

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 Sioux County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	22	Median	91.88
Total Sales Price	\$1,303,980	Mean	96.86
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,303,980	Wgt. Mean	90.46
Total Assessed Value	\$1,179,595	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$43,424
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$59,272	Avg. Assessed Value	\$53,618

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	69.76 to 110.21
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	77.27 to 103.65
95% Mean C.I	81.20 to 112.52
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	4.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.41
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.92

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	17	100	99.52
2011	14	96	96
2010	15	93	93
2009	29	96	96

2013 Commission Summary for Sioux County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	2	Median	103.54
Total Sales Price	\$23,000	Mean	103.54
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$23,000	Wgt. Mean	111.35
Total Assessed Value	\$25,611	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$76,698
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$11,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$12,806

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	-657.72 to 864.80
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.52
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.48

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	4		89.35
2011	3		95
2010	2	100	79
2009	5	100	96

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Sioux County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	92	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Sioux County

For assessment year 2013, the Assessor and her staff completed the residential pick-up work. Also, all residential improvements were increased by 1% and the home site acre for all rural and rural residential property was increased to \$8,250 per acre.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Sioux County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Assessor and her staff.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Harrison—all residential parcels within the village of Harrison and its surroundings.
	80	Rural—all remaining residential parcels that are not part of the village of Harrison, but are within Sioux County.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Replacement cost new minus depreciation is the approach used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
4	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Sioux County uses the tables provided by the CAMA vendor.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	In assessment years 2010 – 2011.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	In assessment year 2012.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	The Assessor uses the market approach and then values the lot per square foot.	

83 Sioux
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 : 22
Total Sales Price : 1,303,980
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,303,980
Total Assessed Value : 1,179,595
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 59,272
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,618

MEDIAN : 92
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 97
COD : 26.90
PRD : 107.07

COV : 36.45
STD : 35.31
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.72
MAX Sales Ratio : 208.94
MIN Sales Ratio : 49.02

95% Median C.I. : 69.76 to 110.21
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.27 to 103.65
95% Mean C.I. : 81.20 to 112.52

Printed:3/26/2013 2:43:08PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qtrts											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	103.67	96.62	102.38	10.80	94.37	68.95	110.21	N/A	93,750	95,979
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	133.10	133.10	133.10	00.00	100.00	133.10	133.10	N/A	20,000	26,620
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	106.42	110.10	113.43	21.50	97.06	74.04	153.51	N/A	29,000	32,895
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	69.76	69.06	64.53	09.68	107.02	58.59	78.83	N/A	95,000	61,304
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	74.29	76.01	72.34	12.01	105.07	66.00	89.47	N/A	59,995	43,398
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	100.63	114.81	109.18	44.84	105.16	49.02	208.94	N/A	38,250	41,762
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	100.30	100.30	98.20	06.87	102.14	93.41	107.18	N/A	57,500	56,466
Study Yrs											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	12	101.15	97.26	91.21	21.92	106.63	58.59	153.51	69.76 to 112.44	66,333	60,502
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	10	89.91	96.39	89.29	28.66	107.95	49.02	208.94	66.00 to 110.91	50,798	45,357
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	12	79.62	90.39	78.02	26.58	115.85	58.59	153.51	68.18 to 112.44	55,082	42,975
ALL	22	91.88	96.86	90.46	26.90	107.07	49.02	208.94	69.76 to 110.21	59,272	53,618

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
10	17	93.41	101.73	95.65	27.55	106.36	49.02	208.94	74.04 to 112.44	40,734	38,961
80	5	69.76	80.34	84.59	23.72	94.98	58.59	105.43	N/A	122,300	103,452
ALL	22	91.88	96.86	90.46	26.90	107.07	49.02	208.94	69.76 to 110.21	59,272	53,618

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	21	93.41	99.14	91.11	25.46	108.81	58.59	208.94	74.04 to 110.21	61,142	55,704
06	1	49.02	49.02	49.02	00.00	100.00	49.02	49.02	N/A	20,000	9,803
07											
ALL	22	91.88	96.86	90.46	26.90	107.07	49.02	208.94	69.76 to 110.21	59,272	53,618

83 Sioux
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 : 22
Total Sales Price : 1,303,980
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,303,980
Total Assessed Value : 1,179,595
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 59,272
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,618

MEDIAN : 92
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 97
COD : 26.90
PRD : 107.07

COV : 36.45
STD : 35.31
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.72
MAX Sales Ratio : 208.94
MIN Sales Ratio : 49.02

95% Median C.I. : 69.76 to 110.21
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.27 to 103.65
95% Mean C.I. : 81.20 to 112.52

