

# 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 Gosper County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	69	Median	95.16
Total Sales Price	\$9,136,462	Mean	94.04
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,116,462	Wgt. Mean	93.30
Total Assessed Value	\$8,505,919	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$90,817
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$132,123	Avg. Assessed Value	\$123,274

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.68 to 95.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.16 to 95.44
95% Mean C.I	92.05 to 96.03
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	21.24
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.92
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.03

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	61	97	96.90
2011	75	96	96
2010	65	96	96
2009	59	95	95

## 2013 Commission Summary for Gosper County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	92.36
Total Sales Price	\$790,500	Mean	89.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$775,500	Wgt. Mean	93.12
Total Assessed Value	\$722,139	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$86,366
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$86,167	Avg. Assessed Value	\$80,238

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	71.40 to 99.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.03 to 107.21
95% Mean C.I	76.25 to 102.29
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.82
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.57
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.96

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	11		92.44
2011	10		94
2010	8	100	100
2009	5	100	98



## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Gosper 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>95</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>74</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 Gosper County**

In conjunction with the Three Year Plan of Assessment, the Gosper County Assessor reports that all residential buildings countywide were updated using the June of 2012 Marshall and Swift costing tables for the 2013 assessment year. All properties that included remodels and new pickup work also were updated using the costing.

New depreciation tables were developed by the Assessor using local market data in Gosper County. As a result of the new costing and depreciation tables, each valuation grouping experienced increased values. For example Bullhead Point at Johnson Lake experienced increases averaging 30% while others such as Ward's Addition averaged 6%.

Lot and land values along with site values around Johnson Lake remained the same as in 2012.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Gosper County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The deputy and lister hired for pickup work.	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Elwood is the largest community in the county. Its location provides easy commuting to job opportunities and other services in Lexington and Holdrege. The market is active in Elwood, and growth is steady.
	02	Smithfield – is a small village with no services. The market is sporadic as is typical for small towns.
	03	Johnson Lake – strong demand due to the recreational opportunities at the lake. Demand for existing housing and growth are both strong.
	04	Rural – all properties outside of the Villages with the exception of those located around Johnson Lake.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Only the cost approach is used in the county, as there are too few sales to develop a sales comparison approach.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2012	
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>	
	Depreciation tables are developed using local market information	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2012-2013 for each valuation grouping	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010 for every valuation grouping	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	Values are applied to lots based on the general size of the lots. For example, within Elwood all lots 1-25’ wide receive a set value. At Johnson Lake, general size is considered; location will also affect lot/leasehold values. Areas that are located along the lakefront are valued higher than those that are not. The rural areas are assessed by the acre using sales of vacant land plus a value for site improvements.	

**37 Gosper  
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 : 69  
 Total Sales Price : 9,136,462  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,116,462  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,505,919  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 132,123  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 123,274

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 94  
 COD : 04.68  
 PRD : 100.79

COV : 08.95  
 STD : 08.42  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.45  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 121.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.12

95% Median C.I. : 94.68 to 95.59  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.16 to 95.44  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.05 to 96.03

Printed:3/27/2013 2:02:51PM

**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-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	94.58	96.53	95.42	03.54	101.16	92.42	104.52	N/A	84,375	80,509
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	95.09	95.38	95.25	00.52	100.14	94.79	96.25	N/A	153,750	146,450
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	11	94.62	91.31	87.64	06.36	104.19	66.12	101.18	82.06 to 98.32	83,145	72,870
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	14	95.05	95.58	95.27	03.84	100.33	84.56	115.10	91.62 to 96.34	136,647	130,179
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	11	95.59	94.87	93.56	02.23	101.40	81.45	98.57	94.92 to 98.42	169,707	158,778
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	92.43	94.70	93.65	07.08	101.12	87.02	106.92	N/A	133,725	125,229
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	11	95.30	96.68	95.38	04.67	101.36	83.38	121.53	92.06 to 99.62	148,880	141,996
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	11	94.89	89.84	90.37	07.01	99.41	64.12	100.27	68.15 to 96.66	131,882	119,185
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	32	94.90	94.21	93.36	04.37	100.91	66.12	115.10	94.36 to 96.20	113,325	105,796
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	37	95.30	93.89	93.27	04.92	100.66	64.12	121.53	94.89 to 95.62	148,380	138,391
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	39	95.18	94.16	93.29	03.90	100.93	66.12	115.10	94.62 to 96.15	132,197	123,333
<u>ALL</u>	69	95.16	94.04	93.30	04.68	100.79	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.59	132,123	123,274

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	24	95.35	96.54	95.86	04.48	100.71	86.73	121.53	93.93 to 96.95	81,924	78,535
03	39	94.92	92.62	92.73	03.87	99.88	64.12	100.27	94.62 to 95.55	161,135	149,427
04	6	95.41	93.24	91.62	10.55	101.77	66.12	115.10	66.12 to 115.10	144,333	132,239
<u>ALL</u>	69	95.16	94.04	93.30	04.68	100.79	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.59	132,123	123,274

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	69	95.16	94.04	93.30	04.68	100.79	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.59	132,123	123,274
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	69	95.16	94.04	93.30	04.68	100.79	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.59	132,123	123,274

**37 Gosper  
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 : 69  
 Total Sales Price : 9,136,462  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,116,462  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,505,919  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 132,123  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 123,274

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 94  
 COD : 04.68  
 PRD : 100.79

COV : 08.95  
 STD : 08.42  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.45  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 121.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.12

95% Median C.I. : 94.68 to 95.59  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.16 to 95.44  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.05 to 96.03

