

Table of Contents

2014 Commission Summary

2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Correlation

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Correlation

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Correlation
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable

Statistical Reports

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

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

Valuation History Charts

2014 Commission Summary for Douglas County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	14696	Median	95.81
Total Sales Price	\$2,766,084,910	Mean	97.84
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,766,099,710	Wgt. Mean	95.25
Total Assessed Value	\$2,634,733,185	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$133,196
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$188,221	Avg. Assessed Value	\$179,282

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.69 to 95.93
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.03 to 95.47
95% Mean C.I	97.52 to 98.16
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	67.96
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.15
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	10.97

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	12,175	96	96.28
2012	13,462	96	95.75
2011	15,074	96	96
2010	15,175	96	96

2014 Commission Summary for Douglas County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	682	Median	96.24
Total Sales Price	\$835,630,616	Mean	97.57
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$835,630,616	Wgt. Mean	89.02
Total Assessed Value	\$743,851,845	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$919,048
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$1,225,265	Avg. Assessed Value	\$1,090,692

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.47 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.74 to 92.29
95% Mean C.I	95.19 to 99.95
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	30.85
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.82

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	616	96	96.45
2012	581	97	96.87
2011	829	96	96
2010	1,015	96	96

2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Douglas County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	*NEI	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	70	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 7th day of April, 2014.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2014 Residential Assessment Actions for Douglas County

For the current assessment year, Douglas County (Douglas) conducted a market analysis of the residential parcels in the county. The staff conducted a total of 30,577 inspections of residential parcels this year. This consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures.

Additionally, 3,400 Board of Equalization packets were prepared, in conjunction with commercial properties, and 781 properties were protested to the Tax Equalization Review Commission (TERC). The staff spent approximately two months on TERC appeals. This year, a separate hearing department was created with a supervisor and two real estate appraisers to work on the residential TERC cases.

The total number of parcels that received a value change in the residential class of property amounted to approximately 53,219.

GIS is constantly being updated into both the CAMA system and the digital GIS mapping layers. Every year, the assessor department goes over all annexations filed by various governmental subdivisions and GIS technology is used to make sure properties are correctly assessed in the correct tax district as stated in the annexation documents.

In addition, all pickup work was completed by Douglas, as were onsite inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction. The county used Pictometry to aid in the identification of new improvements in preparation to conduct visual inspections and to confirm measurements of selected properties.

Finally, all sales were reviewed by Douglas and a spreadsheet analysis of all sales within the study period was completed.

2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Douglas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:																						
	Appraisal Staff																						
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:																						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>South Omaha area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>North Omaha area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Benson area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Midtown area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Upper-end of the Midtown area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Ralston and Millard Areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Southwest Omaha - a developing area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Northwest Omaha - a well-established area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Unincorporated areas west of Omaha</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Rural - all parcels in the rural areas of the county</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	South Omaha area	2	North Omaha area	3	Benson area	4	Midtown area	5	Upper-end of the Midtown area	6	Ralston and Millard Areas	7	Southwest Omaha - a developing area	8	Northwest Omaha - a well-established area	9	Unincorporated areas west of Omaha	10	Rural - all parcels in the rural areas of the county
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																						
1	South Omaha area																						
2	North Omaha area																						
3	Benson area																						
4	Midtown area																						
5	Upper-end of the Midtown area																						
6	Ralston and Millard Areas																						
7	Southwest Omaha - a developing area																						
8	Northwest Omaha - a well-established area																						
9	Unincorporated areas west of Omaha																						
10	Rural - all parcels in the rural areas of the county																						
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.																						
	Cost approach for new construction and properties, but the market approach for existing properties																						
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?																						
	The County uses CAMA tables and calibrates using local market information but, again, the cost approach is used only on new or newer construction																						
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																						
	No																						
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?																						
	Primarily vacant lot sales are used, but the County does use allocation/residual method to establish lot values in older neighborhoods with limited vacant lot sales																						

7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	1	N/A	2012	2013
	2	N/A	2012	2013
	3	N/A	2012	2013
	4	N/A	2012	2013
	5	N/A	2012	2013
	6	N/A	2012	2013
	7	N/A	2012	2013
	8	N/A	2012	2013
	9	N/A	2012	2013
10	N/A	2012	2013	

Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities.

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Douglas County

County Overview

Douglas County (Douglas) was founded in 1854 and named for US Senator Stephen Arnold Douglas, one-time Presidential candidate who created the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Douglas is located in the extreme eastern portion of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). The counties of Sarpy, Saunders, Dodge, Washington, as well as the State of Iowa, abut Douglas, which has a total area of 328 square miles and 531,265 residents, per the Census Bureau's Quick Facts, of which 63.4% are homeowners. Since the State began monitoring county population growth, Douglas has experienced a 2.7% increase between 2010's population of 517,110 and the present. Douglas is also one of twenty-five counties to have experienced population growth since 2000 and is among the top six upward trending counties in the State. Per the US Census, there are 222,975 housing units in Douglas. Among the towns in Douglas are Bennington, Omaha, Ralston, Valley, Boys Town and Waterloo, with Omaha being the most populous at 415,068 within the city limits. Notable people with connections to Douglas include suffragette Carmelia Hinton, actor Edward "Monty" Clift, and Rose O'Neill, the creator of the Kewpie doll.

