

# 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 Sherman County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	79	Median	96.39
Total Sales Price	\$6,199,970	Mean	105.60
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,198,470	Wgt. Mean	90.46
Total Assessed Value	\$5,606,915	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$48,264
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$78,462	Avg. Assessed Value	\$70,974

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.49 to 101.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.28 to 95.64
95% Mean C.I	95.50 to 115.70
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	15.14
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.88
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.17

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	65	99	98.54
2011	60	97	97
2010	54	98	98
2009	74	98	98

## 2013 Commission Summary for Sherman County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8	Median	97.06
Total Sales Price	\$140,090	Mean	95.64
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$140,090	Wgt. Mean	87.21
Total Assessed Value	\$122,170	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$43,973
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$17,511	Avg. Assessed Value	\$15,271

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	50.75 to 125.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	58.92 to 115.50
95% Mean C.I	76.65 to 114.63
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.85
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.69
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.28

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	8		98.90
2011	10		95
2010	13	98	98
2009	9	100	95



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	71	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period (October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2012). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. Annually the county completes the pick-up work from zoning and other information resources brought into the office, including new construction, on the residential properties in a timely manner.

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

The residential assessor locations and valuation groups for 2013 remain unchanged.

For 2012 the residential assessment actions for Valuation Groups 2, 3, 4 and 5 included an onsite review/physical inspection with new pictures taken, records were updated for additions, decks and garages, year built, and effective age determinations. Property record cards were updated or replaced as needed, new Marshall Swift costing was implemented.

For 2013 Valuation Group 1 (Loup City) had an onsite review/physical inspection with new pictures taken, records were updated for additions, decks and garages, year built, and effective age determinations. Property record cards were updated or replaced as needed, new Marshall Swift costing was implemented.

For 2013 Valuation Group 10, which consists of the residential/recreational homes on leased land at Sherman Lake, was physically inspected and reviewed for pickup work and sales, with no assessment adjustments required.

For 2013 Valuation Group 15 (Acreages) had an onsite review/physical inspection with new pictures taken, records were updated for additions, decks and garages, outbuildings, year built, and effective age determinations. Property record cards were updated or replaced as needed, new Marshall Swift costing was implemented.

**2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Sherman County**

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Deputy	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Loup City – Largest community, active retail/business, grain elevator, K-12 school, on highway, permits
	2	Ashton – Small community, retail/business, on highway, fuel station, post office, no school, permits
	3	Hazard – Bedroom community, no post office, no school, no fuel station, one tavern/restaurant, no retail/business, permits
	4	Litchfield – Second largest community, active retail/business, on highway, active railroad line, grain elevator, post office, K-12 school, pay-at-pump fuel station only, permits
	5	Rockville – Bedroom community, limited retail/business, permits, post office, no school, no fuel station
	10	Sherman Lake – Trail#12, residential/recreation homes on leased land
	15	Acreage – Rural residential parcel, permits required
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost approach provided through the CAMA system and sales comparison where there are enough sales.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Loup City & Sherman Lake – 2010; small towns and acreages – 2007.	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Local market information	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	They are reviewed annually	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Litchfield 2008, Loup City 2012 and Sherman Lake 2010	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	Square foot method	

**82 Sherman  
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 : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 6,199,970  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,198,470  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,606,915  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 78,462  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 70,974

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 25.69  
 PRD : 116.74

COV : 43.38  
 STD : 45.81  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.76  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 351.40  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.74

95% Median C.I. : 89.49 to 101.08  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.28 to 95.64  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.50 to 115.70

Printed:3/25/2013 2:10:28PM

**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-10 To 31-DEC-10	15	103.27	101.20	98.55	16.43	102.69	53.74	158.82	90.17 to 108.02	80,067	78,910
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	103.30	104.82	99.26	08.27	105.60	90.47	127.37	90.47 to 127.37	43,795	43,469
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	12	96.24	96.51	91.88	12.78	105.04	72.40	162.18	82.08 to 98.96	74,783	68,713
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	5	119.05	114.85	91.39	20.45	125.67	56.08	160.97	N/A	53,600	48,983
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	12	90.22	103.28	87.93	29.69	117.46	67.09	171.05	74.32 to 146.12	75,733	66,595
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	88.02	114.85	87.94	39.91	130.60	72.11	327.00	73.19 to 114.05	103,278	90,818
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	12	89.08	93.90	86.04	13.50	109.14	71.18	137.56	84.44 to 97.15	93,417	80,376
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	8	105.31	132.95	83.93	52.18	158.41	59.05	351.40	59.05 to 351.40	76,250	63,996
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	38	99.82	102.09	95.62	17.02	106.77	53.74	162.18	96.09 to 107.34	69,189	66,156
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	41	88.82	108.86	86.66	33.64	125.62	59.05	351.40	85.61 to 97.76	87,056	75,439
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	35	97.32	102.88	91.12	21.00	112.91	56.08	171.05	90.47 to 104.14	66,771	60,841
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.39	105.60	90.46	25.69	116.74	53.74	351.40	89.49 to 101.08	78,462	70,974

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	32	96.86	111.20	94.14	26.13	118.12	73.19	351.40	88.24 to 104.14	59,971	56,457
02	5	97.15	103.23	94.08	21.68	109.73	72.40	153.56	N/A	38,500	36,220
03	1	88.82	88.82	88.82	00.00	100.00	88.82	88.82	N/A	73,000	64,835
04	11	96.09	125.55	101.59	39.68	123.58	81.27	327.00	85.13 to 162.18	41,991	42,660
05	3	82.08	92.38	82.04	19.87	112.60	73.06	122.00	N/A	40,500	33,227
10	11	98.96	91.48	88.79	15.73	103.03	59.05	114.05	67.09 to 110.00	138,736	123,180
15	16	96.27	94.68	85.61	24.39	110.59	53.74	158.82	68.89 to 119.05	119,025	101,901
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.39	105.60	90.46	25.69	116.74	53.74	351.40	89.49 to 101.08	78,462	70,974

