

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 Johnson County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	72	Median	96.77
Total Sales Price	\$5,011,565	Mean	113.82
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,057,565	Wgt. Mean	93.46
Total Assessed Value	\$4,726,770	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$52,555
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$70,244	Avg. Assessed Value	\$65,650

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.65 to 102.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.70 to 97.22
95% Mean C.I	96.41 to 131.23
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	16.14
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.07
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.08

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	51	97	97.48
2011	60	97	97
2010	73	97	97
2009	75	97	97

2013 Commission Summary for Johnson County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	7	Median	93.80
Total Sales Price	\$278,850	Mean	80.76
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$278,850	Wgt. Mean	88.47
Total Assessed Value	\$246,710	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$70,979
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$39,836	Avg. Assessed Value	\$35,244

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	13.13 to 113.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	74.21 to 102.74
95% Mean C.I	48.29 to 113.23
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.91
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.20
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.09

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	9		84.72
2011	8		75
2010	13	100	93
2009	12	95	95

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Johnson 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	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Johnson County

The County conducted a sales analysis in the residential class and determined that the following adjustments were required. For the location of Sterling the economic depreciation was adjusted from 35% to 40%, and for the location of Tecumseh the economic depreciation was adjusted from 37% to 40%, with the exception of the additions of East Ridge and Shawnee Ridge. For the rural residential a current economic depreciation adjustment of 33% is in place for entire county.

The County completed all of the pickup and permit work for the residential class of property.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Johnson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy along with contracted lister	
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>
		The County maintains that the groupings are tied to amenities available in the communities and the appraisal cycle the county has. Each valuation group is analyzed separately and they tend to have their own unique markets.
	01	Tecumseh-County seat and main trade center of the County. Stable population, K-12 school (Johnson County Central)
	02	Cook-situated between Tecumseh and Syracuse, limited retail, elementary and middle school
	04	Elk Creek-Located in southern part of County just off highway 50. Limited Commercial, Bank, Bar, Elevator, Service Station. No school
	06	Sterling-K-12 School, limited retail, on highway 41
	09	Rural residential-Acreages
	15	Crab Orchard-Only Post Office few parcels.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	RCNLD	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011- Tecumseh(01) 2008-Balance of the County	
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?	
	Depreciation tables from the CAMA system are used with an economic adjustment for each valuation group.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011 for Tecumseh 01 and 2008 for the remainder of the County	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2011 for Tecumseh 01 and 2008 for the remainder of the County	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Market value based on square foot unit of measurement	

49 Johnson
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 : 72
Total Sales Price : 5,011,565
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,057,565
Total Assessed Value : 4,726,770
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,244
Avg. Assessed Value : 65,650

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 114
COD : 31.07
PRD : 121.78

COV : 66.22
STD : 75.37
Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.07
MAX Sales Ratio : 662.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 38.73

95% Median C.I. : 90.65 to 102.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.70 to 97.22
95% Mean C.I. : 96.41 to 131.23

Printed:3/21/2013 4:46:58PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	93.43	97.22	90.87	13.13	106.99	78.58	132.35	78.58 to 132.35	89,250	81,103
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	92.27	112.38	103.45	27.61	108.63	85.72	179.25	N/A	13,625	14,095
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	99.01	98.22	92.83	05.36	105.81	87.30	107.48	87.30 to 107.48	75,281	69,883
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	15	97.28	110.78	94.21	32.71	117.59	38.73	239.46	84.65 to 119.16	86,011	81,029
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	9	91.27	102.73	96.94	18.48	105.97	78.94	148.41	84.83 to 132.20	72,677	70,453
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	87.41	93.82	88.69	18.84	105.78	64.76	150.40	74.90 to 109.15	74,094	65,712
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	10	115.86	188.61	110.02	75.68	171.43	87.08	662.00	96.51 to 231.07	32,150	35,373
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	11	95.83	96.35	89.00	17.79	108.26	65.58	164.23	71.60 to 106.63	84,791	75,460
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	33	97.12	105.46	93.36	21.85	112.96	38.73	239.46	89.92 to 102.40	75,225	70,227
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	39	96.51	120.90	93.56	38.88	129.22	64.76	662.00	87.63 to 106.63	66,029	61,776
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	36	96.80	106.15	94.77	22.62	112.01	38.73	239.46	89.14 to 102.90	72,250	68,471
<u>ALL</u>	72	96.77	113.82	93.46	31.07	121.78	38.73	662.00	90.65 to 102.40	70,244	65,650

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	35	96.94	112.35	98.64	24.63	113.90	74.90	239.46	90.65 to 105.44	52,476	51,759
02	6	94.65	196.66	87.98	125.28	223.53	64.76	662.00	64.76 to 662.00	48,583	42,745
04	1	96.47	96.47	96.47	00.00	100.00	96.47	96.47	N/A	17,000	16,400
06	11	98.70	114.01	92.28	31.22	123.55	63.76	231.07	75.72 to 173.00	64,309	59,345
09	18	96.48	94.10	91.30	12.57	103.07	65.58	121.30	85.79 to 101.79	120,001	109,561
15	1	38.73	38.73	38.73	00.00	100.00	38.73	38.73	N/A	45,000	17,430
<u>ALL</u>	72	96.77	113.82	93.46	31.07	121.78	38.73	662.00	90.65 to 102.40	70,244	65,650