In total, there are 179,433 residential parcels in Douglas.

Description of Analysis

The Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division (State) verifies the instruments used to analyze the residential data of every county every year. The two main areas where this occurs are a review of the county's valuation groups and an AVU review.

Market information is monitored by Douglas in the context of approximately 2,200 individual neighborhoods grouped together as fieldbooks, but the 10 valuation groupings serve as an equalization monitor for the general residential areas of the county. A review of Douglas's statistical analysis revealed 14,696 residential sales in those 10 valuation groupings, a 17% increase in qualified sales from the prior year. This sample is large enough to be evaluated for measurement purposes. The stratification by valuation groupings reveals all groups have sufficient numbers of sales to perform measurement on and all are within range.

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a three year cyclical review in which thirty-one counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is adopted. The last cyclical review of Douglas's actions occurred in 2012 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Douglas County

Sales Qualification

The second review process is one of the sales verification and qualification procedure in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors. The last review by the State occurred in 2013. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) recognizes that certain types of sales are oftentimes invalid and should be excluded, unless a larger sample size is needed. When a larger sample is needed, some of these sales may be used for measurement purposes, if they are carefully verified and if they are a significant portion of the market area sales. It should be stressed that some sales considered invalid should never be considered for measurement purposes under any circumstances, no matter the sample size. Three types of sales that have the possibility of being considered valid sales for measurement purposes, if needed, are Sales Involving Government Agencies, Sales Involving Financial Institutions as Sellers, and Short Sales.

When a governmental agency is the seller, values typically fall on the low end of the value range and should not be considered in ratio studies unless an analysis indicates governmental sales have affected the market. Sales involving financial institutions as sellers are typically on the low side of the value range because the financial intuition is highly motivated to sell and may be required by banking regulations to remove the property from its books. These sales may be considered as potentially valid for ratio studies if they comprise more than twenty percent of sales in a specific market area. In a short sale, the lien holder agrees to accept a payoff for less than the outstanding balance of the mortgage or loan.

A comparative analysis was conducted of the qualified sales roster against the qualified sales roster with the inclusion of the three aforementioned sales. The results were very analogous between the two rosters, with the medians of both rosters in range. The results indicated that these non-qualified sales were not disqualified based on an apparent bias. Rather, these sales were disqualified because they simply were not needed. The sample size was more than adequate with their exclusion and they did not meet the needed threshold to be considered a significant portion of sales. The review of Douglas revealed that Douglas ensures that all arm's length sales are made available for the measurement of real property and does not base disqualification on any improper criteria.

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Douglas County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Douglas has a cycle of inspection and review in place, utilizing a two-part structure. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. First, the organized list of neighborhoods in the county and when they were last inspected is examined. The list is then cross-referenced with the prior year's statistics looking for areas that warrant an inspection in the coming year. This structure allows for a timely, yet flexible, visit to all residential parcels in Douglas. For the current assessment year, 30,577 residential properties were inspected and reviewed. This was the first year that over 30,000 residential parcels were able to be inspected in a year, although Douglas has increased residential property inspections each year. Based on both Douglas's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the residential class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for residential property within Douglas is 96% of market value.

2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Douglas County

For the current assessment year, Douglas County (Douglas) conducted a market analysis of the commercial parcels in the county. The staff conducted a total of 3,737 inspections this year, concentrating on retail commercial. This consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures. Also, models and capitalization rates were updated.

A priority for Douglas has been to list the permissive exempt properties in the county. While this continues to be ongoing, two staff members have completed over 500 inspections, many of which had never been inspected before. The county feels the benefit to this is enormous. When exempt properties become taxable, they can now be valued without an additional inspection.

Additionally, 3,400 Board of Equalization packets were prepared, in conjunction with residential properties, and 781 properties were protested to the Tax Equalization Review Commission (TERC). Roughly half of those protests were on commercial parcels. The staff spent approximately two months on TERC appeals. Douglas assists the County Attorney's office with TERC cases by maintaining the TERC database.

All pickup work was completed by Douglas, as were onsite inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction. The county used Pictometry to aid in the identification of new improvements in preparation to conduct visual inspections and to confirm measurements of selected properties.

Finally, all sales were reviewed by Douglas and a spreadsheet analysis of all sales within the study period was completed.