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	67	96.39	108.27	91.03	27.38	118.94	53.74	351.40	89.34 to 102.46	69,550	63,309
06	11	98.96	91.48	88.79	15.73	103.03	59.05	114.05	67.09 to 110.00	138,736	123,180
07	1	82.08	82.08	82.08	00.00	100.00	82.08	82.08	N/A	12,500	10,260
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.39	105.60	90.46	25.69	116.74	53.74	351.40	89.49 to 101.08	78,462	70,974

**82 Sherman  
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 : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 6,199,970  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,198,470  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,606,915  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 78,462  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 70,974

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 25.69  
 PRD : 116.74

COV : 43.38  
 STD : 45.81  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.76  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 351.40  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.74

95% Median C.I. : 89.49 to 101.08  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.28 to 95.64  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.50 to 115.70

Printed:3/25/2013 2:10:28PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	2	339.20	339.20	335.71	03.60	101.04	327.00	351.40	N/A	3,500	11,750	
Less Than 15,000	7	127.50	178.76	137.11	62.99	130.38	82.08	351.40	82.08 to 351.40	10,071	13,809	
Less Than 30,000	18	127.44	150.20	132.04	34.90	113.75	82.08	351.40	108.58 to 160.97	17,598	23,236	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	77	96.09	99.54	90.18	19.87	110.38	53.74	171.05	89.34 to 100.55	80,409	72,512	
Greater Than 14,999	72	96.00	98.49	89.92	19.35	109.53	53.74	171.05	88.82 to 99.08	85,111	76,531	
Greater Than 29,999	61	90.94	92.45	88.22	15.80	104.79	53.74	171.05	88.12 to 97.76	96,421	85,060	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	339.20	339.20	335.71	03.60	101.04	327.00	351.40	N/A	3,500	11,750	
5,000 TO 14,999	5	108.58	114.58	115.22	22.08	99.44	82.08	164.58	N/A	12,700	14,633	
15,000 TO 29,999	11	127.37	132.02	130.58	17.02	101.10	84.44	162.18	85.61 to 160.97	22,388	29,235	
30,000 TO 59,999	17	97.76	103.48	102.07	16.55	101.38	67.34	171.05	88.12 to 119.05	41,341	42,198	
60,000 TO 99,999	23	88.82	89.64	89.71	09.92	99.92	72.40	114.05	81.89 to 95.90	77,817	69,808	
100,000 TO 149,999	11	98.96	88.91	88.00	17.12	101.03	53.74	119.83	56.08 to 110.00	123,555	108,725	
150,000 TO 249,999	8	82.58	84.96	83.79	19.10	101.40	59.05	108.02	59.05 to 108.02	176,875	148,211	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	80.26	80.26	78.71	11.31	101.97	71.18	89.34	N/A	307,500	242,030	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.39	105.60	90.46	25.69	116.74	53.74	351.40	89.49 to 101.08	78,462	70,974	



## **2013 Correlation Section for Sherman County**

---

### **A. Residential Real Property**

Sherman County is located in central Nebraska. The county seat and largest town is Loup City. The Middle Loup River runs diagonally the county. The county has two high schools; one in Loup City and one in Litchfield. Just six miles northeast of Loup City is the Sherman Reservoir consisting of 89 lake homes and 200 mobile homes. The population in Loup City has increased slightly and they are experiencing some economic growth. The smaller towns in the county however, are experiencing decreasing population.

The statistical sampling of 79 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Sherman County. The calculated median is 96.39%. All valuation groupings that have an adequate number of sales are within the acceptable range.

All residential, commercial and agricultural sales are reviewed by researching the deed. Sale verification questionnaires are mailed to both the buyer and seller of the property. The questionnaire asked for details to assist the assessor in discovering the terms of the sale. Physical on-site reviews are also performed on the sales as deemed appropriate to verify data at time of sale. Additionally, sales in the study period are monitored for any changes that may take place after the purchase. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified residential sales within the county and is confident that all qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file.

In 2011 the Division implemented a review of the counties to conduct an assessment practices review. This review was scheduled to cover one third of the counties each year during years 2011, 2012 and 2013. Sherman County will be reviewed in 2013. An additional part of this review is to determine whether the County has a 6 year inspection cycle in place and whether they are on schedule to meet the requirements of the 6 year review. Sherman County is on a cyclic review with the listing and inspection work completed by assessor and staff. The county is on schedule to complete the 6 year inspection cycle in 2014.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Sherman 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 Sherman 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 Sherman 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 Sherman 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 Sherman County**

### **Commercial:**

All sales are reviewed through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner.

For 2013 the county conducted a market analysis that included the qualified commercial sales that occurred during the current study period (October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2012). The review and analysis was done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. No commercial assessment actions (adjustments) were needed to improve the equity within the commercial class of property.

Typically, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. For 2014 all commercial properties in the county will be physically inspected, new photos taken, and listing information reviewed for accuracy. New Marshall & Swift costing will be utilized and market depreciation applied. Sherman County will be in compliance with the 6 year inspection cycle for 2014.

