	97.81	107.31	94.01	23.27	114.15	56.50	392.00	94.70 to 102.20	86,176	81,011
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	77	98.48	114.49	93.03	27.56	123.07	50.14	377.40	95.39 to 102.70	90,939	84,602
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	79	97.33	109.46	94.81	24.70	115.45	56.50	392.00	94.70 to 101.32	86,023	81,562
<u>ALL</u>	157	98.28	110.83	93.52	25.35	118.51	50.14	392.00	95.89 to 101.30	88,512	82,772

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	52	96.90	99.69	95.76	12.48	104.10	56.50	256.45	92.74 to 100.09	85,408	81,783
05	31	97.99	117.56	93.41	28.19	125.85	61.78	377.40	94.85 to 108.44	76,066	71,051
10	20	97.52	103.13	94.16	17.43	109.53	71.91	151.95	89.43 to 114.36	54,383	51,209
15	7	115.45	168.43	103.83	68.73	162.22	64.24	297.13	64.24 to 297.13	45,929	47,686
20	7	134.65	194.87	122.57	66.33	158.99	88.06	392.00	88.06 to 392.00	30,071	36,857
25	40	98.84	99.15	89.89	20.01	110.30	50.14	203.97	91.45 to 104.27	136,936	123,097
<u>ALL</u>	157	98.28	110.83	93.52	25.35	118.51	50.14	392.00	95.89 to 101.30	88,512	82,772

<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	157	98.28	110.83	93.52	25.35	118.51	50.14	392.00	95.89 to 101.30	88,512	82,772
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	157	98.28	110.83	93.52	25.35	118.51	50.14	392.00	95.89 to 101.30	88,512	82,772

**11 Burt**  
**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 : 157  
Total Sales Price : 13,896,358  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,896,358  
Total Assessed Value : 12,995,190  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,512  
Avg. Assessed Value : 82,772

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 94  
MEAN : 111  
COD : 25.35  
PRD : 118.51

COV : 46.58  
STD : 51.63  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.91  
MAX Sales Ratio : 392.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 50.14

95% Median C.I. : 95.89 to 101.30  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.24 to 97.79  
95% Mean C.I. : 102.75 to 118.91

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:12AM

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	3	297.13	302.09	281.83	19.62	107.19	217.14	392.00	N/A	3,000	8,455	
Less Than 15,000	12	253.95	239.95	208.52	31.23	115.07	102.04	392.00	132.77 to 318.18	7,729	16,117	
Less Than 30,000	32	124.43	162.60	131.80	53.89	123.37	56.50	392.00	102.04 to 207.31	16,283	21,461	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	154	98.08	107.10	93.39	21.84	114.68	50.14	377.40	95.57 to 100.49	90,178	84,220	
Greater Than 14,999	145	97.19	100.14	92.74	15.64	107.98	50.14	238.00	94.96 to 99.66	95,197	88,288	
Greater Than 29,999	125	96.66	97.57	92.02	13.44	106.03	50.14	203.97	94.14 to 99.03	107,002	98,468	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	297.13	302.09	281.83	19.62	107.19	217.14	392.00	N/A	3,000	8,455	
5,000 TO 14,999	9	251.45	219.24	200.64	32.30	109.27	102.04	377.40	108.56 to 318.18	9,306	18,671	
15,000 TO 29,999	20	102.77	116.19	115.19	27.50	100.87	56.50	238.00	95.57 to 129.96	21,415	24,667	
30,000 TO 59,999	29	104.03	109.23	107.90	13.20	101.23	84.29	203.97	98.28 to 111.10	45,169	48,738	
60,000 TO 99,999	46	96.33	98.69	98.43	12.12	100.26	50.14	155.45	92.45 to 102.20	79,005	77,765	
100,000 TO 149,999	25	93.62	93.29	92.87	13.44	100.45	57.34	140.89	85.97 to 99.85	121,356	112,699	
150,000 TO 249,999	21	92.40	88.43	88.28	10.93	100.17	58.23	104.27	79.30 to 97.19	174,376	153,937	
250,000 TO 499,999	3	83.05	76.48	75.76	09.16	100.95	61.78	84.62	N/A	279,833	211,993	
500,000 TO 999,999	1	70.51	70.51	70.51	00.00	100.00	70.51	70.51	N/A	895,900	631,720	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	157	98.28	110.83	93.52	25.35	118.51	50.14	392.00	95.89 to 101.30	88,512	82,772	



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Burt County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Burt County is located in the northeastern portion of the State of Nebraska and has five residential communities. Tekamah is the largest in population and the county seat, followed by Oakland, Lyons, Decatur and Craig.

The residential sales file for Burt County has a sufficient number of sales (157) to consider the sample adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. Most of the valuation groupings have a sufficient number of sales to be considered statistically reliable with the exception of Decatur (Valuation Group 15) and Craig (Valuation Group 20) which have small samples. Those subclasses with larger samples are all within the acceptable range.

The Burt County Assessor continues to implement a cyclical review and inspection of the residential real property. The known assessment practices of the county indicate that the residential properties are being treated uniformly and proportionately.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 98% for the residential class of property.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt County**

Annually, all subclasses are monitored for problem areas that are revealed by analysis of the sales activity. There was a 3 year total of 20 sales and nothing in the preliminary statistics indicated a need to adjust or revalue the commercial property for 2013. The county has spent the last three years updating the pricing information on both the land and buildings in the CAMA system so the new review of the commercial/ industrial properties can begin. In order to accomplish a portion of the six year inspection process, the county has started the process of updating all commercial property record cards with new photographs being taken of every commercial parcel in the county. The Tekamah City commercial will be reviewed and updated in 2013.

Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick up) is completed in a timely fashion.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Burt County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and staff	
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>
	1	Tekamah
	5	Oakland
	10	Lyons
	15	Decatur
	20	Craig
	25	Rural
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Cost, market and income approach	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	4/1998	
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>	
	Costing tables, multipliers, etc. are from vendor. The depreciation based on our own local market information (economic)	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes, several have different economic depreciations.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The physical/functional is done when the valuation group is reappraised, the economic is considered on a yearly basis.	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Complete study in 2000 and reviewed in 2009 when pricing updated.	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales study of the market	

**11 Burt**  
**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 : 20  
Total Sales Price : 2,019,900  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,900,900  
Total Assessed Value : 1,643,515  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 95,045  
Avg. Assessed Value : 82,176

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 86  
MEAN : 103  
COD : 25.48  
PRD : 119.65

COV : 35.32  
STD : 36.54  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.36  
MAX Sales Ratio : 193.70  
MIN Sales Ratio : 46.79

95% Median C.I. : 82.74 to 111.61  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.16 to 117.76  
95% Mean C.I. : 86.35 to 120.55

