

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 Seward County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	306	Median	95.98
Total Sales Price	\$42,538,372	Mean	96.29
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$42,681,108	Wgt. Mean	94.64
Total Assessed Value	\$40,392,606	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$114,703
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$139,481	Avg. Assessed Value	\$132,002

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.83 to 96.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.58 to 95.70
95% Mean C.I	94.75 to 97.83
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	34.30
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.98
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.73

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	290	95	95.43
2011	299	94	94
2010	315	94	94
2009	515	95	95

2013 Commission Summary for Seward County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	Median	93.40
Total Sales Price	\$4,182,300	Mean	92.96
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,079,800	Wgt. Mean	87.20
Total Assessed Value	\$3,557,590	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$202,839
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$254,988	Avg. Assessed Value	\$222,349

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.93 to 100.62
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	74.76 to 99.64
95% Mean C.I	85.93 to 99.99
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.81
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.32
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.54

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	11		98.11
2011	21		95
2010	26	95	95
2009	42	95	95

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Seward 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	96	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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Seward County

For 2013, Seward County has implemented their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all pickup work of new improvements on residential parcels, and updated any parcels that had partial values in 2012 to reflect their level of completion on January 1, 2013.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

The county reappraised the residences and buildings and updated all land values on all parcels classified as residential in the towns of Bee, Garland, Garland Fringe, Pleasant Dale, Grover, and Milford and started the inspection and review of Seward. The reappraisal process included an on-site inspection to verify or update the measurements, the description of property characteristics, and the observations of quality and condition. If needed the county also took new photos of the improvements, prepared new replacement costs, new depreciation, and new estimates of value. The costs used were all 2012.

The county reviewed and updated lot values in some of the developing subdivisions that are valued using a lot discounting process. The lots in several subdivisions in Seward and in the rural areas were reviewed. This resulted in a few minor adjustments.

In 2013 for the 6 year process of inspection and review, includes the residences and buildings in part of the town of Seward. The inspection and review included an on-site inspection to verify or update the measurements, the description of property characteristics, and the observations of quality and condition. The county takes new photos of the improvements and adds any omitted and unreported changes. The county reviewed new aerial photos and compared them to old photos in precincts D (geocode 3233) & E (geocode 3291) as part of the inspection and review process. They were comparing photos to find changes in existing properties and omitted or unreported new construction on rural residential parcels. When differences were discovered, the property was visited on-site to complete the inspection process.

Any part of Seward that is inspected and reviewed will be held until the remainder of Seward is inspected and reviewed in 2013 so Seward is all implemented for 2014. That will complete the 6 year inspection and review process of all improvements on agricultural, rural residential and urban residential parcels.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Seward County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Office Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	<u>Seward</u> : -Seward is the county seat; has a full K-12 school system; very active commercial trade area with most services; very active real estate market; some influence as a bedroom community for Lincoln.
	02	<u>Beaver Crossing</u> : -Beaver Crossing is in the southwest part of the county. It has paved access as an exit off I-80. This town has very diverse residential properties. Some really nice quality homes and some low quality homes, many older homes and some newer ones. This town has a nice library, hardware store, a new lumberyard, a bank, a post office, a swimming pool, a gas station/auto repair service, a Coop elevator and a funeral home.
	03	<u>Bee</u> : -Bee is 8 miles northeast of Seward. A small town with a tavern, a post office and Coop elevator.
	04	<u>Cordova</u> : -Cordova is located in the far southwest corner of the county. There are three school districts in this town, Centennial, Exeter-Milligan and Friend. Cordova also has a post office, a Coop elevator and bank branch office.
	05	<u>Garland</u> : -Garland is in the eastern part of Seward County, 4 miles north of Highway 34 and 4 miles west of the Lancaster County line. There is some Lincoln influence due to the proximity of the town. The town has 2 taverns, a post office and Coop elevator.
	06	<u>Goehner</u> : -Goehner is located in the western half of the county only a half mile off I-80. The town has a post office and a new restaurant in an existing building that has been totally remodeled. There is no Coop elevator in Goehner.
	07	<u>Grover</u> : -Grover is an unincorporated town just outside of Milford across the Big Blue River. It does have 3 various businesses. About half of Grover is in a flood plain.
	08	<u>Milford</u> : -Milford is the second largest town in Seward County. It is home to Southeast Technical College which influences rental property. The county has identified various neighborhoods. Milford has a K-12 school, a downtown business district, a golf course and a swimming pool. Milford has 32 upscale residential properties ranging in value from \$200,000 to \$430,000.

09	<p><u>Pleasant Dale</u>: -Pleasant Dale is on the eastern edge of Seward County just 1 mile in from the Lancaster County line and 2 ½ miles south of I-80 and 2 miles south of Highway 6. It also has Highway 103 on the edge town that goes south to Crete in Saline County. The town has a post office, a Coop elevator, a lumberyard, a restaurant, two apartment buildings, a gas station/mini mart/car wash and auto service garage. Due to the towns location there is influence from Lincoln. The town has some nice ranch style homes along with older better kept homes.</p>
10	<p><u>Staplehurst</u>: -Staplehurst is located approximately 6 miles northwest of Seward. The town has a Coop elevator, a post office, a tavern, a towing business, storage unit business. There is very little new construction in this town. With the town's proximity and the older homes, it is a less desirable town to live in. Termites are a problem in Staplehurst. Very little to draw people to this town.</p>
11	<p><u>Tamora</u>: -Tamora is an unincorporated town 7 miles west of Seward on Highway 34. The main purpose of Tamora is the huge Coop elevator. The rest of the town has a few older homes and some mobile homes. Nothing is kept very well in this town. The properties have to have their own wells and septic systems.</p>
12	<p><u>Utica</u>: -Utica is the 3rd largest town in Seward County. It is just 1 mile from York County along Highway 34. The town has a K-12 school, a nursing home, a Coop elevator, a senior citizen center, a gas station/service business, a library, a beauty shop, a bowling alley, a grocery store, an auto and truck used/repared part business, a bank, 2 industrial businesses, a well drilling business a nursing home, a Family Medical Center and a book bindery business. It is a unique small town that stands on its own.</p>
13	<p><u>Rural</u>: -The rural residential properties in Seward County are characterized an individual acreages spread throughout the county. The east half of the county has Lancaster County influences. The west half of the county has much less activity for acreages and they tend to sell for less as there aren't the influences from Lincoln. The west half of the county is more agricultural.</p>
14	<p><u>Rural Sub</u>: -The Rural Sub class residential properties are platted subdivisions in the rural. They have gone through county zoning. Most have interior roads of some kind and covenants filed with the plat.</p>
3.	<p>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</p>
	<p>Residential properties in Seward County are valued using the cost approach to value. They do use the market data to develop the depreciation used in the cost approach. Additionally, the county organizes their sales in such a manner that they can compare their cost approach results to the selling price of comparable properties. While this is not a fully developed market or sales comparison approach, it provides an additional perspective on the value.</p>

4	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?
	The county is moving all valuation groups current costs. Presently, Seward has 2004 pricing and will be updated next year when the inspection and review is complete for Seward. The rest of the towns have costs that are commensurate with when they were last inspected and reviewed. Bee, Garland, Grover, Pleasant Dale, Milford were completed for this year and costs were updated to 2012. The other towns and rural residential vary accordingly. As the county revalues a subclass of residential property, the base cost tables have been moved to a current cost. Even though the costs are from different base tables, each subclass has land values and unique locational factors in their depreciation that are developed to work with those costs.
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 local market
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes; The county develops their own base depreciation tables based on the analysis of their market. Then they develop locational factors for use in each individual valuation group. The county continuously monitors their sales to affirm or update the locational factor or to adjust classes or subclasses.
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	Depreciation is updated when a valuation group is recosted and revalued.
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	The lot value analysis is ongoing and is monitored through sales activity. Whenever a class or subclass is reappraised or updated, the lot values are reviewed and either affirmed and left the same or updated based on the available market analysis.
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	The market is monitored to see if there is any need to adjust or update the existing lot values. The lots are valued on a town by town basis.

**80 Seward
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 : 306
 Total Sales Price : 42,538,372
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 42,681,108
 Total Assessed Value : 40,392,606
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 139,481
 Avg. Assessed Value : 132,002

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 96
 COD : 07.94
 PRD : 101.74

COV : 14.30
 STD : 13.77
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.62
 MAX Sales Ratio : 222.05
 MIN Sales Ratio : 63.01

95% Median C.I. : 94.83 to 96.75
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.58 to 95.70
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.75 to 97.83

Printed:4/1/2013 5:01:01PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	97.98	103.65	97.79	12.61	105.99	85.43	202.15	91.64 to 103.31	144,063	140,886
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	31	97.39	95.59	96.05	05.64	99.52	72.90	109.56	94.64 to 98.73	110,601	106,228
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	53	96.97	96.40	95.46	06.24	100.98	76.71	135.36	95.38 to 99.00	131,086	125,138
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	41	96.59	99.20	95.32	10.28	104.07	80.32	222.05	92.70 to 98.18	128,311	122,309
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	41	96.21	94.05	94.10	06.15	99.95	76.48	113.91	90.80 to 98.19	149,151	140,344
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	35	94.87	94.20	92.25	06.54	102.11	63.01	109.99	91.21 to 98.37	147,567	136,126
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	33	94.78	96.49	94.08	08.55	102.56	80.46	143.13	90.33 to 98.73	152,769	143,722
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	56	93.30	95.18	94.29	09.04	100.94	72.13	145.07	90.41 to 96.86	150,317	141,733
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	141	96.93	97.86	95.83	08.04	102.12	72.90	222.05	95.76 to 97.90	127,248	121,945
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	165	94.62	94.95	93.77	07.75	101.26	63.01	145.07	92.98 to 96.38	149,934	140,596
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	166	96.43	96.36	95.14	07.15	101.28	72.90	222.05	95.64 to 97.38	131,037	124,663
<u>ALL</u>	306	95.98	96.29	94.64	07.94	101.74	63.01	222.05	94.83 to 96.75	139,481	132,002

