

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 Cedar County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	175	Median	95.30
Total Sales Price	\$13,145,885	Mean	98.13
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,145,885	Wgt. Mean	90.39
Total Assessed Value	\$11,882,060	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,264
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$75,119	Avg. Assessed Value	\$67,897

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.60 to 96.81
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.25 to 93.53
95% Mean C.I	93.22 to 103.04
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	10.31
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.46
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.48

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	143	97	96.86
2011	155	96	96
2010	185	97	97
2009	212	94	94

2013 Commission Summary for Cedar County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	35	Median	94.30
Total Sales Price	\$7,577,308	Mean	85.22
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,577,308	Wgt. Mean	52.30
Total Assessed Value	\$3,962,935	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$69,483
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$216,495	Avg. Assessed Value	\$113,227

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	74.52 to 98.20
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	31.74 to 72.86
95% Mean C.I	73.29 to 97.15
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.53
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.40
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.80

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	22		86.14
2011	23	95	95
2010	29	97	97
2009	41	96	96

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Cedar County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	94	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	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 Cedar County

To develop a sales review notebook to be used as a guide to develop the depreciation table for the CAMA. Cedar County will continue implementing new costing, reviewing and developing a depreciation table for all residential properties. The residential properties for the towns and small towns have been completed. The county did some updating for four of the rural townships. The complete review of the rural residential parcels will be completed for the 2014 year. The county has contracted with GIS to do an aerial photo of all the rural residential properties. The new rural photos will be used for the review of these properties. The adjustments for the rural residential that was done for this year included percentage changes in precincts 5, 8, 12, and 16. Precincts 5 & 8 were just for one story houses, precincts 12 and 16 were just for one and one half stories. The adjustments ranged from 24% to 37% increase that was determined from the sales file. These changes will be reviewed again for the new year when we have all the new photos from the aerial photos by GIS.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Cedar County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Hartington
	5	Laurel
	10	Randolph
	15	Coleridge
	20	Beldin, Fordyce, Magnet, Obert, St. Helena and Wynot
	30	Rural, Bud Becker Sub, Bow Valley
	40	Brooky Bottom Recreational
	50	West River Recreational
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Sales comparison and cost approaches	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2009	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Tables provided by CAMA vender (MIPS)	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Ongoing as the review/reappraisal is being completed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	They are studied when the review/reappraisal is developed for each valuation grouping.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Sales Comparison	

14 Cedar
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 : 175
 Total Sales Price : 13,145,885
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,145,885
 Total Assessed Value : 11,882,060
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 75,119
 Avg. Assessed Value : 67,897

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 90
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 19.39
 PRD : 108.56

COV : 33.80
 STD : 33.17
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.48
 MAX Sales Ratio : 370.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.11

95% Median C.I. : 93.60 to 96.81
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.25 to 93.53
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.22 to 103.04

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:31PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	15	95.33	99.55	95.12	15.50	104.66	70.09	137.83	86.11 to 117.37	88,920	84,584
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	17	96.81	99.40	89.86	16.27	110.62	54.22	138.73	92.29 to 112.18	56,709	50,956
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	24	96.81	102.25	95.63	13.18	106.92	66.23	223.29	94.37 to 99.26	67,017	64,088
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	23	94.01	95.79	90.54	14.22	105.80	58.98	145.00	89.89 to 99.93	75,876	68,697
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	27	95.85	107.15	87.98	32.11	121.79	52.93	370.10	80.53 to 111.87	60,963	53,638
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	12	97.24	101.18	92.93	22.08	108.88	38.84	196.38	92.04 to 120.39	76,908	71,471
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	27	90.62	86.82	87.33	15.39	99.42	30.11	128.49	75.59 to 94.17	85,292	74,489
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	30	95.46	96.04	88.15	21.77	108.95	41.39	165.60	78.18 to 101.30	87,423	77,061
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	79	95.67	99.24	92.95	14.68	106.77	54.22	223.29	94.37 to 98.33	71,537	66,496
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	96	93.70	97.21	88.45	23.51	109.90	30.11	370.10	90.62 to 96.82	78,068	69,051
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	91	95.85	101.54	91.10	19.70	111.46	52.93	370.10	94.12 to 98.33	65,534	59,699
<u>ALL</u>	175	95.30	98.13	90.39	19.39	108.56	30.11	370.10	93.60 to 96.81	75,119	67,897

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	51	97.68	101.29	95.62	23.59	105.93	30.11	196.38	87.62 to 103.71	78,322	74,893
05	35	94.52	95.05	89.10	16.55	106.68	41.39	150.09	92.29 to 97.40	71,856	64,024
10	33	95.18	106.55	92.83	26.00	114.78	52.93	370.10	92.89 to 99.83	60,105	55,792
15	13	95.67	95.83	88.09	17.71	108.79	38.84	165.60	84.83 to 103.29	44,331	39,049
20	13	97.50	97.43	95.90	03.44	101.60	92.04	110.35	92.18 to 99.79	27,981	26,833
30	25	92.80	88.19	83.77	15.74	105.28	54.22	124.82	75.58 to 97.64	131,500	110,154
40	3	88.34	91.94	91.80	04.49	100.15	87.79	99.70	N/A	46,167	42,380
50	2	85.56	85.56	84.71	08.63	101.00	78.18	92.94	N/A	143,500	121,555
<u>ALL</u>	175	95.30	98.13	90.39	19.39	108.56	30.11	370.10	93.60 to 96.81	75,119	67,897

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	174	95.30	98.19	90.40	19.45	108.62	30.11	370.10	93.60 to 96.82	75,215	67,993
06	1	87.79	87.79	87.79	00.00	100.00	87.79	87.79	N/A	58,500	51,355
07											
<u>ALL</u>	175	95.30	98.13	90.39	19.39	108.56	30.11	370.10	93.60 to 96.81	75,119	67,897

**14 Cedar
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 : 175
 Total Sales Price : 13,145,885
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,145,885
 Total Assessed Value : 11,882,060
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 75,119
 Avg. Assessed Value : 67,897

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 90
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 19.39
 PRD : 108.56

COV : 33.80
 STD : 33.17
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.48
 MAX Sales Ratio : 370.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.11