Printed:3/26/2013 2:43:08PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	1	74.04	74.04	74.04	00.00	100.00	74.04	74.04	N/A	9,000	6,664	
Less Than 30,000	8	95.31	109.77	113.31	43.72	96.88	49.02	208.94	49.02 to 208.94	20,310	23,013	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	22	91.88	96.86	90.46	26.90	107.07	49.02	208.94	69.76 to 110.21	59,272	53,618	
Greater Than 14,999	21	93.41	97.95	90.58	26.73	108.14	49.02	208.94	69.76 to 110.21	61,666	55,854	
Greater Than 29,999	14	91.88	89.49	87.21	16.36	102.61	58.59	112.44	68.18 to 107.18	81,536	71,106	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	74.04	74.04	74.04	00.00	100.00	74.04	74.04	N/A	9,000	6,664	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	110.21	114.88	115.61	38.52	99.37	49.02	208.94	49.02 to 208.94	21,926	25,349	
30,000 TO 59,999	7	90.35	92.09	91.25	13.55	100.92	66.00	112.44	66.00 to 112.44	42,857	39,105	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	93.41	91.36	90.94	14.69	100.46	69.76	110.91	N/A	70,000	63,661	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	85.04	85.04	85.64	19.83	99.30	68.18	101.90	N/A	140,000	119,901	
150,000 TO 249,999	2	82.01	82.01	82.78	28.56	99.07	58.59	105.43	N/A	175,750	145,485	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	22	91.88	96.86	90.46	26.90	107.07	49.02	208.94	69.76 to 110.21	59,272	53,618	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Sioux County**

A. Residential Real Property

With a population of 1,311, Sioux County has a quite limited residential market. The County seat is in the village of Harrison, and there are no incorporated municipalities within the County--thus, all residential activity is either in the village of Harrison or rural residential parcels. Agriculture, education and limited services are the majority occupations within the County. Home ownership constitutes 57.14% of residential property; 22.11% of homes are rented and vacant homes are 20.75% of the total.

The County had completed the physical review of all improvements (residential, commercial and agricultural residences and outbuildings) within the County in assessment year 2011, and re-valued these using a 2010 cost index. A market-derived depreciation schedule was also developed and implemented at this time. In 2012 the Department conducted a review of each county's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as each county's sales verification documentation. Review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for all three property classes.

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Sioux County was selected for review in 2011. It has been confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

The residential sample contains twenty-two qualified sales, and of these seventeen occurred in the village of Harrison and the remaining five were rural residential. This is somewhat skewed, since the in-town or "urban" improvements comprise 66% of all residential improvements--within the sample, these represent 77%. Two of the three overall measures of central tendency are within acceptable range. The weighted mean is skewed by sale A-23, page 303, the second highest dollar sale in the sample, with an A/S ratio of 58.59%. Its removal would move the weighted mean to 95%.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 92% of market value for all residential property and all statistically significant subclasses are determined to be valued within acceptable range.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux County

For assessment year 2013, the County completed any commercial pick-up work.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Sioux County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Assessor and her staff.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Harrison—all commercial properties within the Village of Harrison and its surroundings.
	80	Rural—all remaining commercial parcels that are not within the Village of Harrison.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The cost approach is used.	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	Sioux County does not currently have any unique commercial properties, but if one were developed in the County, the appraiser contracted for the last re-appraisal would be consulted (Stanard Appraisal).	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The County utilizes the tables provided by the CAMA vendor.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Assessment years 2010 – 2011.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	In 2010.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	By the market approach: use of comparable sales.	

83 Sioux
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 : 2
Total Sales Price : 23,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,000
Total Assessed Value : 25,611
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 11,500
Avg. Assessed Value : 12,806

MEDIAN : 104
WGT. MEAN : 111
MEAN : 104
COD : 57.87
PRD : 92.99

COV : 81.83
STD : 84.73
Avg. Abs. Dev : 59.92
MAX Sales Ratio : 163.45
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.62

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : -657.72 to 864.80

Printed:3/26/2013 2:43:09PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	163.45	163.45	163.45	00.00	100.00	163.45	163.45	N/A	13,000	21,249
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	43.62	43.62	43.62	00.00	100.00	43.62	43.62	N/A	10,000	4,362
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	163.45	163.45	163.45	00.00	100.00	163.45	163.45	N/A	13,000	21,249
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	43.62	43.62	43.62	00.00	100.00	43.62	43.62	N/A	10,000	4,362
<u>ALL</u>	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
10	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
<u>ALL</u>	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
04											
<u>ALL</u>	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806

83 Sioux
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 : 2
Total Sales Price : 23,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,000
Total Assessed Value : 25,611
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 11,500
Avg. Assessed Value : 12,806

MEDIAN : 104
WGT. MEAN : 111
MEAN : 104
COD : 57.87
PRD : 92.99

COV : 81.83
STD : 84.73
Avg. Abs. Dev : 59.92
MAX Sales Ratio : 163.45
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.62

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : -657.72 to 864.80

Printed:3/26/2013 2:43:09PM

SALE PRICE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
Less Than 30,000	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
Greater Than 14,999											
Greater Than 29,999											
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999											
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>	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806

OCCUPANCY CODE											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
406	1	43.62	43.62	43.62	00.00	100.00	43.62	43.62	N/A	10,000	4,362
446	1	163.45	163.45	163.45	00.00	100.00	163.45	163.45	N/A	13,000	21,249
<u>ALL</u>	2	103.54	103.54	111.35	57.87	92.99	43.62	163.45	N/A	11,500	12,806

2013 Correlation Section for Sioux County

A. Commercial Real Property

Sioux County is located on the western border of Nebraska's Panhandle, and as of 2010 the population was 1,311. The County seat is the village of Harrison, and there are no incorporated municipalities within the County. Seventy properties are identified as commercial, with thirty-six existing in the village of Harrison and the remainder found in the rural area (many of these are commercial cattle feeding operations). The main economic activity of the County is agricultural in nature--both farming and ranching operations. Thus, it is highly improbable that there is a viable, competitive commercial market in Sioux County.