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	69	96.60	111.74	93.35	29.50	119.70	38.73	662.00	89.36 to 102.40	73,101	68,238
06											
07	3	150.40	161.61	135.00	32.03	119.71	94.96	239.46	N/A	4,533	6,120
<u>ALL</u>	72	96.77	113.82	93.46	31.07	121.78	38.73	662.00	90.65 to 102.40	70,244	65,650

49 Johnson
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 : 72
Total Sales Price : 5,011,565
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,057,565
Total Assessed Value : 4,726,770
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,244
Avg. Assessed Value : 65,650

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 114
COD : 31.07
PRD : 121.78

COV : 66.22
STD : 75.37
Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.07
MAX Sales Ratio : 662.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 38.73

95% Median C.I. : 90.65 to 102.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.70 to 97.22
95% Mean C.I. : 96.41 to 131.23

Printed:3/21/2013 4:46:58PM

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	239.46	358.15	262.34	68.07	136.52	173.00	662.00	N/A	2,283	5,990	
Less Than 15,000	14	161.70	187.07	141.44	52.92	132.26	78.94	662.00	87.08 to 231.07	7,764	10,981	
Less Than 30,000	21	114.78	163.13	120.95	59.42	134.87	78.94	662.00	94.96 to 179.25	14,210	17,186	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	69	96.51	103.20	93.23	20.72	110.69	38.73	231.07	89.36 to 101.79	73,199	68,243	
Greater Than 14,999	58	96.17	96.14	92.41	14.67	104.04	38.73	164.23	89.14 to 99.19	85,325	78,845	
Greater Than 29,999	51	95.83	93.52	91.74	13.38	101.94	38.73	132.35	87.63 to 98.70	93,317	85,605	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	239.46	358.15	262.34	68.07	136.52	173.00	662.00	N/A	2,283	5,990	
5,000 TO 14,999	11	111.00	140.42	133.30	43.85	105.34	78.94	231.07	85.72 to 225.30	9,259	12,343	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	105.69	115.26	109.20	20.78	105.55	88.07	164.23	88.07 to 164.23	27,100	29,594	
30,000 TO 59,999	20	96.77	94.37	93.52	17.61	100.91	38.73	132.35	84.83 to 104.93	44,520	41,637	
60,000 TO 99,999	12	99.12	97.74	97.41	11.02	100.34	64.76	121.30	87.41 to 107.48	78,451	76,416	
100,000 TO 149,999	11	87.63	90.67	90.12	10.24	100.61	71.60	106.63	77.07 to 105.44	122,623	110,505	
150,000 TO 249,999	7	87.80	89.21	89.13	09.01	100.09	75.72	102.90	75.72 to 102.90	175,500	156,431	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	87.30	87.30	87.30	00.00	100.00	87.30	87.30	N/A	350,000	305,560	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	72	96.77	113.82	93.46	31.07	121.78	38.73	662.00	90.65 to 102.40	70,244	65,650	

2013 Correlation Section for Johnson County

A. Residential Real Property

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Tecumseh which is centered in the County. Johnson is bordered to the south by Pawnee County with Gage County to the west. Otoe County is directly north with Nemaha to the east. Johnson County has seen a population increase since 2000 of over 700 people. The County has seen both a population and economic impact from the state correctional facility being located just north of Tecumseh.

The sales file consists of 72 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with the mean being above the range. The quality statistic measurements of the PRD and the COD are both above the recommended range. If one looks at the grouping of 58 sales with a sale price of greater than 14,999 the COD is in the recommended range and the PRD is just above the range. This does not reflect on the valuation efforts of the County but on the effect of the low dollar sales on the statistics. The valuation groups with adequate representation all have medians within the acceptable range. The valuation groups utilized in the county represent the assessor locations in the county. These groupings are influenced as much by the appraisal and inspection cycle the county uses than overall distinct markets.

Johnson County has a consistent procedure for sales verification. In reviewing the non-qualified sales the county has noted in the file the reason for all sale disqualifications. The County utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file. The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties each year to systematically review assessment practices. This review was completed in 2012 for Johnson County. It was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and are being applied consistently.

The County has followed the three year plan of assessment by reviewing by reviewing statistics and making percentage adjustments to various sub-classes within the residential class of properties. Adjustments were made to the economic depreciation for properties in Sterling and Tecumseh.

Johnson County has a consistent approach to valuing and reviewing the property in the county. The assessor and deputy are very aggressive in reviewing the county and spend a portion of their time out of the office physically inspecting properties. The County has a web site for parcel searches with GIS capabilities.