95% Median C.I. : 93.60 to 96.81
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.25 to 93.53
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.22 to 103.04

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:31PM

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	97.50	93.09	92.53	08.43	100.61	78.55	103.22	N/A	3,100	2,868	
Less Than 15,000	18	97.16	120.68	111.83	36.66	107.91	63.33	370.10	92.18 to 110.35	8,469	9,471	
Less Than 30,000	45	98.64	112.32	106.95	29.44	105.02	30.11	370.10	95.85 to 104.50	15,971	17,080	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	172	95.24	98.22	90.38	19.57	108.67	30.11	370.10	93.43 to 96.81	76,375	69,032	
Greater Than 14,999	157	94.64	95.54	90.13	17.41	106.00	30.11	196.38	92.94 to 96.81	82,761	74,596	
Greater Than 29,999	130	93.93	93.22	89.43	15.41	104.24	38.84	149.77	92.42 to 95.33	95,594	85,488	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	97.50	93.09	92.53	08.43	100.61	78.55	103.22	N/A	3,100	2,868	
5,000 TO 14,999	15	96.81	126.20	113.08	42.40	111.60	63.33	370.10	92.18 to 139.80	9,543	10,792	
15,000 TO 29,999	27	100.40	106.75	105.63	24.28	101.06	30.11	196.38	95.67 to 124.00	20,972	22,153	
30,000 TO 59,999	41	97.27	99.87	99.73	15.16	100.14	53.26	149.77	94.37 to 101.68	44,918	44,799	
60,000 TO 99,999	42	96.34	96.76	95.40	16.66	101.43	38.84	138.73	94.01 to 100.03	77,608	74,037	
100,000 TO 149,999	24	88.36	85.44	85.00	12.78	100.52	59.44	121.84	75.09 to 93.84	118,146	100,424	
150,000 TO 249,999	21	88.59	82.22	82.41	12.36	99.77	54.22	101.30	74.59 to 92.80	183,357	151,112	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	91.21	91.21	91.19	01.45	100.02	89.89	92.53	N/A	320,000	291,805	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	175	95.30	98.13	90.39	19.39	108.56	30.11	370.10	93.60 to 96.81	75,119	67,897	

2013 Correlation Section for Cedar County

A. Residential Real Property

Cedar County is located in the northeastern portion of the State of Nebraska and has several residential communities. The city of Hartington (Valuation Group 1) is the largest in population and the county seat. The villages of Laurel (Valuation Group 5) and Randolph (Valuation Group 10) have a population of over 900 people. The village of Coleridge (Valuation Group 15) has the population of over 450 people. There are several small communities with a population of less than 200 people; those communities include Beldin, Bow Valley, Fordyce, Magnet, Obert, St. Helena and St. James. Cedar County is bordered on the north by the Missouri River and has several recreational areas as well.

The residential sales file for Cedar County has a sufficient number of sales (175) 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 Valuation Groups 40 and 50 which have small samples. The whole sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The relationship between all three measures of central tendency is relatively close. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are slightly outside of the acceptable range.

Cedar County has been continuing the cyclical review of the residential class of property and reported in the assessment actions portion of the survey that all the towns and small towns have been completed. The review included a drive by inspection, photo and revaluation based on the findings and analysis completed by the county. The county reported that the review has begun on the rural residential properties.

The Division has implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties to review the assessment practices of the county. Cedar County was one of those selected in 2011. Based on the findings from that review, the county has been aggressive in completing the residential cyclical review. A second review implemented in 2012 was conducted concerning the verification of sales and the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available when determining the level of value for the county.

Based on all available information, the level of value for the residential class of property in Cedar County is 95%. All of the subclasses with sufficient sales are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar County

Review sales activity and update any necessary areas if needed. The towns of Hartington and Laurel had most of the sales in the Commercial Roster which indicated a non-acceptable level of value for these properties. The improvements and land were increased 15% in these two towns. The land for all commercial properties was also increased by \$1,000 per acre for the 1st acre, and \$500 per acre for additional acres. The adjustments that were made put our level of value within the required range. The Commercial property for the county will be reviewed for the 2014 year, which is the last of the 6 year cycle of review.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Cedar County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Hartington
	5	Laurel
	10	Randolph
	15	Coleridge
	20	Beldin, Fordyce, Magnet, Obert, St. Helena and Wynot
	30	Rural, Bud Becker Sub, Bow Valley
	40	Brooky Bottom Recreational
	50	West River Recreational
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Cost, income and comparable sales.	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	Sales review.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2009	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Physical depreciation from tables, economic depreciation based on location.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No, effective age and comparable sales and reconciliation for each property.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	1990	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	1990	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Sales	

14 Cedar
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 : 35
Total Sales Price : 7,577,308
Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,577,308
Total Assessed Value : 3,962,935
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 216,495
Avg. Assessed Value : 113,227

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 52
MEAN : 85
COD : 25.79
PRD : 162.94

COV : 42.26
STD : 36.01
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.32
MAX Sales Ratio : 213.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 20.33

95% Median C.I. : 74.52 to 98.20
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 31.74 to 72.86
95% Mean C.I. : 73.29 to 97.15

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:32PM

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>Qtrrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	98.63	98.63	98.44	00.43	100.19	98.21	99.04	N/A	68,750	67,675
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	129.13	129.13	99.43	24.08	129.87	98.04	160.22	N/A	202,000	200,840
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	78.41	78.41	78.41	00.00	100.00	78.41	78.41	N/A	39,000	30,580
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	98.20	90.43	82.16	08.17	110.07	74.52	98.58	N/A	41,667	34,233
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	94.30	70.97	31.48	27.55	225.44	20.33	98.27	N/A	123,333	38,830
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	76.92	70.72	76.95	24.47	91.90	28.05	99.09	N/A	140,700	108,271
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	6	73.07	74.35	82.18	30.27	90.47	38.89	108.44	38.89 to 108.44	57,976	47,645
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	101.00	100.39	98.78	01.54	101.63	97.74	102.43	N/A	41,484	40,977
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	2	79.33	79.33	90.64	21.40	87.52	62.35	96.30	N/A	255,000	231,140
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	91.88	101.36	47.19	49.64	214.79	40.17	213.50	N/A	319,200	150,623
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	72.81	66.04	31.38	29.67	210.45	30.25	95.05	N/A	1,073,333	336,862
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	8	98.21	100.65	95.01	13.60	105.94	74.52	160.22	74.52 to 160.22	88,188	83,789
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	14	80.11	72.33	66.40	28.72	108.93	20.33	108.44	38.89 to 98.27	101,525	67,408
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	13	95.05	89.60	43.10	29.81	207.89	30.25	213.50	53.26 to 102.43	419,266	180,685
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	98.04	91.21	69.45	21.28	131.33	20.33	160.22	74.52 to 98.58	104,222	72,383
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	84.79	78.63	80.81	23.97	97.30	28.05	108.44	54.96 to 101.00	83,986	67,868
<u>ALL</u>	35	94.30	85.22	52.30	25.79	162.94	20.33	213.50	74.52 to 98.20	216,495	113,227