2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Douglas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:			
	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>		
	1	Douglas County is considered one valuation group.		
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.			
	County primarily uses the income approach because the cost approach is for new construction only			
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.			
	The County uses the income and or the cost approach			
4.	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 develops depreciation tables using local market information			
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?			
	County primarily uses the income approach, as the cost approach is for new construction only. Using local market information, the depreciation tables are calibrated but the actual depreciation tables are the same for all valuation groupings			
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.			
	Sales of similar properties are used to determine commercial lot values			
7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	1	2013	2012	2013
	Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities. In Douglas, all commercial parcels have similar characteristics in that they converge in and around the commercial hub of Omaha. As a result, occupancy code is considered the most accurate measure for the county.			

2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Douglas County

County Overview

The majority of the commercial properties in Douglas County (Douglas) convene in and around the county seat of Omaha, the largest city in the State of Nebraska (State). The smaller community markets, while containing commercial properties of their own, are also guided by the proximity to the larger towns that serve as the area commercial hubs.

90.2% of the residents living in Douglas also work in Douglas. 302,633 people are employed in Douglas (U.S. Census Bureau, Local Employment Dynamics) and, per the Nebraska Department of Labor, there is an expected 11.69% job growth increase in years 2010-2020. Among the top employers in Douglas are Creighton University, Alegent Health, Omaha Public Schools, Methodist Health System, The Nebraska Medical Center, and First Data Corp. (Nebraska Department of Labor). Douglas contains 78 grocery stores, 392 full-service restaurants, and 154 gas stations (city-data.com). The oldest building in Omaha still standing is the Bank of Florence, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Douglas is also home to the world's largest indoor rain forest as well as the largest ball of stamps, attributable to the Boys Town Philatelic Museum.

In total, there are 14,761 nonfarm establishments located in Douglas, per the 2007 Survey of Business Owners, and 9,336 commercial parcels.

Description of Analysis

The Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division (State) verifies the instruments used to analyze the commercial data of every county every year. The two main areas where this occurs are a review of the county's valuation groups and an AVU review.

A review of Douglas's statistical analysis revealed 682 commercial sales, a 10% increase in qualified sales from the prior year. This sample is large enough to be evaluated for measurement purposes. Douglas analyzes the commercial property in the context of occupancy code comparability groupings rather than by specific geographical locations and analyzes those groupings annually. The stratification by occupancy code valuation groupings reveals 12 codes with large enough samples to measure, including, but not limited to, fast-food restaurants, retail stores, storage warehouses, and office buildings, and all are within range, indicating uniformity and proportionality.

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a three year cyclical review in which thirty-one counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is adopted. The last cyclical review of Douglas's actions occurred in 2012 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on

2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Douglas County

point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Sales Qualification

The second review process is one of the sales verification and qualification procedure in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors.

The last review by the State occurred in 2013. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation. The review of Douglas revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determination, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Douglas has a cycle of inspection and review in place, utilizing a two-part structure. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. First, the list of commercial parcels and when they were last inspected is examined. The list is then cross-referenced with the prior year's statistics looking for areas that warrant an inspection in the coming year. This structure allows for a timely, yet flexible, visit to all commercial parcels in Douglas. For the current assessment year, 3,737 commercial and exempt properties were inspected and reviewed. Based on both Douglas's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the commercial class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for commercial property within Douglas is 96% of market value.

2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Douglas County

Douglas County (Douglas) performed a market analysis for the agricultural land class of property to determine market value. While special value, influence, and its subsequent impact on Douglas is discussed further in the agricultural correlation section, for purposes of assessment it is key to note that all agricultural land sales within Douglas are influenced by non-agricultural factors. Therefore agricultural sales arising within Douglas are not representative of the market value of the land. As a result, Douglas analyzed uninfluenced agricultural land sales in comparable counties to determine accurate agricultural market value, thus providing a baseline from which to measure the irrigated, dry, and grass land special values in Douglas. For assessment year 2014, the comparable sales in the counties of Burt, Cass, Dodge, Otoe, Saunders, and Washington were utilized in a ratio study. Indicators calculated from those ratios were examined in terms of majority land use, then employed to develop the 2014 schedule of special values for agricultural land.

While all agricultural land sales in Douglas are considered influenced by non-agricultural factors, Douglas continues to treat those parcels like all parcels in the county when it comes to inspection and examining for trends. Sales are monitored and land use is updated, using GIS imagery, FSA maps, and physical inspections. Additionally, as a way to separate out rural residential land and recreational land, the county physically reviewed agricultural parcels to determine primary use before establishing market value.

In the current assessment year, Douglas prepared and gave a presentation on the county's agricultural market to the county board, where sales, selling prices, and acres sold were discussed.

Finally, all agricultural land in Douglas was updated with the values, as set.