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	169	93.47	94.74	93.81	08.97	100.99	72.13	202.15	91.16 to 94.87	138,104	129,552
02	5	111.33	133.05	110.91	28.92	119.96	94.62	222.05	N/A	65,480	72,624
03	5	98.73	97.72	98.19	01.35	99.52	92.87	99.43	N/A	83,900	82,382
04	1	91.75	91.75	91.75	00.00	100.00	91.75	91.75	N/A	68,000	62,387
05	4	97.69	97.68	97.65	00.74	100.03	96.91	98.44	N/A	46,625	45,528
06	7	96.32	97.84	97.77	03.61	100.07	92.60	109.56	92.60 to 109.56	105,500	103,148
07	2	97.48	97.48	97.32	00.91	100.16	96.59	98.36	N/A	120,700	117,465
08	42	98.80	99.48	98.87	03.14	100.62	85.43	130.27	98.08 to 99.52	132,006	130,521
09	6	99.43	98.61	98.84	01.15	99.77	95.80	99.81	95.80 to 99.81	149,250	147,524
10	3	94.75	94.30	93.64	01.10	100.70	92.51	95.64	N/A	72,983	68,340
11	2	100.18	100.18	98.36	04.64	101.85	95.53	104.83	N/A	5,750	5,656
12	18	97.36	100.83	97.31	06.01	103.62	90.80	145.07	95.38 to 99.74	103,467	100,679
13	33	93.84	92.88	92.75	06.69	100.14	78.03	113.91	87.09 to 96.21	188,658	174,974
14	9	92.00	89.55	90.40	07.66	99.06	63.01	103.33	85.89 to 99.35	289,100	261,352
<u>ALL</u>	306	95.98	96.29	94.64	07.94	101.74	63.01	222.05	94.83 to 96.75	139,481	132,002

80 Seward
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 : 306
Total Sales Price : 42,538,372
Total Adj. Sales Price : 42,681,108
Total Assessed Value : 40,392,606
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 139,481
Avg. Assessed Value : 132,002

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 96
COD : 07.94
PRD : 101.74

COV : 14.30
STD : 13.77
Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.62
MAX Sales Ratio : 222.05
MIN Sales Ratio : 63.01

95% Median C.I. : 94.83 to 96.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.58 to 95.70
95% Mean C.I. : 94.75 to 97.83

Printed:4/1/2013 5:01:01PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	302	95.89	95.70	94.58	07.40	101.18	63.01	202.15	94.78 to 96.73	141,065	133,414
06											
07	4	124.95	141.21	127.76	33.90	110.53	92.87	222.05	N/A	19,875	25,392
<u>ALL</u>	306	95.98	96.29	94.64	07.94	101.74	63.01	222.05	94.83 to 96.75	139,481	132,002

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	104.83	104.83	104.83	00.00	100.00	104.83	104.83	N/A	3,500	3,669
Less Than 15,000	3	104.83	115.14	121.71	15.75	94.60	95.53	145.07	N/A	7,667	9,331
Less Than 30,000	7	104.83	138.70	148.92	37.13	93.14	95.53	222.05	95.53 to 222.05	15,786	23,508
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	305	95.90	96.26	94.64	07.95	101.71	63.01	222.05	94.78 to 96.75	139,927	132,423
Greater Than 14,999	303	95.90	96.11	94.62	07.82	101.57	63.01	222.05	94.75 to 96.75	140,786	133,217
Greater Than 29,999	299	95.80	95.30	94.50	07.09	100.85	63.01	143.13	94.64 to 96.65	142,377	134,542
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	104.83	104.83	104.83	00.00	100.00	104.83	104.83	N/A	3,500	3,669
5,000 TO 14,999	2	120.30	120.30	124.74	20.59	96.44	95.53	145.07	N/A	9,750	12,163
15,000 TO 29,999	4	152.18	156.37	156.07	36.62	100.19	99.06	222.05	N/A	21,875	34,140
30,000 TO 59,999	25	98.84	103.92	105.22	11.26	98.76	72.90	135.41	95.64 to 109.56	51,481	54,169
60,000 TO 99,999	49	96.30	97.21	97.35	08.06	99.86	76.48	143.13	93.97 to 98.36	81,424	79,267
100,000 TO 149,999	105	95.90	94.42	94.55	06.90	99.86	76.71	129.63	93.54 to 97.90	123,202	116,488
150,000 TO 249,999	101	94.92	93.73	93.73	05.40	100.00	72.13	105.80	93.20 to 96.57	183,279	171,795
250,000 TO 499,999	19	92.70	92.26	92.49	06.95	99.75	63.01	110.67	89.61 to 97.82	307,705	284,591
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	306	95.98	96.29	94.64	07.94	101.74	63.01	222.05	94.83 to 96.75	139,481	132,002

2013 Correlation Section for Seward County

A. Residential Real Property

Seward County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Seward is the largest town and the county seat. The county has divided the residential analysis and valuation work into 14 Valuation Groups. Most of these groups are centered on individual towns and rural residential parcels. The characteristics of each Valuation Group are described in in the Residential Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of residential property. Some locations have shown some positive residential growth and some have been stable.

The county reports that the remaining residential parcels in Seward will be reviewed during 2013 for implementation in 2014. That will complete the 6 year inspection and review process of all residential improvements in the county.

During the past year, the Department reviewed the documentation of three years of the county's sale verification process posted in the comments in the sales file. The county has posted comments when required on nearly all of the sales reviewed. In most cases, the comments were complete enough to conclude why the sale was not used or adjusted for the ratio study. There was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process.

Since 2009, the Department has reviewed a sample from the Assessed Value Updates submitted each year to confirm that the assessment practices of the county were consistent, accurate and not reported to bias the measurement of the county. In 2011, the Department began an expanded analysis for each county on a three year cycle to determine if the annual assessment actions were applied uniformly to like parcels whether sold or unsold. Seward County is scheduled for the expanded review in 2013. The sale verification information and property characteristics of the sold parcels have been reported accurately in the sales file.

The Department is confident that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class partly because the sample is adequate and partly because the assessment actions are good. For 2013, the median ratio for the 306 qualified sales is 96% for the residential property. When the entire residential class is considered; the COD is within the acceptable range and the PRD is within the acceptable range. There are no notable subclasses outside the acceptable range.

The apparent level of value for the residential class is 96%, the quality of the assessment, based on the assessment actions of the assessor, is good and there are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward County

For 2013, Seward County has implemented their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all pickup work of new improvements on commercial and industrial parcels, and updated any parcels that had partial values in 2012 to reflect their level of completion on January 1, 2013.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

For 2013, the county reviewed all Section 42 Housing parcels and completed the income approach. Among the Section 42 parcels were 8 duplex parcels and 2 2-story apartment units. They also reappraised all of the apartment properties in Milford, updated the Seward downtown neighborhood which included a 15% land value increase. Additionally, the county inspected, reviewed and reappraised the remaining industrial parcels in the county.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Seward County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	<u>Seward</u> : -Seward is the county seat; has a full K-12 school system; very active commercial trade area with most services; very active real estate market; some influence as a bedroom community for Lincoln.
	02	<u>Beaver Crossing</u> : -Beaver Crossing is in the southwest part of the county. It has paved access as an exit off I-80. This town has very diverse residential properties. Some really nice quality homes and some low quality homes, many older homes and some newer ones. This town has a nice library, hardware store, a new lumberyard, a bank, a post office, a swimming pool, a gas station/auto repair service, a Coop elevator and a funeral home.
	03	<u>Bee</u> : -Bee is 8 miles northeast of Seward. A small town with a tavern, a post office and Coop elevator.
	04	<u>Cordova</u> : -Cordova is located in the far southwest corner of the county. There are three school districts in this town, Centennial, Exeter-Milligan and Friend. Cordova also has a post office, a Coop elevator and bank branch office.
	05	<u>Garland</u> : -Garland is in the eastern part of Seward County, 4 miles north of Highway 34 and 4 miles west of the Lancaster County line. There is some Lincoln influence due to the proximity of the town. The town has 2 taverns, a post office and Coop elevator.
	06	<u>Goehner</u> : -Goehner is located in the western half of the county only a half mile off I-80. The town has a post office and a new restaurant in an existing building that has been totally remodeled. There is no Coop elevator in Goehner.
	07	<u>Grover</u> : -Grover is an unincorporated town just outside of Milford across the Big Blue River. It does have 3 various businesses. About half of Grover is in a flood plain.
	08	<u>Milford</u> : -Milford is the second largest town in Seward County. It is home to Southeast Technical College which influences rental property. The county has identified various neighborhoods. Milford has a K-12 school, a downtown business district, a golf course and a swimming pool. Milford has 32 upscale residential properties ranging in value from \$200,000 to \$430,000.

09	<p><u>Pleasant Dale:</u> -Pleasant Dale is on the eastern edge of Seward County just 1 mile in from the Lancaster County line and 2 ½ miles south of I-80 and 2 miles south of Highway 6. It also has Highway 103 on the edge town that goes south to Saline County. The town has a post office, a Coop elevator, a lumberyard, a restaurant, two apartment buildings, and auto service garage. Due to the towns proximity there is influence from Lincoln. The town has some nice ranch style homes along with older better kept homes.</p>
10	<p><u>Staplehurst:</u> -Staplehurst is located approximately 6 miles northwest of Seward. The town has a Coop elevator, a post office, a tavern, a towing business, storage unit business. There is very little new construction in this town. With the town's proximity and the older homes, it is a less desirable town to live in. Termites are a problem in Staplehurst. There is very little to draw people to this town for new businesses.</p>
11	<p><u>Tamora:</u> - Tamora is an unincorporated town 7 miles west of Seward on Highway 34. The main function of Tamora is the huge Coop elevator. The rest of the town has a few older homes and some mobile homes. Except for the Coop, nothing is kept very well in this town. The properties have to have their own wells and septic systems.</p>
12	<p><u>Utica:</u> -Utica is the 3rd largest town in Seward County. It is just 1 mile from York County along Highway 34. The town has a K-12 school, a nursing home, a Coop elevator, a senior citizen center, a gas station/service business, a library, a beauty shop, a bowling alley, a grocery store, an auto and truck used/repared part business, a bank, 2 industrial businesses, a well drilling business a nursing home, a Family Medical Center and a book bindery business. It is a unique small town that stands on its own.</p>
13	<p><u>Rural:</u> -The rural commercial properties in Seward County are characterized by their location. Seward County has six I-80 Interchanges. The 2 predominant ones are at Milford and Seward. The Pleasant Dale exchange has an old service station and a travel trailer park. The Goehner exchange has a gas station. The other 2 do not have buildings. Other commercial rural properties are scattered throughout the county.</p>

3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.
	The predominant valuation process in this county is to depend on the cost approach to value. They do use the market data to develop the depreciation used in the cost approach. Additionally, the county organizes their sales in broad occupancy groups so that they can compare their cost approach results to the selling price of similar properties. Those groups include retail, warehouse/service garage, office, restaurant/bar, land and other miscellaneous occupancies. While this is not a fully developed market or sales comparison approach, it provides an additional perspective on the value. The county may utilize any income data presented, but does not develop an overall income approach.
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.
	The cost approach is used but the county tries to supplement it with lease information if any is available.
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?
	The base cost year for commercial property in Seward is 2008; costs for Milford, Beaver Crossing and Cordova are 2009; and all the rest of the commercial property in the county is costed from the 2010 cost tables.
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?
	Generally, the county relies on the analysis of sales in their local market to determine the base depreciation and for economic factors used for commercial property. Additional analysis includes linear regression techniques to build and extend depreciation tables.
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	Depreciation studies are conducted and tables are prepared for implementation with the latest new costs or updated costs. When the county reappraises a class or subclass of commercial property, they develop new costs and develop new depreciation tables to use with those costs. So the dates would parallel the cost dates.
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	Usually the land values are updated or affirmed during the reappraisal cycle for the subclass. Seward was current in 2008 and 2009; Beaver Crossing, Cordova, Milford and the commercial land at the Milford and Seward I-80 interchanges was current in 2010. The rest of the county was completed for 2011.
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	Generally, the county relies on the analysis of sales in their local market to determine their commercial land values.