Printed:3/27/2013 2:02:51PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	1	101.18	101.18	101.18	00.00	100.00	101.18	101.18	N/A	6,500	6,577	
Less Than 30,000	4	98.62	97.62	96.84	02.91	100.81	92.06	101.18	N/A	21,250	20,578	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	69	95.16	94.04	93.30	04.68	100.79	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.59	132,123	123,274	
Greater Than 14,999	68	95.13	93.93	93.30	04.66	100.68	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.55	133,970	124,990	
Greater Than 29,999	65	95.09	93.82	93.27	04.71	100.59	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.43	138,946	129,594	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	101.18	101.18	101.18	00.00	100.00	101.18	101.18	N/A	6,500	6,577	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	97.44	96.43	96.48	02.65	99.95	92.06	99.80	N/A	26,167	25,245	
30,000 TO 59,999	10	95.70	95.31	95.45	03.23	99.85	86.73	104.52	91.62 to 98.32	43,438	41,460	
60,000 TO 99,999	13	94.89	96.71	96.47	03.65	100.25	90.68	121.53	92.52 to 96.27	79,654	76,843	
100,000 TO 149,999	19	95.23	93.33	93.04	05.87	100.31	64.12	115.10	89.30 to 95.82	125,750	116,994	
150,000 TO 249,999	15	94.79	90.51	90.96	05.79	99.51	66.12	98.57	88.84 to 95.43	182,322	165,835	
250,000 TO 499,999	8	95.54	94.64	94.34	03.30	100.32	81.45	100.27	81.45 to 100.27	304,688	287,456	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	69	95.16	94.04	93.30	04.68	100.79	64.12	121.53	94.68 to 95.59	132,123	123,274	



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Gosper County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Gosper County primarily is influenced by the strong local agricultural economy but also the recreational influences around Johnson Lake are characteristics that are in the residential market. The assessor uses four valuation groupings that have identifiable market differences. Elwood, 01 is the County seat and where the local trade businesses are located for the entire county. Smithfield continues to decline with approximately 65 residents. Johnson Lake reflects an increasing residential market each year. Local and out of county owners enjoy the recreational atmosphere and summer conditions at the Lake. Rural areas consist of the fourth valuation grouping.

The Assessor made significant changes to all residential buildings countywide with updating the costing tables to June/2012. The comparison of the residential valuation reported on the abstract versus the 2012 CTL, gives a 10.7% increase without the growth of new construction. This is due to the new costing and depreciation tables used in the county. Using the same costing tables is an assessment practice the county uses on a bi-annual basis. The inter-county equalization has been achieved as represented by the qualitative statistics. The near perfect calculations may be unusual, although they are complementary to the proactive assessor in Gosper County. In 2014, the measures may not be as precise if the county experiences market trends in an upward or downward pattern.

Within the sample, Elwood and Johnson Lake are the two reliable and proportionate subclasses in which the statistics are meaningful. Elwood with a sample of 24 qualified sales shows all measures of central tendency and qualitative measures are within acceptable range. Likewise, Johnson Lake with a median of 95 and all related statistics are within acceptable ranges.

Historically, Gosper County has shown indication of consistent appraisal techniques and applied equitably within the residential class. Reviews of sold and unsold properties remain uniform and proportionate. Assessment practices and the qualitative measures are determined to be in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County**

In conjunction with the Three Year Plan of Assessment, the Gosper County Assessor reports that all commercial buildings countywide were updated along with residential properties using the June of 2012 Marshall and Swift costing tables for the 2013 assessment year. All properties that included remodels and new pickup work also were updated using the costing.

The Assessor reviewed occupancy codes and developed new depreciation tables according to local market data within the County. The sales study was completed before applying new depreciation tables to commercial properties. Every year the Assessor continues to adequately discovers, lists and values the commercial property in Gosper County. The Assessor also serves as the current zoning administrator which allows the most reliable information to document as permits and split parcel requests come into the office.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Gosper County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>				
	The Deputy Assessor				
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>There are no market differences within Gosper County Commercial properties to identify more than one valuation grouping.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	There are no market differences within Gosper County Commercial properties to identify more than one valuation grouping.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>				
01	There are no market differences within Gosper County Commercial properties to identify more than one valuation grouping.				
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>				
	The Cost Approach				
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>				
	All properties are valued using the cost approach. Properties are priced using Marshall and Swift occupancy codes. Depreciation is applied based on general structure type and the age/condition of the property.				
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>				
	2012				
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>				
	Depreciation tables are established using local market information				
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>				
	Only one valuation grouping countywide is used in Gosper County.				
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>				
	2012				
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>				
	2010				
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>				
	In the Villages, lot values are applied based on the size of the lot. At Johnson Lake, values are established by neighborhood; areas that are along the lakefront are valued higher than those that are not. Size is not a factor when establishing lot values at the lake. The rural areas are assessed by the acre using sales of vacant land plus a value for the site improvements on the first acre.				