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:14AM

**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	4	100.95	109.04	102.70	25.49	106.17	67.00	167.25	N/A	49,625	50,963
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	81.25	81.25	81.25	00.00	100.00	81.25	81.25	N/A	10,000	8,125
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	101.49	101.49	101.49	00.00	100.00	101.49	101.49	N/A	35,000	35,520
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	99.44	99.44	99.44	00.00	100.00	99.44	99.44	N/A	125,000	124,300
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	136.82	136.82	136.82	00.00	100.00	136.82	136.82	N/A	189,900	259,830
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	50.73	69.71	51.35	42.60	135.75	46.79	111.61	N/A	246,333	126,500
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	81.98	81.98	84.09	14.74	97.49	69.90	94.05	N/A	24,250	20,393
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	88.23	88.23	88.36	06.22	99.85	82.74	93.72	N/A	102,500	90,573
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	120.24	120.24	120.24	00.00	100.00	120.24	120.24	N/A	190,000	228,450
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	150.19	150.19	116.92	28.97	128.46	106.68	193.70	N/A	42,500	49,690
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	121.88	121.88	110.17	21.82	110.63	95.28	148.48	N/A	37,500	41,315
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	7	99.61	102.62	100.89	17.69	101.71	67.00	167.25	67.00 to 167.25	52,643	53,114
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	6	81.98	84.98	69.58	35.59	122.13	46.79	136.82	46.79 to 136.82	162,900	113,353
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	7	106.68	120.12	106.60	25.53	112.68	82.74	193.70	82.74 to 193.70	79,286	84,515
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	99.44	94.06	98.79	06.79	95.21	81.25	101.49	N/A	56,667	55,982
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	8	88.23	85.80	72.84	26.36	117.79	46.79	136.82	46.79 to 136.82	147,800	107,658
<u>ALL</u>	20	99.53	103.45	86.46	25.48	119.65	46.79	193.70	82.74 to 111.61	95,045	82,176

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	97.45	106.73	105.42	16.46	101.24	82.74	148.48	82.74 to 148.48	82,250	86,705
05	8	100.47	110.38	112.22	24.19	98.36	69.90	193.70	69.90 to 193.70	71,238	79,943
10	2	117.13	117.13	121.19	42.80	96.65	67.00	167.25	N/A	9,250	11,210
15	1	102.28	102.28	102.28	00.00	100.00	102.28	102.28	N/A	80,000	81,825
20	2	81.17	81.17	76.37	37.50	106.29	50.73	111.61	N/A	57,000	43,530
25	1	46.79	46.79	46.79	00.00	100.00	46.79	46.79	N/A	625,000	292,440
<u>ALL</u>	20	99.53	103.45	86.46	25.48	119.65	46.79	193.70	82.74 to 111.61	95,045	82,176

**11 Burt**  
**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 : 20	MEDIAN : 100	COV : 35.32	95% Median C.I. : 82.74 to 111.61
Total Sales Price : 2,019,900	WGT. MEAN : 86	STD : 36.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.16 to 117.76
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,900,900	MEAN : 103	Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.36	95% Mean C.I. : 86.35 to 120.55
Total Assessed Value : 1,643,515			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 95,045	COD : 25.48	MAX Sales Ratio : 193.70	
Avg. Assessed Value : 82,176	PRD : 119.65	MIN Sales Ratio : 46.79	

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:14AM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	19	99.61	106.44	105.89	24.01	100.52	50.73	193.70	82.74 to 120.24	67,153	71,109
04	1	46.79	46.79	46.79	00.00	100.00	46.79	46.79	N/A	625,000	292,440
<u>ALL</u>	20	99.53	103.45	86.46	25.48	119.65	46.79	193.70	82.74 to 111.61	95,045	82,176

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	4	124.25	127.30	129.65	42.80	98.19	67.00	193.70	N/A	9,625	12,479
Less Than 30,000	7	94.05	117.38	112.85	44.24	104.01	67.00	193.70	67.00 to 193.70	15,429	17,411
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	20	99.53	103.45	86.46	25.48	119.65	46.79	193.70	82.74 to 111.61	95,045	82,176
Greater Than 14,999	16	99.53	97.49	85.57	18.50	113.93	46.79	148.48	82.74 to 111.61	116,400	99,600
Greater Than 29,999	13	99.61	95.96	84.87	16.25	113.07	46.79	136.82	82.74 to 111.61	137,915	117,049
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	4	124.25	127.30	129.65	42.80	98.19	67.00	193.70	N/A	9,625	12,479
15,000 TO 29,999	3	94.05	104.14	103.55	27.85	100.57	69.90	148.48	N/A	23,167	23,988
30,000 TO 59,999	3	101.49	102.79	102.59	05.36	100.19	95.28	111.61	N/A	45,667	46,848
60,000 TO 99,999	3	102.28	86.56	88.38	18.23	97.94	50.73	106.68	N/A	73,667	65,107
100,000 TO 149,999	3	99.44	93.93	94.35	05.65	99.55	82.74	99.61	N/A	108,333	102,215
150,000 TO 249,999	3	120.24	116.93	120.99	11.95	96.64	93.72	136.82	N/A	161,633	195,562
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999	1	46.79	46.79	46.79	00.00	100.00	46.79	46.79	N/A	625,000	292,440
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	20	99.53	103.45	86.46	25.48	119.65	46.79	193.70	82.74 to 111.61	95,045	82,176

**11 Burt**  
**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 : 20  
Total Sales Price : 2,019,900  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,900,900  
Total Assessed Value : 1,643,515  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 95,045  
Avg. Assessed Value : 82,176

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 86  
MEAN : 103  
COD : 25.48  
PRD : 119.65

COV : 35.32  
STD : 36.54  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.36  
MAX Sales Ratio : 193.70  
MIN Sales Ratio : 46.79

95% Median C.I. : 82.74 to 111.61  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.16 to 117.76  
95% Mean C.I. : 86.35 to 120.55

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:14AM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
344	2	84.67	84.67	95.37	17.44	88.78	69.90	99.44	N/A	72,500	69,140
350	1	193.70	193.70	193.70	00.00	100.00	193.70	193.70	N/A	10,000	19,370
352	1	101.49	101.49	101.49	00.00	100.00	101.49	101.49	N/A	35,000	35,520
384	2	100.37	100.37	103.20	06.30	97.26	94.05	106.68	N/A	51,750	53,408
386	1	102.28	102.28	102.28	00.00	100.00	102.28	102.28	N/A	80,000	81,825
406	6	91.18	102.65	113.45	28.13	90.48	67.00	148.48	67.00 to 148.48	71,567	81,196
419	1	93.72	93.72	93.72	00.00	100.00	93.72	93.72	N/A	105,000	98,405
421	2	79.20	79.20	51.41	40.92	154.06	46.79	111.61	N/A	336,500	173,008
479	1	120.24	120.24	120.24	00.00	100.00	120.24	120.24	N/A	190,000	228,450
528	1	167.25	167.25	167.25	00.00	100.00	167.25	167.25	N/A	10,000	16,725
555	1	50.73	50.73	50.73	00.00	100.00	50.73	50.73	N/A	66,000	33,485
851	1	95.28	95.28	95.28	00.00	100.00	95.28	95.28	N/A	54,000	51,450
<u>ALL</u>	20	99.53	103.45	86.46	25.48	119.65	46.79	193.70	82.74 to 111.61	95,045	82,176



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Burt County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

The commercial property in Burt County is characteristic of a rural community in the northeast portion of Nebraska. The city of Tekamah is the county seat and the largest in population in Burt County. The commercial population in Tekamah is typical for a community of that size. Oakland is the second largest in population and has a large commercial grain facility as well as the other basic commercial properties. In the communities of Decatur and Lyons you will find the bare basic commercial property including banks, post office, and minimal retail. The community of Craig is very limited in commercial services with only a bar and post office.

Burt County has utilized as many sales as possible to represent the commercial market in the county. The declining commercial property represented in the statistical analysis consists of 20 sales. The Valuation Group 1 (Tekamah) has six sales; however the sample is not representative of the commercial population. The Valuation Group 5 (Oakland) has eight sales and also is not representative of the commercial population in that group.