The County had completed the physical review of all improvements within the County in assessment year 2011, and re-valued these using a 2010 cost index. A market-derived depreciation schedule was also developed and implemented at this time. In 2012 the Department conducted a review of each county's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as each county's sales verification documentation. Review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for all three property classes.

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Sioux County was selected for review in 2011. It has been confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that commercial property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Only two qualified commercial sales occurred during the timeframe of the sales study. These are statistically insignificant, and therefore it is believed that the level of value cannot be determined for the Sioux County commercial property class.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux County

Actions taken to address the agricultural real property class for assessment year 2013 included: In market area one, all but one irrigated subclass was raised (the exception was 1A); likewise, all but one subclass of dry land was increased (4D1); all grass subclasses were raised. In market area two, all irrigated and dry classes were raised to closer match 75% of the market.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Sioux County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Assessor and her staff.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	This market area consists of the largest portion of the County and is comprised primarily of ranch operations.
	2	Agricultural market area two is located in the extreme southwest corner of the County and primarily consists of irrigated or crop-producing parcels.
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Land use in each agricultural market area is monitored (via GIS and personal inspection when necessary) and reviewed.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Primary land use is the major consideration used to identify and value both rural residential and recreational land apart from agricultural land within Sioux County. Recreational value is applied by the County to accessory land in parcels where a hunting lodge or cabin is located and/or parcels in which the primary purpose of ownership is to provide recreational opportunities.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	The current GIS maps (dated 2010, but scheduled to be updated in January 2013) as well as FSA maps provided by taxpayers.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	No.	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	The Assessor is not aware of any land currently enrolled in the Wetlands Reserve Program in her County.	

83 Sioux
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 : 54
Total Sales Price : 26,515,931
Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,515,931
Total Assessed Value : 15,771,098
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 491,036
Avg. Assessed Value : 292,057

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 59
MEAN : 72
COD : 26.40
PRD : 121.32

COV : 37.08
STD : 26.76
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.00
MAX Sales Ratio : 143.68
MIN Sales Ratio : 17.87

95% Median C.I. : 62.57 to 75.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.00 to 68.96
95% Mean C.I. : 65.02 to 79.30

Printed:3/26/2013 2:43:10PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	97.19	91.97	77.80	18.21	118.21	65.39	119.85	N/A	242,110	188,357
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	76.21	65.25	74.98	28.30	87.02	27.42	92.13	N/A	725,333	543,891
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	74.30	93.96	82.48	30.47	113.92	68.42	134.38	N/A	209,140	172,507
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	4	59.39	78.59	62.04	41.24	126.68	51.90	143.68	N/A	252,173	156,438
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	72.22	69.34	67.98	09.28	102.00	55.75	80.71	55.75 to 80.71	633,222	430,494
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	81.74	73.45	60.81	13.52	120.79	28.95	85.95	28.95 to 85.95	234,317	142,497
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	69.61	67.64	67.50	08.40	100.21	52.27	75.43	N/A	351,400	237,204
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	135.79	135.79	135.79	00.00	100.00	135.79	135.79	N/A	44,500	60,427
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	6	63.33	58.50	44.01	34.31	132.92	17.87	91.96	17.87 to 91.96	1,169,756	514,858
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	5	62.57	68.13	60.96	29.81	111.76	29.94	111.14	N/A	613,800	374,160
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	60.27	53.57	44.51	17.95	120.35	33.98	66.45	N/A	404,167	179,882
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	52.23	51.07	51.28	15.95	99.59	39.62	60.22	N/A	533,750	273,719
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	17	74.30	84.69	74.65	32.68	113.45	27.42	143.68	62.48 to 119.85	320,055	238,926
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	19	74.07	73.69	66.95	16.47	110.07	28.95	135.79	65.00 to 80.84	402,103	269,205
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	18	60.25	58.70	49.08	27.62	119.60	17.87	111.14	39.62 to 73.51	746,391	366,359
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	19	72.72	77.12	70.80	25.25	108.93	27.42	143.68	62.37 to 80.71	455,945	322,811
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	18	74.35	70.31	50.76	23.51	138.51	17.87	135.79	53.14 to 82.64	568,108	288,365
<u>ALL</u>	54	71.96	72.16	59.48	26.40	121.32	17.87	143.68	62.57 to 75.19	491,036	292,057