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 790,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 775,500  
Total Assessed Value : 722,139  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 86,167  
Avg. Assessed Value : 80,238

MEDIAN : 92  
WGT. MEAN : 93  
MEAN : 89  
COD : 11.63  
PRD : 95.87

COV : 18.98  
STD : 16.94  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.74  
MAX Sales Ratio : 113.95  
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.04

95% Median C.I. : 71.40 to 99.09  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.03 to 107.21  
95% Mean C.I. : 76.25 to 102.29

Printed:3/27/2013 2:02:52PM

**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											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	93.10	93.10	93.10	00.00	100.00	93.10	93.10	N/A	50,000	46,552
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	113.95	113.95	113.95	00.00	100.00	113.95	113.95	N/A	140,000	159,525
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	71.40	71.40	71.40	00.00	100.00	71.40	71.40	N/A	128,500	91,744
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	40,000	39,095
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	55.04	55.04	55.04	00.00	100.00	55.04	55.04	N/A	35,000	19,263
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	92.36	92.36	92.36	00.00	100.00	92.36	92.36	N/A	67,000	61,882
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	95.00	95.00	98.27	04.32	96.67	90.90	99.09	N/A	125,000	122,835
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	89.86	89.86	89.86	00.00	100.00	89.86	89.86	N/A	65,000	58,408
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	3	93.10	92.82	93.51	15.23	99.26	71.40	113.95	N/A	106,167	99,274
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	76.39	76.39	77.81	27.95	98.18	55.04	97.74	N/A	37,500	29,179
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	4	91.63	93.05	95.80	02.91	97.13	89.86	99.09	N/A	95,500	91,490
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	93.10	92.82	93.51	15.23	99.26	71.40	113.95	N/A	106,167	99,274
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	76.39	76.39	77.81	27.95	98.18	55.04	97.74	N/A	37,500	29,179
<u>ALL</u>	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238
<u>ALL</u>	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238

**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	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238
04											
<u>ALL</u>	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 790,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 775,500  
Total Assessed Value : 722,139  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 86,167  
Avg. Assessed Value : 80,238

MEDIAN : 92  
WGT. MEAN : 93  
MEAN : 89  
COD : 11.63  
PRD : 95.87

COV : 18.98  
STD : 16.94  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.74  
MAX Sales Ratio : 113.95  
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.04

95% Median C.I. : 71.40 to 99.09  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.03 to 107.21  
95% Mean C.I. : 76.25 to 102.29

Printed:3/27/2013 2:02:52PM

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	1	90.90	90.90	90.90	00.00	100.00	90.90	90.90	N/A	25,000	22,724
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>											
Greater Than 4,999	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238
Greater Than 14,999	9	92.36	89.27	93.12	11.63	95.87	55.04	113.95	71.40 to 99.09	86,167	80,238
Greater Than 29,999	8	92.73	89.07	93.19	12.83	95.58	55.04	113.95	55.04 to 113.95	93,813	87,427
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	1	90.90	90.90	90.90	00.00	100.00	90.90	90.90	N/A	25,000	22,724
30,000 TO 59,999	2	76.39	76.39	77.81	27.95	98.18	55.04	97.74	N/A	37,500	29,179
60,000 TO 99,999	3	92.36	91.77	91.67	01.17	100.11	89.86	93.10	N/A	60,667	55,614
100,000 TO 149,999	2	92.68	92.68	93.58	22.96	99.04	71.40	113.95	N/A	134,250	125,635
150,000 TO 249,999	1	99.09	99.09	99.09	00.00	100.00	99.09	99.09	N/A	225,000	222,946
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<b>ALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>92.36</b>	<b>89.27</b>	<b>93.12</b>	<b>11.63</b>	<b>95.87</b>	<b>55.04</b>	<b>113.95</b>	<b>71.40 to 99.09</b>	<b>86,167</b>	<b>80,238</b>

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	91.63	91.63	91.96	00.80	99.64	90.90	92.36	N/A	46,000	42,303
336	1	89.86	89.86	89.86	00.00	100.00	89.86	89.86	N/A	65,000	58,408
349	1	93.10	93.10	93.10	00.00	100.00	93.10	93.10	N/A	50,000	46,552
352	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	40,000	39,095
353	1	99.09	99.09	99.09	00.00	100.00	99.09	99.09	N/A	225,000	222,946
386	1	71.40	71.40	71.40	00.00	100.00	71.40	71.40	N/A	128,500	91,744
442	1	113.95	113.95	113.95	00.00	100.00	113.95	113.95	N/A	140,000	159,525
528	1	55.04	55.04	55.04	00.00	100.00	55.04	55.04	N/A	35,000	19,263
<b>ALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>92.36</b>	<b>89.27</b>	<b>93.12</b>	<b>11.63</b>	<b>95.87</b>	<b>55.04</b>	<b>113.95</b>	<b>71.40 to 99.09</b>	<b>86,167</b>	<b>80,238</b>



## **2013 Correlation Section for Gosper County**

---

### **A. Commercial Real Property**

Commercial properties in Gosper County will primarily exist around the Johnson Lake area and in the town of Elwood although there are no market differences within Gosper County commercial properties to identify more than one valuation grouping. Historically there has not been a viable market in this property class but local residents and recreational visitors at the Lake rely on the existing businesses for daily shopping.

The sales verification process in the county involves sending a sales questionnaire to the buyers of all properties; the document includes questions that are designed to determine how selling prices were established and whether they included any personal property or business interest. Interviews are often conducted with parties involved in the transaction to verify sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sale rosters, revealed no apparent bias in the qualification determinations.

Gosper County was chosen in 2011 as one of the counties reviewed by the Department to conduct an expanded audit of the assessment practices and ensure that appraisal techniques were consistently to sold and unsold properties. The review indicated that Gosper County fairly applies assessment procedures and the requirement of the six year inspection has been fulfilled.

The Gosper County Assessor updated the commercial properties with 2012 costing tables and new depreciation tables derived from all available local market data. The assessor uses the cost approach to estimate the market value of the entire class. Lot values within the villages are applied based on the size of the lot. At Johnson Lake, the values are established by neighborhood. For example the lakefront properties are higher due to the higher market for these locations.