80 Seward
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 : 16
Total Sales Price : 4,182,300
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,079,800
Total Assessed Value : 3,557,590
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 254,988
Avg. Assessed Value : 222,349

MEDIAN : 93
WGT. MEAN : 87
MEAN : 93
COD : 10.18
PRD : 106.61

COV : 14.20
STD : 13.20
Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.51
MAX Sales Ratio : 117.29
MIN Sales Ratio : 61.96

95% Median C.I. : 85.93 to 100.62
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.76 to 99.64
95% Mean C.I. : 85.93 to 99.99

Printed:4/1/2013 5:01:02PM

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	2	98.07	98.07	97.72	00.85	100.36	97.24	98.90	N/A	60,750	59,367
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	102.35	102.35	102.35	00.00	100.00	102.35	102.35	N/A	65,000	66,525
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	89.11	89.11	89.14	01.11	99.97	88.12	90.09	N/A	31,250	27,858
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	91.74	91.74	91.74	00.00	100.00	91.74	91.74	N/A	75,000	68,806
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	97.21	91.76	94.93	14.28	96.66	61.96	110.66	N/A	199,375	189,271
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	80.07	80.07	80.07	00.00	100.00	80.07	80.07	N/A	75,000	60,054
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	87.83	87.83	81.47	12.60	107.81	76.76	98.90	N/A	1,270,000	1,034,656
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	93.00	98.74	105.26	11.24	93.81	85.93	117.29	N/A	114,433	120,455
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	3	98.90	99.50	99.33	01.72	100.17	97.24	102.35	N/A	62,167	61,753
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	3	90.09	89.98	90.56	01.34	99.36	88.12	91.74	N/A	45,833	41,507
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	10	93.40	91.90	86.47	13.22	106.28	61.96	117.29	76.76 to 110.66	375,580	324,781
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	102.35	102.35	102.35	00.00	100.00	102.35	102.35	N/A	65,000	66,525
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	91.74	91.00	94.29	10.10	96.51	61.96	110.66	61.96 to 110.66	133,571	125,943
<u>ALL</u>	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	7	91.74	90.88	82.04	09.18	110.78	76.76	110.66	76.76 to 110.66	407,686	334,467
02	1	88.12	88.12	88.12	00.00	100.00	88.12	88.12	N/A	30,000	26,435
05	2	96.22	96.22	98.26	06.37	97.92	90.09	102.35	N/A	48,750	47,903
08	4	95.95	92.79	99.44	15.96	93.31	61.96	117.29	N/A	225,750	224,495
09	2	99.76	99.76	100.31	00.86	99.45	98.90	100.62	N/A	97,750	98,051
<u>ALL</u>	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349

**80 Seward
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 : 16
 Total Sales Price : 4,182,300
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,079,800
 Total Assessed Value : 3,557,590
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 254,988
 Avg. Assessed Value : 222,349

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 87
 MEAN : 93
 COD : 10.18
 PRD : 106.61

COV : 14.20
 STD : 13.20
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.51
 MAX Sales Ratio : 117.29
 MIN Sales Ratio : 61.96

95% Median C.I. : 85.93 to 100.62
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.76 to 99.64
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.93 to 99.99

Printed:4/1/2013 5:01:02PM

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	15	93.79	94.04	97.24	09.60	96.71	61.96	117.29	88.12 to 100.62	138,653	134,823
04	1	76.76	76.76	76.76	00.00	100.00	76.76	76.76	N/A	2,000,000	1,535,245
<u>ALL</u>	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000											
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349
Greater Than 14,999	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349
Greater Than 29,999	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999	4	89.11	90.76	90.71	04.20	100.06	85.93	98.90	N/A	34,575	31,364
60,000 TO 99,999	4	94.49	92.85	92.69	07.36	100.17	80.07	102.35	N/A	75,250	69,752
100,000 TO 149,999	3	93.00	88.54	92.81	17.45	95.40	61.96	110.66	N/A	93,500	86,782
150,000 TO 249,999	2	108.96	108.96	109.56	07.65	99.45	100.62	117.29	N/A	172,500	188,994
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999	2	96.35	96.35	96.51	02.66	99.83	93.79	98.90	N/A	507,500	489,775
1,000,000 +	1	76.76	76.76	76.76	00.00	100.00	76.76	76.76	N/A	2,000,000	1,535,245
<u>ALL</u>	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349

80 Seward
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 : 16
Total Sales Price : 4,182,300
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,079,800
Total Assessed Value : 3,557,590
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 254,988
Avg. Assessed Value : 222,349

MEDIAN : 93
WGT. MEAN : 87
MEAN : 93
COD : 10.18
PRD : 106.61

COV : 14.20
STD : 13.20
Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.51
MAX Sales Ratio : 117.29
MIN Sales Ratio : 61.96

95% Median C.I. : 85.93 to 100.62
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.76 to 99.64
95% Mean C.I. : 85.93 to 99.99

Printed:4/1/2013 5:01:02PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	90.09	90.09	90.09	00.00	100.00	90.09	90.09	N/A	32,500	29,280
340	1	117.29	117.29	117.29	00.00	100.00	117.29	117.29	N/A	185,000	216,995
352	1	98.90	98.90	98.90	00.00	100.00	98.90	98.90	N/A	540,000	534,066
353	5	91.74	84.80	86.81	10.51	97.68	61.96	97.24	N/A	82,800	71,880
358	1	102.35	102.35	102.35	00.00	100.00	102.35	102.35	N/A	65,000	66,525
406	2	88.69	88.69	78.53	13.45	112.94	76.76	100.62	N/A	1,080,000	848,119
426	1	110.66	110.66	110.66	00.00	100.00	110.66	110.66	N/A	102,500	113,428
470	1	85.93	85.93	85.93	00.00	100.00	85.93	85.93	N/A	40,300	34,630
528	1	88.12	88.12	88.12	00.00	100.00	88.12	88.12	N/A	30,000	26,435
597	1	93.79	93.79	93.79	00.00	100.00	93.79	93.79	N/A	475,000	445,484
851	1	98.90	98.90	98.90	00.00	100.00	98.90	98.90	N/A	35,500	35,109
<u>ALL</u>	16	93.40	92.96	87.20	10.18	106.61	61.96	117.29	85.93 to 100.62	254,988	222,349

2013 Correlation Section for Seward County

A. Commercial Real Property

Seward County is an agriculturally based county consisting of Seward and several small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Many of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. Seward is the predominant location for the larger commercial and industrial property. In all, the commercial values are stable to increasing in Seward and Milford but generally stable to flat in other parts of the county.

The Six Year Inspection and Review process was completed prior to 2011. All of the commercial and industrial records are up to date. Based on that, the process used to value the commercial property is considered to be consistent and uniform.

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The findings, that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process also applies to the commercial sales.

The Department's review of the Assessed Value Update that was reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The commercial assessment procedures reviewed were acceptable. The assessed value information and property characteristics of the sold parcels have been reported accurately in the sales file.

The key statistics considered for measurement are as follows: there are just 16 qualified sales; the median ratio is 93%; the COD is 10.18; and the PRD is 106.61. Of the 16 qualified sales, 7 are in Seward, 4 in Milford, no more than 2 in any of the 3 other valuation groups represented and no sales from 8 valuation groups. When the 10 different occupancy codes are reviewed, there are 5 sales in code 353 (retail store); and the remaining 9 codes have no more than 2 sales each. It is notable that the class of commercial and industrial is so broad that the value of the class is impacted by both local and regional economic forces. The use of the statistics to determine a level of value is problematic as it is likely that neither the class of commercial and industrial property nor any subclass is adequately represented.

The county has implemented thorough, timely and consistent assessment actions that should produce consistent valuations. The median ratio calculated from this group of sales is not considered to be representative of the commercial and industrial property in Seward County so there is not enough information to call a level of value.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward County

For 2013, Seward County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all pickup work of new improvements on agricultural parcels. They continually monitor and update the land use on all parcels where changes are reported or observed. Use changes are discovered through land owner reports, GIS and the observations of the assessor and staff. They are verified and measured using GIS, as well as NRD and FSA records and maps.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. They focused on the configuration of the 3 market areas and concluded that no change would be made for 2013. This analysis did however demonstrate that the values in Areas 2 and 3 are now equivalent so the sales in both areas were analyzed together to develop the values applied to both areas. Following that, they implemented new values for agricultural land. Irrigated, dry and grass values changed in all 3 Market Areas. The assessed values in Area 2 (Special Valuation Area) were also changed and reflect the same LCG values as Market Area 3.