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	10	94.09	87.98	89.07	10.64	98.78	63.24	99.09	74.52 to 98.27	169,084	150,598
05	9	94.30	76.66	52.86	23.33	145.02	20.33	101.00	53.26 to 99.04	74,722	39,499
10	5	108.00	129.28	97.28	38.71	132.89	78.41	213.50	N/A	52,300	50,875
15	1	54.96	54.96	54.96	00.00	100.00	54.96	54.96	N/A	47,500	26,105
20	4	55.85	62.05	53.81	51.17	115.31	28.05	108.44	N/A	31,750	17,085
30	6	96.37	77.22	36.68	22.89	210.52	30.25	102.43	30.25 to 102.43	796,328	292,107
<u>ALL</u>	35	94.30	85.22	52.30	25.79	162.94	20.33	213.50	74.52 to 98.20	216,495	113,227

14 Cedar
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 : 35
 Total Sales Price : 7,577,308
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,577,308
 Total Assessed Value : 3,962,935
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 216,495
 Avg. Assessed Value : 113,227

MEDIAN : 94
 WGT. MEAN : 52
 MEAN : 85
 COD : 25.79
 PRD : 162.94

COV : 42.26
 STD : 36.01
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.32
 MAX Sales Ratio : 213.50
 MIN Sales Ratio : 20.33

95% Median C.I. : 74.52 to 98.20
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 31.74 to 72.86
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.29 to 97.15

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:32PM

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	35	94.30	85.22	52.30	25.79	162.94	20.33	213.50	74.52 to 98.20	216,495	113,227
04											
<u>ALL</u>	35	94.30	85.22	52.30	25.79	162.94	20.33	213.50	74.52 to 98.20	216,495	113,227

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	1	213.50	213.50	213.50	00.00	100.00	213.50	213.50	N/A	1,000	2,135
Less Than 15,000	4	130.61	134.39	109.80	40.17	122.40	62.85	213.50	N/A	7,500	8,235
Less Than 30,000	10	99.79	108.24	94.90	28.94	114.06	38.89	213.50	62.85 to 160.22	13,960	13,249
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	34	93.09	81.44	52.28	23.13	155.78	20.33	160.22	72.81 to 98.20	222,833	116,494
Greater Than 14,999	31	91.88	78.87	52.07	21.96	151.47	20.33	108.44	72.81 to 98.04	243,462	126,774
Greater Than 29,999	25	83.29	76.01	51.50	24.31	147.59	20.33	108.00	63.24 to 96.30	297,508	153,218
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	213.50	213.50	213.50	00.00	100.00	213.50	213.50	N/A	1,000	2,135
5,000 TO 14,999	3	101.00	108.02	106.22	32.14	101.69	62.85	160.22	N/A	9,667	10,268
15,000 TO 29,999	6	98.43	90.80	90.83	12.55	99.97	38.89	108.44	38.89 to 108.44	18,267	16,591
30,000 TO 59,999	9	78.41	74.20	71.51	24.26	103.76	28.05	99.04	53.26 to 95.05	44,111	31,542
60,000 TO 99,999	4	68.88	74.46	74.63	16.94	99.77	62.35	97.74	N/A	90,463	67,513
100,000 TO 149,999	6	97.95	95.43	94.96	06.47	100.49	83.29	108.00	83.29 to 108.00	117,309	111,392
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	4	86.61	72.90	76.06	28.02	95.85	20.33	98.04	N/A	362,500	275,719
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +	2	35.21	35.21	33.27	14.09	105.83	30.25	40.17	N/A	2,262,500	752,648
<u>ALL</u>	35	94.30	85.22	52.30	25.79	162.94	20.33	213.50	74.52 to 98.20	216,495	113,227

14 Cedar
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 : 35
Total Sales Price : 7,577,308
Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,577,308
Total Assessed Value : 3,962,935
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 216,495
Avg. Assessed Value : 113,227

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 52
MEAN : 85
COD : 25.79
PRD : 162.94

COV : 42.26
STD : 36.01
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.32
MAX Sales Ratio : 213.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 20.33

95% Median C.I. : 74.52 to 98.20
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 31.74 to 72.86
95% Mean C.I. : 73.29 to 97.15