A minimal amount of 9 total qualified sales are within the statistical sample for Gosper County. Six are located in the town of Elwood, and three are located at the Lake. There are no identifiable factors that these 9 sales fairly represent the population of the commercial property base countywide.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County**

In conjunction with residential and commercial structures, the agricultural buildings were also revalued using the June/2012 Marshal and Swift costing tables and new depreciation tables applied. The inspection cycle within the county for all improved parcels was completed prior to this year. Gosper County is ready to begin a new cyclical review.

Current market information provided the need to increase all subclasses of agricultural land. Both market areas, one and four received significant increases similar to surrounding counties.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Gosper County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The Deputy Assessor	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	<b>Market Area</b>	<b>Description of unique characteristics</b>
	01	This area consists of flat, rich farmland. Irrigation is accessible and well depths are shallow.
	04	The terrain in this area is rougher than area 1, and generally the soils are poorer. Well depths can be extreme; it is not always possible for irrigators to pump a sufficient amount of water for their crops in this area.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The market areas were developed based on topography, soil type and access to water for irrigation. Sales are plotted annually, and a sales study is completed to monitor the market areas.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Non-agricultural land uses are identified by completing the land use study and through the sales verification process. Currently, the only recreational parcels within the county are those at Johnson Lake.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The assessor conducts a sales ratio study and a sales verification process to attempt to identify sales that have a non-agricultural influence. Land sales are also plotted annually to look for areas of non-agricultural influence. At this time, the office has not observed a non-agricultural influence in the sales of agricultural land.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	No	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	N/A	

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 72  
Total Sales Price : 35,852,383  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,480,338  
Total Assessed Value : 23,452,868  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 492,782  
Avg. Assessed Value : 325,734

MEDIAN : 74  
WGT. MEAN : 66  
MEAN : 70  
COD : 31.89  
PRD : 106.22

COV : 40.86  
STD : 28.69  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.67  
MAX Sales Ratio : 145.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 09.98

95% Median C.I. : 57.92 to 80.10  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
95% Mean C.I. : 63.58 to 76.84

Printed:3/27/2013 2:02:53PM

<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-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	102.93	101.78	99.44	16.97	102.35	73.58	137.81	73.58 to 137.81	367,363	365,307	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	81.78	78.22	73.14	14.16	106.95	38.07	99.18	38.07 to 99.18	775,429	567,120	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	89.33	93.55	92.24	04.84	101.42	89.17	102.14	N/A	204,000	188,161	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	96.67	96.67	96.87	08.58	99.79	88.38	104.95	N/A	307,500	297,865	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	82.11	86.38	82.81	18.20	104.31	57.92	115.51	66.74 to 112.23	351,415	291,012	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	58.37	70.48	78.99	54.19	89.23	11.37	145.50	11.37 to 145.50	444,550	351,131	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	6	62.55	58.93	59.50	47.19	99.04	09.98	98.77	09.98 to 98.77	236,525	140,732	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11												
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	9	53.15	59.30	55.34	27.41	107.16	39.16	94.31	41.36 to 81.55	822,641	455,268	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	12	47.51	52.29	51.11	27.93	102.31	33.17	80.10	38.85 to 66.37	643,607	328,929	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	39.21	39.58	38.57	05.30	102.62	37.04	42.51	N/A	336,635	129,838	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	48.56	54.91	54.30	24.69	101.12	40.09	76.07	N/A	349,000	189,492	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	19	89.17	91.26	83.32	15.52	109.53	38.07	137.81	80.58 to 102.93	485,607	404,590	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	24	76.19	74.88	77.45	32.92	96.68	09.98	145.50	57.92 to 91.20	349,857	270,977	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	29	45.52	52.55	51.87	28.36	101.31	33.17	94.31	40.09 to 58.71	615,767	319,387	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	23	86.79	85.73	79.19	14.85	108.26	38.07	115.51	77.20 to 91.20	457,416	362,225	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	22	54.50	62.76	62.00	44.72	101.23	09.98	145.50	41.36 to 81.55	542,490	336,351	
<u>ALL</u>	72	74.22	70.21	66.10	31.89	106.22	09.98	145.50	57.92 to 80.10	492,782	325,734	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
1	36	74.83	73.15	69.28	29.81	105.59	37.04	145.50	54.83 to 82.11	616,941	427,417	
4	36	70.80	67.26	60.78	35.37	110.66	09.98	115.47	45.00 to 86.04	368,624	224,051	
<u>ALL</u>	72	74.22	70.21	66.10	31.89	106.22	09.98	145.50	57.92 to 80.10	492,782	325,734	

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 72  
 Total Sales Price : 35,852,383  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,480,338  
 Total Assessed Value : 23,452,868  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 492,782  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 325,734

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 31.89  
 PRD : 106.22

COV : 40.86  
 STD : 28.69  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.67  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 145.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 09.98

95% Median C.I. : 57.92 to 80.10  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.58 to 76.84