The county reviewed and accounted for all of the parcels containing CRP and WRP acres. If necessary the records were updated.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Seward County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Deputy Assessor does the land use and acre count and the county staff does improvements.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Seward County is divided from east to west based mostly on general soil structure, irrigation water availability and the resulting farming practices. The western part of the county has water availability throughout and has developed irrigation, making the predominant farming practices irrigated row crop.
	2	The eastern part of the county has little water availability and developed irrigation, leaving the predominant farming practices as dry land crop or pasture uses. That eastern area is further divided due to non-agricultural influences impacting the easternmost part of the county abutting Lancaster County. That area has been valued under the provisions of special valuation. The special valuation schedule of value is annually derived from the analysis of the sales in Market Area 3.
	3	Seward County is divided from east to west based mostly on general soil structure, irrigation water availability and the resulting farming practices. The eastern part of the county has little water availability and developed irrigation, leaving the predominant farming practices as dry land crop or pasture uses.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Sale verification and market analysis provide insight into market trends. The general land use is the key to each market area. If a trend were to change, the market area may also.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	The predominant use of the parcel drives the decision. Then the analysis of the local market is used to establish values.	

5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?
	Yes; The first (home site) acre is the same. The first acre for home sites on agricultural parcels and on residential parcels is valued at \$18,000. The additional site acres have different values for the two subclasses. The next four rural residential site acres are valued at \$5,000 to \$3,500 per acre, up to four additional rural residential site acres are valued at \$2,500 to \$1,500 per acre, and any residual acres over nine are valued at \$1,750 to \$1,000. Those variations are higher in the east where the special valuation exists and lower in the west of the county. The land beyond the first acre on parcels classified as agricultural is valued as a site value at \$1,800 per acre.
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.
	The special value area is monitored by comparing sales in Market Area 2 to the sales in Market Area 3. The values used for the parcels in Market Area 2, (special value area), are derived from the verification and analysis of the sales in Market Area 3. The two areas are very similar in land use and farming practices.
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.
	Yes there are applications and a special valuation procedure in place. The values are derived from Market Area 3 sales. As the agricultural land value rises, this difference has diminished and is being monitored.
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.
	The county reports 5 to 6 parcels of WRP throughout the county. This subclass of land has been valued like grass land but at 100% rather than 75% for grass land in an agricultural use. This practice was established using information from the only known sale of WRP in the county. That was in 2003. This practice allows for the WRP value to trend along with the grassland values in the county.

80 Seward
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 : 62
Total Sales Price : 35,829,721
Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,626,721
Total Assessed Value : 23,642,036
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 574,625
Avg. Assessed Value : 381,323

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 73
COD : 25.56
PRD : 110.10

COV : 31.67
STD : 23.14
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.34
MAX Sales Ratio : 131.22
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.13

95% Median C.I. : 65.38 to 79.15
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.15 to 71.57
95% Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 78.82

Printed: 4/1/2013 5:01:03PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	84.30	89.20	82.28	17.27	108.41	71.14	131.22	71.78 to 97.55	595,088	489,644
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	88.88	89.33	84.66	16.67	105.52	70.34	109.68	70.34 to 109.68	417,008	353,033
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	67.88	67.88	66.48	08.01	102.11	62.44	73.32	N/A	955,430	635,200
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	78.06	78.06	77.35	01.40	100.92	76.97	79.15	N/A	691,500	534,854
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	74.78	74.87	73.40	21.33	102.00	30.13	96.47	65.38 to 93.82	362,404	266,000
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	65.99	62.90	70.76	22.96	88.89	38.63	84.09	N/A	645,333	456,659
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	61.95	65.04	54.33	27.70	119.71	38.82	93.06	N/A	512,676	278,528
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	79.61	79.61	81.05	14.62	98.22	67.97	91.25	N/A	226,950	183,944
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	56.53	69.48	59.62	36.00	116.54	39.31	122.29	39.31 to 122.29	503,284	300,037
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	46.71	57.83	48.51	34.72	119.21	38.12	96.99	40.25 to 96.70	829,684	402,518
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	54.95	50.69	51.50	19.87	98.43	32.18	64.95	N/A	439,720	226,443
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	62.76	62.76	63.78	02.90	98.40	60.94	64.57	N/A	1,082,763	690,622
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	22	78.49	86.28	79.88	17.24	108.01	62.44	131.22	73.32 to 97.55	588,044	469,729
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	19	67.97	70.89	67.25	24.23	105.41	30.13	96.47	61.95 to 91.25	432,364	290,763
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	21	56.24	61.17	53.77	30.73	113.76	32.18	122.29	42.93 to 65.04	689,278	370,643
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	19	76.97	79.04	75.65	17.55	104.48	30.13	109.68	66.28 to 93.82	476,713	360,648
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	17	65.04	68.21	61.71	28.52	110.53	38.63	122.29	48.14 to 91.25	498,604	307,692
<u>ALL</u>	62	71.74	73.06	66.36	25.56	110.10	30.13	131.22	65.38 to 79.15	574,625	381,323

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	31	74.16	74.40	67.07	24.04	110.93	32.18	131.22	64.57 to 89.78	744,848	499,606
2	31	70.34	71.72	65.04	26.56	110.27	30.13	122.75	61.95 to 79.15	404,401	263,041
<u>ALL</u>	62	71.74	73.06	66.36	25.56	110.10	30.13	131.22	65.38 to 79.15	574,625	381,323

80 Seward
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 : 62
 Total Sales Price : 35,829,721
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,626,721
 Total Assessed Value : 23,642,036
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 574,625
 Avg. Assessed Value : 381,323

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 25.56
 PRD : 110.10

COV : 31.67
 STD : 23.14
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.34
 MAX Sales Ratio : 131.22
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.13

95% Median C.I. : 65.38 to 79.15
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.15 to 71.57
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 78.82

Printed:4/1/2013 5:01:03PM

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
Irrigated											
County	8	70.08	77.40	68.85	27.53	112.42	47.47	131.22	47.47 to 131.22	688,958	474,369
1	8	70.08	77.40	68.85	27.53	112.42	47.47	131.22	47.47 to 131.22	688,958	474,369
Dry											
County	12	69.55	70.04	60.00	31.47	116.73	32.18	122.75	39.31 to 96.47	537,402	322,422
1	2	64.33	64.33	52.87	49.98	121.68	32.18	96.47	N/A	331,750	175,388
2	10	69.55	71.18	60.81	28.51	117.05	38.12	122.75	39.31 to 102.83	578,532	351,829
ALL	62	71.74	73.06	66.36	25.56	110.10	30.13	131.22	65.38 to 79.15	574,625	381,323

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	19	71.78	74.55	68.64	22.89	108.61	46.71	131.22	56.53 to 84.79	787,161	540,297
1	19	71.78	74.55	68.64	22.89	108.61	46.71	131.22	56.53 to 84.79	787,161	540,297
Dry											
County	23	74.78	75.37	66.79	23.11	112.85	32.18	122.75	67.97 to 89.78	462,401	308,832
1	4	93.13	78.78	71.96	19.11	109.48	32.18	96.70	N/A	325,250	234,058
2	19	73.32	74.65	66.07	21.17	112.99	38.12	122.75	64.95 to 83.81	491,275	324,574
Grass											
County	1	30.13	30.13	30.13	00.00	100.00	30.13	30.13	N/A	204,400	61,590
2	1	30.13	30.13	30.13	00.00	100.00	30.13	30.13	N/A	204,400	61,590
ALL	62	71.74	73.06	66.36	25.56	110.10	30.13	131.22	65.38 to 79.15	574,625	381,323

Seward County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Seward	1	5,200	5,100	4,900	4,600	4,400	N/A	3,400	3,000	4,737
Butler	1	4,800	4,500	4,397	3,964	3,848	3,308	2,495	2,244	4,233
Fillmore	1	4,900	4,800	4,700	4,600	4,300	N/A	3,900	3,750	4,677
Polk	1	4,675	4,228	3,956	3,698	3,635	3,361	3,237	2,840	4,281
Saline	3	4,121	4,124	4,069	4,044	3,672	2,975	2,974	2,925	3,956
York	2	5,350	5,350	4,995	4,995	4,500	N/A	4,036	4,036	5,116
Seward	2	3,800	3,700	3,450	N/A	2,800	2,800	2,600	2,000	3,435
Seward	3	3,800	3,700	3,450	3,300	2,800	N/A	2,600	2,000	3,457
Butler	1	4,800	4,500	4,397	3,964	3,848	3,308	2,495	2,244	4,233
Lancaster	1	6,000	6,000	6,000	5,993	4,875	4,854	2,999	2,998	5,468
Saline	3	4,121	4,124	4,069	4,044	3,672	2,975	2,974	2,925	3,956
Saunders	1	5,118	4,902	4,700	4,250	4,100	3,702	2,808	2,600	3,969

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Seward	1	3,500	3,500	3,100	3,100	2,600	N/A	2,200	2,000	2,991
Butler	1	4,525	4,350	4,150	3,747	3,650	3,199	2,300	2,100	3,578
Fillmore	1	2,655	2,615	2,515	2,465	2,303	N/A	2,021	1,955	2,504
Polk	1	3,011	2,848	2,160	2,160	1,970	1,910	1,850	1,850	2,634
Saline	3	2,769	2,764	2,372	2,216	1,971	1,600	1,596	1,500	2,337
York	2	3,570	3,570	2,940	2,940	2,730	N/A	2,519	2,520	3,214
Seward	2	3,800	3,700	3,450	3,300	2,800	2,800	2,600	2,000	3,120
Seward	3	3,800	3,700	3,450	3,300	2,800	2,800	2,600	2,000	3,257
Butler	1	4,525	4,350	4,150	3,747	3,650	3,199	2,300	2,100	3,578
Lancaster	1	3,748	3,750	3,371	3,373	3,000	3,000	2,625	2,625	3,264
Saline	3	2,769	2,764	2,372	2,216	1,971	1,600	1,596	1,500	2,337
Saunders	1	4,709	4,500	4,300	3,850	3,700	3,300	2,417	2,229	3,283

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Seward	1	1,062	1,196	978	939	966	1,800	948	821	926
Butler	1	1,819	2,170	2,183	1,790	1,961	1,886	1,735	1,639	1,807
Fillmore	1	1,060	1,040	980	920	900	N/A	800	800	886
Polk	1	822	867	930	945	926	947	874	813	882
Saline	3	1,078	1,289	1,034	1,293	1,215	1,034	1,076	773	1,024
York	2	977	945	898	904	866	N/A	859	852	874
Seward	2	1,287	1,398	1,275	1,216	1,106	1,236	1,027	887	1,077
Seward	3	1,235	1,240	1,012	1,052	988	1,217	1,033	821	985
Butler	1	1,819	2,170	2,183	1,790	1,961	1,886	1,735	1,639	1,807
Lancaster	1	2,355	2,539	2,087	2,162	1,816	1,829	1,430	1,366	1,802
Saline	3	1,078	1,289	1,034	1,293	1,215	1,034	1,076	773	1,024
Saunders	1	1,619	1,389	1,926	1,866	2,125	1,135	1,214	1,062	1,427

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

METHODOLOGY REPORT OF SPECIAL VALUATION PROCEDURES

SEWARD COUNTY – 2013

Special valuation methodology:

As done in the past, the agricultural values are set according to the agricultural sales that are determined to be arms length by the assessor and by the Nebraska Property Assessment Division. A market study is done based on those sales. Each sale is listed and contains the number of acres in each land capability group. New values per acre are substituted for last year's values to calculate new assessed values and ratios. New statistical measurements including the mean, median and weighted mean, coefficient of dispersion, price-related differential and the absolute standard deviation are calculated. The final step is the reconciliation of value. It is the process in which the estimates of value are evaluated and the applicability of the indicated values is weighed. This is a reconciliation of the facts, trends and observations developed in the analysis and a review of the conclusions and the validity and reliability of those conclusions. The market study to arrive at the special value was analyzed using only the uninfluenced sales from the Market Area 3, which was created in 2002. Area 3 does not have the aquifer lying under it. Market Area 3 is most like Market Area 2, which has special valuation. The new assessed value from Market Area 3 for each land capability group is then applied to all agricultural parcels in area 2.