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	32	69.55	69.42	65.21	21.61	106.46	17.87	119.96	62.37 to 75.25	529,415	345,206
2	22	72.85	76.13	49.34	33.95	154.30	27.42	143.68	51.90 to 97.19	435,211	214,750
<u>ALL</u>	54	71.96	72.16	59.48	26.40	121.32	17.87	143.68	62.57 to 75.19	491,036	292,057

83 Sioux
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 : 54
Total Sales Price : 26,515,931
Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,515,931
Total Assessed Value : 15,771,098
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 491,036
Avg. Assessed Value : 292,057

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 59
MEAN : 72
COD : 26.40
PRD : 121.32

COV : 37.08
STD : 26.76
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.00
MAX Sales Ratio : 143.68
MIN Sales Ratio : 17.87

95% Median C.I. : 62.57 to 75.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.00 to 68.96
95% Mean C.I. : 65.02 to 79.30

Printed:3/26/2013 2:43:10PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	8	74.98	81.54	68.62	33.53	118.83	29.94	134.38	29.94 to 134.38	167,563	114,980
2	8	74.98	81.54	68.62	33.53	118.83	29.94	134.38	29.94 to 134.38	167,563	114,980
Dry											
County	2	81.29	81.29	75.60	19.56	107.53	65.39	97.19	N/A	147,275	111,341
1	1	65.39	65.39	65.39	00.00	100.00	65.39	65.39	N/A	200,000	130,788
2	1	97.19	97.19	97.19	00.00	100.00	97.19	97.19	N/A	94,550	91,893
Grass											
County	15	75.25	80.35	70.02	17.01	114.75	53.14	119.96	67.41 to 85.95	452,915	317,138
1	14	75.22	80.57	70.00	18.03	115.10	53.14	119.96	62.48 to 92.13	484,116	338,901
2	1	77.40	77.40	77.40	00.00	100.00	77.40	77.40	N/A	16,100	12,462
ALL	54	71.96	72.16	59.48	26.40	121.32	17.87	143.68	62.57 to 75.19	491,036	292,057

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	11	75.43	86.38	72.35	33.33	119.39	29.94	143.68	58.59 to 134.38	164,409	118,947
2	11	75.43	86.38	72.35	33.33	119.39	29.94	143.68	58.59 to 134.38	164,409	118,947
Dry											
County	2	81.29	81.29	75.60	19.56	107.53	65.39	97.19	N/A	147,275	111,341
1	1	65.39	65.39	65.39	00.00	100.00	65.39	65.39	N/A	200,000	130,788
2	1	97.19	97.19	97.19	00.00	100.00	97.19	97.19	N/A	94,550	91,893
Grass											
County	23	74.07	74.16	69.12	17.92	107.29	27.42	119.96	62.48 to 80.84	439,720	303,932
1	20	74.19	77.45	69.79	15.70	110.98	53.14	119.96	67.41 to 82.64	494,123	344,849
2	3	51.90	52.24	40.44	32.10	129.18	27.42	77.40	N/A	77,033	31,151
ALL	54	71.96	72.16	59.48	26.40	121.32	17.87	143.68	62.57 to 75.19	491,036	292,057

Sioux County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Sioux	1	N/A	640	600	560	560	560	470	470	548
Sioux	2	N/A	1,557	1,550	1,550	N/A	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,489
ScottsBluff	3	N/A	N/A	1,950	1,575	1,575	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,609
Dawes	1	N/A	610	515	515	455	455	435	435	470
Dawes	4	N/A	1,350	N/A	1,350	1,000	1,000	950	950	1,174
Box Butte	1	N/A	1,272	1,128	1,280	1,275	1,270	1,271	1,274	1,273
Box Butte	2	N/A	1,602	1,608	1,594	1,230	1,211	1,191	1,219	1,536
Box Butte	3	N/A	1,265	1,300	1,213	850	816	820	845	1,210

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Sioux	1	N/A	360	275	265	260	260	250	235	267
Sioux	2	N/A	N/A	320	320	N/A	280	280	260	300
ScottsBluff	3	N/A	N/A	330	310	260	230	230	210	275
Dawes	1	N/A	415	375	375	340	340	330	330	366
Dawes	4	N/A	500	N/A	450	400	400	375	375	463
Box Butte	1	N/A	380	N/A	350	230	230	230	230	310
Box Butte	2	N/A	500	500	500	325	325	325	325	470
Box Butte	3	N/A	500	470	470	300	300	300	300	465

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Sioux	1	N/A	260	260	260	225	225	200	208	212
Sioux	2	N/A	250	250	240	235	230	230	230	231
ScottsBluff	3	N/A	N/A	250	240	235	215	215	200	214
Dawes	1	N/A	210	195	195	180	180	180	180	182
Dawes	4	N/A	400	375	375	325	325	300	300	320
Box Butte	1	N/A	276	250	260	234	234	231	230	234
Box Butte	2	N/A	297	263	250	250	229	227	230	243
Box Butte	3	N/A	336	327	323	319	324	300	300	311

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

2013 Correlation Section for Sioux County

A. Agricultural Land

Sioux County has a total of 2067 square miles of land. Agricultural land consists approximately of 89% grass, 3% dry land and about 4% irrigated. The remaining four percent is classified as waste. The County currently has two clearly defined agricultural market areas based on topography, soil type and availability of water. Market Area One is the largest area in the County and consists mostly of grass land. Market Area Two on the southwestern end of the County has irrigated farm ground and borders Scotts Bluff County on the south and the State of Wyoming to the west. Other counties contiguous to Sioux are Dawes and Box Butte to the east. All of the neighboring counties have multiple market areas.