Printed:3/27/2013 2:02:53PM

**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	9	73.58	65.52	63.57	21.85	103.07	37.04	91.20	37.10 to 81.78	579,494	368,374
1	9	73.58	65.52	63.57	21.85	103.07	37.04	91.20	37.10 to 81.78	579,494	368,374
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	1	33.25	33.25	33.25	00.00	100.00	33.25	33.25	N/A	295,000	98,097
4	1	33.25	33.25	33.25	00.00	100.00	33.25	33.25	N/A	295,000	98,097
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	75.17	76.36	69.70	28.54	109.56	38.85	112.66	40.15 to 110.46	239,698	167,065
1	5	69.57	67.30	66.96	31.32	100.51	38.85	98.77	N/A	354,615	237,444
4	6	82.25	83.91	75.32	24.61	111.40	49.49	112.66	49.49 to 112.66	143,933	108,416
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>74.22</b>	<b>70.21</b>	<b>66.10</b>	<b>31.89</b>	<b>106.22</b>	<b>09.98</b>	<b>145.50</b>	<b>57.92 to 80.10</b>	<b>492,782</b>	<b>325,734</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	22	75.21	67.19	60.22	25.69	111.57	33.17	104.95	40.09 to 82.11	711,146	428,252
1	14	75.21	68.21	64.29	21.99	106.10	37.04	99.18	39.16 to 82.11	688,246	442,444
4	8	65.69	65.41	53.70	36.84	121.81	33.17	104.95	33.17 to 104.95	751,222	403,415
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	2	44.04	44.04	35.86	24.50	122.81	33.25	54.83	N/A	167,750	60,152
1	1	54.83	54.83	54.83	00.00	100.00	54.83	54.83	N/A	40,500	22,207
4	1	33.25	33.25	33.25	00.00	100.00	33.25	33.25	N/A	295,000	98,097
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	15	74.86	75.74	70.36	28.57	107.65	38.85	115.51	49.49 to 98.77	216,445	152,295
1	7	69.57	70.15	68.51	38.08	102.39	38.85	115.51	38.85 to 115.51	314,011	215,142
4	8	75.02	80.64	74.24	21.69	108.62	49.49	112.66	49.49 to 112.66	131,075	97,304
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>74.22</b>	<b>70.21</b>	<b>66.10</b>	<b>31.89</b>	<b>106.22</b>	<b>09.98</b>	<b>145.50</b>	<b>57.92 to 80.10</b>	<b>492,782</b>	<b>325,734</b>

## Gosper County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Gosper	1	N/A	2,899	2,460	2,050	1,910	1,800	1,775	1,643	2,785
Gosper	4	N/A	2,900	2,460	2,050	1,915	N/A	1,775	1,645	2,446
Frontier	1	1,950	1,947	1,817	1,868	1,800	1,800	1,722	1,673	1,907
Furnas	1	3,050	2,750	2,290	2,175	1,655	1,540	1,410	1,410	2,459
Dawson	1	N/A	2,975	2,900	2,680	2,425	2,062	2,021	1,945	2,778
Dawson	2	N/A	2,225	2,160	1,855	1,274	N/A	960	960	2,039
Phelps	1	2,806	3,800	3,000	2,798	2,500	2,400	2,300	2,100	3,526
Phelps	2	N/A	2,300	2,000	1,800	1,600	1,500	1,400	1,300	1,975

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Gosper	1	N/A	1,080	1,010	945	865	745	715	715	1,010
Gosper	4	N/A	1,080	1,009	945	865	N/A	715	715	999
Frontier	1	910	910	850	850	795	795	740	740	876
Furnas	1	1,450	1,450	1,100	1,100	950	950	850	850	1,260
Dawson	1	N/A	1,485	1,390	1,310	1,215	1,124	935	935	1,214
Dawson	2	N/A	985	920	770	705	N/A	570	530	759
Phelps	1	1,400	1,400	1,200	1,100	1,050	1,000	900	800	1,277
Phelps	2	N/A	1,400	1,200	1,100	1,050	1,000	900	800	1,158

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Gosper	1	N/A	696	613	551	506	567	484	481	502
Gosper	4	N/A	690	610	550	500	N/A	480	480	498
Frontier	1	390	390	390	390	390	390	390	390	390
Furnas	1	650	650	620	620	500	485	450	425	454
Dawson	1	N/A	915	775	720	685	625	625	620	641
Dawson	2	N/A	695	605	515	515	N/A	395	395	433
Phelps	1	750	925	1,127	813	728	726	639	530	708
Phelps	2	N/A	600	550	500	506	475	463	450	465

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



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Gosper County**

---

**A. Agricultural Land**

Historically Gosper County has identified two market areas that reflected a difference in values for agricultural land. In 2012 irrigated values were slightly different between market areas one and four. This year the market of land in area four has caught up to the current values in market area one. Recent sales show no difference in water restrictions or well depths when you compare selling prices. The County Assessor has kept the market area lines for future monitoring of sales, although for valuation purposes both areas have the same values for each subclass.

In review of the sample of sold properties within Gosper County, both market areas were determined to be proportionately distributed and fairly representative of the majority land uses in the population. The expanded balanced sample consists of 72 sales; 36 in each market area defined in the abstract. Higher increases were necessary in the irrigated subclasses in market area four in order to be within acceptable levels of value. Irrigation in market area one increased approximately 20% whereas market area four increased 40%. The same increases took place in both dry land in each area; 35% and grass 25% in each.