2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Douglas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:				
	Appraisal Staff				
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; width: 20%;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td>All ag land in Douglas County is currently considered fully influenced and is given special value.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	N/A	All ag land in Douglas County is currently considered fully influenced and is given special value.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>				
N/A	All ag land in Douglas County is currently considered fully influenced and is given special value.				
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.				
	Because all ag parcels in Douglas County are influenced by non ag factors, the county has one schedule of agricultural land values for the entire county				
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.				
	The county physically reviews the parcel to determine primary use, and then comparable properties are used to establish market value				
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?				
	In cases where the characteristics are similar, the farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued similarly. Platted Subdivisions may have different values because they have different amenities than farm home sites				
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.				
	The county uses sale information from within the county to determine market values, and uninfluenced sales from outside the county to determine uninfluenced values. The difference is monitored and quantified as the portion attributable to non-ag influences				
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.				
	Applications have been received and the county recognizes a difference in assessed value				
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.				
	N/A				

Douglas County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Douglas	1	4,425	4,425	4,425	4,425	4,425	4,425	4,425	4,425	4,425
Burt	2	5,375	5,350	N/A	4,725	4,336	4,450	3,575	2,775	4,960
Cass	54	5,760	5,570	4,900	4,900	4,140	4,140	3,760	3,760	5,163
Dodge	1	5,529	5,383	5,231	5,080	4,777	4,755	4,590	4,280	5,126
Otoe	8000	4,700	4,700	4,500	4,000	3,400	3,200	3,000	2,800	3,917
Sarpy	1	5,428	5,267	4,888	4,500	4,230	4,000	3,240	2,800	4,606
Saunders	3	5,800	5,607	5,408	4,950	4,800	4,500	3,618	3,400	4,842
Washington	1	5,450	5,315	4,915	4,475	4,340	3,935	3,055	2,540	4,680

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Douglas	1	4,346	4,348	4,350	4,350	4,350	4,347	4,348	4,350	4,348
Burt	2	5,350	5,325	4,850	4,675	4,442	4,424	3,550	2,725	4,741
Cass	54	4,340	4,300	4,130	3,720	3,550	3,550	3,560	2,980	3,928
Dodge	1	5,360	5,300	5,270	5,100	4,500	4,440	4,025	3,550	4,939
Otoe	8000	4,100	4,100	3,900	3,600	3,300	3,200	3,000	2,700	3,490
Sarpy	1	5,000	4,850	4,510	4,140	3,900	3,690	2,990	2,580	4,141
Saunders	3	5,315	5,108	4,918	4,560	4,409	4,112	3,265	3,065	4,105
Washington	1	5,230	5,135	4,830	4,185	3,925	3,850	2,965	2,235	4,413

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Douglas	1	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,399	2,400	2,400	2,400
Burt	2	2,192	2,125	2,422	1,611	1,898	1,769	1,816	1,531	1,832
Cass	54	1,770	1,770	1,500	1,500	1,460	1,460	1,340	1,340	1,496
Dodge	1	1,900	1,956	1,760	1,832	1,815	1,650	1,643	1,477	1,731
Otoe	8000	1,682	1,924	1,669	1,926	1,815	1,657	1,488	1,051	1,607
Sarpy	1	2,040	1,970	1,840	1,680	1,580	1,490	1,200	1,050	1,514
Saunders	3	1,715	1,436	2,307	1,963	2,029	1,530	1,443	1,059	1,698
Washington	1	2,162	2,149	1,947	1,545	3,214	1,526	1,759	1,525	1,844

Source: 2014 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

2014 DOUGLAS COUNTY SPECIAL VALUATION METHODOLOGY

Douglas County focused on using generally accepted appraisal practices in establishing its special valuations on agricultural land. The county relied on information supplied by DPAT from the state sales file. Sales were analyzed from Burt, Cass, Dodge, Washington, Saunders and Otoe Counties.

Two models were analyzed from the sales data. Both involved utilizing statistical analyses involving arriving at the median sale price per acre with the coefficient of dispersion used to judge the confidence of the results. The first model involved analyzing sales from all the above listed counties with at least 70% predominant use of irrigated cropland, dry cropland and grassland. The second model utilized sales that had at least 90% predominant

Both models revealed similar results. The analysis also revealed that the soil productivity rating for each sale did not tend to correlate with the sale price. The primary value determinant for the agricultural sales was use and location. Thus an overall rate was selected and used for each of the agricultural uses.

2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Douglas County

County Overview

Douglas County (Douglas) is a county with a 52% dry land majority composition that lies in the eastern half of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). It falls within the Papio-Missouri River Natural Resource District (NRD), which saw 1 water application and 131 new wells in Douglas for the current assessment year, bringing their total well count to 3,152 (DNR Monthly Apps). Per the most recent United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Census of Agriculture, there are 362 farms in Douglas, totaling 84,374 acres. When weighed against the rest of Nebraska, Douglas ranks first for nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod, second in Christmas tree production, and tenth for horses, ponies, donkeys, and burros, respectively. Row crop production remains the predominant agricultural use in Douglas.

Description of Analysis

Given the agricultural trends of the last several years, agricultural land values have surpassed the value for alternative uses in many areas. In effect, agricultural use has become the highest and best use of land historically influenced by development and other non-agricultural activities. In Nebraska, counties once considered “fully influenced” have been eliminated from that category, and their annual methodology confirms the correctness of that movement.