For 2013 it was determined that sales in Market Area 2 were not selling much differently than in Market Area 3. Therefore, all the qualified sales in the 2 market areas were used to set the values for both areas. The 2 areas are still being maintained separately but were grouped together for analysis and valuation.

2013 Correlation Section for Seward County

A. Agricultural Land

Seward County is an agriculturally based county with Seward and several small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The prevalent crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. There is also some grazing land, primarily in the east part of the county. The county land use is approximately 42% irrigated land, 37% dry land, 18% grass land and 3% other uses. Seward County is bordered on the north by Butler County, on the south by Saline County, on the east by Lancaster County and on the west by York County. The agricultural land is valued using three market areas that are more fully described in the survey. Area 1 is about 68% irrigated crop land covering about 60% of the west part of the county. Area 2 and 3 are predominantly dry crop and grass land. They are geographically similar and for 2013, have been analyzed together to produce a common value. Prior to 2013, Seward County has only analyzed only the sales in Area 3 and applied the results to both areas as Area 2 has been considered a special valuation area. The recent increases in land values have caused the sales in both areas to reflect only agricultural value. The county will maintain the separate market areas until they have sufficient time to see if the values are maintained or fall back to lower levels. For 2013 the department will not report a measurement of special valuation for Seward County.

The county reports that the improvements on the agricultural parcels have all been inspected and reviewed prior to 2011, so the first cycle of the 6 year inspection and review process of all agricultural improvements in the county has been completed.

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The findings, that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process applies to the agricultural sales too.

The Department's review of the Assessed Value Update that was reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The agricultural assessment procedures reviewed were acceptable. The assessed value information and property characteristics of the sold parcels have been reported accurately in the sales file.

There was a total sample of 62 qualified sales used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in Seward County. The sample used was deemed adequate, proportional among study years and representative based on major land uses. Any comparable sales used were selected from a similar agricultural area within six miles of the subject county. The calculated median ratio is 72%. The 2013 abstract reports; overall agricultural land increased by 29.55%; irrigated land increased by nearly 37%, dry land increased by over 17%, and grass land increased by 44%. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values. The quality of assessment for agricultural land is acceptable.

It is the opinion of the Department that the level of value for agricultural land of value falls at or near the median ratio. Neither the COD nor the PRD are particularly useful indicators of equity or regression because of the dramatic increases in the value of agland during the three year study period. In this case, the apparent level of value is 72% and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. There are no major subclasses that were measured outside

**2013 Correlation Section
for Seward County**

the range. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward 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 Seward 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 : 10,148	Value : 2,054,739,735	Growth 19,011,270	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	362	4,250,663	125	3,426,089	166	5,336,305	653	13,013,057	
02. Res Improve Land	3,896	63,324,128	393	12,706,246	1,028	40,586,876	5,317	116,617,250	
03. Res Improvements	3,973	370,991,860	400	55,037,613	1,075	147,842,572	5,448	573,872,045	
04. Res Total	4,335	438,566,651	525	71,169,948	1,241	193,765,753	6,101	703,502,352	8,303,031
% of Res Total	71.05	62.34	8.61	10.12	20.34	27.54	60.12	34.24	43.67
05. Com UnImp Land	77	1,811,209	7	121,708	29	912,379	113	2,845,296	
06. Com Improve Land	446	15,167,842	25	761,199	37	4,746,352	508	20,675,393	
07. Com Improvements	471	67,577,637	35	8,694,154	58	21,093,092	564	97,364,883	
08. Com Total	548	84,556,688	42	9,577,061	87	26,751,823	677	120,885,572	3,184,989
% of Com Total	80.95	69.95	6.20	7.92	12.85	22.13	6.67	5.88	16.75
09. Ind UnImp Land	5	51,581	0	0	0	0	5	51,581	
10. Ind Improve Land	7	1,661,505	1	160,875	0	0	8	1,822,380	
11. Ind Improvements	7	14,159,754	1	3,039,461	0	0	8	17,199,215	
12. Ind Total	12	15,872,840	1	3,200,336	0	0	13	19,073,176	3,081,044
% of Ind Total	92.31	83.22	7.69	16.78	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.93	16.21
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	2	66,429	1	152,500	3	218,929	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	2	85,721	3	49,055	5	134,776	
15. Rec Improvements	1	1,320	4	363,606	35	513,180	40	878,106	
16. Rec Total	1	1,320	6	515,756	36	714,735	43	1,231,811	810
% of Rec Total	2.33	0.11	13.95	41.87	83.72	58.02	0.42	0.06	0.00
Res & Rec Total	4,336	438,567,971	531	71,685,704	1,277	194,480,488	6,144	704,734,163	8,303,841
% of Res & Rec Total	70.57	62.23	8.64	10.17	20.78	27.60	60.54	34.30	43.68
Com & Ind Total	560	100,429,528	43	12,777,397	87	26,751,823	690	139,958,748	6,266,033
% of Com & Ind Total	81.16	71.76	6.23	9.13	12.61	19.11	6.80	6.81	32.96
17. Taxable Total	4,896	538,997,499	574	84,463,101	1,364	221,232,311	6,834	844,692,911	14,569,874
% of Taxable Total	71.64	63.81	8.40	10.00	19.96	26.19	67.34	41.11	76.64

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	4	139,408	2,108,520	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	4	139,408	2,108,520
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	139,408	2,108,520

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	377	71	113	561

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	8	970,077	295	90,153,740	1,824	604,671,003	2,127	695,794,820
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	142	54,309,617	926	350,028,154	1,068	404,337,771
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	152	15,032,371	1,035	94,881,862	1,187	109,914,233
30. Ag Total							3,314	1,210,046,824

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	18,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	97	100.00	1,787,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	95	95.00	10,782,574	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	5	135.57	260,622	22	69.14	36,294	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	139	649.51	1,557,679	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	149	0.00	4,249,797	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.77	0	0	744.17	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	109.07	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	10	10.00	180,000	11	11.00	198,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	630	636.00	11,368,500	727	736.00	13,155,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	598	591.00	68,110,306	693	686.00	78,892,880	4,441,396
34. HomeSite Total				704	747.00	92,246,380	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	151	610.35	679,407	178	815.06	976,323	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	906	3,124.16	7,254,818	1,045	3,773.67	8,812,497	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,012	0.00	26,771,556	1,161	0.00	31,021,353	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,339	4,588.73	40,810,173	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,849.50	0	0	6,594.44	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	196.32	0	0	305.39	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,043	12,235.56	133,056,553	4,441,396

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	3	343.02	725,554
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	12	1,194.55	1,847,281	15	1,537.57	2,572,835

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	102	10,297.26	25,234,072
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	102	10,297.26	25,234,072
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	807	81,144.55	171,909,560	909	91,441.81	197,143,632
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	38,833.71	30.24%	201,935,292	33.20%	5,200.00
46. 1A	33,539.51	26.12%	171,051,501	28.12%	5,100.00
47. 2A1	11,893.90	9.26%	58,280,110	9.58%	4,900.00
48. 2A	755.08	0.59%	3,473,368	0.57%	4,600.00
49. 3A1	28,065.44	21.86%	123,487,953	20.30%	4,400.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	10,216.39	7.96%	34,735,726	5.71%	3,400.00
52. 4A	5,099.87	3.97%	15,299,610	2.52%	3,000.00
53. Total	128,403.90	100.00%	608,263,560	100.00%	4,737.11
Dry					
54. 1D1	9,016.25	20.91%	31,556,887	24.46%	3,500.00
55. 1D	11,670.73	27.06%	40,847,555	31.66%	3,500.00
56. 2D1	3,869.47	8.97%	11,995,357	9.30%	3,100.00
57. 2D	351.30	0.81%	1,089,030	0.84%	3,100.00
58. 3D1	9,604.99	22.27%	24,972,974	19.36%	2,600.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	6,523.61	15.13%	14,351,942	11.13%	2,200.00
61. 4D	2,092.71	4.85%	4,185,422	3.24%	2,000.00
62. Total	43,129.06	100.00%	128,999,167	100.00%	2,991.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	566.48	4.29%	601,643	4.92%	1,062.07
64. 1G	944.76	7.15%	1,129,801	9.23%	1,195.86
65. 2G1	1,137.16	8.61%	1,112,376	9.09%	978.21
66. 2G	383.98	2.91%	360,746	2.95%	939.49
67. 3G1	2,210.84	16.73%	2,135,169	17.45%	965.77
68. 3G	0.13	0.00%	234	0.00%	1,800.00
69. 4G1	2,759.60	20.89%	2,615,739	21.38%	947.87
70. 4G	5,209.59	39.43%	4,278,442	34.97%	821.26
71. Total	13,212.54	100.00%	12,234,150	100.00%	925.95
Irrigated Total					
	128,403.90	68.24%	608,263,560	81.07%	4,737.11
Dry Total					
	43,129.06	22.92%	128,999,167	17.19%	2,991.00
Grass Total					
	13,212.54	7.02%	12,234,150	1.63%	925.95
72. Waste	1,655.89	0.88%	165,589	0.02%	100.00
73. Other	1,768.57	0.94%	652,654	0.09%	369.03
74. Exempt	74.07	0.04%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	188,169.96	100.00%	750,315,120	100.00%	3,987.43