Sioux County has the distinction of lying within two Natural Resource Districts. Market Area One lies within the Upper Niobrara White NRD (UNWNRD). “In 2003, the UNWNRD established a stay on new high capacity wells to prevent the over-appropriation of the water supply. Working with Nebraska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the UNWNRD strives to maintain a balance of supply and demand for ground and surface water. Currently, DNR has determined that the majority of the UNWNRD is fully appropriated. Fully appropriated means the balance between the water supply and demand has been reached...no new high capacity wells or surface water rights are allowed in this area” (taken from the UNWNRD website).

However, after the June 2011 Nebraska Supreme Court reversal of the Lower Niobrara Basin Fully Appropriated Status, the Niobrara NRDs continue to monitor and may allow limited expansion of irrigated acres under provisions authorized by LB 483.

Market Area Two lies within the North Platte NRD that instituted a moratorium on new water well drilling in 2001. “In 2007-08 the NRD worked with landowners to certify all ground water uses within the District. The NPNRD needs its surface irrigation system in order to maintain a sustainable ground water mound and is working to encourage irrigates to use their surface water first before tapping the ground water supply” (material taken from the North Platte NRD web site). Since the southern portion of the County contains 66% of all irrigated land in Sioux County, the availability of water and its regulation are extremely important.

Preliminary analysis of the original sales sample indicated that there was no time proportionality among the study years for the County overall or for Market Area Two. Market Area One was time proportional and exhibited representativeness by Majority Land Use. Area Two had fourteen sales of which eight occurred during the third year of the study, and was therefore over-represented. Further, by MLU, grass was under-represented (62% base, only 13% sample) and irrigated land was greatly over-represented (base of 33% vs. 76% sample). While comparable sales can be utilized to correct the lack of time proportionality in Area Two, it would be virtually impossible to acquire enough comparable grass sales to rectify the MLU representativeness. This is due to the fact that only Scotts Bluff County borders Sioux County’s Area Two, and most of the comparable sales are not 95% MLU grass. Therefore, it was possible to utilize eight comparable sales to correct for time, but for the second market area, grass is still under-represented and irrigated land is still over-represented.

2013 Correlation Section for Sioux County

A statistical sample of fifty-four sales was used to determine the level of value in Sioux County. This sample was produced by incorporating the comparable sales in conjunction with the particular assessment actions taken by the Assessor to address agricultural land by specific market area: 1) In Market Area One, all but one LCG (1A) was increased from 8-24%; six of the dry capability groups were raised from 2-6%; all grass LCG's were increased from 7-13%. Waste in Area One was increased by \$10 per acre. 2) For Area Two, the irrigated subclass was raised on average by 18% (15-21%); the dry subclass received increases that ranged from 4-10%, and the lowest three grass LCG's were raised to a uniform \$230 per acre. Waste in Area Two was increased by \$5 per acre. The resultant overall calculated median is 72%, with a COD of 26%. Under the heading "Area (Market)," Area One's thirty-two sales have a median of 70%, and a COD of 22% (all figures rounded). Area Four's sample of twenty-two sales show a median of 73%, but displays a coefficient of dispersion of 34% (that tends to discount the reliability of the median measure of central tendency).

Further review of the statistical profile by examining the heading, "95% MLU by Market Area" reveals eight Area Two irrigated sales with two of the three measures of central tendency within range (the median and the weighted mean). However, the COD is still 34%. Fourteen grass sales in Market Area One produce a calculated median of 75% and this is supported by a coefficient of dispersion of 18%.

A 2013 value review between Sioux and its neighboring counties can be examined by the two most comparable counties (based on numeric soil type matches)—Dawes Area One and Scotts Bluff (Area 3). Regarding the irrigated class of land, Sioux Area One is higher than Dawes Area One; Sioux Area Two lower irrigated LCG's are higher than neighbor Scotts Bluff, but the upper LCG's are lower than Scotts Bluff's (and it should be noted that the highest irrigated LCG in Scotts Bluff is 2A1). Sioux dry land is on average 37% lower than neighboring Dawes Area One. Average dry values in Sioux Area One are quite comparable with southern neighbor Scotts Bluff—but are higher in Area Two. However, it should be remembered that the total dry acres in Area Two are less than 1,000, compared to Scotts Bluff's 34,189 dry acres. Sioux Area One grass is higher than Dawes One and comparable to Scotts Bluff (again, except when compared with Area Two). Overall, it is believed that Sioux County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

There will be no non-binding recommendation made for the agricultural class of property in Sioux County.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux 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 Sioux County**