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:32PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	2	81.48	81.48	92.00	32.55	88.57	54.96	108.00	N/A	78,750	72,453
326	1	78.41	78.41	78.41	00.00	100.00	78.41	78.41	N/A	39,000	30,580
340	1	160.22	160.22	160.22	00.00	100.00	160.22	160.22	N/A	9,000	14,420
341	1	101.00	101.00	101.00	00.00	100.00	101.00	101.00	N/A	10,000	10,100
350	4	98.63	95.74	91.38	05.06	104.77	83.29	102.43	N/A	76,485	69,895
353	4	69.64	69.09	73.50	26.52	94.00	38.89	98.20	N/A	109,500	80,486
384	1	62.85	62.85	62.85	00.00	100.00	62.85	62.85	N/A	10,000	6,285
386	2	68.03	68.03	66.01	07.04	103.06	63.24	72.81	N/A	69,000	45,550
406	3	98.58	136.78	101.64	38.96	134.57	98.27	213.50	N/A	12,000	12,197
410	1	96.30	96.30	96.30	00.00	100.00	96.30	96.30	N/A	425,000	409,280
418	1	86.28	86.28	86.28	00.00	100.00	86.28	86.28	N/A	102,500	88,440
420	1	74.52	74.52	74.52	00.00	100.00	74.52	74.52	N/A	85,000	63,345
421	1	20.33	20.33	20.33	00.00	100.00	20.33	20.33	N/A	315,000	64,030
424	1	98.04	98.04	98.04	00.00	100.00	98.04	98.04	N/A	395,000	387,260
434	1	99.09	99.09	99.09	00.00	100.00	99.09	99.09	N/A	135,000	133,770
442	2	94.68	94.68	94.62	00.40	100.06	94.30	95.05	N/A	35,000	33,118
453	1	97.68	97.68	97.68	00.00	100.00	97.68	97.68	N/A	108,516	106,000
476	1	40.17	40.17	40.17	00.00	100.00	40.17	40.17	N/A	1,375,000	552,350
479	1	53.26	53.26	53.26	00.00	100.00	53.26	53.26	N/A	55,000	29,295
527	1	91.88	91.88	91.88	00.00	100.00	91.88	91.88	N/A	55,000	50,535
841	3	30.25	55.58	30.60	88.60	181.63	28.05	108.44	N/A	1,073,000	328,387
851	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	93,853	91,730
<u>ALL</u>	<u>35</u>	94.30	85.22	52.30	25.79	162.94	20.33	213.50	74.52 to 98.20	216,495	113,227

2013 Correlation Section for Cedar County

A. Commercial Real Property

The commercial population in Cedar County is characteristic of a rural community setting in northeast Nebraska. The city of Hartington (Valuation Group 1) is the county seat, largest in population and the most diversified in commercial occupancy. The town of Laurel (Valuation Group 5), Randolph (Valuation Group 10) and Coleridge (Valuation Group 15) commercial base is characteristic of the towns of their size. There are several small communities that have minimal to no commercial activity (Valuation Groups 20 and 30).

Cedar County utilized as many sales as possible to represent the commercial market in the county. There are 35 sales in the statistical analysis, the latest two years of the study period indicating an increase in market activity. Those sales are distributed among six valuation groupings. The assessor reported that Hartington and Laurel were increased 15% to achieve an acceptable level of value. The county has made percentage adjustments to the commercial class of property several times since the last commercial reappraisal and there is a strong need to complete a reappraisal in the near future.

The Division has implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties to review the assessment practices of the counties. Cedar County was one of those selected for 2011. The county has been aggressive in the review of the residential class of property but they have not begun the cyclical review of the commercial class. There are 549 commercial and industrial improved parcels as reported in the county abstract. The assessor noted in the assessment actions portion of the survey that the commercial will be reviewed, inspected and completed for the 2014 assessment year. A second review implemented in 2012 was conducted concerning the verification of sales and the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available when determining the level of value of the commercial class of property.

Blanket percentage adjustments since the last reappraisal eventually creates a disproportionate assessment of the commercial class. The Division strongly recommends that the completion of a review and inspection also warrants updated costing tables and depreciation analysis to achieve a uniform and proportionate assessment of the commercial class of property.

Based on all available information, the level of value for the commercial class of property in Cedar County is 94%.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar County

Complete a market analysis and review the market boundaries. The Ag values all had to be increased in both market areas to meet the required level of value; this increase does include grass land. The implementation of the GIS program was completed this past year. The office is currently on line with the information that is available through the GIS system, which includes all the land information, including the aerial maps, and most of the residential data and photos. The rural photos should be available by next year as the county is being flown and the data should be available by this summer for implementation.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Cedar County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The northern portion of the county, consisting of smaller fields and hilly parcels.
	2	The southern portion of the county has more irrigation potential and larger crop fields.
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Market areas are drawn based on the topography and geographic characteristics of the two areas in the county.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Determine majority land use.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Farm home sites and rural residential home sites are considered the same and valued the same.	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Physical inspection, use GIS photos, FSA maps and talking with the land owners	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	No	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	The land enrolled in the program is valued at \$500 an acre.	

14 Cedar
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 : 98
Total Sales Price : 66,116,800
Total Adj. Sales Price : 66,113,300
Total Assessed Value : 44,302,680
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 674,626
Avg. Assessed Value : 452,068

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 77
COD : 31.65
PRD : 114.39

COV : 38.37
STD : 29.41
Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.46
MAX Sales Ratio : 186.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 24.60

95% Median C.I. : 64.96 to 78.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.99 to 72.03
95% Mean C.I. : 70.83 to 82.47

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:33PM

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	9	105.08	101.41	98.04	15.42	103.44	74.55	127.49	78.09 to 122.03	531,726	521,308
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	104.88	105.18	107.08	18.57	98.23	74.55	142.65	74.55 to 142.65	300,238	321,490
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	119.16	120.69	126.51	25.35	95.40	68.73	186.38	68.73 to 186.38	284,103	359,418
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	97.12	97.09	93.55	15.29	103.78	66.43	127.82	N/A	272,374	254,805
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	17	79.10	80.21	76.84	17.70	104.39	50.73	141.71	66.48 to 87.72	493,597	379,273
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	77.79	83.67	78.48	24.27	106.61	51.03	115.97	64.96 to 114.47	518,213	406,714
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	70.46	58.49	69.53	17.50	84.12	34.01	70.99	N/A	422,994	294,128
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	5	63.32	62.14	60.43	16.71	102.83	42.01	85.14	N/A	1,223,158	739,128
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	56.30	55.71	56.23	16.73	99.08	38.94	70.97	39.90 to 67.58	1,185,176	666,435
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	10	47.81	49.32	48.49	16.94	101.71	24.60	72.21	41.34 to 60.17	1,061,825	514,919
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	8	47.49	48.34	49.58	16.40	97.50	34.26	60.00	34.26 to 60.00	685,196	339,734
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	67.01	71.26	63.26	15.83	112.65	60.50	90.50	N/A	681,815	431,300
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	28	104.28	105.85	104.29	19.74	101.50	66.43	186.38	90.62 to 114.61	366,211	381,937
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	34	73.85	76.55	71.85	21.98	106.54	34.01	141.71	65.75 to 82.89	601,172	431,944
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	36	54.18	54.02	53.42	19.31	101.12	24.60	90.50	47.54 to 60.17	983,876	525,621
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	36	86.81	94.85	89.83	25.49	105.59	50.73	186.38	79.10 to 103.47	384,987	345,836
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	31	64.73	65.13	61.34	22.42	106.18	34.01	115.97	54.36 to 70.46	923,908	566,727
<u>ALL</u>	98	70.96	76.65	67.01	31.65	114.39	24.60	186.38	64.96 to 78.09	674,626	452,068