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	362.85	29.98%	1,378,830	33.17%	3,800.00
46. 1A	227.46	18.79%	841,602	20.25%	3,700.00
47. 2A1	354.33	29.28%	1,222,448	29.41%	3,450.03
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	164.11	13.56%	459,508	11.05%	2,800.00
50. 3A	11.19	0.92%	31,332	0.75%	2,800.00
51. 4A1	70.98	5.86%	184,548	4.44%	2,600.00
52. 4A	19.39	1.60%	38,780	0.93%	2,000.00
53. Total	1,210.31	100.00%	4,157,048	100.00%	3,434.70
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,260.70	10.89%	16,190,660	13.26%	3,800.00
55. 1D	7,408.27	18.93%	27,410,599	22.45%	3,700.00
56. 2D1	6,387.80	16.32%	22,038,108	18.05%	3,450.03
57. 2D	737.57	1.88%	2,433,981	1.99%	3,300.00
58. 3D1	6,262.24	16.00%	17,534,272	14.36%	2,800.00
59. 3D	5,167.14	13.20%	14,467,992	11.85%	2,800.00
60. 4D1	7,016.54	17.93%	18,243,004	14.94%	2,600.00
61. 4D	1,900.82	4.86%	3,801,640	3.11%	2,000.00
62. Total	39,141.08	100.00%	122,120,256	100.00%	3,120.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	249.40	0.66%	320,897	0.79%	1,286.68
64. 1G	1,065.07	2.81%	1,488,855	3.65%	1,397.89
65. 2G1	4,399.66	11.62%	5,608,174	13.75%	1,274.68
66. 2G	716.43	1.89%	871,280	2.14%	1,216.14
67. 3G1	4,955.22	13.08%	5,481,916	13.44%	1,106.29
68. 3G	6,190.41	16.34%	7,654,150	18.76%	1,236.45
69. 4G1	9,679.43	25.56%	9,943,928	24.38%	1,027.33
70. 4G	10,619.44	28.04%	9,423,051	23.10%	887.34
71. Total	37,875.06	100.00%	40,792,251	100.00%	1,077.02
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	1,210.31	1.46%	4,157,048	2.47%	3,434.70
Dry Total					
Dry Total	39,141.08	47.34%	122,120,256	72.53%	3,120.00
Grass Total					
Grass Total	37,875.06	45.80%	40,792,251	24.23%	1,077.02
72. Waste	1,588.29	1.92%	158,829	0.09%	100.00
73. Other	2,873.74	3.48%	1,133,533	0.67%	394.45
74. Exempt	58.70	0.07%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	82,688.48	100.00%	168,361,917	100.00%	2,036.10

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,194.81	36.17%	8,340,278	39.75%	3,800.00
46. 1A	1,286.00	21.19%	4,758,200	22.68%	3,700.00
47. 2A1	1,110.41	18.30%	3,830,934	18.26%	3,450.02
48. 2A	164.86	2.72%	544,038	2.59%	3,300.00
49. 3A1	855.11	14.09%	2,394,308	11.41%	2,800.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	329.88	5.44%	857,688	4.09%	2,600.00
52. 4A	127.60	2.10%	255,200	1.22%	2,000.00
53. Total	6,068.67	100.00%	20,980,646	100.00%	3,457.21
Dry					
54. 1D1	9,253.90	23.26%	35,164,820	27.14%	3,800.00
55. 1D	9,189.46	23.10%	34,001,002	26.24%	3,700.00
56. 2D1	4,428.23	11.13%	15,277,487	11.79%	3,450.02
57. 2D	360.43	0.91%	1,189,419	0.92%	3,300.00
58. 3D1	7,626.36	19.17%	21,353,808	16.48%	2,800.00
59. 3D	157.19	0.40%	440,132	0.34%	2,800.00
60. 4D1	7,681.03	19.31%	19,970,678	15.41%	2,600.00
61. 4D	1,081.95	2.72%	2,163,900	1.67%	2,000.00
62. Total	39,778.55	100.00%	129,561,246	100.00%	3,257.06
Grass					
63. 1G1	329.99	4.41%	407,534	5.53%	1,234.99
64. 1G	556.01	7.44%	689,657	9.37%	1,240.37
65. 2G1	993.12	13.28%	1,005,158	13.65%	1,012.12
66. 2G	211.60	2.83%	222,660	3.02%	1,052.27
67. 3G1	985.45	13.18%	973,330	13.22%	987.70
68. 3G	177.03	2.37%	215,474	2.93%	1,217.16
69. 4G1	1,796.72	24.03%	1,856,304	25.21%	1,033.16
70. 4G	2,426.76	32.46%	1,993,188	27.07%	821.34
71. Total	7,476.68	100.00%	7,363,305	100.00%	984.84
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	6,068.67	10.94%	20,980,646	13.25%	3,457.21
Dry Total					
Dry Total	39,778.55	71.70%	129,561,246	81.84%	3,257.06
Grass Total					
Grass Total	7,476.68	13.48%	7,363,305	4.65%	984.84
72. Waste	1,416.30	2.55%	141,630	0.09%	100.00
73. Other	737.17	1.33%	266,407	0.17%	361.39
74. Exempt	39.47	0.07%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	55,477.37	100.00%	158,313,234	100.00%	2,853.65

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	14,564.75	66,854,427	121,118.13	566,546,827	135,682.88	633,401,254
77. Dry Land	227.60	690,709	21,248.04	67,616,723	100,573.05	312,373,237	122,048.69	380,680,669
78. Grass	15.44	15,908	6,508.87	6,272,961	52,039.97	54,100,837	58,564.28	60,389,706
79. Waste	17.54	1,754	969.44	96,944	3,673.50	367,350	4,660.48	466,048
80. Other	5.38	1,084	624.54	223,329	4,749.56	1,828,181	5,379.48	2,052,594
81. Exempt	4.17	0	39.47	0	128.60	0	172.24	0
82. Total	265.96	709,455	43,915.64	141,064,384	282,154.21	935,216,432	326,335.81	1,076,990,271

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	135,682.88	41.58%	633,401,254	58.81%	4,668.25
Dry Land	122,048.69	37.40%	380,680,669	35.35%	3,119.09
Grass	58,564.28	17.95%	60,389,706	5.61%	1,031.17
Waste	4,660.48	1.43%	466,048	0.04%	100.00
Other	5,379.48	1.65%	2,052,594	0.19%	381.56
Exempt	172.24	0.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	326,335.81	100.00%	1,076,990,271	100.00%	3,300.25

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

80 Seward

	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	684,831,638	703,502,352	18,670,714	2.73%	8,303,031	1.51%
02. Recreational	1,431,925	1,231,811	-200,114	-13.98%	810	-14.03%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	91,303,592	92,246,380	942,788	1.03%	4,441,396	-3.83%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	777,567,155	796,980,543	19,413,388	2.50%	12,745,237	0.86%
05. Commercial	116,876,056	120,885,572	4,009,516	3.43%	3,184,989	0.71%
06. Industrial	16,326,719	19,073,176	2,746,457	16.82%	3,081,044	-2.05%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	36,821,825	40,810,173	3,988,348	10.83%	0	10.83%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	170,024,600	180,768,921	10,744,321	6.32%	6,266,033	2.63%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	947,591,755	977,749,464	30,157,709	3.18%	19,011,270	1.18%
11. Irrigated	463,627,057	633,401,254	169,774,197	36.62%		
12. Dryland	325,267,118	380,680,669	55,413,551	17.04%		
13. Grassland	41,938,514	60,389,706	18,451,192	44.00%		
14. Wasteland	466,498	466,048	-450	-0.10%		
15. Other Agland	32,874	2,052,594	2,019,720	6,143.82%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	831,332,061	1,076,990,271	245,658,210	29.55%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,778,923,816	2,054,739,735	275,815,919	15.50%	19,011,270	14.44%

**Seward County
2012 Plan of Assessment
For years 2013, 2014 & 2015**

Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the Assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned to the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan if necessary, after the county board approves the budget. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes or real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land and;
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Assessment Statistics for 2012:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	95%	8.79	101.21
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural Land	72%	21.24	111.71
Agricultural Land receiving Special Valuation	72%	21.24	111.71

Median: The middle placement when the assessment/sales ratios are arrayed from high to low (or low to high)

COD: (Coefficient of Dispersion) the average absolute deviation divided by the median

PRD: (Price Related Differential) the mean ratio divided by the aggregate ratio

Aggregate: The sum of the assessed values divided by the sum of the sales prices

Average Absolute Deviation: Each ratio minus the median, summed and divided by the number of sales

Mean: The sum of the ratios divided by the number of sales.

Office Staff and Budget Information

Seward County Assessor's Office currently employs 1 full time person, 1 three quarter (3/4) time person 1 part time field lister, 1 temporary part time person and a part time contract Appraiser besides the Assessor and Deputy Assessor. Information pertaining to budget and staffing is included in the survey given to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (PAD). Staff salaries are included in the office's budget presented to the County Board each year.

Goals

The primary goal for the Seward County Assessor's Office is doing the best job possible in a professional manner to maintain fair and equitable values in meeting the statutory statistical requirements with the resources available.

Procedures Manual

Procedures have been established in the office and are updated as needed. The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Regulations and Directives as approved by the Attorney General and signed by the Governor is filed in the office.

Responsibilities:

Record Maintenance

Property record cards are maintained for every parcel of real property including improvements on leased land. The cards are updated annually to include any changes made to the assessment information of the property. The record cards contain current owner name and address, legal description, book and page number of the last deed of record and any changes of record of ownership. Also included is situs address, pictures of improvement or main structure, sketches, cadastral map book and page numbers, tax district codes, valuation information and other codes created that are relevant to the specific parcel.

The office maintains a cadastral map system. The current cadastral maps were done in May 1966. They have been kept up to date with name changes, separations and new subdivisions. Seward County has implemented a GIS system. The office staff has completed identifying each parcel and attaching the parcel identification number used in the Terra Scan CAMA system. A land use layer is completed. A flood plane layer has been added. Other layers will be developed in the future.