**2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Sherman County**

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>														
	Assessor and deputy														
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Loup City – Largest community, active retail/business, grain elevator, K-12 school, on highway, permits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Ashton – Small community, retail/business, on highway, fuel station, post office, no school, permits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Hazard – Bedroom community, no post office, no school, no fuel station, one tavern/restaurant, no retail/business, permits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Litchfield – Second largest community, active retail/business, on highway, active railroad line, grain elevator, post office, K-12 school, pay-at-pump fuel station only, permits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Rockville – Bedroom community, limited retail/business, permits, post office, no school, no fuel station</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Rural – all businesses not located in a town</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Loup City – Largest community, active retail/business, grain elevator, K-12 school, on highway, permits	2	Ashton – Small community, retail/business, on highway, fuel station, post office, no school, permits	3	Hazard – Bedroom community, no post office, no school, no fuel station, one tavern/restaurant, no retail/business, permits	4	Litchfield – Second largest community, active retail/business, on highway, active railroad line, grain elevator, post office, K-12 school, pay-at-pump fuel station only, permits	5	Rockville – Bedroom community, limited retail/business, permits, post office, no school, no fuel station	6	Rural – all businesses not located in a town
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>														
1	Loup City – Largest community, active retail/business, grain elevator, K-12 school, on highway, permits														
2	Ashton – Small community, retail/business, on highway, fuel station, post office, no school, permits														
3	Hazard – Bedroom community, no post office, no school, no fuel station, one tavern/restaurant, no retail/business, permits														
4	Litchfield – Second largest community, active retail/business, on highway, active railroad line, grain elevator, post office, K-12 school, pay-at-pump fuel station only, permits														
5	Rockville – Bedroom community, limited retail/business, permits, post office, no school, no fuel station														
6	Rural – all businesses not located in a town														
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>														
	Cost approach through CAMA system – depreciation through the local market, sales comparison where there are enough sales and income if information is available. Use contract appraiser on some parcels.														
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>														
	Review like sales from surrounding counties for comparable parcels, purchase price & use, receive assistance from contract appraiser, Jason Wozniak.														
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>														
	2002														
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>														
	The county develops their own based on local market information.														
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>														
	Yes														
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>														
	Annually the tables are reviewed and updated if necessary														
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>														
	2000														
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>														
	All lots are valued by square foot or by the acre, based on sales and like properties														

**82 Sherman**  
**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 : 8  
Total Sales Price : 140,090  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 140,090  
Total Assessed Value : 122,170  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 17,511  
Avg. Assessed Value : 15,271

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 96  
COD : 16.35  
PRD : 109.67

COV : 23.75  
STD : 22.71  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.87  
MAX Sales Ratio : 125.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 50.75

95% Median C.I. : 50.75 to 125.50  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.92 to 115.50  
95% Mean C.I. : 76.65 to 114.63

Printed:3/25/2013 2:10:29PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											
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	102.48	102.48	100.68	02.96	101.79	99.45	105.50	N/A	24,590	24,758
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	94.67	94.67	94.67	00.00	100.00	94.67	94.67	N/A	5,910	5,595
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	82.53	82.53	82.53	00.00	100.00	82.53	82.53	N/A	20,000	16,505
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	50.75	50.75	50.75	00.00	100.00	50.75	50.75	N/A	37,500	19,030
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	125.50	125.50	125.50	00.00	100.00	125.50	125.50	N/A	6,000	7,530
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	115.58	115.58	115.58	00.00	100.00	115.58	115.58	N/A	18,000	20,805
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	91.14	91.14	91.14	00.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A	3,500	3,190
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	5	94.67	86.58	80.51	15.14	107.54	50.75	105.50	N/A	22,518	18,129
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	1	125.50	125.50	125.50	00.00	100.00	125.50	125.50	N/A	6,000	7,530
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	103.36	103.36	111.60	11.82	92.62	91.14	115.58	N/A	10,750	11,998
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	82.53	75.98	64.86	17.74	117.14	50.75	94.67	N/A	21,137	13,710
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	125.50	125.50	125.50	00.00	100.00	125.50	125.50	N/A	6,000	7,530
<u>ALL</u>	8	97.06	95.64	87.21	16.35	109.67	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	17,511	15,271

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	97.06	91.41	85.34	15.90	107.11	50.75	115.58	50.75 to 115.58	21,765	18,575
02	1	91.14	91.14	91.14	00.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A	3,500	3,190
04	1	125.50	125.50	125.50	00.00	100.00	125.50	125.50	N/A	6,000	7,530
<u>ALL</u>	8	97.06	95.64	87.21	16.35	109.67	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	17,511	15,271

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	8	97.06	95.64	87.21	16.35	109.67	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	17,511	15,271
04											
<u>ALL</u>	8	97.06	95.64	87.21	16.35	109.67	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	17,511	15,271

**82 Sherman  
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 : 8  
 Total Sales Price : 140,090  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 140,090  
 Total Assessed Value : 122,170  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 17,511  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 15,271

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 87  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 16.35  
 PRD : 109.67

COV : 23.75  
 STD : 22.71  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.87  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.75

95% Median C.I. : 50.75 to 125.50  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.92 to 115.50  
 95% Mean C.I. : 76.65 to 114.63

Printed:3/25/2013 2:10:29PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	91.14	91.14	91.14	00.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A	3,500	3,190	
Less Than 15,000	4	100.09	104.20	105.73	11.29	98.55	91.14	125.50	N/A	6,353	6,716	
Less Than 30,000	6	100.09	102.49	101.21	13.03	101.26	82.53	125.50	82.53 to 125.50	10,568	10,696	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	7	99.45	96.28	87.11	17.04	110.53	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	19,513	16,997	
Greater Than 14,999	4	90.99	87.08	83.11	22.46	104.78	50.75	115.58	N/A	28,670	23,826	
Greater Than 29,999	2	75.10	75.10	75.63	32.42	99.30	50.75	99.45	N/A	38,340	28,998	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	91.14	91.14	91.14	00.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A	3,500	3,190	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	105.50	108.56	108.06	09.74	100.46	94.67	125.50	N/A	7,303	7,892	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	99.06	99.06	98.18	16.69	100.90	82.53	115.58	N/A	19,000	18,655	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	75.10	75.10	75.63	32.42	99.30	50.75	99.45	N/A	38,340	28,998	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	8	97.06	95.64	87.21	16.35	109.67	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	17,511	15,271	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
353	4	100.09	94.11	71.88	21.38	130.93	50.75	125.50	N/A	14,853	10,676	
384	1	91.14	91.14	91.14	00.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A	3,500	3,190	
444	1	99.45	99.45	99.45	00.00	100.00	99.45	99.45	N/A	39,180	38,965	
528	1	82.53	82.53	82.53	00.00	100.00	82.53	82.53	N/A	20,000	16,505	
556	1	115.58	115.58	115.58	00.00	100.00	115.58	115.58	N/A	18,000	20,805	
<u>ALL</u>	8	97.06	95.64	87.21	16.35	109.67	50.75	125.50	50.75 to 125.50	17,511	15,271	