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	58	68.64	71.73	58.82	31.12	121.95	24.60	141.71	60.17 to 78.09	524,933	308,759
2	40	70.98	83.77	74.00	33.74	113.20	34.26	186.38	63.77 to 97.12	891,680	659,867
<u>ALL</u>	98	70.96	76.65	67.01	31.65	114.39	24.60	186.38	64.96 to 78.09	674,626	452,068

14 Cedar
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 : 98
Total Sales Price : 66,116,800
Total Adj. Sales Price : 66,113,300
Total Assessed Value : 44,302,680
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 674,626
Avg. Assessed Value : 452,068

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 77
COD : 31.65
PRD : 114.39

COV : 38.37
STD : 29.41
Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.46
MAX Sales Ratio : 186.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 24.60

95% Median C.I. : 64.96 to 78.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.99 to 72.03
95% Mean C.I. : 70.83 to 82.47

Printed:3/27/2013 3:11:33PM

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
_____Dry_____											
County	34	74.55	76.65	63.98	29.19	119.80	38.94	129.07	59.48 to 90.62	550,985	352,494
1	22	75.42	75.68	60.04	30.97	126.05	38.94	127.82	47.58 to 103.47	486,069	291,858
2	12	72.76	78.43	69.20	25.87	113.34	49.96	129.07	57.91 to 97.12	669,998	463,659
_____Grass_____											
County	6	81.97	88.67	72.77	27.88	121.85	50.73	141.71	50.73 to 141.71	99,583	72,462
1	5	80.32	84.56	70.52	26.93	119.91	50.73	141.71	N/A	112,576	79,391
2	1	109.24	109.24	109.24	00.00	100.00	109.24	109.24	N/A	34,619	37,818
_____ALL_____	98	70.96	76.65	67.01	31.65	114.39	24.60	186.38	64.96 to 78.09	674,626	452,068

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	13	70.99	80.06	68.57	32.58	116.76	46.48	186.38	54.36 to 103.99	903,328	619,440
1	7	73.22	70.54	62.34	23.96	113.15	46.48	104.84	46.48 to 104.84	657,291	409,771
2	6	67.99	91.17	72.59	43.07	125.60	60.00	186.38	60.00 to 186.38	1,190,372	864,053
_____Dry_____											
County	50	72.76	77.31	64.56	31.42	119.75	38.94	137.24	60.50 to 83.50	616,112	397,753
1	30	75.42	74.64	58.47	31.72	127.66	38.94	134.59	51.03 to 83.50	567,979	332,089
2	20	70.96	81.31	72.10	29.45	112.77	49.96	137.24	60.50 to 97.12	688,310	496,249
_____Grass_____											
County	7	80.32	80.90	64.04	32.57	126.33	34.26	141.71	34.26 to 141.71	110,357	70,675
1	5	80.32	84.56	70.52	26.93	119.91	50.73	141.71	N/A	112,576	79,391
2	2	71.75	71.75	46.64	52.25	153.84	34.26	109.24	N/A	104,810	48,885
_____ALL_____	98	70.96	76.65	67.01	31.65	114.39	24.60	186.38	64.96 to 78.09	674,626	452,068

Cedar County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Cedar	1	4,860	4,860	4,800	4,800	4,240	4,240	3,680	3,680	4,300
Dixon	2	4,015	3,940	3,750	3,625	3,375	3,310	3,065	2,940	3,513
Knox	1	4,750	4,734	4,523	4,523	4,230	4,242	3,951	3,970	4,341
Knox	3	3,430	3,472	3,400	3,296	3,189	3,087	2,479	2,457	2,962
Pierce	1	3,892	3,753	3,518	3,459	3,391	3,291	2,622	2,485	3,387
Cedar	2	5,410	5,410	5,215	5,215	5,140	5,140	4,160	4,160	4,930
Dixon	1	4,015	3,940	3,750	3,625	3,375	3,310	3,065	2,940	3,602
Wayne	10	4,660	4,660	4,620	4,620	3,530	2,825	2,680	2,530	3,691

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Cedar	1	3,190	3,190	3,155	3,153	3,120	3,120	2,360	2,360	2,858
Dixon	2	3,345	3,160	3,160	3,040	2,810	2,690	2,455	2,461	2,784
Knox	1	3,565	3,565	3,420	3,275	3,190	2,985	2,790	2,790	3,180
Knox	3	2,054	1,985	1,905	1,880	1,829	1,730	1,535	1,270	1,766
Pierce	1	3,130	3,030	2,855	2,724	2,580	2,510	1,595	1,395	2,702
Cedar	2	4,780	4,780	4,625	4,623	4,510	4,510	3,530	3,530	4,343
Dixon	1	3,490	3,260	3,145	3,025	2,849	2,675	2,560	2,339	2,892
Wayne	10	4,165	3,955	3,670	3,385	3,090	2,800	2,510	2,225	3,262

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Cedar	1	1,452	1,634	1,413	1,510	1,325	1,400	1,212	1,009	1,219
Dixon	2	1,712	1,803	1,549	1,440	1,265	1,148	1,032	867	1,133
Knox	1	1,159	1,170	1,169	1,170	1,160	1,160	1,158	1,160	1,162
Knox	3	1,000	1,000	985	985	975	975	975	975	978
Pierce	1	1,486	1,749	1,457	1,367	1,394	1,276	1,010	859	1,186
Cedar	2	1,700	1,697	1,547	1,545	1,402	1,395	1,250	1,255	1,424
Dixon	1	1,945	1,840	1,580	N/A	1,383	1,150	1,065	980	1,399
Wayne	10	2,457	2,433	2,145	2,044	2,086	1,766	1,591	1,270	2,016

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

2013 Correlation Section for Cedar County

A. Agricultural Land

Cedar County is divided into two market areas. Market Area 1 is bordered on the north by the Missouri River, the land use as reported in the county abstract represents percentages of 21% irrigated, 49% dry land and the remainder is grass and waste. Market Area 2 which is the southeastern six GEO codes consists of 41% irrigated land use, 54% dry land and the remainder is grass and waste. This area of the county has more irrigation potential and larger crop fields. The counties adjoining market area two are Dixon, Wayne and Pierce Counties.