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

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 4,311	Value : 353,988,593	Growth 350,075	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	25	67,559	0	0	0	0	25	67,559	
02. Res Improve Land	187	717,924	0	0	0	0	187	717,924	
03. Res Improvements	191	6,349,621	1	1,408	97	6,170,021	289	12,521,050	
04. Res Total	216	7,135,104	1	1,408	97	6,170,021	314	13,306,533	207,004
% of Res Total	68.79	53.62	0.32	0.01	30.89	46.37	7.28	3.76	59.13
05. Com UnImp Land	19	65,765	0	0	3	4,726	22	70,491	
06. Com Improve Land	32	174,218	0	0	12	896,075	44	1,070,293	
07. Com Improvements	36	1,320,702	0	0	12	2,907,381	48	4,228,083	
08. Com Total	55	1,560,685	0	0	15	3,808,182	70	5,368,867	12,965
% of Com Total	78.57	29.07	0.00	0.00	21.43	70.93	1.62	1.52	3.70
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	22	804,486	22	804,486	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	7	283,714	7	283,714	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	7	499,564	7	499,564	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	29	1,587,764	29	1,587,764	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.67	0.45	0.00
Res & Rec Total	216	7,135,104	1	1,408	126	7,757,785	343	14,894,297	207,004
% of Res & Rec Total	62.97	47.90	0.29	0.01	36.73	52.09	7.96	4.21	59.13
Com & Ind Total	55	1,560,685	0	0	15	3,808,182	70	5,368,867	12,965
% of Com & Ind Total	78.57	29.07	0.00	0.00	21.43	70.93	1.62	1.52	3.70
17. Taxable Total	271	8,695,789	1	1,408	141	11,565,967	413	20,263,164	219,969
% of Taxable Total	65.62	42.91	0.24	0.01	34.14	57.08	9.58	5.72	62.83

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

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	2	5,840	2	5,840	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
25. Total	0	0	0	0	2	5,840	2	5,840	157

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	15	0	273	288

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	71,109	3,229	232,729,097	3,230	232,800,206
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	10,880	1	3,980	721	68,179,958	723	68,194,818
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	666	32,724,565	666	32,724,565
30. Ag Total							3,896	333,719,589

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	1	1.00	8,250	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	2.63	2,630	1	3.98	3,980	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	67	70.20	579,138	67	70.20	579,138	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	498	603.50	4,978,936	499	604.50	4,987,186	
33. HomeSite Improvements	462	0.00	23,657,306	462	0.00	23,657,306	87,523
34. HomeSite Total				529	674.70	29,223,630	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	90	526.41	512,641	90	526.41	512,641	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	576	2,117.54	2,017,849	578	2,124.15	2,024,459	
37. FarmSite Improvements	608	0.00	9,067,259	608	0.00	9,067,259	42,426
38. FarmSite Total				698	2,650.56	11,604,359	
39. Road & Ditches	1,529	5,480.54	0	1,529	5,480.54	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,227	8,805.80	40,827,989	129,949

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	4	1,477.80	296,748	4	1,477.80	296,748
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	1,707.99	11.15%	1,093,111	13.02%	640.00
47. 2A1	1,455.16	9.50%	873,095	10.40%	600.00
48. 2A	954.12	6.23%	534,305	6.36%	560.00
49. 3A1	1,779.27	11.61%	996,392	11.86%	560.00
50. 3A	5,242.62	34.22%	2,935,868	34.96%	560.00
51. 4A1	2,542.12	16.59%	1,194,805	14.23%	470.00
52. 4A	1,638.81	10.70%	770,247	9.17%	470.00
53. Total	15,320.09	100.00%	8,397,823	100.00%	548.16
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	3,544.95	9.34%	1,276,179	12.61%	360.00
56. 2D1	5,927.42	15.62%	1,630,073	16.11%	275.01
57. 2D	6,323.39	16.66%	1,675,696	16.56%	265.00
58. 3D1	3,063.07	8.07%	796,402	7.87%	260.00
59. 3D	3,848.21	10.14%	1,000,537	9.89%	260.00
60. 4D1	10,425.14	27.47%	2,606,399	25.76%	250.01
61. 4D	4,814.57	12.69%	1,131,448	11.18%	235.00
62. Total	37,946.75	100.00%	10,116,734	100.00%	266.60
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	11,442.23	1.14%	2,974,979	1.39%	260.00
65. 2G1	28,602.32	2.84%	7,436,601	3.48%	260.00
66. 2G	45,922.56	4.56%	11,939,857	5.58%	260.00
67. 3G1	53,570.18	5.32%	12,053,465	5.64%	225.00
68. 3G	101,940.00	10.13%	22,936,890	10.72%	225.00
69. 4G1	319,404.60	31.73%	63,880,488	29.87%	200.00
70. 4G	445,633.98	44.27%	92,661,890	43.32%	207.93
71. Total	1,006,515.87	100.00%	213,884,170	100.00%	212.50
Irrigated Total					
	15,320.09	1.39%	8,397,823	3.58%	548.16
Dry Total					
	37,946.75	3.44%	10,116,734	4.31%	266.60
Grass Total					
	1,006,515.87	91.29%	213,884,170	91.09%	212.50
72. Waste	42,722.19	3.88%	2,399,775	1.02%	56.17
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	1,102,504.90	100.00%	234,798,502	100.00%	212.97