Sale price analysis continues to demonstrate that not only do sale prices diminish as the land moves away from the urban centers, but sale prices become comparable to uninfluenced neighboring counties with similar land features. For 2014, all agricultural land within the counties of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy were determined to be completely influenced by non-agricultural factors, the only counties fully influenced by nonagricultural factors, whereas land in the remaining counties had a highest and best use as agricultural land. Therefore, measurement is not conducted on the influenced valuation for agricultural land since deficient sales information exists.

The special valuation in Douglas was analyzed by the Property Assessment Division (the State) using assessment-to-sales ratios developed with sales data from uninfluenced areas considered comparable to Douglas. Income rental rates, production factors, topography, typical farming practices, proximity, and other factors were considered to determine general areas of comparability. 279 sales from uninfluenced areas comprised of similar soil types were used from the counties of Burt, Cass, Dodge, Otoe, Saunders, and Washington, to serve as Douglas’s “surrogate” sales.

A 2014 assessment level was estimated by the ratio of special valuation assessment divided by the estimated agricultural land market value determination. Those assessed values established by Douglas were then used to estimate value for the uninfluenced sales and measured against their

2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Douglas County

surrogate sale prices. The results of this analysis conveyed that Douglas fell into the acceptable overall median range, as evidenced by the following chart.

Median	70.23%	AAD	21.94%
Mean	77.10%	PRD	109.30%
Weighted Mean	70.55%	COD	31.23%

Analysis was also conducted of the rental rates in the comparable counties and used to estimate the gross rental value per land capability grouping for Douglas. Gross rent multipliers were determined based on an analysis of rental information from the comparable counties and market values indicated from sale prices.

Sales Qualification

Because special valuation encompasses Douglas, Douglas's agricultural sales are not examined for qualification as all sales are coded as non-qualified. However, Douglas does keep a meticulous record of agricultural sales and has had several discussions with the State regarding those sales, leading the State to feel secure in Douglas's knowledge of their own agricultural sales.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

After first ensuring that Douglas measured at an appropriate level, the county's resulting values were then compared with the average assessed values of the comparative counties to confirm equalization. In comparing the average assessed values by LCG of Douglas to adjacent counties, the evidence supported that the values were generally equalized, with no extreme outliers noted.

Assessment practices are considered to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Special Valuation

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land special value in Douglas is 70%.

28 Douglas
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 14,696
 Total Sales Price : 2,766,084,910
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,766,099,710
 Total Assessed Value : 2,634,733,185
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 188,221
 Avg. Assessed Value : 179,282

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 09.72
 PRD : 102.72

COV : 20.01
 STD : 19.58
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.31
 MAX Sales Ratio : 594.46
 MIN Sales Ratio : 16.58

95% Median C.I. : 95.69 to 95.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.03 to 95.47
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.52 to 98.16

Printed:3/28/2014 1:22:00PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1,275	97.51	100.10	97.58	08.40	102.58	52.48	382.78	97.06 to 97.96	186,947	182,426
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1,179	97.90	100.13	97.59	08.89	102.60	16.58	431.69	97.39 to 98.40	180,690	176,331
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2,134	96.27	97.70	95.86	07.55	101.92	48.30	232.92	95.99 to 96.58	187,066	179,315
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2,052	95.94	97.46	95.74	08.17	101.80	34.16	276.79	95.68 to 96.29	189,717	181,643
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	1,695	96.48	99.02	96.17	09.94	102.96	39.12	474.20	96.06 to 96.93	185,453	178,349
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1,387	96.23	98.19	95.70	10.15	102.60	48.25	370.96	95.82 to 96.67	179,166	171,454
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2,421	94.37	96.23	93.79	10.59	102.60	17.06	421.13	93.99 to 94.70	190,198	178,383
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2,553	93.26	96.63	92.84	12.08	104.08	40.22	594.46	92.87 to 93.67	196,983	182,877
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	6,640	96.66	98.52	96.45	08.18	102.15	16.58	431.69	96.47 to 96.86	186,730	180,102
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	8,056	94.91	97.28	94.28	10.93	103.18	17.06	594.46	94.69 to 95.12	189,450	178,607
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	7,060	96.44	98.35	96.18	08.56	102.26	16.58	474.20	96.28 to 96.63	186,384	179,261
<u>ALL</u>	14,696	95.81	97.84	95.25	09.72	102.72	16.58	594.46	95.69 to 95.93	188,221	179,282