All adjoining counties have land characteristics similar to Cedar County, and were considered comparable. The analysis of the sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time. The agricultural land sales sample was expanded by five sales in market area one resulting in 58 sales and 12 sales in market area two representing 40 sales, resulting in a combined total of 98 arm's length sales. All measures were taken to utilize comparable sales and meet the thresholds of determining an adequate sample of the agricultural sales.

The actions of the Cedar County Assessor included increasing all grassland in both market areas 20%. The irrigated and dry cropland in both areas was increased based on the market analysis completed by the assessor. The statistical profile shows both market areas within the acceptable range, the dry land subclasses have medians within the acceptable range in both the 95% and 80% majority land use.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 71% of market value for the agricultural class of property; all subclasses are in the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar County**

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

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 8,328	Value : 1,779,500,074	Growth 13,937,686	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	358	1,565,215	0	0	4	7,480	362	1,572,695	
02. Res Improve Land	2,025	13,919,550	0	0	73	669,075	2,098	14,588,625	
03. Res Improvements	2,032	112,484,847	0	0	574	48,911,355	2,606	161,396,202	
04. Res Total	2,390	127,969,612	0	0	578	49,587,910	2,968	177,557,522	4,621,595
% of Res Total	80.53	72.07	0.00	0.00	19.47	27.93	35.64	9.98	33.16
05. Com UnImp Land	74	295,230	0	0	23	254,540	97	549,770	
06. Com Improve Land	437	1,813,520	0	0	89	2,100,235	526	3,913,755	
07. Com Improvements	447	25,733,975	0	0	99	12,103,515	546	37,837,490	
08. Com Total	521	27,842,725	0	0	122	14,458,290	643	42,301,015	2,241,680
% of Com Total	81.03	65.82	0.00	0.00	18.97	34.18	7.72	2.38	16.08
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	2	16,710	2	16,710	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	3	77,035	3	77,035	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	3	2,630,180	3	2,630,180	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	5	2,723,925	5	2,723,925	675,000
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.06	0.15	4.84
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	51	953,220	51	953,220	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	92	1,848,565	92	1,848,565	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	184	3,058,310	184	3,058,310	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	235	5,860,095	235	5,860,095	414,800
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	2.82	0.33	2.98
Res & Rec Total	2,390	127,969,612	0	0	813	55,448,005	3,203	183,417,617	5,036,395
% of Res & Rec Total	74.62	69.77	0.00	0.00	25.38	30.23	38.46	10.31	36.14
Com & Ind Total	521	27,842,725	0	0	127	17,182,215	648	45,024,940	2,916,680
% of Com & Ind Total	80.40	61.84	0.00	0.00	19.60	38.16	7.78	2.53	20.93
17. Taxable Total	2,911	155,812,337	0	0	940	72,630,220	3,851	228,442,557	7,953,075
% of Taxable Total	75.59	68.21	0.00	0.00	24.41	31.79	46.24	12.84	57.06

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	2	1,245	590,920	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	202,945	269,320	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	2	1,245	590,920
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	202,945	269,320
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	204,190	860,240

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	274	0	118	392

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	3	219,145	0	0	2,830	871,588,395	2,833	871,807,540
28. Ag-Improved Land	7	204,415	0	0	2,007	563,754,020	2,014	563,958,435
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,644	115,291,542	1,644	115,291,542
30. Ag Total							4,477	1,551,057,517

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	7	3.00	43,500	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.61	2,335	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	80	37.33	665,205	80	37.33	665,205	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,507	1,453.57	21,076,715	1,514	1,456.57	21,120,215	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,030	0.00	72,420,145	1,030	0.00	72,420,145	81,500
34. HomeSite Total				1,110	1,493.90	94,205,565	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	498	1,203.44	1,752,250	498	1,203.44	1,752,250	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,705	9,291.06	13,472,140	1,706	9,292.67	13,474,475	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,552	0.00	42,871,397	1,552	0.00	42,871,397	5,903,111
38. FarmSite Total				2,050	10,496.11	58,098,122	
39. Road & Ditches	3,726	8,950.50	0	3,726	8,950.50	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	29	34.40	310,835	29	34.40	310,835	
41. Total Section VI				3,160	20,974.91	152,614,522	5,984,611

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	4	379.60	198,110	4	379.60	198,110

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	5,912.84	8.88%	28,736,385	10.04%	4,860.00
46. 1A	8,364.29	12.56%	40,650,435	14.20%	4,860.00
47. 2A1	6,248.52	9.39%	29,992,935	10.48%	4,800.01
48. 2A	6,313.07	9.48%	30,302,740	10.59%	4,800.00
49. 3A1	10,067.11	15.12%	42,684,545	14.91%	4,240.00
50. 3A	8,411.63	12.63%	35,665,305	12.46%	4,240.00
51. 4A1	17,839.81	26.79%	65,650,530	22.93%	3,680.00
52. 4A	3,422.12	5.14%	12,593,380	4.40%	3,679.99
53. Total	66,579.39	100.00%	286,276,255	100.00%	4,299.77
Dry					
54. 1D1	9,619.50	6.34%	30,684,205	7.08%	3,189.79
55. 1D	21,996.72	14.50%	70,169,180	16.18%	3,189.98
56. 2D1	9,709.31	6.40%	30,629,755	7.06%	3,154.68
57. 2D	14,099.52	9.29%	44,459,355	10.25%	3,153.25
58. 3D1	21,250.13	14.01%	66,303,300	15.29%	3,120.14
59. 3D	18,849.06	12.42%	58,809,060	13.56%	3,120.00
60. 4D1	46,565.40	30.69%	109,891,365	25.34%	2,359.94
61. 4D	9,634.51	6.35%	22,734,655	5.24%	2,359.71
62. Total	151,724.15	100.00%	433,680,875	100.00%	2,858.35
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,263.86	1.44%	1,835,225	1.71%	1,452.08
64. 1G	6,670.17	7.59%	10,897,715	10.17%	1,633.80
65. 2G1	2,422.84	2.76%	3,423,240	3.19%	1,412.90
66. 2G	6,000.18	6.83%	9,057,950	8.45%	1,509.61
67. 3G1	6,160.93	7.01%	8,162,895	7.62%	1,324.95
68. 3G	6,404.13	7.28%	8,963,050	8.36%	1,399.57
69. 4G1	26,260.27	29.87%	31,827,760	29.69%	1,212.01
70. 4G	32,727.57	37.23%	33,018,080	30.80%	1,008.88
71. Total	87,909.95	100.00%	107,185,915	100.00%	1,219.27
Irrigated Total					
	66,579.39	21.36%	286,276,255	34.49%	4,299.77
Dry Total					
	151,724.15	48.68%	433,680,875	52.25%	2,858.35
Grass Total					
	87,909.95	28.21%	107,185,915	12.91%	1,219.27
72. Waste	5,454.44	1.75%	2,823,935	0.34%	517.73
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	5.17	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	311,667.93	100.00%	829,966,980	100.00%	2,662.98