## 2013 Correlation Section for Sherman County

---

### A. Commercial Real Property

Sherman County is located in central Nebraska with Loup City being the county seat, located 50 miles northwest of Grand Island on Highway 92.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 8 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 97.06%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Sherman County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The county reviews all sales that occurred during the current study period through research of the deed and sending out supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers. The disqualified sales were coded out for being substantially changed, foreclosure sales, unimproved at time of sale, family sales, etc. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified commercial sales within the county and is confident that all qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file.

The county completed a review and analysis to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. As a result of this review, there were no assessment actions taken in the commercial class of property for assessment year 2013 other than pickup work. The county plans on completing their statutory six-year inspection timely.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Sherman County will be reviewed in 2013.

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

**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 Sherman 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 Sherman 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 Sherman 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 Sherman County**

The Sherman County Assessor and staff confirm agricultural sales by the use of questionnaires or by contacting the seller and/or buyer to gather as much information about the sales as possible. All ag sales are reviewed and discussed with liaison to work toward the goal of inclusion of all qualified sales.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural sales that occurred during the current study period (October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2012). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural class of real property.

Annually the county conducts the pickup of new construction of agricultural improvements and updates any known land use changes in a timely manner. Pickup work was completed and placed on the 2013 assessment roll. The assessor and staff continued working with the local Farm Service Agency and Natural Resource Districts for information regarding land use and acres.

Sherman County reviewed all sales and made the determination that there were no economic differences across the county and therefore has one market area for the entire county.

Land usage is updated annually through reviewing NRD permits, CRP owner verification, physical inspection and property owner reports. Land use changes are measured and attached to the individual file. New property record cards were completed.

Non-agricultural influences are reviewed to determine if there is a difference indicating a need for special valuation.

The Irrigated land went up 30%, Dry land went up 40% and Grass and CRP increased 4% to keep in line with the market.

The first seven out of 13 townships will have an on-sight review/physical inspection of all improvements and out buildings. Pictures will be taken for the 2014 year.

**2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Sherman County**

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and deputy	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	No discernible differences have been determined for agricultural land for 2013.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Annually sales are plotted, topography & geographic characteristics are reviewed.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Written and on site review, sales are monitored and verified for recreational use, areas along the river are reviewed for recreational usage.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Written sales verifications, zoning permits.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	Yes, no value difference has been determined.	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	No Wetland Reserve Program parcels in Sherman County.	

**82 Sherman**  
**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 : 59  
Total Sales Price : 21,432,750  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,330,038  
Total Assessed Value : 14,438,297  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 378,475  
Avg. Assessed Value : 244,717

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 65  
MEAN : 71  
COD : 28.62  
PRD : 109.42

COV : 35.83  
STD : 25.35  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.39  
MAX Sales Ratio : 163.34  
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.08

95% Median C.I. : 56.06 to 79.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.43 to 71.89  
95% Mean C.I. : 64.28 to 77.22

Printed:3/25/2013 2:10:30PM

**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	3	82.62	93.35	93.64	20.30	99.69	73.56	123.88	N/A	254,333	238,153
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	95.68	90.65	90.31	11.91	100.38	65.17	109.94	65.17 to 109.94	275,214	248,538
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	79.23	77.66	80.59	12.34	96.36	52.68	97.87	52.68 to 97.87	351,700	283,436
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	4	86.79	83.37	75.49	08.68	110.44	65.50	94.42	N/A	253,826	191,604
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	82.37	85.68	90.44	18.25	94.74	61.90	109.31	61.90 to 109.31	263,534	238,347
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	87.00	75.97	66.58	15.34	114.10	50.43	90.48	N/A	179,333	119,393
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	79.61	106.65	110.95	36.15	96.12	77.01	163.34	N/A	176,667	196,014
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	51.15	51.98	49.93	13.67	104.11	43.06	62.55	N/A	385,000	192,219
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	46.86	47.61	45.64	18.67	104.32	30.08	70.35	N/A	505,249	230,587
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	10	50.35	53.40	46.09	18.27	115.86	40.19	95.00	43.25 to 56.45	500,813	230,818
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	60.07	60.07	70.10	18.61	85.69	48.89	71.25	N/A	1,220,882	855,873
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	40.97	44.13	45.82	11.84	96.31	37.74	58.11	N/A	399,597	183,114
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	21	84.44	85.32	84.40	14.64	101.09	52.68	123.88	73.57 to 95.68	293,653	247,843
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	16	76.18	79.37	75.08	27.01	105.71	43.06	163.34	55.39 to 90.48	261,825	196,574
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	22	46.99	50.58	50.85	19.51	99.47	30.08	95.00	43.25 to 56.06	544,279	276,747
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	24	85.31	84.40	84.76	14.54	99.58	52.68	109.94	74.71 to 95.68	291,038	246,680
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	15	55.39	66.26	55.86	38.78	118.62	30.08	163.34	46.86 to 79.61	342,283	191,202
<u>ALL</u>	59	71.25	70.75	64.66	28.62	109.42	30.08	163.34	56.06 to 79.23	378,475	244,717

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	59	71.25	70.75	64.66	28.62	109.42	30.08	163.34	56.06 to 79.23	378,475	244,717
<u>ALL</u>	59	71.25	70.75	64.66	28.62	109.42	30.08	163.34	56.06 to 79.23	378,475	244,717

**82 Sherman**  
**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 : 59  
 Total Sales Price : 21,432,750  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,330,038  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,438,297  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 378,475  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 244,717