The county has continued the effort to review the commercial parcels and update the property record cards with current information. They have been through one cyclical review and are starting a second with the City of Tekamah scheduled the summer of 2013.

Based on all information available including the assessment practices of the county and the declining market it is determined that there is not enough sufficient information available to determine a level of value.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt County**

Annually, the county conducts a review and market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural sales. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land.

Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick up) is completed in a timely fashion.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection

The county has conducted an extensive review of the rural properties of the county over the last few years. With the completion of Decatur Township in 2012, all twelve townships are reviewed. Arizona was partially reviewed as well because of the 2011 flood, and to continue on with the 6 year plan of assessment. Review was completed in 2012 of Oakland and Pershing Townships. In 2013, Arizona will be completed along with follow up on the flood damaged properties. The county will continue with Riverside and Quinnebaugh Townships, so their flood damages can be updated, along with the regular review of all other properties. During the inspection process, the records are reviewed for listing accuracy, property characteristics, and to note the current condition of all improvements. Listers are going on-site for a close up examination of the improvements, photos, and if necessary a measurement of the improvements. Every effort is made to conduct interior inspections of the residences. When property owners are not home, the listers leave questionnaires and make return trips to contact them. If possible, phone appointments are arranged following the return of the questionnaire.

The county closely monitored agricultural sales throughout 2012 to determine if the strong upward trend of the past 2-3 years would continue. The market has continued to be strong and the land values have seen more increase. The county will be looking at adjustments to the LCG sub-strata as indicated by the market analysis.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Burt County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and staff	
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	Mainly flat river bottom land (North and Eastern GEO Codes)
	2	More hills and valleys (South and Western GEO Codes)
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Market areas are determined through market analysis and are delineated by both topography and market activity. Boundaries currently follow township lines.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Parcels less than 20 acres are checked for current use. It is classified accordingly. Some parcels are mixed use with several acres of residential and additional acres being farmed or grazed. Currently do not have a recreational class.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Home sites are the same on both.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Each sale is reviewed and questionnaires are mailed if any question as to the future use or other influences.	
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>	
	Only one on file until 2012. When Oakland school district passed their new bond, a local taxpayer handed out forms at the local coffee shop with the misinformation that filing the greenbelt form would lower their taxes. They were also told that if enough of them filed, we would have to greenbelt the county. At this time, our market is farm ground that is selling for ag purpose and there is no other influence.	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	We originally checked with Cuming County's sales on Wetland Reserve to have a starting value. Since that time, we have moved them to 100% of market after the Tax Equalization and Review Commission made their ruling. We currently track the sales every year that occur on WRP to see if any adjustments are necessary. All Wetland Reserve Program acres are given their own separate classification (WRP).	

11 Burt

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 113  
 Total Sales Price : 53,318,343  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 53,318,343  
 Total Assessed Value : 36,373,231  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 471,844  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 321,887

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 21.44  
 PRD : 109.04

COV : 26.28  
 STD : 19.55  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.17  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.34  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.43

95% Median C.I. : 67.77 to 75.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.95 to 71.48  
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.79 to 77.99

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:16AM

DATE OF SALE *	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	11	93.03	87.91	88.68	17.03	99.13	54.93	113.66	59.89 to 103.99	318,634	282,568
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	97.97	101.09	97.78	10.49	103.39	85.35	120.12	85.35 to 120.12	257,548	251,818
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	84.24	84.18	84.43	10.64	99.70	67.51	97.04	67.51 to 97.04	259,640	219,213
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	7	81.41	85.09	82.19	13.48	103.53	67.77	104.79	67.77 to 104.79	494,286	406,242
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	22	72.13	74.36	70.47	11.91	105.52	50.53	117.90	69.83 to 79.93	450,205	317,266
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	62.39	68.17	64.73	17.21	105.31	46.34	85.91	59.28 to 85.77	399,069	258,326
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	68.16	60.42	65.27	12.90	92.57	43.36	69.73	N/A	292,000	190,590
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	62.94	65.07	67.89	13.78	95.85	54.83	79.58	N/A	680,372	461,889
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	19	59.09	59.21	57.05	14.52	103.79	41.43	77.25	49.01 to 68.66	735,684	419,742
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	14	63.64	78.45	69.71	35.36	112.54	42.77	132.34	55.18 to 118.69	347,313	242,100
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	60.85	60.63	57.42	09.06	105.59	51.56	72.59	N/A	847,700	486,771
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	64.08	65.90	62.55	14.22	105.36	50.25	86.88	N/A	512,113	320,324
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	32	92.05	89.36	87.38	14.19	102.27	54.93	120.12	81.41 to 98.84	330,790	289,036
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	38	70.72	70.81	68.59	13.73	103.24	43.36	117.90	67.29 to 74.88	449,832	308,529
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	43	62.34	66.42	60.06	21.00	110.59	41.43	132.34	55.83 to 64.24	596,266	358,139
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	43	79.93	82.06	77.25	15.94	106.23	50.53	120.12	72.54 to 88.21	394,996	305,134
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	35	61.90	62.29	60.09	15.35	103.66	41.43	85.91	57.98 to 68.16	604,774	363,410
<u>ALL</u>	113	70.77	74.39	68.22	21.44	109.04	41.43	132.34	67.77 to 75.45	471,844	321,887

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	63	71.72	75.54	69.58	21.93	108.57	41.43	132.34	67.77 to 79.93	474,652	330,274
2	50	70.36	72.95	66.48	20.52	109.73	43.36	120.12	62.63 to 75.78	468,305	311,320
<u>ALL</u>	113	70.77	74.39	68.22	21.44	109.04	41.43	132.34	67.77 to 75.45	471,844	321,887

**11 Burt**  
**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 : 113  
 Total Sales Price : 53,318,343  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 53,318,343  
 Total Assessed Value : 36,373,231  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 471,844  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 321,887

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 21.44  
 PRD : 109.04

COV : 26.28  
 STD : 19.55  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.17  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.34  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.43

95% Median C.I. : 67.77 to 75.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.95 to 71.48  
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.79 to 77.99

Printed:3/27/2013 9:48:16AM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	8	78.25	75.23	69.09	09.06	108.89	60.18	86.88	60.18 to 86.88	458,313	316,628
1	7	79.93	75.04	68.70	09.53	109.23	60.18	86.88	60.18 to 86.88	498,071	342,175
2	1	76.56	76.56	76.56	00.00	100.00	76.56	76.56	N/A	180,000	137,800
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	54	71.09	77.21	69.89	23.39	110.47	42.77	120.12	67.77 to 84.24	465,184	325,101
1	27	70.66	78.50	74.63	23.66	105.19	42.77	118.69	63.04 to 89.99	443,778	331,179
2	27	71.51	75.93	65.56	23.07	115.82	47.09	120.12	59.09 to 88.21	486,589	319,023
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	9	57.98	59.53	58.77	16.76	101.29	43.36	85.91	46.34 to 72.59	248,053	145,786
1	7	57.98	61.79	59.64	17.47	103.60	46.34	85.91	46.34 to 85.91	278,096	165,869
2	2	51.63	51.63	52.83	16.02	97.73	43.36	59.89	N/A	142,900	75,496
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>70.77</b>	<b>74.39</b>	<b>68.22</b>	<b>21.44</b>	<b>109.04</b>	<b>41.43</b>	<b>132.34</b>	<b>67.77 to 75.45</b>	<b>471,844</b>	<b>321,887</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	11	76.56	75.66	70.39	11.51	107.49	60.18	97.04	60.18 to 86.88	467,823	329,280
1	10	77.79	75.57	70.16	12.46	107.71	60.18	97.04	60.18 to 86.88	496,605	348,428
2	1	76.56	76.56	76.56	00.00	100.00	76.56	76.56	N/A	180,000	137,800
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	72	72.31	78.31	70.92	23.92	110.42	42.77	132.34	69.73 to 84.24	460,462	326,552
1	34	72.31	80.65	74.63	26.37	108.07	42.77	132.34	67.77 to 92.20	435,833	325,263
2	38	72.40	76.21	67.92	21.71	112.21	47.09	120.12	62.63 to 86.00	482,499	327,706
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	13	59.89	61.72	62.57	16.26	98.64	43.36	85.91	50.53 to 72.59	282,816	176,969
1	8	61.11	64.01	63.39	18.93	100.98	46.34	85.91	46.34 to 85.91	299,584	189,898
2	5	59.89	58.06	61.05	11.37	95.10	43.36	68.66	N/A	255,988	156,284
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>70.77</b>	<b>74.39</b>	<b>68.22</b>	<b>21.44</b>	<b>109.04</b>	<b>41.43</b>	<b>132.34</b>	<b>67.77 to 75.45</b>	<b>471,844</b>	<b>321,887</b>