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	0.14	0.00%	218	0.00%	1,557.14
47. 2A1	4,476.78	14.92%	6,939,037	15.53%	1,550.01
48. 2A	7,128.10	23.75%	11,048,638	24.73%	1,550.01
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	8,489.68	28.29%	12,310,120	27.55%	1,450.01
51. 4A1	8,702.69	29.00%	12,618,986	28.25%	1,450.01
52. 4A	1,212.51	4.04%	1,758,173	3.94%	1,450.03
53. Total	30,009.90	100.00%	44,675,172	100.00%	1,488.68
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	93.90	9.42%	30,048	10.07%	320.00
57. 2D	402.20	40.37%	128,703	43.11%	320.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	356.91	35.82%	99,936	33.48%	280.00
60. 4D1	128.97	12.94%	36,112	12.10%	280.00
61. 4D	14.38	1.44%	3,740	1.25%	260.08
62. Total	996.36	100.00%	298,539	100.00%	299.63
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1.76	0.00%	440	0.00%	250.00
65. 2G1	386.02	0.69%	96,513	0.74%	250.02
66. 2G	3,333.88	5.93%	800,137	6.17%	240.00
67. 3G1	160.06	0.28%	37,616	0.29%	235.01
68. 3G	8,335.32	14.83%	1,917,134	14.78%	230.00
69. 4G1	25,152.81	44.74%	5,785,181	44.60%	230.00
70. 4G	18,848.13	33.53%	4,335,088	33.42%	230.00
71. Total	56,217.98	100.00%	12,972,109	100.00%	230.75
Irrigated Total	30,009.90	33.04%	44,675,172	76.90%	1,488.68
Dry Total	996.36	1.10%	298,539	0.51%	299.63
Grass Total	56,217.98	61.89%	12,972,109	22.33%	230.75
72. Waste	3,615.09	3.98%	147,278	0.25%	40.74
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	90,839.33	100.00%	58,093,098	100.00%	639.51

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	45,329.99	53,072,995	45,329.99	53,072,995
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	38,943.11	10,415,273	38,943.11	10,415,273
78. Grass	0.00	0	318.17	71,036	1,062,415.68	226,785,243	1,062,733.85	226,856,279
79. Waste	0.00	0	1.83	73	46,335.45	2,546,980	46,337.28	2,547,053
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	320.00	71,109	1,193,024.23	292,820,491	1,193,344.23	292,891,600

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	45,329.99	3.80%	53,072,995	18.12%	1,170.81
Dry Land	38,943.11	3.26%	10,415,273	3.56%	267.45
Grass	1,062,733.85	89.06%	226,856,279	77.45%	213.46
Waste	46,337.28	3.88%	2,547,053	0.87%	54.97
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	1,193,344.23	100.00%	292,891,600	100.00%	245.44

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

83 Sioux

	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	13,098,724	13,306,533	207,809	1.59%	207,004	0.01%
02. Recreational	1,549,411	1,587,764	38,353	2.48%	0	2.48%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	28,185,010	29,223,630	1,038,620	3.69%	87,523	3.37%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	42,833,145	44,117,927	1,284,782	3.00%	294,527	2.31%
05. Commercial	5,231,969	5,368,867	136,898	2.62%	12,965	2.37%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	11,501,626	11,604,359	102,733	0.89%	42,426	0.52%
08. Minerals	0	5,840	5,840		157	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	16,733,595	16,979,066	245,471	1.47%	55,548	1.13%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	59,566,740	61,096,993	1,530,253	2.57%	350,075	1.98%
11. Irrigated	44,663,087	53,072,995	8,409,908	18.83%		
12. Dryland	9,587,483	10,415,273	827,790	8.63%		
13. Grassland	210,898,787	226,856,279	15,957,492	7.57%		
14. Wasteland	2,168,941	2,547,053	378,112	17.43%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	267,318,298	292,891,600	25,573,302	9.57%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	326,885,038	353,988,593	27,103,555	8.29%	350,075	8.18%

2013 Plan of Assessment for Sioux County Nebraska
Assessment years 2013, 2014 and 2015
June 15, 2012

To: Sioux County Board of Equalization
Ruth Sorensen, Nebraska Property Tax Administrator

FROM: Michelle Zimmerman, Sioux County Clerk/Ex-Officio Assessor

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, Sioux County Assessor Michelle Zimmerman hereby presents a Three-year Assessment Plan as follows:

Assessment levels for 2012 are: Agricultural – 73%, Residential – 100% and Commercial – 100%.