Based on the consideration of all available information the level of value is determined to be 97% 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson County

The county conducted a complete review for the entire class of commercial property. This physical review consisted of an onsite inspection for all commercial parcels. Any noted changes were updated on the property record cards and new photos were taken of the improvements. The county updated the condition of the improvements, and measurements were reviewed and verified if needed. The county conducted a sales analysis and values were adjusted in the entire commercial class.

The County also completed all pickup and permit work for the current year.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Johnson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Office Staff, Lister	
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	The entire County is considered as one valuation group. For Johnson County there is not a lot of commercial activity in the County and what does occur is not an organized or consistent market.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	RCNLD	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	The County relies on comparable properties in similar markets with local adjustments.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2012 for the entire class	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The County uses the tables from CAMA along with economic depreciation based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	There is only one grouping in the County	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2012	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2007	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market value based on square foot unit of measurement	

49 Johnson
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 : 7
Total Sales Price : 278,850
Total Adj. Sales Price : 278,850
Total Assessed Value : 246,710
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 39,836
Avg. Assessed Value : 35,244

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 88
MEAN : 81
COD : 23.21
PRD : 91.29

COV : 43.47
STD : 35.11
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.77
MAX Sales Ratio : 113.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 13.13

95% Median C.I. : 13.13 to 113.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.21 to 102.74
95% Mean C.I. : 48.29 to 113.23

Printed:3/21/2013 4:46:59PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	100.06	100.06	100.06	00.00	100.00	100.06	100.06	N/A	35,000	35,020
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	53.23	53.23	53.23	00.00	100.00	53.23	53.23	N/A	35,000	18,630
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	93.80	93.80	93.80	00.00	100.00	93.80	93.80	N/A	59,500	55,810
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	98.90	98.90	98.90	00.00	100.00	98.90	98.90	N/A	10,000	9,890
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	63.07	63.07	36.09	79.18	174.76	13.13	113.00	N/A	2,175	785
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	93.18	93.18	93.18	00.00	100.00	93.18	93.18	N/A	135,000	125,790
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	1	100.06	100.06	100.06	00.00	100.00	100.06	100.06	N/A	35,000	35,020
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	3	93.80	81.98	80.70	16.23	101.59	53.23	98.90	N/A	34,833	28,110
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	3	93.18	73.10	91.40	35.73	79.98	13.13	113.00	N/A	46,450	42,453
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	76.65	76.65	76.64	30.55	100.01	53.23	100.06	N/A	35,000	26,825
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	96.35	79.71	91.09	27.23	87.51	13.13	113.00	N/A	18,463	16,818
<u>ALL</u>	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244
<u>ALL</u>	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244
04											
<u>ALL</u>	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244

49 Johnson
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 : 7
Total Sales Price : 278,850
Total Adj. Sales Price : 278,850
Total Assessed Value : 246,710
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 39,836
Avg. Assessed Value : 35,244

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 88
MEAN : 81
COD : 23.21
PRD : 91.29

COV : 43.47
STD : 35.11
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.77
MAX Sales Ratio : 113.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 13.13

95% Median C.I. : 13.13 to 113.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.21 to 102.74
95% Mean C.I. : 48.29 to 113.23

Printed:3/21/2013 4:46:59PM

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	2	63.07	63.07	36.09	79.18	174.76	13.13	113.00	N/A	2,175	785	
Less Than 15,000	3	98.90	75.01	79.86	33.66	93.93	13.13	113.00	N/A	4,783	3,820	
Less Than 30,000	3	98.90	75.01	79.86	33.66	93.93	13.13	113.00	N/A	4,783	3,820	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	5	93.80	87.83	89.30	11.20	98.35	53.23	100.06	N/A	54,900	49,028	
Greater Than 14,999	4	93.49	85.07	88.94	12.69	95.65	53.23	100.06	N/A	66,125	58,813	
Greater Than 29,999	4	93.49	85.07	88.94	12.69	95.65	53.23	100.06	N/A	66,125	58,813	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	63.07	63.07	36.09	79.18	174.76	13.13	113.00	N/A	2,175	785	
5,000 TO 14,999	1	98.90	98.90	98.90	00.00	100.00	98.90	98.90	N/A	10,000	9,890	
15,000 TO 29,999												
30,000 TO 59,999	3	93.80	82.36	84.53	16.64	97.43	53.23	100.06	N/A	43,167	36,487	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	1	93.18	93.18	93.18	00.00	100.00	93.18	93.18	N/A	135,000	125,790	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	98.90	98.90	98.90	00.00	100.00	98.90	98.90	N/A	10,000	9,890	
353	2	106.53	106.53	100.42	06.07	106.08	100.06	113.00	N/A	18,000	18,075	
390	1	93.80	93.80	93.80	00.00	100.00	93.80	93.80	N/A	59,500	55,810	
479	1	13.13	13.13	13.13	00.00	100.00	13.13	13.13	N/A	3,350	440	
528	2	73.21	73.21	84.95	27.29	86.18	53.23	93.18	N/A	85,000	72,210	
<u>ALL</u>	7	93.80	80.76	88.47	23.21	91.29	13.13	113.00	13.13 to 113.00	39,836	35,244	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Johnson County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Tecumseh which is centered in the County. Johnson is bordered to the south by Pawnee County with Gage County to the west. Otoe County is directly north with Nemaha to the east. The County has seen both a population and economic impact from the state correctional facility being located just north of Tecumseh.