Although the qualitative measures are above the recommended IAAO standards, there are no signs after reviewing all information, that assessments are not treated uniformly and proportionately. The assessor took homogeneous areas of similar characteristics of neighboring counties and used adjective market data to improve the sample data prior to setting the 2013 values. The Gosper County values are very comparative to the market in market areas one and four.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 : 2,908</b>	<b>Value : 498,515,093</b>	<b>Growth 2,331,457</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>	75	172,250	0	0	61	689,039	136	861,289	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	308	1,262,610	0	0	600	15,831,063	908	17,093,673	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	324	19,800,434	0	0	668	68,038,555	992	87,838,989	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	399	21,235,294	0	0	729	84,558,657	1,128	105,793,951	1,146,371
<b>% of Res Total</b>	35.37	20.07	0.00	0.00	64.63	79.93	38.79	21.22	49.17
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	5	18,507	0	0	4	12,225	9	30,732	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	51	262,120	0	0	33	471,046	84	733,166	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	52	3,814,969	0	0	42	3,405,954	94	7,220,923	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	57	4,095,596	0	0	46	3,889,225	103	7,984,821	298,731
<b>% of Com Total</b>	55.34	51.29	0.00	0.00	44.66	48.71	3.54	1.60	12.81
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	9,035	0	0	0	0	1	9,035	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	2	1,074,532	0	0	0	0	2	1,074,532	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	2	1,083,567	0	0	0	0	2	1,083,567	459,788
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.22	19.72
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	36	27,000	36	27,000	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	38	71,825	38	71,825	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	38	98,825	38	98,825	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	1.31	0.02	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	399	21,235,294	0	0	767	84,657,482	1,166	105,892,776	1,146,371
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	34.22	20.05	0.00	0.00	65.78	79.95	40.10	21.24	49.17
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	59	5,179,163	0	0	46	3,889,225	105	9,068,388	758,519
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	56.19	57.11	0.00	0.00	43.81	42.89	3.61	1.82	32.53
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	458	26,414,457	0	0	813	88,546,707	1,271	114,961,164	1,904,890
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	36.03	22.98	0.00	0.00	63.97	77.02	43.71	23.06	81.70

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	5	10,750	647,550	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	5	10,750	647,550
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				5	10,750	647,550

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	3	8,478	3	8,478	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	3	8,478	3	8,478	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	31	0	229	260

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	2	58,555	1	1,802	1,313	272,318,741	1,316	272,379,098
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	304	95,311,600	304	95,311,600
29. Ag Improvements	1	46,305	0	0	317	15,808,448	318	15,854,753
30. Ag Total							1,634	383,545,451

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	46,305	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.45	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	9	9.00	54,900	9	9.00	54,900	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	215	217.58	1,315,640	215	217.58	1,315,640	
33. HomeSite Improvements	191	190.58	12,024,613	191	190.58	12,024,613	426,567
34. HomeSite Total				<b>200</b>	<b>226.58</b>	<b>13,395,153</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	20	47.98	35,765	20	47.98	35,765	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	260	1,038.85	636,682	260	1,038.85	636,682	
37. FarmSite Improvements	298	0.00	3,783,835	299	0.00	3,830,140	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>319</b>	<b>1,086.83</b>	<b>4,502,587</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,480.53	0	0	4,480.98	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>519</b>	<b>5,794.39</b>	<b>17,897,740</b>	<b>426,567</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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	46,912.90	87.29%	136,019,532	90.87%	2,899.41
47. 2A1	1,852.00	3.45%	4,555,921	3.04%	2,460.00
48. 2A	457.24	0.85%	937,347	0.63%	2,050.01
49. 3A1	2,376.15	4.42%	4,537,920	3.03%	1,909.78
50. 3A	195.93	0.36%	352,674	0.24%	1,800.00
51. 4A1	620.26	1.15%	1,100,971	0.74%	1,775.02
52. 4A	1,330.70	2.48%	2,185,737	1.46%	1,642.55
53. Total	53,745.18	100.00%	149,690,102	100.00%	2,785.18
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	5,804.20	70.57%	6,268,534	75.47%	1,080.00
56. 2D1	346.74	4.22%	350,207	4.22%	1,010.00
57. 2D	195.42	2.38%	184,673	2.22%	945.01
58. 3D1	1,053.32	12.81%	911,125	10.97%	865.00
59. 3D	55.76	0.68%	41,541	0.50%	745.00
60. 4D1	377.29	4.59%	269,764	3.25%	715.00
61. 4D	392.40	4.77%	280,570	3.38%	715.01
62. Total	8,225.13	100.00%	8,306,414	100.00%	1,009.88
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	4,636.86	8.28%	3,225,866	11.47%	695.70
65. 2G1	639.77	1.14%	392,383	1.40%	613.32
66. 2G	1,043.22	1.86%	574,801	2.04%	550.99
67. 3G1	1,690.93	3.02%	854,938	3.04%	505.60
68. 3G	121.17	0.22%	68,655	0.24%	566.60
69. 4G1	1,609.24	2.87%	778,566	2.77%	483.81
70. 4G	46,255.70	82.60%	22,232,420	79.04%	480.64
71. Total	55,996.89	100.00%	28,127,629	100.00%	502.31
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	53,745.18	45.38%	149,690,102	80.41%	2,785.18
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	8,225.13	6.94%	8,306,414	4.46%	1,009.88
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	55,996.89	47.28%	28,127,629	15.11%	502.31
72. Waste	427.41	0.36%	21,375	0.01%	50.01
73. Other	40.70	0.03%	4,883	0.00%	119.98
74. Exempt	5,986.29	5.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	118,435.31	100.00%	186,150,403	100.00%	1,571.75