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 71  
 COD : 28.62  
 PRD : 109.42

COV : 35.83  
 STD : 25.35  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.39  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 163.34  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.08

95% Median C.I. : 56.06 to 79.23  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.43 to 71.89  
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.28 to 77.22

Printed:3/25/2013 2:10:30PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	2	71.82	71.82	46.05	44.04	155.96	40.19	103.44	N/A	1,080,000	497,293
1	2	71.82	71.82	46.05	44.04	155.96	40.19	103.44	N/A	1,080,000	497,293
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	61.90	66.67	54.57	27.32	122.17	43.69	94.42	N/A	260,301	142,054
1	3	61.90	66.67	54.57	27.32	122.17	43.69	94.42	N/A	260,301	142,054
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	20	68.06	66.54	60.11	25.99	110.70	30.08	103.64	52.18 to 82.62	203,259	122,189
1	20	68.06	66.54	60.11	25.99	110.70	30.08	103.64	52.18 to 82.62	203,259	122,189
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>71.25</b>	<b>70.75</b>	<b>64.66</b>	<b>28.62</b>	<b>109.42</b>	<b>30.08</b>	<b>163.34</b>	<b>56.06 to 79.23</b>	<b>378,475</b>	<b>244,717</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	15	71.72	80.33	65.90	36.39	121.90	40.19	163.34	55.39 to 103.44	600,773	395,918
1	15	71.72	80.33	65.90	36.39	121.90	40.19	163.34	55.39 to 103.44	600,773	395,918
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	56.17	62.61	53.40	27.68	117.25	43.69	94.42	N/A	272,726	145,626
1	4	56.17	62.61	53.40	27.68	117.25	43.69	94.42	N/A	272,726	145,626
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	26	74.14	68.59	61.42	22.42	111.67	30.08	103.64	52.68 to 82.62	220,699	135,556
1	26	74.14	68.59	61.42	22.42	111.67	30.08	103.64	52.68 to 82.62	220,699	135,556
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>71.25</b>	<b>70.75</b>	<b>64.66</b>	<b>28.62</b>	<b>109.42</b>	<b>30.08</b>	<b>163.34</b>	<b>56.06 to 79.23</b>	<b>378,475</b>	<b>244,717</b>

## Sherman County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Sherman	1	N/A	2,700	2,610	2,610	2,520	2,520	2,460	2,459	2,549
Custer	1	N/A	3,199	2,823	2,682	2,521	2,309	2,294	2,290	2,765
Valley	1	N/A	3,200	3,200	2,400	2,100	2,100	1,500	1,500	2,528
Greeley	2	N/A	3,225	2,945	2,755	2,610	2,555	2,555	2,390	2,766
Howard	7200	3,100	2,900	2,725	2,700	2,550	2,550	2,525	2,400	2,747
Howard	7100	2,900	2,800	2,700	2,600	2,400	2,300	2,200	2,100	2,355
Hall	1	4,096	4,099	3,512	3,498	2,553	2,551	2,420	2,420	3,631
Buffalo	1	3,190	3,180	2,949	2,824	2,500	2,450	2,348	2,347	2,685

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Sherman	1	N/A	1,210	1,150	1,150	1,085	1,085	1,020	1,019	1,076
Custer	1	N/A	1,365	1,275	1,265	1,185	925	915	910	1,140
Valley	1	N/A	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,050	1,224
Greeley	2	N/A	1,675	1,650	1,640	1,435	1,370	950	780	1,221
Howard	7200	970	950	810	800	770	750	740	700	788
Howard	7100	1,200	1,200	1,100	1,100	1,000	950	900	800	959
Hall	1	2,047	2,046	1,809	1,802	1,365	1,347	1,205	1,204	1,763
Buffalo	1	1,350	1,350	1,300	1,250	1,000	950	925	900	1,077

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Sherman	1	N/A	631	613	610	583	582	571	570	574
Custer	1	N/A	561	555	556	550	550	528	534	536
Valley	1	N/A	751	751	747	750	741	566	548	574
Greeley	2	N/A	703	668	633	622	604	576	555	569
Howard	7200	760	740	713	713	675	666	611	610	629
Howard	7100	805	800	795	780	750	750	700	700	717
Hall	1	1,555	1,556	1,221	1,224	896	896	892	897	1,002
Buffalo	1	849	832	799	788	672	595	549	535	593

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

2013 Methodology Report for Special Valuation  
Sherman County, Nebraska

Upon review of the properties and sales within the current time period, there is no evidence for cause to implement special value for Sherman County. Sherman County has two filings from one property owner in 2004. There is no evidence to implement special value at this time. The parcels that have applications on file for special value are valued the same as other agricultural land within their own market area.

Dated this 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2013.

---

Sherie Kuszak  
Sherman County Assessor



## 2013 Correlation Section for Sherman County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Sherman County is located in the central portion of Nebraska just north of the Platte River Valley and just south of the sandhill region. The county seat of Sherman County is Loup City, located 50 miles northwest of Grand Island on Highways 58 and 92.

Sherman County is comprised of approximately 27% irrigated land, 13% dry crop land and 60% grass/pasture land. The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot irrigated. The average annual precipitation, mean annual growing-degree days above 50, and the annual freeze-free season all increase from northwest to southeast across this area of the state. These factors influence land values. Annual precipitation in this area is about 22 inches. The Middle Loup River runs diagonally through the county. Sherman County is all located within the Lower Loup Natural Resource District. Certification of irrigated acres is strictly enforced, with close monitoring of assessed irrigated acres, with regulations prohibiting the irrigation of uncertified acres.