The R&O statistics reveal a sample of 7 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated median indicates an acceptable level of value, the other measures of central tendency provide no support for the level. There are not a sufficient number of sales to provide any confidence in the statistics. The qualitative statistics also demonstrate the unreliability of the sample.

Johnson County has consistent sales review and verification process for the commercial class of property. The counties contract appraiser verifies all commercial sales along with a physical review of the property. The County reviewed all commercial properties for the 2013 assessment year. The counties assessment actions for this year detail this commercial review.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties each year to systematically review assessment practices. This review was completed in 2012 for Johnson County. It was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and are being applied consistently.

Based on consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner as is possible.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson County

Johnson continually verifies sales along with updating land use in the agricultural class of property. After a market analysis of the sales and a review of the statistics the county adjusted values within the LCG structure along with adjustments for various soil types in the county. The county utilizes physical inspections along with the GIS system to track changes for land use within the agricultural class. The county has been emphasizing the review of the CRP parcels within the county for the past several years.

The office completed the pickup and permit work for the year.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Johnson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy	
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 entire county is considered as one market area
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Sales verification and analysis to determine characteristics that drive the market	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Present use of the parcel is given the greatest consideration. Recreational land is land that is generally not used for residential, commercial or agricultural uses. WRP is one type of land that is considered as recreational land.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales review and verification	
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 county is only aware of one parcel of WRP in the county. With the lack of comparable parcels the county uses the associated grass value and factor that to 100% of market.	

49 Johnson
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 : 42
Total Sales Price : 11,526,407
Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,634,407
Total Assessed Value : 8,031,770
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 277,010
Avg. Assessed Value : 191,233

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 74
COD : 22.37
PRD : 107.66

COV : 28.97
STD : 21.53
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.07
MAX Sales Ratio : 124.28
MIN Sales Ratio : 37.76

95% Median C.I. : 67.86 to 76.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.66 to 75.41
95% Mean C.I. : 67.81 to 80.83

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:00PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	111.72	100.28	98.04	15.87	102.28	58.70	118.99	N/A	218,709	214,430
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	71.45	79.81	76.77	14.79	103.96	68.13	99.84	N/A	286,937	220,290
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	68.22	74.28	74.89	18.47	99.19	58.40	96.21	N/A	245,117	183,557
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	87.44	97.83	90.43	16.21	108.18	81.76	124.28	N/A	120,133	108,640
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	73.58	74.73	75.00	06.20	99.64	69.98	81.77	N/A	234,555	175,915
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	78.53	83.11	65.38	22.96	127.12	47.34	123.30	N/A	247,816	162,034
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	72.95	69.92	71.17	07.64	98.24	56.94	76.85	N/A	341,482	243,028
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	59.57	59.57	60.43	13.92	98.58	51.28	67.86	N/A	206,500	124,795
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	67.40	66.42	64.55	19.72	102.90	47.70	83.16	N/A	516,500	333,408
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	5	71.92	67.90	68.98	12.96	98.43	46.72	81.40	N/A	212,948	146,896
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	52.70	49.21	48.54	09.56	101.38	37.76	54.96	N/A	343,208	166,590
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	13	87.44	88.99	84.59	22.53	105.20	58.40	124.28	68.13 to 117.02	217,800	184,245
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	15	74.13	74.22	69.14	15.12	107.35	47.34	123.30	67.86 to 78.53	263,749	182,369
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	14	56.76	60.80	59.86	21.42	101.57	37.76	83.16	46.72 to 76.25	346,199	207,219
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	13	76.81	81.13	77.42	16.50	104.79	58.40	124.28	68.22 to 96.21	222,676	172,394
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	15	74.13	72.00	66.20	18.25	108.76	47.34	123.30	56.94 to 78.53	338,934	224,367
<u>ALL</u>	42	71.85	74.32	69.03	22.37	107.66	37.76	124.28	67.86 to 76.85	277,010	191,233

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	42	71.85	74.32	69.03	22.37	107.66	37.76	124.28	67.86 to 76.85	277,010	191,233
<u>ALL</u>	42	71.85	74.32	69.03	22.37	107.66	37.76	124.28	67.86 to 76.85	277,010	191,233