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	23,146.19	59.00%	67,123,951	69.96%	2,900.00
47. 2A1	308.01	0.79%	757,704	0.79%	2,460.00
48. 2A	294.36	0.75%	603,445	0.63%	2,050.02
49. 3A1	6,641.39	16.93%	12,718,272	13.26%	1,915.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	1,534.95	3.91%	2,724,547	2.84%	1,775.01
52. 4A	7,307.34	18.63%	12,017,229	12.53%	1,644.54
53. Total	39,232.24	100.00%	95,945,148	100.00%	2,445.57
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	30,992.42	68.93%	33,467,319	74.49%	1,079.85
56. 2D1	705.37	1.57%	711,873	1.58%	1,009.22
57. 2D	293.86	0.65%	277,698	0.62%	945.00
58. 3D1	7,961.91	17.71%	6,886,801	15.33%	864.97
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,424.83	5.39%	1,733,448	3.86%	714.87
61. 4D	2,586.88	5.75%	1,849,629	4.12%	715.00
62. Total	44,965.27	100.00%	44,926,768	100.00%	999.14
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,508.17	7.10%	3,801,859	9.85%	690.22
65. 2G1	751.63	0.97%	458,551	1.19%	610.08
66. 2G	567.61	0.73%	312,020	0.81%	549.71
67. 3G1	3,941.57	5.08%	1,971,317	5.11%	500.13
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	4,920.79	6.35%	2,364,332	6.12%	480.48
70. 4G	61,858.83	79.77%	29,701,070	76.93%	480.14
71. Total	77,548.60	100.00%	38,609,149	100.00%	497.87
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	39,232.24	24.22%	95,945,148	53.45%	2,445.57
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	44,965.27	27.76%	44,926,768	25.03%	999.14
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	77,548.60	47.87%	38,609,149	21.51%	497.87
72. Waste	172.12	0.11%	8,611	0.00%	50.03
73. Other	63.60	0.04%	7,632	0.00%	120.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	161,981.83	100.00%	179,497,308	100.00%	1,108.13

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	13.00	37,700	0.00	0	92,964.42	245,597,550	92,977.42	245,635,250
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	19.31	20,855	0.00	0	53,171.09	53,212,327	53,190.40	53,233,182
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	2.67	1,802	133,542.82	66,734,976	133,545.49	66,736,778
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	599.53	29,986	599.53	29,986
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	104.30	12,515	104.30	12,515
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,986.29	0	5,986.29	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>32.31</b>	<b>58,555</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>1,802</b>	<b>280,382.16</b>	<b>365,587,354</b>	<b>280,417.14</b>	<b>365,647,711</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	92,977.42	33.16%	245,635,250	67.18%	2,641.88
<b>Dry Land</b>	53,190.40	18.97%	53,233,182	14.56%	1,000.80
<b>Grass</b>	133,545.49	47.62%	66,736,778	18.25%	499.73
<b>Waste</b>	599.53	0.21%	29,986	0.01%	50.02
<b>Other</b>	104.30	0.04%	12,515	0.00%	119.99
<b>Exempt</b>	5,986.29	2.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>280,417.14</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>365,647,711</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,303.94</b>

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

37 Gosper

	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	94,155,888	105,793,951	11,638,063	12.36%	1,146,371	11.14%
02. Recreational	93,570	98,825	5,255	5.62%	0	5.62%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,069,303	13,395,153	1,325,850	10.99%	426,567	7.45%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>106,318,761</b>	<b>119,287,929</b>	<b>12,969,168</b>	<b>12.20%</b>	<b>1,572,938</b>	<b>10.72%</b>
05. Commercial	7,339,858	7,984,821	644,963	8.79%	298,731	4.72%
06. Industrial	1,066,296	1,083,567	17,271	1.62%	459,788	-41.50%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,297,871	4,502,587	-2,795,284	-38.30%	0	-38.30%
08. Minerals	8,478	8,478	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>15,712,503</b>	<b>13,579,453</b>	<b>-2,133,050</b>	<b>-13.58%</b>	<b>758,519</b>	<b>-18.40%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>122,031,264</b>	<b>132,867,382</b>	<b>10,836,118</b>	<b>8.88%</b>	<b>2,331,457</b>	<b>6.97%</b>
11. Irrigated	191,425,302	245,635,250	54,209,948	28.32%		
12. Dryland	39,384,627	53,233,182	13,848,555	35.16%		
13. Grassland	54,705,374	66,736,778	12,031,404	21.99%		
14. Wasteland	18,039	29,986	11,947	66.23%		
15. Other Agland	12,375	12,515	140	1.13%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>285,545,717</b>	<b>365,647,711</b>	<b>80,101,994</b>	<b>28.05%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>407,576,981</b>	<b>498,515,093</b>	<b>90,938,112</b>	<b>22.31%</b>	<b>2,331,457</b>	<b>21.74%</b>

**THREE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN  
GOSPER COUNTY  
June 8, 2012  
Amended July 31, 2012**

**Introduction**

Pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Nebraska Legislature, the Assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment by June 15 and submit this plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year. On or before October 31 the Assessor shall mail the plan and any amendments to the Department of Revenue, Property Tax Division.

**Office Duties**

Each year, the Assessor's Office is responsible for locating and valuing all taxable real and personal property. This includes overseeing the appraiser when he/she does the yearly reviews on new or changed property and also the complete relisting required by statute every six years. We also recommend to the commissioners the exemptions for educational, charitable and religious organizations. We approve or deny the beginning farmer exemption and mail out and receive the homestead exemption forms. As these forms are somewhat complicated, we offer help to our taxpayers in filling them out. Questions are answered in regard to new valuations and the reasons for changes. We attend protest hearings to provide testimony to the County Board of Equalization.

Keeping our computer system current is a large part of our routine. This includes both updating and adding to the records already on the system and keeping the hardware and programs it uses up to date. We compile and submit data for the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and prepare spreadsheets to determine the values for each political subdivision. We receive certified values for centrally assessed companies from the Department of Revenue and add them into the valuation spreadsheets, giving us a total county value. We are responsible for preparing the permanent tax list and also give permission to send the electronic information to the Treasurer's software vender for the printing of the tax statements.