Sherman County had 43 qualified agricultural land sales occurring in their county. These 43 sales occurred throughout the 3 year study period but they did not meet the thresholds. The irrigated sales within Sherman County were in the first year of the study period, the grassland sales were in the last year of the study period. Both the irrigated and grassland sales showed significant increases in sales prices during the three year study period. Year 1 and 2 sales ratios were up to 100% or more. Year 3 sales ratios were generally 50% or less. Because of the significant increase in sales prices and disproportionate number of sales in each of the study years, sales were added to balance the sales by year and by land use. Three irrigated sales were added in year 2 and 4 in year 3. Five grassland sales were added in year 1 and 4 in year 2. With the added sales, the sales file meets the thresholds and the apparent bias had been removed due to number of sales in each of the study years. Added sales came from comparable sales that existed within a six mile parameter of Sherman County. The resulting statistical profile shows 59 sales with a calculated median of 71.25%, a COD of 28.62% and a PRD of 109.42%. The statistical sample is comprised of 25% of the acres irrigated, 13% dry land acres, and 62% of the acres grassland. The acceptable thresholds for adequacy, time and majority land use are met.

The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use with the 80% majority land use providing a better indication of the level of value by majority land use. Irrigated land values were increased 30%. One subclass, dry land is outside of the acceptable range. There were not sufficient dry land sales to measure a level of value. Dry land values were increased based on consideration of rapidly increasing irrigated land prices and consistent increases in market values throughout this area. Dry land values were raised 40%. It should be noted that dry land values have failed to maintain a consistent value with irrigated as there generally are not enough dry land sales to support an increase in the level of value. Now with the continuing grain and irrigated land price increases, it is realized that number of sales are not there due to amount of dry land acres within the county, and the dry land sales that do exist fully support a price increase similar to irrigated lands. A slight increase in grassland values of about 2% was made based on sales from within the county and those that were added to bring the values into range for equalization and to respond to a

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Sherman County**

---

market indication that grassland prices are starting to increase in this area.

These land values are equalized with comparable adjoining areas. This entire area has seen a tremendous increase in ag land values during the last several years, with a continuing increase in cropland prices. The county has analyzed and addressed the increase in ag land prices with their assessment actions. The assessed value increases in cropland and dry land is significant, is consistent, and is widespread throughout this area. The Sherman County values for 2013 are well within the range and supported by assessed values for 2013 for comparable areas of adjoining counties.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 71% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**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 Sherman 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 Sherman 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 Sherman County**

---

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

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 3,730</b>	<b>Value : 516,399,890</b>	<b>Growth 2,379,719</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	204	563,425	14	104,440	19	99,525	237	767,390	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	891	2,949,085	63	1,198,960	115	2,814,325	1,069	6,962,370	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	895	35,963,925	65	3,878,870	125	10,770,090	1,085	50,612,885	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,099	39,476,435	79	5,182,270	144	13,683,940	1,322	58,342,645	927,215
<b>% of Res Total</b>	83.13	67.66	5.98	8.88	10.89	23.45	35.44	11.30	38.96
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	48	119,020	2	2,455	0	0	50	121,475	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	149	534,810	6	75,450	5	88,345	160	698,605	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	152	7,215,085	6	407,730	8	925,755	166	8,548,570	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	200	7,868,915	8	485,635	8	1,014,100	216	9,368,650	122,230
<b>% of Com Total</b>	92.59	83.99	3.70	5.18	3.70	10.82	5.79	1.81	5.14
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	58,950	0	0	0	0	1	58,950	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	114,435	0	0	0	0	1	114,435	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	1	173,385	0	0	0	0	1	173,385	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	5	175,645	5	175,645	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	292	5,233,415	292	5,233,415	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	293	14,436,085	293	14,436,085	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	298	19,845,145	298	19,845,145	63,850
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	7.99	3.84	2.68
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,099	39,476,435	79	5,182,270	442	33,529,085	1,620	78,187,790	991,065
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	67.84	50.49	4.88	6.63	27.28	42.88	43.43	15.14	41.65
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	201	8,042,300	8	485,635	8	1,014,100	217	9,542,035	122,230
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	92.63	84.28	3.69	5.09	3.69	10.63	5.82	1.85	5.14
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,300	47,518,735	87	5,667,905	450	34,543,185	1,837	87,729,825	1,113,295
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	70.77	54.16	4.74	6.46	24.50	39.37	49.25	16.99	46.78

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	6	248,475	879,720	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	6	248,475	879,720
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				6	248,475	879,720

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	170	18	342	530

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	32,055	89	11,829,725	1,112	210,203,565	1,202	222,065,345
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	63	13,539,570	609	166,194,045	672	179,733,615
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	65	2,655,090	626	24,216,015	691	26,871,105
30. Ag Total							1,893	428,670,065