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

Prepare annually and file the following Administrative Reports

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property
- Assessor Survey
- Certification of Values to Political Subdivisions
- School District Taxable Value Report
- Sales information including rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
- Certification of Taxes Levied Report
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss
- Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
- Annual Plan of Assessment Report

Homestead Exemptions - Homestead Exemption applications are accepted in the office from February 1st through June 30. They are verified that the applicant is owner/occupant. An ad is placed in the two newspapers in the county with information about the Homestead Exemption. Follow up post cards and phone calls are made to ensure all applicants from the previous year refile and those inquiring throughout the year are notified that they may now file. Applications along with an income statement and a doctor's certification of disability (where appropriate) is forwarded to the Nebraska Department of Revenue by August 1 for income verification. Notice of rejection is sent when the applicant does not meet the requirement of owner/occupant through August 15th. The State returns a roster in October of approved (with a percentage) and disapproved for final processing. Property record cards are pulled and the Homestead Exemption percentage and amount is notated on them with a follow up of the data entered in the computer.

Personal Property - All depreciable tangible personal property which is used in a trade or business for the production of income, and which has a determinable life of longer than one year is filed on or before May 1. After May 1st but before August 1st a 10 percent penalty is applied and on August 1st and after a 25 percent penalty is applied. Every year notices are published in the local newspapers and a weekly news supplement for non-subscribers. The office has filing of Personal Property Schedules available on the internet. A postcard is sent to those with existing schedules as reminders and also includes the User ID and Password to access their schedules on the internet to complete and submit. A letter is sent to those who would be new filers explaining what is needed. This office documents at least 4-6 reminders to those who need to file personal property.

Permissive Exemptions - Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use or continued exempt use. Review and make recommendations to the county board.

Taxable Government Owned Property - Annual review of government owned property not used public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

Centrally Assessed Properties - Review the valuations as certified by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. Establish and maintain assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.

Tax Districts and Tax Rates – Maintain school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information including the input of tax rates used for tax billing.

Tax Lists - Prepare and certify the tax lists to the county treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed properties.

Tax List Corrections - Prepare tax list correction documents for the county board's approval.

County Board of Equalization - Attend county board of equalization meetings including meetings for valuation protests. Prepare documentation for the board for the hearings.

TERC (Tax Equalization and Review Commission) Appeals - Prepare the information and attend the taxpayer appeals hearings before TERC. Testify in defense of the county's valuation.

TERC Statewide Equalization - Attend the hearings if applicable to the county, to testify in defense of the county's values, and to implement TERC's orders.

Education - Attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain the required hours of continuing education to maintain the assessor certification.

Real Property: A four-year comprehensive countywide reappraisal of all classes of real property was started for assessment year 1997 and completed for assessment year 2000. The county contracted with an appraisal company for this project. The reappraisal consisted of visiting every property, re-measuring, new photographs of the main structure and interior inspections of homes where permitted. New property record cards were made. The following is a list of what properties were complete in each year.

- 1997 - Residential properties in the towns of Seward and Milford
- 1998 - Residential properties in the towns of Beaver Crossing, Bee, Garland, Goehner, Pleasant Dale, Staplehurst, Tamora, Utica and all the acreages
- 1999 - All improvements on properties classified as farm (residences and outbuildings)
- 2000 - All commercial and industrial properties in the county.

An annual analysis will be done and areas prioritized for reappraisal accordingly. Reviews of properties will be done along with a market analysis to establish physical and economic depreciation. New pricing will be applied. Adequate funding will be needed to support the continuation of this process.

For assessment year **2001** the following was reappraised: Bee and Milford residential.

For assessment year **2002**, the following was reappraised:

- Seward residential land and changed some boundaries on some neighborhoods and added some new ones.
- Reappraised the residential properties in the towns of Cordova, Pleasant Dale, and Staplehurst including new lot values.
- Re-priced acreage land in the county. Range 4 houses received a 5% increase and Range 3 received 3% increase.
- Approximately 550 building and development permits were picked up along with approximately 70 recounts of agricultural land due to use changes or requests.
- Ag Land: Established a 3rd Market Area and expanded Market Area 2 by 8 sections.
Market Area 1 is an area defined as such as it lies over an aquifer and recognizes the possibility for irrigation.
Market Area 2 is an area defined as Range 4 (six miles wide adjacent to Lancaster County). It was expanded for 2002 by 8 sections, 2 miles closer to Seward and 2 miles on either side of Highway 34. Area 2 is a special valuation area.
Market Area 3 is an area defined as it does not lie over an aquifer. The probability of irrigation will likely be limited to ponds and rivers. The agricultural values established in Market Area 3 set the special valuations in Market Area 2.

For the assessment year **2003**, the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reappraisal of the towns of Garland, Goehner and land in Beaver Crossing
- Range 3 & 4 acreages – increase in land values & Range 3 acreage houses – increased 3%
- Countywide increased improved site by an additional 2000 valuation
- Reviewed new subdivisions in Seward, recalculated discount cash flow and re-priced some to reflect current market trends

- Completed pickup work – 376 parcels including building permits on new construction

Commercial:

- Reviewed and analyzed sales to see if the comprehensive 2000 reappraisal was staying with the current market
- Revalued land in the towns of Garland, Goehner and Beaver Crossing
- Reviewed neighborhoods in Seward and re-neighborhooded 2 areas
- Completed pickup work – 34 parcels including building permits on new construction

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed and analyzed sales to verify Market Areas follow the market trends
- Changed irrigated values in Market Area 1
- Verified land use changes using FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and inspection of the property
- Reclassified wetlands into it's own class and valuation
- Started to reclassify CRP into it's own class and valuation
- Completed pickup work on ag improvements and building permits (rural homes and out buildings) – 64

For the assessment year **2004**, the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the towns of Bee, Utica and improvements only in Beaver Crossing.
- Reappraisal of the acreages in Range 4
- Reappraisal of the platted rural subdivisions in Range 4
- Reviewed new subdivisions in Seward, recalculated discount cash flow and priced some to reflect current market trends
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction
- Completed inspections on rural sites, both farms and acreages in the north half of the county (8 precincts) except about two-thirds of A Precinct due to running out of time. Inspected and updated properties for new construction, changes in construction including condition and removal or buildings.

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales to see if the 2000 county's comprehensive reappraisal was staying with the current market.
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction.

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed sales and verified Market Areas still follow the market trends
- Verified land use changes using FSA records and maps, form 13AG (Nebraska Sales and Use Tax Exemption Certificate) along with contact with property owners. Completed changes and recounted acres on 110 properties.
- Reviewed and made changes for the properties enrolled in CRP as needed.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value.
- Revalued the market (recapture) value as needed to comply with the required level of value.

For assessment year **2005**, the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the towns of Seward and Milford
- Reappraisal of the acreages in Range 3 (Precincts B, G, J and O)
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction
- Completed inspections on rural sites, both farms and acreages in the south half of the county. Picked up unreported improvements.
- Increased by five percent (5%) the houses on properties classified as farms in the east half of the county.

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales
- Completed pickup work

Agricultural land:

- Reviewed sales
- Verified land use changes, completed changes.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties in CRP.
- Verified Market Areas still follow the market trends.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value.
- Started to create the land use layer in the GIS program.

For assessment year **2006**, the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the acreages in the west half of the county. (Completes a 3 year process of county-wide acreage reappraisal)
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2005 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2006

- Increased by five percent (5%) the houses on properties classified as farms in the west half of the county
- Appraisal update on residential properties in the towns of Garland, Goehner, Grover and Pleasant Dale
- Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted and re-classified some neighborhoods in Seward as the market analysis indicated.

Commercial:

- Reviewed the sales
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2005 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2006
- Reviewed and revalued tower sites on improvements on leased land (IOLL)
- Revalued land in Garland, Goehner, Grover and Pleasant Dale
- Reappraisal of the apartment buildings in Seward, Milford and Pleasant Dale

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed the sales
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry cropland LCG values in the Market Area 1. Changed 1D1, 1D and 3D1 in Market Area 3
- Analyzed and changed market/recapture values in all the LCG's in the special valuation Market Area 2

For assessment year **2007**, the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the villages of Garland, Pleasant Dale and Staplehurst
- Reanalyzed neighborhoods in Milford and changed 5 of them
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2006 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2007.
- Reappraisal of the houses and buildings on properties classified as farms in Range 4
- Changed farm home sites county wide from 12,000 to 15,000 for the first acre.
- Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted.
- Picked up improvements at Horseshoe Bend Lake in 15-10-3

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that was a partial valuation for 2006 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2007.
- Re-Neighborhooded and repriced land at the Seward and I80 Interchange.

Agricultural land:

- Reviewed sales
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA maps along with contacting property owners and physical inspections. Completed changes and recounted acres. Fifteen out of sixteen precincts completed for GIS land use layer.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry cropland LCG values in Market Area 1. Changed various irrigated LCG values in Market Areas 2 & 3.
- Analyzed and changed market/recapture values in the special valuation Market Area 2.

For assessment year **2008**, the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the improvements in the city of Milford
- Reanalyzed neighborhoods in Milford and changed some subdivision lot values
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2007 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2008.
- Reappraisal of the houses and buildings on properties classified as farms in Range 3. New aerial photos were taken in May 2008 for the project and GPS'd into the GIS system and attached to the parcel in the TerraScan cama system.
- Changed farm homesites and rural residential homesites county wide from 15,000 and 17,000 respectively to 18,000 for the first acre.
- Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted.
- Reviewed land values in rural residential subdivisions and revalued Westford Downs Subdivision.
- Reviewed and revalued lots in several Seward subdivisions.
- Reviewed, inspected and disqualified special valuation on parcels not primarily used for agricultural and horticultural purposes. Sent disqualification notices and held County Board of Equalization hearings for appeals.

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales

- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2007 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2008.
- Revalued land in the city of Seward
- Revalued land in Seward on properties classified as apartments.
- Reviewed Section 42 Housing properties and revalued.

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed sales
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres. All sixteen precincts completed for GIS land use layer.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made necessary changes.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends. Made a slight change in moving properties in 3 Sections from Market Area 1 to Market Area 3.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry land crop and grassland LCG values in Market Areas 1 and 3. Changed special valuation and market (recapture) values in Market Area 2.
- Changed building site acre from 1,750 to 1,800.

For assessment year **2009** the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the land and improvements in the unincorporated village of Tamora with 2005 pricing.
- Reappraisal of the houses and buildings on properties classified as farms in Range 2.
- Increased land in Beaver Crossing by 10% (percent).
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2008 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2009.
- Increased the first vacant acre value and the additional acres on the homesites.
- Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted.
- Reviewed lots in several Seward subdivisions and made minor adjustments.
- Reappraised the properties that were annexed to Milford in 2008 using the same cost table as the rest of the town.