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,361.61	2.60%	7,366,305	2.85%	5,410.00
46. 1A	6,833.23	13.04%	36,967,795	14.31%	5,410.00
47. 2A1	5,311.38	10.13%	27,698,890	10.72%	5,215.01
48. 2A	704.00	1.34%	3,671,360	1.42%	5,215.00
49. 3A1	8,717.44	16.63%	44,807,700	17.34%	5,140.01
50. 3A	15,545.46	29.66%	79,903,635	30.92%	5,140.00
51. 4A1	13,763.56	26.26%	57,256,410	22.16%	4,160.00
52. 4A	180.74	0.34%	751,885	0.29%	4,160.04
53. Total	52,417.42	100.00%	258,423,980	100.00%	4,930.12
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,759.30	2.53%	8,409,460	2.79%	4,780.00
55. 1D	8,975.06	12.93%	42,896,365	14.23%	4,779.51
56. 2D1	7,777.38	11.21%	35,970,565	11.94%	4,625.02
57. 2D	2,739.52	3.95%	12,666,045	4.20%	4,623.45
58. 3D1	13,236.81	19.07%	59,698,085	19.81%	4,510.01
59. 3D	18,884.99	27.21%	85,166,970	28.26%	4,509.77
60. 4D1	15,772.54	22.73%	55,675,830	18.47%	3,529.92
61. 4D	255.70	0.37%	902,630	0.30%	3,530.04
62. Total	69,401.30	100.00%	301,385,950	100.00%	4,342.66
Grass					
63. 1G1	56.87	0.99%	96,680	1.18%	1,700.02
64. 1G	645.27	11.25%	1,095,070	13.40%	1,697.07
65. 2G1	872.98	15.21%	1,350,440	16.52%	1,546.93
66. 2G	563.16	9.81%	870,085	10.65%	1,545.00
67. 3G1	614.78	10.71%	861,635	10.54%	1,401.53
68. 3G	1,135.10	19.78%	1,583,850	19.38%	1,395.34
69. 4G1	1,494.89	26.05%	1,869,335	22.87%	1,250.48
70. 4G	355.00	6.19%	445,530	5.45%	1,255.01
71. Total	5,738.05	100.00%	8,172,625	100.00%	1,424.29
Irrigated Total					
	52,417.42	40.79%	258,423,980	45.46%	4,930.12
Dry Total					
	69,401.30	54.00%	301,385,950	53.02%	4,342.66
Grass Total					
	5,738.05	4.46%	8,172,625	1.44%	1,424.29
72. Waste	958.52	0.75%	493,460	0.09%	514.81
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	128,515.29	100.00%	568,476,015	100.00%	4,423.41

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	6.23	32,515	0.00	0	118,990.58	544,667,720	118,996.81	544,700,235
77. Dry Land	94.06	338,735	0.00	0	221,031.39	734,728,090	221,125.45	735,066,825
78. Grass	3.68	5,475	0.00	0	93,644.32	115,353,065	93,648.00	115,358,540
79. Waste	2.00	1,000	0.00	0	6,410.96	3,316,395	6,412.96	3,317,395
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	5.17	0	5.17	0
82. Total	105.97	377,725	0.00	0	440,077.25	1,398,065,270	440,183.22	1,398,442,995

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	118,996.81	27.03%	544,700,235	38.95%	4,577.44
Dry Land	221,125.45	50.23%	735,066,825	52.56%	3,324.21
Grass	93,648.00	21.27%	115,358,540	8.25%	1,231.83
Waste	6,412.96	1.46%	3,317,395	0.24%	517.30
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	5.17	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	440,183.22	100.00%	1,398,442,995	100.00%	3,176.96

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

14 Cedar

	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	171,339,252	177,557,522	6,218,270	3.63%	4,621,595	0.93%
02. Recreational	4,354,770	5,860,095	1,505,325	34.57%	414,800	25.04%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	90,156,108	94,205,565	4,049,457	4.49%	81,500	4.40%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	265,850,130	277,623,182	11,773,052	4.43%	5,117,895	2.50%
05. Commercial	37,686,570	42,301,015	4,614,445	12.24%	2,241,680	6.30%
06. Industrial	2,028,035	2,723,925	695,890	34.31%	675,000	1.03%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	54,117,086	58,098,122	3,981,036	7.36%	5,903,111	-3.55%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	93,831,691	103,123,062	9,291,371	9.90%	8,819,791	0.50%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	359,681,821	381,057,079	21,375,258	5.94%	13,937,686	2.07%
11. Irrigated	392,113,480	544,700,235	152,586,755	38.91%		
12. Dryland	589,868,165	735,066,825	145,198,660	24.62%		
13. Grassland	96,945,790	115,358,540	18,412,750	18.99%		
14. Wasteland	2,744,530	3,317,395	572,865	20.87%		
15. Other Agland	258,830	0	-258,830	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	1,081,930,795	1,398,442,995	316,512,200	29.25%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,441,612,616	1,779,500,074	337,887,458	23.44%	13,937,686	22.47%

**2012 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
FOR
CEDAR COUNTY
By Don Hoelsing, Assessor**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 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 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 (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.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Cedar County: Per the 2012 County Abstract, Cedar County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	2958	35.69%	11.83%
Commercial	636	7.67%	2.59%
Recreational	229	2.76%	.003%
Agricultural	4465	53.87%	85.26%

Game & Parks

4

.00048%

.0001%

Agricultural land - taxable acres 440,127.54

Other pertinent facts: 85.26% of Cedar County value comes from agricultural parcels. 25.81% of the agricultural acres are in irrigated farming, 50.98% is dry land and 21.73% is in grasslands and wastelands. The county consists of 3 smaller cities and 8 villages. The commercial properties are typical for small city and villages. They consist of the banks, grocery stores, mini marts, bars. The smaller villages have fewer operating commercial properties.