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	1,483	96.36	104.79	96.76	19.20	108.30	26.80	431.69	95.94 to 96.99	110,503	106,927
02	335	97.58	109.52	96.48	26.29	113.52	16.58	594.46	96.16 to 99.93	87,085	84,021
03	626	96.15	100.75	96.87	11.37	104.01	56.76	382.78	95.73 to 96.68	109,521	106,098
04	958	95.58	98.85	94.72	13.30	104.36	55.90	269.03	95.03 to 96.07	120,767	114,385
05	940	94.85	95.37	92.71	12.04	102.87	47.93	192.10	93.82 to 95.74	260,162	241,203
06	1,649	95.14	96.99	95.57	08.55	101.49	59.59	277.86	94.69 to 95.54	159,418	152,351
07	1,838	95.54	95.90	94.46	07.81	101.52	57.53	263.43	95.23 to 95.96	221,997	209,709
08	1,978	95.91	96.65	95.57	07.71	101.13	53.72	181.81	95.56 to 96.29	180,502	172,502
09	3,148	95.96	96.47	95.77	05.93	100.73	52.08	474.20	95.68 to 96.26	238,473	228,375
10	1,741	96.01	96.10	95.32	06.69	100.82	38.15	287.66	95.60 to 96.28	209,987	200,160
<u>ALL</u>	14,696	95.81	97.84	95.25	09.72	102.72	16.58	594.46	95.69 to 95.93	188,221	179,282

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	14,696	95.81	97.84	95.25	09.72	102.72	16.58	594.46	95.69 to 95.93	188,221	179,282
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	14,696	95.81	97.84	95.25	09.72	102.72	16.58	594.46	95.69 to 95.93	188,221	179,282

28 Douglas
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 14,696
 Total Sales Price : 2,766,084,910
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,766,099,710
 Total Assessed Value : 2,634,733,185
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 188,221
 Avg. Assessed Value : 179,282

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 09.72
 PRD : 102.72

COV : 20.01
 STD : 19.58
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.31
 MAX Sales Ratio : 594.46
 MIN Sales Ratio : 16.58

95% Median C.I. : 95.69 to 95.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.03 to 95.47
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.52 to 98.16

Printed:3/28/2014 1:22:00PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	3	162.35	164.56	164.19	27.62	100.23	98.40	232.92	N/A	3,000	4,926	
Less Than 15,000	74	153.92	186.09	189.82	55.52	98.03	44.79	594.46	115.80 to 204.38	10,177	19,318	
Less Than 30,000	253	137.45	165.05	159.03	46.90	103.79	26.80	594.46	129.51 to 159.45	18,802	29,901	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	14,693	95.81	97.83	95.25	09.71	102.71	16.58	594.46	95.69 to 95.93	188,259	179,318	
Greater Than 14,999	14,622	95.79	97.40	95.23	09.26	102.28	16.58	398.24	95.67 to 95.91	189,122	180,092	
Greater Than 29,999	14,443	95.74	96.66	95.14	08.52	101.60	16.58	382.78	95.62 to 95.85	191,189	181,899	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	162.35	164.56	164.19	27.62	100.23	98.40	232.92	N/A	3,000	4,926	
5,000 TO 14,999	71	148.39	187.00	190.13	58.61	98.35	44.79	594.46	115.41 to 218.18	10,480	19,926	
15,000 TO 29,999	179	136.42	156.35	153.23	40.73	102.04	26.80	398.24	126.44 to 154.57	22,368	34,276	
30,000 TO 59,999	514	103.96	116.20	114.78	23.87	101.24	16.58	382.78	100.80 to 108.21	45,448	52,165	
60,000 TO 99,999	1,624	97.35	100.20	100.04	12.18	100.16	35.62	222.06	96.88 to 98.03	81,513	81,545	
100,000 TO 149,999	4,663	96.01	96.20	96.12	06.80	100.08	48.30	158.93	95.80 to 96.16	125,999	121,104	
150,000 TO 249,999	4,531	95.30	95.63	95.60	07.11	100.03	48.25	197.02	95.00 to 95.51	190,407	182,036	
250,000 TO 499,999	2,715	94.55	94.11	93.93	07.67	100.19	45.44	189.18	94.14 to 95.00	323,913	304,255	
500,000 TO 999,999	358	92.98	91.69	91.66	09.13	100.03	45.68	152.21	91.71 to 94.13	636,212	583,149	
1,000,000 +	38	93.58	90.48	90.53	08.92	99.94	67.40	113.99	88.26 to 95.97	1,267,157	1,147,203	
<u>ALL</u>	14,696	95.81	97.84	95.25	09.72	102.72	16.58	594.46	95.69 to 95.93	188,221	179,282	

28 Douglas
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 682
Total Sales Price : 835,630,616
Total Adj. Sales Price : 835,630,616
Total Assessed Value : 743,851,845
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,225,265
Avg. Assessed Value : 1,090,692

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 98
COD : 17.87
PRD : 109.60

COV : 32.55
STD : 31.76
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.20
MAX Sales Ratio : 405.45
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.70

95% Median C.I. : 95.47 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.74 to 92.29
95% Mean C.I. : 95.19 to 99.95