## Burt County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Burt	1	4,530	4,320	4,060	3,810	3,099	3,265	2,600	2,145	3,579
Thurston	2	3,750	3,735	3,305	3,380	3,305	3,300	3,020	2,730	3,378
Washington	1	4,740	4,620	4,275	3,890	3,775	3,420	2,655	2,210	4,015
Cuming	1	4,273	4,282	3,981	3,982	3,630	3,648	3,111	2,977	3,977
Burt	2	4,580	4,450	N/A	3,890	3,595	3,710	2,880	2,230	4,148
Cuming	4	4,354	4,367	4,087	4,026	3,698	3,687	3,105	3,112	4,007
Dodge	2	5,265	4,895	4,550	4,230	3,874	3,655	3,400	3,170	4,527
Washington	1	4,740	4,620	4,275	3,890	3,775	3,420	2,655	2,210	4,015

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Burt	1	4,455	4,175	3,950	3,780	3,135	3,180	2,545	2,105	3,380
Thurston	2	3,440	3,365	3,165	2,815	2,740	2,740	2,700	2,500	2,872
Washington	1	4,550	4,465	4,200	3,640	3,415	3,350	2,580	1,945	3,824
Cuming	1	3,962	3,965	3,710	3,685	3,317	3,317	2,774	2,733	3,580
Burt	2	4,500	4,340	4,010	3,835	3,663	3,660	2,775	2,125	3,891
Cuming	4	4,050	4,050	3,760	3,715	3,362	3,252	2,626	2,684	3,663
Dodge	2	4,867	4,529	4,207	3,920	3,617	3,170	2,875	2,365	3,930
Washington	1	4,550	4,465	4,200	3,640	3,415	3,350	2,580	1,945	3,824

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Burt	1	1,909	1,838	1,825	1,511	1,553	1,579	1,518	1,253	1,524
Thurston	2	822	777	672	742	626	633	615	499	612
Washington	1	1,845	1,645	1,510	1,345	1,319	1,185	1,130	1,020	1,366
Cuming	1	2,053	1,819	1,750	1,625	1,469	1,456	1,547	839	1,576
Burt	2	1,902	1,834	2,085	1,373	1,626	1,512	1,519	1,301	1,556
Cuming	4	2,069	1,923	1,805	1,641	1,532	1,478	1,230	923	1,526
Dodge	2	1,725	1,515	1,580	1,508	1,368	1,393	1,371	1,339	1,456
Washington	1	1,845	1,645	1,510	1,345	1,319	1,185	1,130	1,020	1,366

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

# Burt County Assessor's Office

111 N 13<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 10

Tekamah, NE 68061

Phone - 402.374.2926 \* Fax - 402.374.2956

Joni L. Renshaw	Joan K. Zessin	Dan Magill	Jeanice Bowers	Jay Johnson
County Assessor	Deputy Assessor	Sales /Review	Office Clerk	Reviewer

---

February 25, 2013

Dear Ms. Sorensen:

This correspondence is concerning Burt County being a county needing special valuation procedures. Please see below for our current methodology concerning the few parcels where application has been made for special value.

***Burt County Special Valuation Methodology:***

- *Due to the application by several taxpayers, Burt County has implemented a special valuation process.*
- *This is reported on lines 43 and 44 of Form 45 of the 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property.*
- *The market analysis that has been performed over the past years has not demonstrated that there are consistently measureable non-agricultural influences in the Burt County market.*
- *In my opinion, the valuations that have been prepared for the agricultural land in Burt County do not reflect any non-agricultural influence. As a result, the special valuation process that is in place in Burt County has identical values for special value and regular assessment value.*
- *This is demonstrated in the county's Abstract on lines 43 and 44 of Form 45.*

I hope this explanation of the situation in Burt County and our methodology will suffice. If you need anything further, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Joni L. Renshaw  
Burt County Assessor





## 2013 Correlation Section for Burt County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Burt County is currently divided into two market areas. Market Area 1 which borders the Missouri River on the east has land use as reported in the county abstract of 27% irrigated, 55% dry land and the remainder is grass and waste land use. Market Area 2 which is the western portion of the county includes approximately 9% irrigated land use and 78% dry land use, the remainder is grass and waste land use. The market for agricultural land is strong and it is getting difficult to recognize characteristics in the market to justify the independent market areas. However, it was determined that to combine them this year would not be reasonable.

The analysis of the sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time, with sales lacking in the oldest and newest study years. All adjoining counties have land characteristics similar to Burt County so the agricultural sample was expanded by 18 sales and resulted in 113 qualified arm's length sales of which 63 sales are in area one and 50 sales in area two. All measures were taken to utilize comparable sales and meet the thresholds of determining an adequate sample of agricultural sales.

The county increased values in both of the market areas for the 2013 assessment year. The values in Burt County are reasonably comparable to all adjoining counties indicating that both market areas are at uniform portions of market value. The calculated median for Market Area 1 is 72% and Market Area 2 is 70%. The overall calculated median is 71%.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the overall level of value is determined to be 71% of market value for the agricultural class of property and each market area is determined to be valued within an acceptable level of value.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt 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 Burt County**