New Property: For assessment year 2012, an estimated 185 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2012 Reports & Opinion, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

1 Assessor, 1 Deputy Assessor, 3 full time clerks and one part time employee responsible for the measuring and listing of the "pickup work" for the year.

The total budget for Cedar County for 2012/2013 is \$223,060. Included in the total is \$12,500 dedicated to the GIS Workshop, MIPS/CAMA is part of the county general budget. There is no specific amount designated for appraisal work due to the fact that all appraisal work is done in house. \$2,000 is for continuing education.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further his knowledge of the assessment field.

B. Cadastral Maps

The Cedar County cadastral maps are up-dated on a continual basis once the proper information is filed and delivered to the county assessor. The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards

The property record cards in Cedar County are in reasonable shape. County Assessment Office is not on-line at this time. GIS WORKSHOP ag information should be on line by the end of the year.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

The provider for our CAMA and assessment administration is provided by MIPS. Currently, Cedar County is implementing the GIS Workshop system.

E. Web based – property record information access

Property record cards are not available online. The ag land information should be available on line through GIS Workshop later this year (2012).

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.

Step 1-Building permits are gathered from the zoning administrator for the rural properties and all cities and villages forward permits to the county assessor. They are separated into separate categories (rural, towns, etc), and put into a three ring binder, a plan of action is developed based on the number and location of each permit.

Step 2-A complete review of the readily accessible areas of the improvement is conducted. Measurements and photos are taken; and physical characteristics are noted at the time of inspection.

Step 3-Inspection data is entered into the CAMA system, using Marshall and Swift cost tables; and market data; a value is generated for each property inspected.

Step 4-The value generated for each property is compared to similar properties in the area, for equalization purposes.

Step 5-When all permit information is noted on the file, the new value generated will be applied for the current assessment year.

B. Data Collection.

All arm's length transactions are analyzed and sorted into valuation groupings. The current preliminary statistical information will be reviewed. A market and depreciation study will reveal where the greatest area of concern will be for the next assessment cycle. Currently, based on the information, the cities, of Hartington, Laurel, Coleridge, and Randolph, villages of Wynot, and St. Helena have been repriced and a new depreciation study developed to achieve uniform and proportionate valuation. The small towns of Obert, Magnet, and Fordyce will be next for this same process.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

As part of market analysis and data collection, all market areas are reviewed on a yearly basis.

1) Approaches to Value:

All three approaches are considered when determining market values. The extent each approach is used depends upon the property type and market data available. The cost approach is most heavily relied upon in the initial evaluation

process for residential and commercial. All arm's length sales are gathered, and analyzed to develop a market generated depreciation table. The market approach is used to support the value generated by the cost approach. Commercial properties are valued in a manner similar to residential properties. The income approach is used as a check when comparing agricultural properties. Limited or no data is available for the residential or commercial class of properties to utilize the income approach.

Market Approach; sales comparisons, see above.

- 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,
New costing manuals and software, dated 2008 for residential and 2009 for commercial have been purchased to be used for the 2012 assessment year.
- 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,
See above
- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

All arm's length sales are gathered and analyzed to determine if the current market areas are reflective of what the sales information has provided.

Special value generation: Currently Cedar County does not have any special value.

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	15.77	107.34
Commercial	NOI(86)	30.32	132.87
Agricultural Land	72	23.37	108.36

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2012 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

- Residential:
 - 1. Continue using the new costing 2008 software.
 - 2. Develop assessment ratios for all valuation groupings

3. Develop a sales review notebook with all current sales pictures to utilize in developing models and depreciation spread sheet.
4. The city of Hartington has been completed.

5. The small towns of Obert, Magnet, and Fordyce will be analyzed and completed, with the remainder of the rural residential properties to follow at a later year. Commercial property will be reviewed for this year.

Agricultural Land: This will be the 3rd year that the GIS Workshop will be utilized to inventory the land classification groupings. Market analysis will be completed to determine if the current market area boundaries are sufficient.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 201³2:

Residential: The same process will follow as for 2012 with the remainder of the city and village parcels within the determined valuation groupings.

Commercial: Analysis will be completed based on the preliminary statistics, with a complete review to be and new costing to be implemented.

Agricultural Land: This will be the 3rd year that the GIS Workshop will be utilized to inventory the land classification groupings. Market analysis will be completed to determine if the current market area boundaries are sufficient.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential: The intent is to have all the recosted information and depreciation analysis completed for the residential class, with the exception of rural residential. This data will be analyzed from aerial photos through GIS.

Commercial: Analysis should have been completed in 2013.

Agricultural Land: This will be the 5th year that the GIS Workshop will be utilized to inventory the land classification groupings. Market analysis will be completed to determine if the current market area boundaries are sufficient.

Conclusion:

The new and revised three year plan for 2012 has been submitted to the Cedar County Board of Equalization and will be submitted to the Property Tax Administrator on or before October 31, 2010.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: Don J. Hoising Date: 6-11-12

2013 Assessment Survey for Cedar County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	Assessor is a Certified General Appraiser
3.	Other full-time employees:
	3
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$223,060.00
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$223,060.00
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$0
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$8,000.00
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,000.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$12,500.00 for GIS maintenance (included in budget)
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$7,259.00

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	County Solutions
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes, minimally
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, cedar.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Beldin, Bow Valley, Coleridge, Fordyce, Hartington, Laurel, Magnet, Obert, Randolph, St. Helena and Wynot
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2002

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	No
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?

2013 Certification for Cedar 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 Cedar County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