Printed:3/28/2014 1:22:01PM

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	46	96.22	92.39	91.04	09.11	101.48	42.91	125.00	92.38 to 97.84	2,030,946	1,848,879
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	36	96.71	99.81	101.34	18.62	98.49	33.17	275.86	94.08 to 100.00	1,172,926	1,188,675
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	41	96.10	93.30	86.38	10.11	108.01	45.77	128.59	94.66 to 99.73	851,663	735,628
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	43	97.77	96.05	91.19	11.84	105.33	56.52	131.93	94.65 to 100.02	2,055,802	1,874,758
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	80	96.11	102.25	88.06	20.58	116.11	40.57	327.60	92.22 to 98.57	1,133,403	998,056
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	47	97.97	99.61	98.36	10.87	101.27	54.02	153.97	95.79 to 101.99	363,917	357,948
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	60	96.90	100.77	91.81	18.97	109.76	47.05	219.94	92.16 to 99.52	951,096	873,163
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	54	98.44	105.88	93.19	19.80	113.62	54.93	238.01	95.15 to 100.00	853,284	795,158
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	98	96.57	94.91	84.45	18.02	112.39	31.28	274.85	93.43 to 99.84	781,135	659,632
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	32	91.82	100.50	92.31	30.65	108.87	34.83	405.45	76.67 to 100.00	739,653	682,784
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	77	94.16	94.40	83.00	18.64	113.73	28.70	252.58	86.63 to 98.27	1,854,895	1,539,620
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	68	92.34	93.14	88.18	23.77	105.62	31.54	213.44	86.63 to 95.65	1,804,378	1,591,112
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	166	96.41	95.17	92.14	12.20	103.29	33.17	275.86	95.51 to 97.95	1,560,039	1,437,446
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	241	97.12	102.18	91.03	18.17	112.25	40.57	327.60	95.79 to 98.65	875,184	796,665
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	275	94.32	94.98	85.64	21.15	110.91	28.70	405.45	92.59 to 96.34	1,329,981	1,139,052
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	200	96.38	98.65	91.10	16.25	108.29	33.17	327.60	95.47 to 98.32	1,281,076	1,167,061
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	259	97.65	99.41	89.84	17.27	110.65	31.28	274.85	95.82 to 98.83	759,840	682,609
<u>ALL</u>	682	96.24	97.57	89.02	17.87	109.60	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,225,265	1,090,692

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	682	96.24	97.57	89.02	17.87	109.60	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,225,265	1,090,692
<u>ALL</u>	682	96.24	97.57	89.02	17.87	109.60	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,225,265	1,090,692

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	153	96.20	95.50	87.27	12.12	109.43	41.67	213.44	94.99 to 97.56	1,075,090	938,199
03	415	96.67	99.43	90.36	19.79	110.04	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.96	1,361,610	1,230,357
04	114	94.63	93.57	84.57	18.49	110.64	31.28	238.01	90.00 to 98.08	930,470	786,921
<u>ALL</u>	682	96.24	97.57	89.02	17.87	109.60	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,225,265	1,090,692

28 Douglas
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 682
 Total Sales Price : 835,630,616
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 835,630,616
 Total Assessed Value : 743,851,845
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,225,265
 Avg. Assessed Value : 1,090,692

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 89
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 17.87
 PRD : 109.60

COV : 32.55
 STD : 31.76
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.20
 MAX Sales Ratio : 405.45
 MIN Sales Ratio : 28.70

95% Median C.I. : 95.47 to 97.14
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.74 to 92.29
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.19 to 99.95

Printed:3/28/2014 1:22:01PM

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	327.60	327.60	327.60	00.00	100.00	327.60	327.60	N/A	4,000	13,104	
Less Than 15,000	5	105.33	166.59	140.07	76.64	118.93	67.09	327.60	N/A	9,689	13,571	
Less Than 30,000	16	109.94	142.30	132.97	49.29	107.02	42.99	327.60	94.48 to 219.94	18,650	24,798	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	681	96.24	97.23	89.02	17.55	109.22	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,227,058	1,092,274	
Greater Than 14,999	677	96.24	97.06	89.01	17.37	109.04	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,234,242	1,098,647	
Greater Than 29,999	666	96.19	96.50	89.00	16.88	108.43	28.70	405.45	95.33 to 97.04	1,254,253	1,116,299	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	327.60	327.60	327.60	00.00	100.00	327.60	327.60	N/A	4,000	13,104	
5,000 TO 14,999	4	100.12	126.33	123.19	45.29	102.55	67.09	238.01	N/A	11,111	13,688	
15,000 TO 29,999	11	111.88	131.25	131.59	37.13	99.74	42.99	274.85	94.26 to 219.94	22,723	29,901	
30,000 TO 59,999	28	100.04	107.36	106.43	15.62	100.87	65.33	171.06	95.51 to 108.60	44,560	47,427	
60,000 TO 99,999	50	96.96	96.49	96.89	12.53	99.59	40.50	150.59	94.56 to 99.32	80,324	77,829	
100,000 TO 149,999	82	97.07	105.48	104.16	23.34	101.27	31.54	405.45	96.12 to 99.25	120,823	125,847	
150,000 TO 249,999	102	95.99	94.45	94.46	16.10	99.99	42.91	187.23	94.79 to 99.20	191,297	180,690	
250,000 TO 499,999	117	95.26	96.91	96.16	16.23	100.78	28.70	266.74	92.47 to 98.10	351,773	338,267	
500,000 TO 999,999	119	96.61	95.13	95.49	15.15	99.62	31.28	189.63	94.78 to 98.89	719,821	687,346	
1,000,000 +	168	92.65	92.22	87.28	17.36	105.66	43.00	275.86	90.91 to 96.04	4,010,907	3,500,682	
<u>ALL</u>	682	96.24	97.57	89.02	17.87	109.60	28.70	405.45	95.47 to 97.14	1,225,265	1,090,692	