---

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

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 6,880</b>	<b>Value : 1,280,514,647</b>	<b>Growth 7,393,152</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	396	2,580,740	11	166,180	24	333,500	431	3,080,420	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,073	11,198,665	68	1,703,435	422	12,595,505	2,563	25,497,605	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,086	112,855,625	68	5,799,275	422	35,144,236	2,576	153,799,136	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,482	126,635,030	79	7,668,890	446	48,073,241	3,007	182,377,161	3,205,838
<b>% of Res Total</b>	82.54	69.44	2.63	4.20	14.83	26.36	43.71	14.24	43.36
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	59	218,040	12	59,705	5	209,660	76	487,405	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	340	2,121,520	19	566,210	21	149,835	380	2,837,565	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	340	20,854,361	19	2,227,240	21	5,113,945	380	28,195,546	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	399	23,193,921	31	2,853,155	26	5,473,440	456	31,520,516	1,492,709
<b>% of Com Total</b>	87.50	73.58	6.80	9.05	5.70	17.36	6.63	2.46	20.19
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	4	59,370	0	0	3	503,005	7	562,375	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	4	1,415,880	0	0	3	17,803,895	7	19,219,775	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	4	1,475,250	0	0	3	18,306,900	7	19,782,150	259,350
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	57.14	7.46	0.00	0.00	42.86	92.54	0.10	1.54	3.51
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	4	0	0	0	23	151,370	27	151,370	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	28	0	10	0	153	836,535	191	836,535	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	28	359,435	10	66,890	161	3,214,450	199	3,640,775	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	32	359,435	10	66,890	184	4,202,355	226	4,628,680	42,260
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	14.16	7.77	4.42	1.45	81.42	90.79	3.28	0.36	0.57
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,514	126,994,465	89	7,735,780	630	52,275,596	3,233	187,005,841	3,248,098
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	77.76	67.91	2.75	4.14	19.49	27.95	46.99	14.60	43.93
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	403	24,669,171	31	2,853,155	29	23,780,340	463	51,302,666	1,752,059
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	87.04	48.09	6.70	5.56	6.26	46.35	6.73	4.01	23.70
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,917	151,663,636	120	10,588,935	659	76,055,936	3,696	238,308,507	5,000,157
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	78.92	63.64	3.25	4.44	17.83	31.91	53.72	18.61	67.63

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	13,415	546,510	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	13,415	546,510
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	13,415	546,510

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	212	23	110	345

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	10	814,180	154	34,205,960	2,044	591,004,850	2,208	626,024,990
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	0	53	17,398,445	922	331,705,815	976	349,104,260
29. Ag Improvements	1	7,670	53	5,254,465	922	61,814,755	976	67,076,890
30. Ag Total							3,184	1,042,206,140

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	14,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	38	43.00	602,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	7,670	38	0.00	3,698,175	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	3.07	12,280	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	49	187.99	751,960	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	49	0.00	1,556,290	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	3	2.00	0	113	236.64	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	16	16.00	224,000	17	17.00	238,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	492	519.00	7,259,000	530	562.00	7,861,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	502	0.00	38,070,990	541	0.00	41,776,835	842,500
34. HomeSite Total				<b>558</b>	<b>579.00</b>	<b>49,875,835</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	79	151.51	606,040	81	154.58	618,320	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	827	3,302.24	13,208,980	876	3,490.23	13,960,940	
37. FarmSite Improvements	884	0.00	23,743,765	933	0.00	25,300,055	1,550,495
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,014</b>	<b>3,644.81</b>	<b>39,879,315</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,302	5,937.19	0	2,418	6,175.83	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,572</b>	<b>10,399.64</b>	<b>89,755,150</b>	<b>2,392,995</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	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	14	943.62	3,033,645	14	943.62	3,033,645
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	9,770.09	21.94%	44,258,530	27.77%	4,530.00
46. 1A	835.65	1.88%	3,610,020	2.26%	4,320.01
47. 2A1	4,338.86	9.74%	17,615,790	11.05%	4,060.00
48. 2A	5,129.31	11.52%	19,542,675	12.26%	3,810.00
49. 3A1	22,552.51	50.64%	69,888,445	43.85%	3,098.92
50. 3A	280.22	0.63%	914,945	0.57%	3,265.10
51. 4A1	149.65	0.34%	389,090	0.24%	2,600.00
52. 4A	1,474.77	3.31%	3,163,425	1.98%	2,145.03
53. Total	44,531.06	100.00%	159,382,920	100.00%	3,579.14
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	11,823.67	12.85%	52,675,045	16.94%	4,455.05
55. 1D	14,461.22	15.72%	60,377,130	19.42%	4,175.11
56. 2D1	3,055.18	3.32%	12,067,995	3.88%	3,950.01
57. 2D	8,089.77	8.79%	30,579,325	9.83%	3,780.00
58. 3D1	23,177.83	25.19%	72,653,260	23.36%	3,134.60
59. 3D	7,064.87	7.68%	22,466,285	7.23%	3,180.00
60. 4D1	20,249.99	22.01%	51,538,055	16.57%	2,545.09
61. 4D	4,082.75	4.44%	8,594,560	2.76%	2,105.09
62. Total	92,005.28	100.00%	310,951,655	100.00%	3,379.72
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	480.67	2.94%	917,765	3.69%	1,909.35
64. 1G	2,089.19	12.80%	3,840,635	15.44%	1,838.34
65. 2G1	288.81	1.77%	527,035	2.12%	1,824.85
66. 2G	1,166.18	7.14%	1,761,745	7.08%	1,510.70
67. 3G1	1,312.53	8.04%	2,038,920	8.20%	1,553.43
68. 3G	841.60	5.16%	1,328,600	5.34%	1,578.66
69. 4G1	6,595.32	40.41%	10,013,640	40.26%	1,518.29
70. 4G	3,547.89	21.74%	4,446,745	17.88%	1,253.35
71. Total	16,322.19	100.00%	24,875,085	100.00%	1,524.00
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	44,531.06	26.50%	159,382,920	31.44%	3,579.14
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	92,005.28	54.76%	310,951,655	61.34%	3,379.72
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	16,322.19	9.71%	24,875,085	4.91%	1,524.00
72. Waste	3,887.67	2.31%	486,310	0.10%	125.09
73. Other	11,281.72	6.71%	11,271,915	2.22%	999.13
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	168,027.92	100.00%	506,967,885	100.00%	3,017.16

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	3,442.23	30.73%	15,765,405	33.93%	4,580.00
46. 1A	2,229.77	19.90%	9,922,505	21.35%	4,450.01
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	2,833.40	25.29%	11,021,965	23.72%	3,890.01
49. 3A1	1,062.60	9.48%	3,820,195	8.22%	3,595.14
50. 3A	1,498.58	13.38%	5,559,750	11.96%	3,710.01
51. 4A1	116.77	1.04%	336,295	0.72%	2,879.98
52. 4A	20.00	0.18%	44,600	0.10%	2,230.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>11,203.35</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>46,470,715</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,147.93</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	11,838.18	12.26%	53,271,810	14.18%	4,500.00
55. 1D	29,037.32	30.07%	126,021,940	33.54%	4,340.00
56. 2D1	181.20	0.19%	726,610	0.19%	4,009.99
57. 2D	12,199.21	12.63%	46,784,750	12.45%	3,835.06
58. 3D1	11,102.62	11.50%	40,666,250	10.82%	3,662.76
59. 3D	22,086.91	22.87%	80,838,085	21.51%	3,660.00
60. 4D1	9,152.22	9.48%	25,398,230	6.76%	2,775.09
61. 4D	962.42	1.00%	2,045,285	0.54%	2,125.15
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>96,560.08</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>375,752,960</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,891.39</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	363.59	2.73%	691,700	3.34%	1,902.42
64. 1G	2,648.78	19.90%	4,857,515	23.45%	1,833.87
65. 2G1	56.83	0.43%	118,515	0.57%	2,085.43
66. 2G	1,906.01	14.32%	2,617,440	12.64%	1,373.26
67. 3G1	859.65	6.46%	1,397,455	6.75%	1,625.61
68. 3G	1,101.30	8.27%	1,665,615	8.04%	1,512.41
69. 4G1	4,897.30	36.79%	7,439,250	35.92%	1,519.05
70. 4G	1,478.10	11.10%	1,923,555	9.29%	1,301.37
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>13,311.56</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>20,711,045</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,555.87</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>11,203.35</b>	<b>9.00%</b>	<b>46,470,715</b>	<b>10.43%</b>	<b>4,147.93</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>96,560.08</b>	<b>77.57%</b>	<b>375,752,960</b>	<b>84.35%</b>	<b>3,891.39</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>13,311.56</b>	<b>10.69%</b>	<b>20,711,045</b>	<b>4.65%</b>	<b>1,555.87</b>
72. Waste	1,071.44	0.86%	128,570	0.03%	120.00
73. Other	2,337.89	1.88%	2,419,815	0.54%	1,035.04
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>124,484.32</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>445,483,105</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,578.63</b>