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Dry</u>											
County	7	76.81	81.17	77.30	21.79	105.01	56.94	117.02	56.94 to 117.02	285,384	220,591
1	7	76.81	81.17	77.30	21.79	105.01	56.94	117.02	56.94 to 117.02	285,384	220,591
<u>Grass</u>											
County	9	75.70	78.76	80.83	14.97	97.44	51.28	106.41	68.22 to 96.21	208,929	168,877
1	9	75.70	78.76	80.83	14.97	97.44	51.28	106.41	68.22 to 96.21	208,929	168,877
<u>ALL</u>	42	71.85	74.32	69.03	22.37	107.66	37.76	124.28	67.86 to 76.85	277,010	191,233

49 Johnson
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 : 42
 Total Sales Price : 11,526,407
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,634,407
 Total Assessed Value : 8,031,770
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 277,010
 Avg. Assessed Value : 191,233

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 22.37
 PRD : 107.66

COV : 28.97
 STD : 21.53
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.07
 MAX Sales Ratio : 124.28
 MIN Sales Ratio : 37.76

95% Median C.I. : 67.86 to 76.85
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.66 to 75.41
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.81 to 80.83

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:00PM

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
_____Dry_____											
County	15	71.77	74.07	66.45	25.47	111.47	47.34	123.30	56.94 to 87.44	363,411	241,471
1	15	71.77	74.07	66.45	25.47	111.47	47.34	123.30	56.94 to 87.44	363,411	241,471
_____Grass_____											
County	15	74.13	74.33	75.99	15.47	97.82	51.28	106.41	67.86 to 81.77	204,824	155,637
1	15	74.13	74.33	75.99	15.47	97.82	51.28	106.41	67.86 to 81.77	204,824	155,637
_____ALL_____	42	71.85	74.32	69.03	22.37	107.66	37.76	124.28	67.86 to 76.85	277,010	191,233

Johnson County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Johnson	1	3,958	3,558	3,650	3,121	2,950	N/A	2,021	1,700	3,168
Pawnee	1	3,010	3,360	N/A	2,880	2,630	N/A	1,975	1,975	2,875
Gage	1	3,702	3,730	3,336	3,344	2,996	3,006	2,767	2,748	3,387
Otoe	7000	3,900	3,900	3,690	3,280	2,560	N/A	2,360	2,050	3,103
Nemaha	8300	4,750	4,750	3,750	3,000	2,625	3,735	2,000	2,000	3,406

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Johnson	1	2,981	2,693	2,650	2,255	2,300	2,308	1,600	1,300	2,224
Pawnee	1	2,510	2,800	2,567	2,400	2,190	1,900	1,645	1,645	2,219
Gage	1	2,800	2,800	2,500	2,500	2,100	2,100	1,665	1,665	2,303
Otoe	7000	3,120	3,120	2,950	2,620	2,050	N/A	1,890	1,640	2,305
Nemaha	8300	3,789	3,800	2,994	2,400	2,100	2,909	1,600	1,600	2,610

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Johnson	1	1,436	1,761	1,380	1,337	1,388	1,300	1,168	883	1,233
Pawnee	1	1,430	1,587	1,077	1,383	1,272	1,134	1,196	1,031	1,254
Gage	1	984	1,377	1,196	1,402	1,125	983	992	712	1,036
Otoe	7000	1,294	1,154	1,093	1,267	1,160	N/A	1,045	723	1,100
Nemaha	8300	1,719	2,021	1,906	1,160	1,200	1,157	982	830	1,161

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

2013 Correlation Section for Johnson County

A. Agricultural Land

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The County is bordered by Pawnee to the south Gage to the west Nemaha to the east and Otoe to the north. Johnson County is comprised of approximately 9% irrigated land, 44% dry crop land and 46% grass/pasture land. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. For 2013 the county continues to utilize one market area for the entire county. The county uses a schedule of values based generally on the LCG structure with some variations by soil type.

The sales review and verification process relies on the knowledge of the local market as well as contact with real estate professionals. If there are questions about the transaction they will contact the buyer or seller to clarify terms of the sales. They will also conduct physical inspections to verify the land use of the parcel. There has been a portion of the sales where CRP land is being returned to the production of row crops.

The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years. 42 qualified agricultural sales were used in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. The calculated median of the sample is rounded to 72. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range.

All subclasses within the county are at the same relative proportion of market value as demonstrated by the statistics for the 80% MLU calculation in the statistical profile.

The schedule of values for Johnson County is similar when compared to the market area 1 of Gage County in irrigated and dry land uses. The grass land measures well against the Pawnee county grass. The dry land in Nemaha tends to trend higher due to greater capability of the soils.

Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to 72% 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson County**

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

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 4,355	Value : 576,630,575	Growth 2,430,740	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	171	846,510	25	162,830	26	418,350	222	1,427,690	
02. Res Improve Land	1,176	6,115,160	63	1,355,650	275	6,569,550	1,514	14,040,360	
03. Res Improvements	1,198	50,695,880	63	4,861,680	287	21,952,450	1,548	77,510,010	
04. Res Total	1,369	57,657,550	88	6,380,160	313	28,940,350	1,770	92,978,060	629,080
% of Res Total	77.34	62.01	4.97	6.86	17.68	31.13	40.64	16.12	25.88
05. Com UnImp Land	50	555,265	2	19,320	3	96,630	55	671,215	
06. Com Improve Land	237	1,576,060	5	132,760	10	748,780	252	2,457,600	
07. Com Improvements	241	11,837,740	6	234,550	13	4,925,470	260	16,997,760	
08. Com Total	291	13,969,065	8	386,630	16	5,770,880	315	20,126,575	63,520
% of Com Total	92.38	69.41	2.54	1.92	5.08	28.67	7.23	3.49	2.61
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	85,940	0	0	0	0	3	85,940	
11. Ind Improvements	3	2,358,650	0	0	0	0	3	2,358,650	
12. Ind Total	3	2,444,590	0	0	0	0	3	2,444,590	0
% of Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.42	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	95,200	1	95,200	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	1,340	1	1,340	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	96,540	1	96,540	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.02	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,369	57,657,550	88	6,380,160	314	29,036,890	1,771	93,074,600	629,080
% of Res & Rec Total	77.30	61.95	4.97	6.85	17.73	31.20	40.67	16.14	25.88
Com & Ind Total	294	16,413,655	8	386,630	16	5,770,880	318	22,571,165	63,520
% of Com & Ind Total	92.45	72.72	2.52	1.71	5.03	25.57	7.30	3.91	2.61
17. Taxable Total	1,663	74,071,205	96	6,766,790	330	34,807,770	2,089	115,645,765	692,600
% of Taxable Total	79.61	64.05	4.60	5.85	15.80	30.10	47.97	20.06	28.49

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	3	556,885	1,872,785	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	3	556,885	1,872,785
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	556,885	1,872,785

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	178	63	250	491

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	35	152,600	154	20,012,750	1,279	228,894,280	1,468	249,059,630
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	4,600	56	10,574,410	716	158,000,040	773	168,579,050
29. Ag Improvements	1	1,760	56	2,032,670	741	41,311,700	798	43,346,130
30. Ag Total							2,266	460,984,810

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	22	23.00	276,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	23	23.00	1,523,130	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	1.16	2,790	35	45.18	180,010	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.00	2,400	54	159.42	435,770	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	1,760	54	0.00	509,540	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.86	0	0	270.31	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	1.00	10,700	1	1.00	10,700	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	428	437.61	4,850,340	450	460.61	5,126,440	
33. HomeSite Improvements	437	426.61	30,461,580	460	449.61	31,984,710	1,738,140
34. HomeSite Total				461	461.61	37,121,850	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	231	277.18	1,170,780	268	323.52	1,353,580	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	667	1,989.01	5,305,480	722	2,149.43	5,743,650	
37. FarmSite Improvements	713	0.00	10,850,120	768	0.00	11,361,420	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,036	2,472.95	18,458,650	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,391.51	0	0	4,662.68	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,497	7,597.24	55,580,500	1,738,140

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	20	2,027.46	2,740,740	20	2,027.46	2,740,740

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	1,772.27	14.87%	7,015,480	18.59%	3,958.47
46. 1A	2,127.74	17.86%	7,570,800	20.06%	3,558.14
47. 2A1	517.97	4.35%	1,890,640	5.01%	3,650.10
48. 2A	3,410.65	28.62%	10,646,280	28.20%	3,121.48
49. 3A1	2,566.73	21.54%	7,571,850	20.06%	2,950.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	1,447.98	12.15%	2,926,670	7.75%	2,021.21
52. 4A	73.20	0.61%	124,460	0.33%	1,700.27
53. Total	11,916.54	100.00%	37,746,180	100.00%	3,167.55
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,814.91	5.37%	5,409,800	7.20%	2,980.75
55. 1D	4,056.54	12.01%	10,925,960	14.55%	2,693.42
56. 2D1	2,220.89	6.58%	5,885,490	7.84%	2,650.06
57. 2D	6,849.39	20.28%	15,447,090	20.57%	2,255.25
58. 3D1	10,611.78	31.42%	24,407,400	32.50%	2,300.03
59. 3D	0.26	0.00%	600	0.00%	2,307.69
60. 4D1	7,839.27	23.21%	12,542,700	16.70%	1,599.98
61. 4D	376.32	1.11%	489,300	0.65%	1,300.22
62. Total	33,769.36	100.00%	75,108,340	100.00%	2,224.16
Grass					
63. 1G1	789.47	2.66%	1,133,530	3.10%	1,435.81
64. 1G	1,325.80	4.47%	2,334,080	6.38%	1,760.51
65. 2G1	1,841.85	6.21%	2,541,970	6.94%	1,380.12
66. 2G	3,977.80	13.40%	5,319,720	14.53%	1,337.35
67. 3G1	4,226.49	14.24%	5,866,660	16.03%	1,388.07
68. 3G	4.50	0.02%	5,850	0.02%	1,300.00
69. 4G1	13,813.28	46.54%	16,130,100	44.07%	1,167.72
70. 4G	3,701.87	12.47%	3,269,550	8.93%	883.22
71. Total	29,681.06	100.00%	36,601,460	100.00%	1,233.16
Irrigated Total	11,916.54	15.72%	37,746,180	25.25%	3,167.55
Dry Total	33,769.36	44.55%	75,108,340	50.24%	2,224.16
Grass Total	29,681.06	39.16%	36,601,460	24.48%	1,233.16
72. Waste	428.89	0.57%	42,920	0.03%	100.07
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	40.01	0.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	75,795.85	100.00%	149,498,900	100.00%	1,972.39