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	44	45.00	337,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	44	45.00	1,848,795	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	59	193.27	193,520	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	65	0.00	806,295	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	318.62	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	7.64	3,020	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	2.00	15,000	2	2.00	15,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	374	388.09	2,917,500	418	433.09	3,255,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	376	384.09	14,664,360	420	429.09	16,513,155	1,266,424
34. HomeSite Total				<b>422</b>	<b>435.09</b>	<b>19,783,155</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	8	20.14	16,470	8	20.14	16,470	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	552	2,201.50	2,211,570	611	2,394.77	2,405,090	
37. FarmSite Improvements	598	0.00	9,551,655	663	0.00	10,357,950	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>671</b>	<b>2,414.91</b>	<b>12,779,510</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,967.21	0	0	5,285.83	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	2.04	805	0	9.68	3,825	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,093</b>	<b>8,145.51</b>	<b>32,566,490</b>	<b>1,266,424</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	2	442.25	593,195	2	442.25	593,195
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	22,791.71	25.16%	61,537,625	26.65%	2,700.00
47. 2A1	6,567.80	7.25%	17,141,920	7.42%	2,609.99
48. 2A	7,178.95	7.92%	18,737,000	8.11%	2,609.99
49. 3A1	5,953.80	6.57%	15,003,545	6.50%	2,519.99
50. 3A	3,194.64	3.53%	8,050,170	3.49%	2,519.90
51. 4A1	21,531.90	23.77%	52,969,100	22.94%	2,460.03
52. 4A	23,380.32	25.81%	57,488,775	24.89%	2,458.85
53. Total	90,599.12	100.00%	230,928,135	100.00%	2,548.90
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	7,471.31	16.84%	9,040,330	18.95%	1,210.01
56. 2D1	3,223.46	7.27%	3,706,990	7.77%	1,150.00
57. 2D	2,515.24	5.67%	2,892,535	6.06%	1,150.00
58. 3D1	3,774.95	8.51%	4,095,935	8.58%	1,085.03
59. 3D	959.20	2.16%	1,040,755	2.18%	1,085.02
60. 4D1	13,600.01	30.66%	13,871,930	29.07%	1,019.99
61. 4D	12,814.28	28.89%	13,063,690	27.38%	1,019.46
62. Total	44,358.45	100.00%	47,712,165	100.00%	1,075.60
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,431.46	2.66%	3,427,200	2.92%	630.99
65. 2G1	2,809.48	1.37%	1,722,255	1.47%	613.02
66. 2G	3,603.22	1.76%	2,199,600	1.87%	610.45
67. 3G1	5,010.46	2.45%	2,922,425	2.49%	583.26
68. 3G	5,605.39	2.74%	3,260,065	2.78%	581.59
69. 4G1	49,270.13	24.09%	28,129,530	23.95%	570.92
70. 4G	132,823.87	64.93%	75,767,775	64.52%	570.44
71. Total	204,554.01	100.00%	117,428,850	100.00%	574.07
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	90,599.12	26.66%	230,928,135	58.30%	2,548.90
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	44,358.45	13.05%	47,712,165	12.05%	1,075.60
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	204,554.01	60.18%	117,428,850	29.65%	574.07
72. Waste	382.45	0.11%	34,425	0.01%	90.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	9,506.31	2.80%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	339,894.03	100.00%	396,103,575	100.00%	1,165.37

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<hr/>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry Total</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass Total</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	115.44	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	10.50	28,350	6,157.26	15,868,465	84,431.36	215,031,320	90,599.12	230,928,135
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	3,324.50	3,622,785	41,033.95	44,089,380	44,358.45	47,712,165
<b>78. Grass</b>	6.50	3,705	9,293.01	5,343,755	195,254.50	112,081,390	204,554.01	117,428,850
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	2.80	250	379.65	34,175	382.45	34,425
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	164.86	0	9,456.89	0	9,621.75	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>32,055</b>	<b>18,777.57</b>	<b>24,835,255</b>	<b>321,099.46</b>	<b>371,236,265</b>	<b>339,894.03</b>	<b>396,103,575</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	90,599.12	26.66%	230,928,135	58.30%	2,548.90
<b>Dry Land</b>	44,358.45	13.05%	47,712,165	12.05%	1,075.60
<b>Grass</b>	204,554.01	60.18%	117,428,850	29.65%	574.07
<b>Waste</b>	382.45	0.11%	34,425	0.01%	90.01
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	9,621.75	2.83%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>339,894.03</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>396,103,575</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,165.37</b>

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

82 Sherman

	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	51,311,495	58,342,645	7,031,150	13.70%	927,215	11.90%
02. Recreational	18,526,250	19,845,145	1,318,895	7.12%	63,850	6.77%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	19,237,595	19,783,155	545,560	2.84%	1,266,424	-3.75%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>89,075,340</b>	<b>97,970,945</b>	<b>8,895,605</b>	<b>9.99%</b>	<b>2,257,489</b>	<b>7.45%</b>
05. Commercial	9,130,845	9,368,650	237,805	2.60%	122,230	1.27%
06. Industrial	173,385	173,385	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	11,966,050	12,779,510	813,460	6.80%	0	6.80%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>21,270,280</b>	<b>22,321,545</b>	<b>1,051,265</b>	<b>4.94%</b>	<b>122,230</b>	<b>4.37%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>110,345,620</b>	<b>120,296,315</b>	<b>9,950,695</b>	<b>9.02%</b>	<b>2,379,719</b>	<b>6.86%</b>
11. Irrigated	176,741,140	230,928,135	54,186,995	30.66%		
12. Dryland	34,232,035	47,712,165	13,480,130	39.38%		
13. Grassland	112,166,855	117,428,850	5,261,995	4.69%		
14. Wasteland	34,425	34,425	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	414,320	0	-414,320	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>323,588,775</b>	<b>396,103,575</b>	<b>72,514,800</b>	<b>22.41%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>433,934,395</b>	<b>516,399,890</b>	<b>82,465,495</b>	<b>19.00%</b>	<b>2,379,719</b>	<b>18.46%</b>

**2012 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
SHERMAN COUNTY  
By Sherie Kuszak  
Sherman County Assessor**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2009).

General Description of Real Property in Sherman County:

Per the 2012 County Abstract, Sherman County consists of 3,732 parcels of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Residential	1323	35.45 %	11.85 %
Commercial	217	5.81 %	2.10 %
Industrial	1	.03 %	.04 %
Recreational	298	7.98 %	4.29 %
Agricultural	1893	50.72 %	81.70 %
Special Value	-	---	---

Agricultural land - taxable acres 339,815.94 with a value of 322,898,575

Other pertinent facts: County is predominantly agricultural with 60.74% grassland, 26.09% irrigated, and 13.07% dry-broke and .10 for other and waste.

Current Resources:

A. Staff: County Assessor, Deputy and Part time Clerk.

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

The Deputy Assessor has taken and passed her Assessor's Exam.

B. Cadastral Maps 1969/soil maps/land use maps, aerial photos.

The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards

The property record cards in Sherman County were new in 1994 for Residential and Commercial and 1997 for Agricultural. The office went on-line in June of 2006 with the property record information.