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	2,211.00	8,424,380	53,523.41	197,429,255	55,734.41	205,853,635
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	209.40	814,180	10,063.13	37,777,365	178,292.83	648,113,070	188,565.36	686,704,615
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	2,017.06	3,353,095	27,616.69	42,233,035	29,633.75	45,586,130
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	352.54	43,570	4,606.57	571,310	4,959.11	614,880
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	648.94	625,755	12,970.67	13,065,975	13,619.61	13,691,730
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>209.40</b>	<b>814,180</b>	<b>15,292.67</b>	<b>50,224,165</b>	<b>277,010.17</b>	<b>901,412,645</b>	<b>292,512.24</b>	<b>952,450,990</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	55,734.41	19.05%	205,853,635	21.61%	3,693.47
<b>Dry Land</b>	188,565.36	64.46%	686,704,615	72.10%	3,641.73
<b>Grass</b>	29,633.75	10.13%	45,586,130	4.79%	1,538.32
<b>Waste</b>	4,959.11	1.70%	614,880	0.06%	123.99
<b>Other</b>	13,619.61	4.66%	13,691,730	1.44%	1,005.30
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>292,512.24</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>952,450,990</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,256.11</b>

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

### 11 Burt

	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	176,449,396	182,377,161	5,927,765	3.36%	3,205,838	1.54%
02. Recreational	3,845,345	4,628,680	783,335	20.37%	42,260	19.27%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	49,502,160	49,875,835	373,675	0.75%	842,500	-0.95%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>229,796,901</b>	<b>236,881,676</b>	<b>7,084,775</b>	<b>3.08%</b>	<b>4,090,598</b>	<b>1.30%</b>
05. Commercial	30,195,416	31,520,516	1,325,100	4.39%	1,492,709	-0.56%
06. Industrial	19,522,800	19,782,150	259,350	1.33%	259,350	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	37,150,020	39,879,315	2,729,295	7.35%	1,550,495	3.17%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>86,868,236</b>	<b>91,181,981</b>	<b>4,313,745</b>	<b>4.97%</b>	<b>3,302,554</b>	<b>1.16%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>316,665,137</b>	<b>328,063,657</b>	<b>11,398,520</b>	<b>3.60%</b>	<b>7,393,152</b>	<b>1.26%</b>
11. Irrigated	162,638,110	205,853,635	43,215,525	26.57%		
12. Dryland	527,364,590	686,704,615	159,340,025	30.21%		
13. Grassland	42,438,585	45,586,130	3,147,545	7.42%		
14. Wasteland	309,510	614,880	305,370	98.66%		
15. Other Agland	11,448,740	13,691,730	2,242,990	19.59%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>744,199,535</b>	<b>952,450,990</b>	<b>208,251,455</b>	<b>27.98%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,060,864,672</b>	<b>1,280,514,647</b>	<b>219,649,975</b>	<b>20.70%</b>	<b>7,393,152</b>	<b>20.01%</b>

# **Burt County's 3 Year Plan of Assessment June 15, 2012**

## **PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

This plan of assessment is required by law, as amended by Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. The former provisions relating to the assessors' 5-year plan of assessment in Neb. Rev. Stat 77-1311(8) were repealed. On or before June 15<sup>th</sup> each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and present it to the county board of equalization on or before July 31<sup>st</sup>. The county assessor may amend the plan of assessment, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. The plan shall be updated annually before its adoption. The updates shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the County and shall describe the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete these actions. A copy of the plan and any amendments shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, on or before October 31<sup>st</sup> each year.

## **REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade", Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
  - 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
  - 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344.
- Reference: Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R.S. Supp 2007)

## GENERAL COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Burt County has a total count of 6,841 parcels as reported on the 2012 County Abstract. Per the 2012 County Abstract, Burt County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	3,000	43.85%	16.46%
Commercial	452	6.61%	2.88%
Industrial	7	.10%	1.80%
Recreational	215	3.14%	.37%
Agricultural	3,167	46.30%	78.49%

Agricultural land – 292,611.680 taxable acres

New Property: For assessment year 2012, an estimated 105 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions to the county.

The county handled 837 personal property schedules for 2012. The office also processed 402 homestead applications. Approximately 59 permissive exemptions are applied for each year through the County Assessor's Office.

The Burt County Assessor has the required assessor certification, several IAAO educational course certifications and numerous assessor workshops of assessment education. She has a continuing education requirement pursuant to Section 77-414 of 40 hours prior to December 31, 2002 and thereafter, 60 hours of continued education as required within the following 4-year period. She has completed the required IAAO Course 101 – Fundamentals of Real Property Appraisal and IAAO Course 300 – Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal.

The County Assessor's Office has a deputy and two full-time clerks to carry out the responsibilities and duties of the office with the assessor. The deputy has the necessary certification to hold the position and will fulfill the continuing education requirement of 60 hours required within the next 4-year period. The county does not have a full-time appraiser but has three part-time lister/reviewers for "pickup work" and other needed valuation projects being completed to keep Burt County in line with uniform and proportionate valuations.

The current 2012-2013 budget for the office is being reviewed by the County Board. The general fund request is \$127,697.20 which includes the Assessor,

Deputy, and one clerk's salaries. The clerk's salary had been included in the reappraisal budget previously, but really should be allocated to the general budget as that is where she primarily works. The appraisal budget request is \$128,370.68 which includes the payroll for one regular clerk and three part-time employees. This also funds all cadastral map work, appraisal schooling, GIS system, and data service contracts and fees. The GIS yearly maintenance contract amount had never been added to the appraisal budget, causing the appraisal budget to go over in 2011-2012. The aerial photos were flown in the fall of 2008 and have been reviewed for any changes that have occurred in the county. It was funded over two years and the county was provided with DVD's so duplicate photos could be printed if needed. The aerial photos have all been identified with parcel numbers so they can be tied to the GIS and other data systems.

### **PROCEDURES**

A procedures manual is in place with continual updating that describes the procedures and operations of the office. The manual adheres to the statutes, regulations and directives that apply to the Assessor's Office. A copy of this is entered into the record at the County Board of Equalization meetings each year as part of the process of hearing protests.

### **CADASTRAL MAPS**

The cadastral maps are updated on a daily basis as sales and other changes arise. The city maps were completed with all information having been proofed by the Assessor's Office staff over the last 3-4 years. The maps are currently in the process of being revised and updated by a local surveyor to improve the readability. We hope to be able to continue on with the rural maps if we are allowed to budget for them.

### **PROPERTY RECORD CARDS**

Regulation 10-004 requires the assessor to prepare and maintain a property record file for each parcel of real property including improvements on leased land in the county. New property record cards have been made for all residential, commercial, agricultural, exempt, and leased improvements. The new cards will contain all the required information including ownership, legal description, classification codes, and tax districts.