For the 2012 County Abstract, Sioux County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	313	7	4
Commercial	69	2	2
Recreational	29	1	1
Agricultural	3881	90	94
TOTAL	4292		

90% of Sioux County is agricultural land. There are 266 tax exempt parcels. Sioux County had 358 personal property schedules filed on May 1, 2012. There were 45 Homestead exemption applications filed for 2012. For the year 2012, seven new homes were added to the Sioux County valuation. For more information see 2012 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

I had one staff member who handled all of the personal property returns, again, she required depreciation schedules be filed with every return and also mailed notices to new property owners in the event that they were not aware of the personal property filing requirement. That employee who was my deputy has taken employment elsewhere, and I am in the process of replacing her. As Sioux County Clerk/Ex-Officio Assessor, I cross-train employees to perform other duties that I am also responsible for. I currently have one deputy county clerk who is studying to take the assessor certification test have hired a new full time employee and I have a part-time employee who is mostly responsible for filing.

The budget for FY 2011-2012 for Sioux County Assessor was \$144,268.92. Of this budget, \$30,000 was included for contract for reappraisal, which was not used in this budget cycle.

In 2011 I was able to successfully complete the requirement of IAAO Course 300. I had completed the IAAO course 101 in 2010. I attend as many Panhandle District Assessor's

meetings as possible, as I believe that the networking with other assessors in the area is invaluable. I also have been able to attend the summer workshops offered by NACO in order to gain knowledge and education credits. As stated previously, I do not have a deputy assessor at the time, but do have one employee studying for the assessor certification test. I will continue to take courses offered through IAAO, NACO and PAD.

Sioux County contracts with GIS Workshop for a web based GIS system. The images are 2010, with anticipated 2012 images being available in early 2013. I and my staff are currently reviewing those photos and comparing them to land classifications in the MIPS PCAdmin program. We have completed review of three townships and plan to continue until all parcels are reviewed by 2014. We also maintain a cadastral plat map showing ownership. MIPS PCAdmin and MIPSCAMA programs are used for assessment purposes. Property record cards are maintained by me and my staff. The record owner name and mailing addresses are updated from 521's. Pictures are taken when properties are updated and electronically attached to parcels. Current sketches are also attached electronically.

Ownership on all parcels is updated upon review of 521's filed. Sales data questionnaires are mailed to all purchasers of property listed on 521's on a quarterly basis. I utilize data collected, and am also able to use my personal knowledge on sold properties. Sioux County has county-wide zoning in place and requires building permits for residential construction and improvement information forms for ag construction. The Village of Harrison also requires building permits and I receive a copy of those from the village clerk annually. Property inspections and listing are done by the assessor and staff. I also work very closely with Mark Loose, Field Liaison to prepare and review sales ratio studies.

Market approach to value is used on all properties. Sales comparisons are used to compare similar properties.

Cost approach to value is used on residential and commercial properties. For 2012, Marshall & Swift costing dated 2010 was used for RCN.

Income approach was used in Stanard's reappraisal of commercial properties in 2010.

"Notice of Valuation Changes" are sent out prior to June 1. Levels of Value are published in the local newspaper and in the office.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2012:

	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	100	18.36	106.97
Commercial	100		
Agricultural	73	16.71	101.80

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2013:

Residential: Monitor costing index to ensure current values are keeping up with market trends. Continue to physically review parcels for changes and monitor building permits issued by the village.

Commercial: Monitor building permits issued by the village. Study sales to ensure that no changes should be made in commercial properties.

Agricultural: Compare GIS mapping, reviewing Townships 28, 29, 30 and 31 which is to be updated in early 2013 to compare land classifications.

Perform market analysis by market areas. Physically inspect those properties on which improvement sheets or building permits have been filed.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2014:

Residential: Monitor costing index to ensure current values are keeping up with market trends. Continue to physically review parcels for changes and monitor building permits issued by the village.

Commercial: Monitor building permits issued by the village. Study sales to ensure that no changes should be made in commercial properties.

Agricultural: Compare GIS mapping, reviewing Townships 24, 25, 26 and 27. Perform market analysis by market areas. Physically inspect those properties on which improvement sheets or building permits have been filed.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2015:

Residential: Monitor costing index to ensure current values are keeping up with market trends. Continue to physically review parcels for changes and monitor building permits issued by the village.

Commercial: Monitor building permits issued by the village. Study sales to ensure that no changes should be made in commercial properties.

Agricultural: Physically inspect properties on which improvement sheets or building permits have been filed.

I, as Sioux County Assessor, will continue to maintain acceptable levels and quality of assessment throughout the county.

2013 Assessment Survey for Sioux County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	None
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	Two—shared between the ex-officio’s Assessor and Clerk functions.
6.	Assessor’s requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$121,845.74
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same
8.	Amount of the total assessor’s budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$30,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor’s budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$12,000
11.	Amount of the assessor’s budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$9,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year’s assessor’s budget not used:
	\$57,705 (part of this is the yearly \$30,000 set aside for the next reappraisal).

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS/PC Admin
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	The Assessor
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, both maps and record information. http://sioux.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Harrison
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Pritchard & Abbott for mineral interest appraisal.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	MIPS/PC Admin.

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Only Pritchard & Abbott for mineral interest appraisal.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Expertise in the appraisal of mineral interests.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Don't know.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	Yes, for mineral interests.

2013 Certification for Sioux 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 Sioux 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