D. The County uses the CAMA and Assessment Administration system. Sherman County **does not** have GIS.

E. Web based – property record information access- June 2006. The County is now with GIS Workshop.

- F. Agri-data, Inc software implemented to re-measure all rural parcels to original plat with consideration to documented surveys and to aid conversion from old soil symbols to new numeric symbols.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property (*e.g. how you handle processes for Real Estate Transfers & ownership changes, Sales Review, building permits/information statements*).

The Assessor's staff processes sales transactions in the computer system and prints a copy of the 521 forms, property review sheet, which are given to the staff for review. Buyer/seller questionnaires are mailed at this time. The staff reviews the sales, takes new pictures, check accuracy of the data that we currently are using. Information confirmed is the land use for agricultural sales including verification with FSA records, the quality, condition and other data for any and all improvements. Properties are re-measured if something doesn't appear to be correct. Permits are provided to the Office by either the county zoning administrator or the city clerk which ever has the jurisdiction for the applicable property. The permits are all entered in the state computer system to facilitate possible changes on parcels. In addition to the permits property information statements are utilized to track property alterations. The permits remain in the system for reference through the Property Record Card.

- B. Data Collection (*e.g. frequency & method of physical property inspections, listing, gather market and income data*)

In accordance with Neb. Statute §77-1311.03 the County is working to ensure that all parcels of real property are reviewed no less frequently than every six years. Further, properties are reviewed as deemed necessary from analysis of the market conditions within each Assessor Location.

The permit and sales review system offer opportunity for individual property reviews annually.

Working with ag-land property owners or tenants with land certification requirements between the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resource District provides updates for changes.

- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions (*e.g. how you perform A/S ratio studies internally or work with Field Liaison on analysis of A/S ratio studies*).

All statistics are reviewed annually to determine if adjustments are necessary to remain current with the market and building activity. For each assessor location and market area consideration is given to the number of sales in the study and the epoch of the parcel data.

The application of definitive market area boundaries within the agricultural sector is reviewed annually. This review attempts to ensure equality of sales distribution and types of classes and sub-classes moving in the market.

Analysis of this data is reviewed with the assigned Field Liaison and the plan of action for the year is developed.

D. Approaches to Value (*e.g. how you perform mass appraisal techniques or calibrate models, etc*);

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons,

Similar and like properties are studied to determine if action is necessary for adjustments for the upcoming year.

2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division CAMA system is utilized for costing and applying market depreciation. Marshall & Swift cost manual dates are updated when appropriate to revaluing and introducing updated depreciation tables.

Specific manual dates and depreciation studies may vary between assigned assessor locations. A preliminary and final chart depicting this information is completed each assessment year.

3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

Gather income information as available for commercial properties. Rental income has been requested for residential property. The income approach generally is not used since income/expense data is not readily available.

4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

Sales are plotted on a map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Analysis is completed for agricultural sales based on but not limited to the following components: number of sales; time frame of sales; number of acres selling; Further review is completed in attempt to make note of any difference in selling price paid per acre to be classed as special value.

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

The market is analyzed based on the standard approaches to valuation and the final valuation is determined based on the most appropriate method.

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.

Assessment ratios on current sale study periods are reviewed after final values are applied. The new costing and depreciation is then applied to the entire population of the class or sub-class being studied. Finally a unit of comparison analysis is completed to insure uniformity within the class or sub-class.

G. Notices and Public Relations

Notices of valuation change are mailed to property owners with assessed values different than the previous year on or before June 1<sup>st</sup>. These are mailed to the last known address of property owners. After notices have been mailed the appraisal staff is available to answer any questions or concerns of the taxpayers.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2012:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u># Sales</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	60	99.00	19.36	108.89
Commercial	10	95.00	13.84	103.33
Agricultural Land	44	72.00	13.89	102.70
Special Value Agland	N/A			

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

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:**

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Planned property reviews with new photos are in place for Loup City and Acreages. This will include compliance to the uniformity criteria components, implementation of the effective age method (removal of the blended age method), updated cost tables and market depreciation.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriation in the valuation method, will be scrutinized for proportionality i.e. number of sales, timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties.

Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:**

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

All other Residential parcels will be subject to in-house reviews with adjustments made as necessary to be compliant with market statistics.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion

of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

The commercial class of property in Sherman County will be reviewed and new pictures taken.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

The top two tiers of agland will be reviewed for data and new pictures will be taken. All outbuildings will be reviewed and new pictures taken.

Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriation in the valuation method, will be scrutinized for proportionality i.e. number of sales, timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties.

Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:**

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Review of all commercial parcels with new photos for all commercials located in Sherman County. Updated cost tables and market depreciation as necessary.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

The bottom two tiers of agland will be reviewed for data and new pictures will be taken. The outbuildings will be reviewed and new pictures taken.

Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriation in the valuation method, will be scrutinized for proportionality i.e. number of sales, timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties.

Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

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

*(Optional Section as it may be relevant to achieving assessment actions planned - for example describe):*

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by statute/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property

j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 636 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 212 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Tax Year 2012 finds 6 TIF's in Loup City City with a TIF Excess Value of 879,720.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification Retention of the assessor certification requires 60 hours of approved continuing education every four years.

Conclusion:

*Summarize current budget request & resources needed for the future to achieve assessment actions planned.*

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

SHERIE KUSZAK  
SHERMAN COUNTY ASSESSOR

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to County Board of Equalization.  
Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 of each year.



## 2013 Assessment Survey for Sherman County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	1
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$125,083
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$20,000
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$7,200
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$4,000
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and deputy
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>

	Yes. Sherman.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	n/a
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Loup City has their own zoning and Ashton, Rockville, Litchfield & Hazard are governed by county zoning
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Jason Wozniak provides general assistance with appraisal questions or issues.
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GISWorkshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	Agri-Data

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes, Robin Hendrickson for appraisal of grain terminals.
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	State Certification
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Current contract with Hendrickson has been approved by PTA.
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes



# 2013 Certification for Sherman 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 Sherman 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