We are responsible to publish in the local paper notification of the completion of the Real Property Assessment. We certify valuations and growth to all political subdivisions, and certify to the Secretary of State all trusts owning agricultural land in Gosper County.

The Assessor's Office is required to make several reports each year. These include: the mobile home report to all mobile home court owners in the county, a real estate abstract, the 3-year plan of assessment, a report listing over- and under-valued property for correction by the County Board of Equalization, certification of value to all political subdivisions in the county, an inventory of county property located in this office, the budget for the office and Certificate of Taxes Levied to the State Tax Administrator. We also prepare maps and charts for protest hearings and general information to the County Commissioners and the taxpayers.

This office has the record of the certified irrigated acres and we work with the NRD for irrigated acre transfers. Each year we compile and give them a list of all the taxpayers with irrigation. We measure proposed irrigation in preparation for presentation to the NRD Board for approval and then change our records accordingly.

I am also, at the request of the County Commissioners, the Zoning Administrator, the Flood Plain Administrator, the Liaison for the Census for Gosper County, and with the elimination of the County School Superintendent's position, we are in charge of the grade school art for the county fair.

### 2012 Assessment Year

#### Level of Value, Quality, Uniformity

<b>PROPERTY CLASS</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
Residential	97	21.11	109.76
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural	73	19.90	105.50

### 2013 Assessment Year

#### Residential

1. All residential buildings to be repriced using the **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013 using **06/12** pricing.
3. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied, if needed.

#### Commercial

1. All commercial buildings to be repriced using the **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013, using **06/12** pricing.
3. Complete the sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedules made up if needed.

#### Agricultural

1. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013, using **06/12** pricing.
3. Market area and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and the level of value. Corrections to areas and values completed as needed.
4. If a CD for land use will be available, we will update the land use.

## **2014 Assessment Year**

### **Residential**

1. All residential buildings to be repriced using the 06/12 pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2014 using 06/12 pricing.
3. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied if necessary.

### **Commercial**

1. All commercial buildings to be repriced using 06/12 pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2014 using 06/12 pricing.
3. Complete sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedule made up and implemented as necessary.

### **Agricultural**

1. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using the 06/12 pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2014 using 06/12 pricing.
3. Market Areas and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and levels of value. Corrections to the land areas and values completed as needed.
4. If a CD for land use is available, land use will be updated.

### **Other**

Preparation for the next six-year relisting project is to be completed. Applications and/or bids for listers will be taken. A new employment agreement made up for the approved lister.

## **2015 Assessment Year**

### **Residential**

4. All residential buildings to be repriced using the 06/14 pricing.
5. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2015 using 06/14 pricing.
6. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied.

### **Commercial**

4. All commercial buildings to be repriced using 06/14 pricing.
5. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2015 using 06/14 pricing.
6. Complete sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedule made up and implemented as necessary.

### **Agricultural**

5. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using the 06/14 pricing.
6. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2015 using 06/14 pricing.
7. Market Areas and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and levels of value. Corrections to the land areas and values completed as needed.
8. If a CD for land use is available, land use will be updated.

### **Other**

The six year relisting project should be underway. We would like to include pictures of each outbuilding along with the front and back of each house in the new listings. This should make it easier to pick out a specific building when a taxpayer comes in with a question or complaint. We will continue to commercially print one picture for each parcel that has improvements. All other pictures will be printed on paper and placed in the appropriate card.

### **Summary/Conclusion**

Gosper County presently uses the TerraScan CAMA system. This corporation has been recently purchased by Manatron, a Thomson Reuters Business. At present, we have no plans to switch to any other system. However, we have been notified that if a new server is needed, several reports will not be able to be printed on a newer than 2008 server. It seems evident that if a new server is needed, it would be prudent to explore changing to Manatron's system.

All of our personal property schedules and real estate records are in both hardcopy and in the computer. We continue to enter all sales into the computer and we use the sales reports generated to compare to our own ratio reports developed on our PC and to sales reports and rosters provided by Property Tax. We also utilize the "Expanded What If" program for ag sales.

We acquired a new server from TerraScan in October, 2005 and at this time we replaced the battery backup on the server. A new PC was purchased in March, 2009 since the mother board on the old PC went down. We were advised to purchase new, rather than put that much money into an old computer.

All other functions and duties required by the Assessor's office are performed in a timely fashion.

**2012/13 Budget**

Salaries	67,647.18
Telephone	500.00
PTAS/CAMA	3,500.00
Repair	480.00
Lodging	450.00
Mileage	630.00
Dues, Registration	275.00
Reappraisal	625.00
Schooling	600.00
Office Supplies	425.00
Equipment	100.00
Comp Expense General	2,000.00
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>77,232.18</b>

---

Cheryl L. Taft, Gosper County Assessor

Date: July 31, 2012

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$77,232.18
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>
	\$625
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	Data Processing is \$3500 plus an additional \$2000 for future computer equipment.
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$600 is allocated for assessor's workshops and \$275 for dues and registration
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$480 repairs; \$450 lodging; \$630 Mileage; \$425 Supplies
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$512.94

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters, previously known as Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters, previously known as Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No

6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters

### 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>
	All of the municipalities in Gosper County are zoned.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1991

### D. Contracted Services

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

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	The Assessor hires Gene Witte to assist the Deputy with listing the data for new properties and pickup work. He does not participate with the valuation process.
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	General knowledge of appraisal practices.
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	N/A
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	No



# 2013 Certification for Gosper 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 Gosper 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