## **REPORT GENERATION**

The County Assessor has basic duties and requirements in filing administrative reports with the Property Tax Administrator that may be different than those specified in statute to ensure proper administration of the law. They include the County Real Estate Abstract due March 19<sup>th</sup>, 3 Year Plan of Assessment to be presented to the county board of equalization by July 31<sup>st</sup>, and due with the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, by October 31<sup>st</sup>, Certification of Values to School Districts and Political Subdivisions due August 20<sup>th</sup>, School District Taxable Value Report due August 25<sup>th</sup>, generate Tax Roll to be given to the County Treasurer by November 22<sup>nd</sup>, and Certificate of Taxes Levied Report due December 1<sup>st</sup>. Taxpayer appeals must be handled during the months of June and July. Regulation 10-002.09 requires tax list corrections created because of undervalued or overvalued real property and omitted real property must be reported to the County Board of Equalization by July 25<sup>th</sup>. Clerical error may be corrected as needed.

The assessor must do an annual review of all government owned property and if not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, and place on the tax roll. All centrally assessed property valuations must be reviewed after being certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities along with establishing assessment records and tax billing for the tax list. The assessor also manages school district and other entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information. This process includes the input and review of all tax rates for the billing process. We prepare and certify the tax lists/books to the county treasurer for real, personal property, and centrally assessed. The assessor prepares all tax list correction documents for county board approval. The assessor must attend all County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests where information is assembled and provided. The assessor must prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC where we also defend the valuation. During TERC Statewide Equalization, we attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

There are many numerous other deadlines that the assessor must meet throughout the year. All administrative reports are prepared by the County Assessor by their due dates and will continue to be done in a timely fashion as part of Burt County's assessment plan.

## **HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS**

Statutes 77-3510 through 77-3528 require the County Assessor to furnish forms for persons desiring to make application for Homestead Exemption. Applications are furnished and accepted along with an income statement between the dates of February 1<sup>st</sup> and June 30<sup>th</sup> of each year. The County Assessor must approve or disapprove the applications based on conformity to law. Notices shall be sent to rejected applicants by July 31<sup>st</sup> of each year except in the case of change of ownership or occupancy from January 1<sup>st</sup> through August 15<sup>th</sup>. Notice will be sent within a reasonable time. Approved applications will be sent to the Tax Commissioner on or before August 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. The County Assessor and clerical staff will process the applications and place them on the tax roll after their approval by the State based on income.

Per section 77-3506.02, the county assessor is required to certify to the Department of Revenue the average assessed value of single-family residential property in the county and to report the computed exempt amounts pursuant to section 77-3501.01 on or before September 1<sup>st</sup> each year.

## **PERSONAL PROPERTY**

The Burt County Assessor's office will require that all taxable personal property be lawfully assessed throughout the county according to the requirements of the statutes and regulations. All schedules are to be filed by May 1<sup>st</sup> to be considered timely. From May 1 to July 31, all schedules received by the office have a 10% penalty applied. After July 31, a 25% penalty is assessed. Postcards are mailed around February 1 to remind taxpayers that it is the beginning of personal property season. Advertisements are placed in the three county newspapers to remind taxpayers of the deadlines and to alert new personal property owners of the requirements for filing a timely schedule with the appropriate information. The taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule is used as a basis for the personal property schedule. Local accountants are provided with their clients' forms when requested, which they compute and return to our office. Legislation has eliminated the 13AG's and the taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule will be our only source of information in the future. We have been requiring them and have close to 95% compliance. The assessor and staff process Personal Property schedules.

## **REAL PROPERTY**

All real property is assessed each year as of January 1, 12:01 a.m. following the statutes. The assessment level of residential and commercial property will be set

between 92-100% of actual market value. The agricultural land will be assessed at 69-75% of actual market value. Valuation notices will be sent out on or before June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year to every owner of record in which the assessed valuation changed from the previous year.

Real property is updated annually through maintenance and "pickup work". We plan to finish by the end of February, to allow time for data entry and completion of value generation. We do sales analysis with assistance of our liaison to determine what assessment actions need to be implemented. This is an ongoing study with all data available on spread-sheets in our computers. Information is updated and areas for adjustment are determined along with the information provided from the current rosters.

The mass appraisal process for valuing properties in the county mainly is performed with the cost approach and market approach. We use the Marshall & Swift costing data supplied through MIPS/County Solutions. We do a depreciation study on an annual basis to determine any actions that may need to be taken. The income approach was applied on the contracted commercial reappraisal. The county plans to accomplish a portion of the required six year inspection process annually and previously was using a system of review that was similar.

Burt County has changed from Northeast Data to MIPS/County Solutions for real estate pricing programs. They will also do our administrative and report programs. The conversion process was very time consuming but has been completed and reviewed for correctness.

Countywide zoning was adopted by the Burt County Board effective February 4, 2000. The Assessor's Office works with the zoning administrator in locating new improvements. We also let the administrator know about improvements that need to have an accompanying permit application where they have failed to file one.

The review process in place in Burt County consists of a physical inspection of all properties that are being revalued. If there was any question as to the accuracy of the data, the property was remeasured, confirmed, and/or corrected. Additional information was collected that is necessary for the new CAMA software. The quality and condition of the property are noted as well as any other outstanding facts. A new digital photo was taken of each parcel. With the owner's permission and accompaniment, an interior inspection was performed. If permission was denied or there was no response to our door hanger and follow-up calls, we assumed that the interior condition of the property was the same as the exterior, unless there was evidence otherwise.

REG-50-003 requires the county assessor to determine the portion to be inspected and reviewed each year to assure that all parcels of real property in the county have been inspected and reviewed no less frequently than every six years. This plan is given in more detail below.

LEVEL OF VALUE, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2012

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	97.00	22.88	112.15
Commercial	NEI <i>(not enough information to set level)</i>		
Agricultural Land	71.00	18.16	102.45

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see the 2011 Reports & Opinions.

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED

RESIDENTIAL

2013 – Continue on with the cycle of review of the rural residential and improved parcels with Pershing and Bell Creek Townships. Implement a review of the Village of Craig to continue the city residential inspection and review 6-year cycle. We will continue working on depreciation analysis and effective age studies. The COD and PRD will be examined on an annual basis to see if the quality of assessment is appropriate, and what might be done to improve these numbers. Continue to analyze for uniformity and that levels are within the acceptable ranges.

2014 – Continue on with our rural revalue with the townships of Quinnebaugh and Riverside. It will be necessary to review Arizona as well since all three of these townships were affected by the flooding in 2011. We will continue our review process with Decatur Village, updating data, condition, and depreciation as needed.

2015 - Craig and Oakland Townships will be reviewed for both residential and farm buildings to determine current condition and valuation. We continue to check for buildings added to parcels without benefit of building permits and report such to the zoning administrator. We will continue on with the review of the city residential in Lyons City.

## COMMERCIAL

The commercial class of property had a complete reappraisal done in 2000 by Great Plains Appraisal Company. The pricing program that was applied was 1999 and all data was entered in the new CAMA 2000 system. Market, income, and cost approach were all applied in valuing the commercial class. In 2010, all commercial data was moved to the windows version of CAMA 2000 along with the implementation of newer pricing. Bill Kaiser and Jeff Quist have been assisting the office with an updated sales analysis and depreciation study. The COD and PRD will be examined to address the quality of the assessments and their uniformity. The office staff will be entering and reviewing all data in the commercial program.

2013 - We will review all commercial properties in Tekamah along with the updated pricing. We may start the review of commercial in Oakland City as time and deadlines will allow. We did not have enough sales information in 2012 to establish a level of value on the commercial. We may continue to have issues with determining our level if sales do not increase.