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	963.04	15.31%	3,772,900	19.76%	3,917.70
46. 1A	521.22	8.29%	1,934,090	10.13%	3,710.70
47. 2A1	302.22	4.80%	1,103,120	5.78%	3,650.06
48. 2A	2,105.94	33.48%	6,412,260	33.59%	3,044.84
49. 3A1	1,128.59	17.94%	3,329,360	17.44%	2,950.02
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	1,224.22	19.46%	2,460,630	12.89%	2,009.96
52. 4A	45.36	0.72%	77,100	0.40%	1,699.74
53. Total	6,290.59	100.00%	19,089,460	100.00%	3,034.61
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,556.40	4.21%	4,509,400	5.51%	2,897.33
55. 1D	3,732.40	10.10%	9,987,680	12.20%	2,675.94
56. 2D1	2,858.11	7.74%	7,574,100	9.25%	2,650.04
57. 2D	9,371.42	25.36%	21,063,000	25.72%	2,247.58
58. 3D1	11,107.24	30.06%	25,546,900	31.20%	2,300.02
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	7,945.98	21.50%	12,713,590	15.53%	1,600.00
61. 4D	378.58	1.02%	492,270	0.60%	1,300.31
62. Total	36,950.13	100.00%	81,886,940	100.00%	2,216.15
Grass					
63. 1G1	273.06	0.91%	395,430	1.07%	1,448.14
64. 1G	1,027.74	3.43%	1,813,060	4.92%	1,764.12
65. 2G1	2,020.24	6.74%	2,768,990	7.51%	1,370.62
66. 2G	4,812.23	16.06%	6,481,150	17.57%	1,346.81
67. 3G1	3,883.66	12.96%	5,445,140	14.76%	1,402.06
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	14,047.79	46.90%	16,540,640	44.85%	1,177.45
70. 4G	3,890.73	12.99%	3,436,360	9.32%	883.22
71. Total	29,955.45	100.00%	36,880,770	100.00%	1,231.19
Irrigated Total					
	6,290.59	8.55%	19,089,460	13.84%	3,034.61
Dry Total					
	36,950.13	50.25%	81,886,940	59.39%	2,216.15
Grass Total					
	29,955.45	40.74%	36,880,770	26.75%	1,231.19
72. Waste	339.28	0.46%	33,920	0.02%	99.98
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	745.14	1.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	73,535.45	100.00%	137,891,090	100.00%	1,875.16

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	138.03	7.65%	523,950	10.25%	3,795.91
46. 1A	116.17	6.43%	444,500	8.70%	3,826.29
47. 2A1	117.36	6.50%	428,340	8.38%	3,649.80
48. 2A	572.50	31.71%	1,789,500	35.01%	3,125.76
49. 3A1	211.13	11.69%	622,830	12.18%	2,949.98
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	646.46	35.81%	1,296,130	25.36%	2,004.97
52. 4A	3.82	0.21%	6,510	0.13%	1,704.19
53. Total	1,805.47	100.00%	5,111,760	100.00%	2,831.26
Dry					
54. 1D1	834.55	2.84%	2,394,530	4.00%	2,869.25
55. 1D	1,577.20	5.36%	4,423,690	7.39%	2,804.77
56. 2D1	1,847.74	6.28%	4,896,290	8.18%	2,649.88
57. 2D	4,549.31	15.47%	9,774,520	16.33%	2,148.57
58. 3D1	7,880.90	26.79%	18,126,230	30.28%	2,300.02
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	12,337.71	41.94%	19,740,300	32.98%	1,600.00
61. 4D	388.23	1.32%	504,840	0.84%	1,300.36
62. Total	29,415.64	100.00%	59,860,400	100.00%	2,034.99
Grass					
63. 1G1	276.64	0.64%	398,280	0.75%	1,439.71
64. 1G	1,186.27	2.73%	2,131,080	4.02%	1,796.45
65. 2G1	2,547.52	5.87%	3,822,560	7.21%	1,500.50
66. 2G	5,303.35	12.22%	7,106,970	13.40%	1,340.09
67. 3G1	3,875.68	8.93%	5,463,830	10.30%	1,409.77
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	24,124.16	55.58%	28,685,910	54.10%	1,189.09
70. 4G	6,093.15	14.04%	5,418,400	10.22%	889.26
71. Total	43,406.77	100.00%	53,027,030	100.00%	1,221.63
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	1,805.47	2.41%	5,111,760	4.33%	2,831.26
Dry Total					
Dry Total	29,415.64	39.34%	59,860,400	50.72%	2,034.99
Grass Total					
Grass Total	43,406.77	58.05%	53,027,030	44.93%	1,221.63
72. Waste	150.92	0.20%	15,130	0.01%	100.25
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	78.15	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	74,778.80	100.00%	118,014,320	100.00%	1,578.18