Commercial:

- Reviewed the sales to see if the 2000 county's comprehensive reappraisal was staying with the current market.
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2008 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2009.
- Revalued land in the city of Seward for 2008 and made some adjustments for 2009.
- Revalued land and improvements in the city of Milford and adjusted by a percentage.
- Reviewed land reappraised commercial properties (improvements) in the city limits of Seward.
- Reviewed Section 42 Housing properties. No adjustments were made.

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed the sales.
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections if necessary. Completed such changes and recounted acres. Completed all sixteen precincts for GIS land use layer.
- Reviewed and accounted for properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes as necessary.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends. No change for 2009.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry Cropland and grassland LCG values in Market Areas 1 and 3. Values in area 3 are the special valuations for Market Area 2.
- Changed the tree cover classifications into one class which is GRT1 with one value for trees.
- Completed the soil conversion in Market Areas 2 and 3. Recounted all the acres in these two market areas.
- Removed the spot symbol adjustments.

For assessment year **2010** the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of houses and buildings on properties classified as farms in Range 1.
- Revalued lots in the town of Beaver Crossing under 1 acre
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2009 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2010.
- Reviewed lots in several Seward subdivisions and made minor changes

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2009 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2010.
- Reappraisal of improvements and land in the city of Milford. Physical inspections and new photos were taken.
- Reappraisal of improvements in the village of Cordova. Physical inspections and new photos were taken.
- Reappraisal of improvements and land in the village of Beaver Crossing. Physical inspections and new photos were taken.
- Reappraisal of the improvements and land at the I-80 and Milford Interchange. Physical inspections and new photos

were taken.

- Reviewed Section 42 Housing projects. No adjustments were made.

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed the sales.
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and some physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes as necessary.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends. No change for 2010.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry Cropland LCG values in Market Area 1.
- Completed the soil conversion in Market Area 1. Recounted all agricultural parcels in this market area.
- Revalued wetland easements.

For assessment year **2011** the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the houses and buildings on properties in Beaver Crossing. Physical inspections and new photos were completed.
- Completed pickup work and buildings permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2010 and changed according to completion on January 1, 2011.
- Reviewed new subdivisions that were discounted and priced as necessary.
- Reviewed lots in several Seward subdivisions and made minor changes.
- Reviewed and inspected properties in Cordova, Goehner, Utica and Tamora as part of the 6 year inspection requirement. New photos were taken and measurements when necessary. Added omitted, unreported changes.
- Reviewed acreages and changed land pricing in the west half of the county.
- Using GIS, recounted excess farm building sites and values.

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales.
- Completed pickup work for 2010 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2011.
- Reappraisal of improvements in the Village of Bee, Goehner, Pleasant Dale and the unincorporated towns of Tamora and Ruby. Changed some lot pricing. Physical inspections and new photos completed.
- Reappraisal of improvements and land in the Village of Garland and Utica. Physical inspections and new photos completed.
- Reappraisal of improvements in the Village of Staplehurst. Physical inspections and new photos completed.
- Reappraisal of the improvements and land in the rural except for the I 80 interchanges at Seward and Milford which were completed in 2010.
- Reviewed Section 42 Housing properties and made no changes.

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed the sales.
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres.
- Verified the existing market area areas still follow the market trends. No change for 2011.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required levels of value. Changed various irrigated, dry cropland and grass LCG values in all 3 market areas. Change market values in the Special Valuation Market Area 2.

For assessment year **2012** the following changes were made:

Residential:

- Reviewed sales.
- Reappraised the houses, buildings and land on properties in Cordova, Goehner, Utica, Utica fringe area, Tamora, Staplehurst and Beaver Crossing fringe area. Physical inspections and new photos completed. Market analysis completed. 2011 pricing used for all except Beaver Crossing fringe. Used 2010 to match the town of Beaver Crossing that was reappraised in 2010.
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2011 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2012.
- Reviewed and recalculated lot discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted.
- Reviewed lots in several Seward subdivisions and some rural subdivisions and made minor adjustments.
- Reviewed and inspected properties in Bee, Garland, Pleasant Dale and Staplehurst as part of the 6 year inspection requirement. New photos were taken and measurements when necessary. Added omitted and unreported changes.
- Reviewed and compared new aerial photography with old ones in the following precincts: I, P, B, G J and O as part of The 6 year inspection requirement. Visited properties with changes, took new photos, measurements. Added omitted and unreported changes.

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales.
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2011 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2012.
- Reviewed Section 42 Housing properties. No adjustment made.

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed sales
- Verified land use changes using GIS, NRD and FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes as necessary.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends. No change for 2012.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated, dry and grass LCG values in all three (3) market areas. Changed market values in the Special Valuation Market Area 2.

Agricultural land is reviewed every year and values established to maintain the ratios and statistics mandated by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. An annual study will be conducted to see if the current market continues to support the areas.

The office utilizes the Terra Scan administrative and CAMA system using the Marshall Swift costs. We download digital camera photos into the system. Eight by ten color aerial photos were taken during 2000 and 2001. The aerial photos were scanned into the computer and attached to the property record card. Some new digital aerials of the rural properties in Ranges 1 and 2 have been taken in 2008 and 2009. New digital aerials were taken of the rural properties with improvements in Range 3 and 4 in 2010.

Pickup work, the collection of data relating to new construction, remodeling, additions, alterations and removals of existing buildings or structures along with zoning and annexation is done on a continuous year round basis. Parcels are flagged if the value is to be added for the following year to be changed during the appropriate time frame.

RCN (replacement cost new). The cost approach is used in setting our values. An income analysis is only used occasionally for commercial property to substantiate the cost approach.

The real estate transfer statements, form 521, are processed on a continual basis.

The assessment plans for year 2013 are as follows:

Residential:

- ◆ Reappraisal of the towns of Bee, Garland, Pleasant Dale, Grover, Milford and Milford fringe areas.
- ◆ Review and analyze sales. Prioritize other areas that need adjustments. Possible percentage adjustments as budget restraints, personnel limitations and time factors limit resources to reappraise.
- ◆ Reappraisal of Section 42 Housing
- ◆ Review and analyze and recalculate newer subdivisions in Seward that already have land values discounted. Set values in new subdivisions.
- ◆ Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.
- ◆ Inspections started for the town of Seward for the 6 year inspection requirement. Analyze other villages/towns to continue with the 6 year inspection cycle.

Commercial:

- ◆ Complete pickup work and building permits on new construction.
- ◆ Review and analyze the sales.
- ◆ Reappraisal (including inspections, review and new photos) of the industrial properties in the county.

Agricultural Land:

- ◆ Review and analyze sales for market trends
- ◆ Review and analyze the 3 market areas
- ◆ Revalue land as needed to comply with the required level of value
- ◆ Continue to monitor land use changes, using GIS, FSA records, maps, owner information and inspection of properties

The assessment plans for year 2014 are as follows:

Residential:

- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize areas that need appraisal review.
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.
- Reappraise the town of Seward.
- Continue with the 6 year inspection, review and new photos process.

Commercial:

- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize areas that need appraisal review.
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.

Agricultural Land:

- Review and analyze sales and market areas.
- Review and keep current on CRP and other farm programs.
- Monitor and keep current with land use changes.
-

The assessment plans for year 2015 are as follows:

Residential:

- Prioritize areas that need review and analyze sales.
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.
- Continue with the 6 year inspection process.

Commercial:

- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize areas that need appraisal and review.
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.

Agricultural Land:

- Review and analyze sales and market areas.
- Review and keep current with CRP and other farm programs.
- Monitor and keep current with land use changes.

I respectfully submit this plan of assessment and request the resources needed to continue with maintaining up-to-date, fair and equitable assessments in achieving the statutory required statistics.

June 13, 2012
Date

Marilyn Hladky
Marilyn Hladky, Seward County Assessor

2013 Assessment Survey for Seward County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2 - One employee is 40 hours a week and the other is 30 hours a week
4.	Other part-time employees:
	2 -1 temporary part time & -1 part time lister 20 -25 hrs per week
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 255,685
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget <i>if different from above</i>:
	Same
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$ 39,000
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	0
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$ 28,000 Includes GIS, Network maintenance, GIS Workshop, and Personal Property on line.
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 1,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	There is a sinking fund established with the treasurer to replace the server. Each office annually budgets \$1,000 for this fund.
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$ 8,386.37

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software: Thompson Reuters; formerly TerraScan
2.	CAMA software: Thompson Reuters; formerly TerraScan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used? Yes; The cadastral maps were purchased in 1966 and are still maintained by the County Assessor's office. The county also uses GIS.
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps? The county assessor's staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software? Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address? Yes; seward.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps? The programming is maintained by GIS Workshop and the maps are maintained by the county assessor's office staff.
8.	Personal Property software: Thompson Reuters; formerly TerraScan

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? Beaver Crossing, Bee, Garland, Goehner, Milford, Pleasant Dale, Seward, and Utica
4.	When was zoning implemented? 1973; The comprehensive plan was updated in 1995. More recently, the county board conducted a total review of the comprehensive plan. It was then updated and adopted in 2007.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Jon Fritz does all commercial & industrial valuations including pickup work, sales verification and maintenance. He also assists in residential market studies and has been doing reappraisal of towns and rural areas as needed. Jon assists in other requests from the assessor, including difficult to value properties.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop; GIS Workshop maintains and supports the GIS software ESRI updates and maintains a website that provides public access to the counties assessment records.
3.	Other services:
	TerraScan software package for administrative purposes and for CAMA processes, including Marshall and Swift. An on line personal property schedule system developed by Bottom Line Resources from Aurora.

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Verbal agreement
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	The county has not specified specific certificates or qualifications, but Jon Fritz, who has been employed by the county for quite a few years, holds the Certified General appraiser credential. Jon also has significant experience in mass appraisal in Nebraska.
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?
	The Appraiser does analysis, develops land values, depreciation, and submits preliminary value estimates to the assessor. The assessor reviews all of the values and either approves them or in some instances may alter a value after consulting with the appraiser. Most of the work that the appraiser does is with the commercial or industrial property and a few hard to value properties. The assessor and staff do most of the residential and agricultural valuation.

2013 Certification for Seward 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 Seward 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