2014 – The review of the commercial properties will continue with completion of Oakland and continue on with Lyons. We will continue to monitor the COD and PRD to see if we are improving our quality of assessments. Our smaller communities have such a wide variance in commercial sales; we may never be able to achieve really tight numbers.

2015 – We will review the commercial properties in Craig and Decatur Village and also conduct another study on vacant lots if any sales are available. Rural commercial will be reviewed as well.

## AGRICULTURAL

Burt County will study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values will be set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute. The new level has been implemented as changed by the Legislature in 2006. Burt County currently has implemented two market areas and will continue to monitor the market activity to be assured that the market areas are needed. Market areas were adjusted in 2006 with Logan and Everett Townships being moved from Area 2 to Area 1 as their sales showed it was needed. We will continue to review and locate sales of Solomon and Luton soils in Map Area 2 as it is becoming a problem on the west side of the county as well as on the east.

We have adjusted both dry and irrigated acres within these soil types. It is classified as 3A1 and 3D1 which falls in with some of the Monona and Moody that are bringing higher prices on the market. We have separated our Solomon and Luton and call them "gumbo" in our current computer pricing program. The problem is in finding enough sales to verify value as it is not very desirable and there are not a lot of sales. We will also be looking at Forney and Albaton as they are a type of "gumbo" as well although not as heavy. The value on these soils is no longer comparable with the Monona and Moody when it comes to sales.

We are implementing wetland reserve pricing on the acres that have been converted and verified as such with the Farm Service Agency. We were originally told that there could be as many as 3,000 acres with the wetland reserve easement. With additional acres still being added, over 3,776 acres have already been converted. This land is actually no longer considered agland once it is implemented and goes on at 100% of market as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

In 2010, we implemented the new numeric identifiers from the Natural Resource Conservation Service on our soil surveys. The new numeric system combined several mapping symbols for similar soils, reducing the total number of soils and creating more uniformity across the state. We will be reviewing all of our soil maps for any changes, especially along the county's boundaries where changes were made to blend soil types. The Natural Resource Conservation Service will not be publishing a book this time. We are implementing a new GIS system to be able to obtain the 2008 soil maps and to assist in determining acres of each soil type on individual parcels. We started with the areas that had experienced changes in classification first as those changes had to be completed for the 2010 tax year. Completion of the total GIS project will probably extend into 2014. Lower Elkhorn Natural Resource District has offered some assistance in the completion of the land use phase as they will need it in determining the number of irrigated acres currently in Burt County.

2013 – Besides continuing the study of all agricultural sales on the required 3-year sale period, we will be monitoring flood damaged land. We had over 4,300 acres of agland that was adjusted in 2012 due to the damages incurred during the flood of 2011. Some was lowered to 4A, 4D, 4G, or even down to waste. We will need to keep in contact with the individual landowners or ag producers to see how the land is responding to their efforts to return it to its former productivity. We will request their most current FSA Farm Summary Report (Form 578) to see how it compares with the previous years. They will have to let us know of continuing issues with problem areas so we can address them. We have many parcels covered with deep enough sand that they may

never be farmed again. We will also monitor these parcels. We will track any sales that occur on these damaged parcels to see if we can better determine the current market value.

2014 – Review data from the GIS program now that the land use is almost complete along with the current aerial maps from 2012-2013. We may still request new farm summary reports from agland owners if we have any questions that cannot be determined from our GIS system. All those individuals will be contacted about providing us with that information. We need to be watching for land to be removed from CRP with contracts coming up for renewal. We will continue to monitor sales in the northwest corner of the county to see if an additional market area needs to be implemented. We have even considered moving all of the county back into one map area if sales would indicate it was possible. We will be collecting and studying all sales data we can find on wetland reserve acres to establish its current value. We will continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute.

2015 – Review all information that we have been able to obtain on land in the CRP program. Implement a study on the available sales data to determine how CRP land compares to both dryland and grassland sales. We hope to be able to use our new GIS system maps to assist in updating areas that were affected by the flooding and seeing if they are being renovated and put back into full farming capabilities. Continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute.

All school land was valued according to soil and use for 2012. Current soil survey is dated 2008 and is required by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. All school land will be updated for 2012 with the new soil survey and numeric designations.

New aerial photos were taken of the rural properties for 2009. They were used to assist in the review of the rural properties as well as a physical inspection of the parcel. Plans have been completed to review two to three townships a year for the next six years. All outbuildings have been measured again, and their condition verified. Each home has been physically inspected or a detailed questionnaire was left for completion. We have implemented the 2000 CAMA software during the review and are monitoring the market activity to ensure that the quality and level of assessment are uniform. We are continuing on with our 6 year review cycle of rural land, residences, and outbuildings.

Small tracts continue to be a concern in our sales study. Buyers purchase as much as 20-40 acres to build a home in the country. A home may be located on 1-2 acres but the remainder acres are used as farmland. Some are grazing cattle or allowing the nearest neighbor to farm along with his operation. New legislative statute LB 777 clarified the definition of agricultural and horticultural land versus land associated with a building or enclosed structure. This legislation was needed to support our procedure for valuing these properties. We did raise our homesite value to 14,000 and our building site value to 2,500 for 2008. As we reviewed and studied our rural sales, we found we needed to adjust the building site value to 3,500 for 2010. We will continue to monitor this as sales occur.

### **SALES REVIEW**

Effective January 1, 2009, the prescribed Real Estate Transfer Statement (Form 521) will be a single part form, rather than a multi-part form. The register of deeds shall forward the completed statement to the county assessor. The assessor shall process the statement and submit the original single part Real Estate Transfer Statement to the Department of Revenue according to the instructions of the Property Tax Administrator. See *Neb. Rev. Stat. §76-214*.

The County Assessor shall forward the completed "original" single part Form 521 to the Tax Commissioner on or before the fifteenth of the second month following the month the deed was recorded. This data is to be provided to the Property Assessment Division electronically in 2011 and the county is currently doing so. The office makes every effort to file them as timely as possible. Two full-time employees help with the completion of the 521's and filling out of the supplemental sheets after the review of all transfer statements by the assessor. Verification of all sales is done primarily with a questionnaire that is mailed first to the seller. If additional information is needed, we may call whoever might be able to provide that information. All sales are reviewed with the property card out in the field to see if any major improvements or changes have occurred. A new photo is taken at that time. The office maintains sales books for residential, commercial, small tracts, and farms. All agricultural sales are maintained on a spreadsheet to allow for setting value according to market. The sales review process will continue to be a part of the assessment plan with sales being disallowed as non-qualified based on statutes.

### **CONCLUSION**

The office will continue to do studies annually to determine if values are within range and determine what type of revaluations are needed. We hope to be

able to complete the above-mentioned projects for better assessment and data control in the office. The end result should create better efficiency and improved assessment and appraisal practices. It is important that we follow these requirements set forth by law and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, to prove to the State and our taxpayers that the assessment in our county is being done well.

This process will be accomplished with the current amount of \$127,697.20 for our general budget and the requested \$128,370.68 for the appraisal budget in 2012-2013.

I attest this to be true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Joni L. Renshaw  
Burt County Assessor

6/12/12

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Burt County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	Part-time for commercial
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	3
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	2
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$127,697.20
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$128,370.68
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$17,500.00
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,500.00
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$0

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor/staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes, GIS Workshop (ESRI)

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

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Decatur, Lyons, Oakland, Tekamah (only Craig does not have municipal zoning)
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

### D. Contracted Services

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

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	No
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 Burt 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 Burt 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