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	1.08	4,090	2,081.15	6,822,890	17,930.37	55,120,420	20,012.60	61,947,400
77. Dry Land	43.47	116,300	6,580.89	15,235,250	93,510.77	201,504,130	100,135.13	216,855,680
78. Grass	26.57	31,620	6,451.89	7,618,400	96,564.82	118,859,240	103,043.28	126,509,260
79. Waste	0.54	0	187.20	18,740	731.35	73,230	919.09	91,970
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	87.44	0	775.86	0	863.30	0
82. Total	71.66	152,010	15,301.13	29,695,280	208,737.31	375,557,020	224,110.10	405,404,310

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	20,012.60	8.93%	61,947,400	15.28%	3,095.42
Dry Land	100,135.13	44.68%	216,855,680	53.49%	2,165.63
Grass	103,043.28	45.98%	126,509,260	31.21%	1,227.73
Waste	919.09	0.41%	91,970	0.02%	100.07
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	863.30	0.39%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	224,110.10	100.00%	405,404,310	100.00%	1,808.95

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

49 Johnson

	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	96,147,860	92,978,060	-3,169,800	-3.30%	629,080	-3.95%
02. Recreational	96,340	96,540	200	0.21%	0	0.21%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	38,395,990	37,121,850	-1,274,140	-3.32%	1,738,140	-7.85%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	134,640,190	130,196,450	-4,443,740	-3.30%	2,367,220	-5.06%
05. Commercial	20,942,085	20,126,575	-815,510	-3.89%	63,520	-4.20%
06. Industrial	2,361,770	2,444,590	82,820	3.51%	0	3.51%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	15,244,410	18,458,650	3,214,240	21.08%	0	21.08%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	38,548,265	41,029,815	2,481,550	6.44%	63,520	6.27%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	173,188,455	171,226,265	-1,962,190	-1.13%	2,430,740	-2.54%
11. Irrigated	50,017,870	61,947,400	11,929,530	23.85%		
12. Dryland	175,230,080	216,855,680	41,625,600	23.75%		
13. Grassland	109,484,460	126,509,260	17,024,800	15.55%		
14. Wasteland	1,433,930	91,970	-1,341,960	-93.59%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	336,166,340	405,404,310	69,237,970	20.60%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	509,354,795	576,630,575	67,275,780	13.21%	2,430,740	12.73%

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR JOHNSON COUNTY

To: Johnson County Board of Equalization
Nebr. Dept of Revenue--Property Assessment Division

As required by Sec. 77-1311.02, R.R.S. Nebr. as amended by 2007 Neb. Laws LB334, Section 64, the assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment on or before June 15 of each year, which shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter and submit such plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year, and may amend the plan, if necessary, after a budget is approved by the County Board, and submit a copy of the plan and any amendments to the Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year. 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.

The following is a plan of assessment for:

Tax Year 2013:

Residential—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Re-appraisal of all commercial property in Johnson County, including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, with new photos of the property, develop new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2013.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, adjusting by class/subclass to arrive at acceptable levels of value.

2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

BUDGET REQUEST FOR 2012-2013:

Requested budget of \$15,000 is needed to:

1. Complete pickup work for new improvements or improvement changes made throughout county in all classes;
2. In October 2013 drive-by reviews will begin for Commercial—It will include new pictures, new June 2012 cost, and re-calculation of physical and economic depreciation. New values will be applied for the 2013 tax roll.
3. Analyze and possible adjustment to class/subclass of residential (includes mobile homes)
4. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of agland.

Tax Year 2014:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all residential property in the towns of Sterling and Cook, include all related improvements associated improvement, with new photos of the property, develop new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2014.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

Tax Year 2015:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all rural residential property in Township 6, including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, with new photos of the property, develop new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2015.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

Date: June 15, 2012

Karen A. Koehler
Johnson County Assessor

UPDATE FOLLOWING September 2012 ADOPTION OF 2012-2013 BUDGET

No changes.

Date: October 11, 2012

Karen A. Koehler
Johnson County Assessor

2013 Assessment Survey for Johnson County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	1
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	101,565
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	15,000 is budgeted for a lister.
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	15,854 Includes Terra Scan, Web-site, Hardware, Software, and GIS Website
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	1,350
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	None

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan`
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes. http://johnson.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and staff.
8.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	January of 2006

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	No contracted services for appraisal
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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

2013 Certification for Johnson 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 Johnson 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