28 Douglas
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 682
Total Sales Price : 835,630,616
Total Adj. Sales Price : 835,630,616
Total Assessed Value : 743,851,845
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,225,265
Avg. Assessed Value : 1,090,692

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 98
COD : 17.87
PRD : 109.60

COV : 32.55
STD : 31.76
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.20
MAX Sales Ratio : 405.45
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.70

95% Median C.I. : 95.47 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.74 to 92.29
95% Mean C.I. : 95.19 to 99.95

Printed:3/28/2014 1:22:01PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
106	6	95.94	96.35	96.33	05.27	100.02	83.20	107.93	83.20 to 107.93	141,083	135,900
116	77	96.38	97.23	92.68	13.51	104.91	41.67	274.85	95.08 to 98.59	192,698	178,598
118	63	95.74	94.82	83.97	10.43	112.92	64.48	161.05	92.83 to 97.97	1,833,692	1,539,836
146	1	54.02	54.02	54.02	00.00	100.00	54.02	54.02	N/A	215,000	116,149
149	2	159.79	159.79	114.08	37.64	140.07	99.64	219.94	N/A	62,500	71,299
210	20	96.05	95.35	86.92	12.56	109.70	60.42	131.93	87.03 to 104.13	921,250	800,741
227	2	99.05	99.05	97.96	01.41	101.11	97.65	100.44	N/A	1,037,500	1,016,293
228	1	48.55	48.55	48.55	00.00	100.00	48.55	48.55	N/A	170,000	82,537
304	8	94.48	95.01	96.30	17.02	98.66	68.56	152.86	68.56 to 152.86	1,451,786	1,398,090
306	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	6,500,000	6,499,965
309	3	99.48	119.30	105.47	20.94	113.11	97.96	160.46	N/A	145,000	152,936
312	2	83.47	83.47	85.53	26.90	97.59	61.02	105.92	N/A	4,312,532	3,688,389
313	2	128.22	128.22	112.18	66.46	114.30	43.00	213.44	N/A	2,094,300	2,349,318
319	5	94.32	90.04	87.00	06.05	103.49	71.59	97.31	N/A	1,410,000	1,226,713
325	44	98.82	95.47	92.29	17.50	103.45	34.83	187.68	91.99 to 103.08	305,209	281,663
326	2	53.80	53.80	43.45	24.72	123.82	40.50	67.09	N/A	45,000	19,555
332	6	94.17	102.75	97.60	18.85	105.28	76.67	161.63	76.67 to 161.63	10,348,718	10,100,498
333	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	994,400	994,395
334	8	100.00	98.35	98.03	08.98	100.33	76.47	124.81	76.47 to 124.81	1,123,193	1,101,063
336	4	102.88	108.66	107.05	11.12	101.50	96.43	132.45	N/A	149,250	159,775
340	2	94.28	94.28	91.53	03.02	103.00	91.43	97.12	N/A	2,622,100	2,400,092
341	9	98.27	100.54	96.61	11.92	104.07	72.57	152.00	84.49 to 103.98	997,556	963,785
343	5	100.01	97.63	91.75	07.70	106.41	79.81	111.16	N/A	1,565,253	1,436,062
344	108	94.28	96.84	86.86	23.82	111.49	28.70	266.74	87.88 to 99.60	1,964,058	1,706,073
345	1	144.93	144.93	144.93	00.00	100.00	144.93	144.93	N/A	2,043,700	2,962,000
349	15	91.80	110.25	87.77	47.02	125.61	33.17	405.45	66.72 to 125.00	871,973	765,367
350	17	92.47	92.07	90.48	10.11	101.76	74.65	116.17	80.30 to 100.57	802,759	726,349
351	1	97.04	97.04	97.04	00.00	100.00	97.04	97.04	N/A	20,010,024	19,416,800
353	52	96.39	98.59	85.92	10.98	114.75	48.22	138.27	94.80 to 98.45	367,580	315,823
380	1	83.29	83.29	83.29	00.00	100.00	83.29	83.29	N/A	1,885,000	1,570,000
382	2	88.20	88.20	84.55	09.10	104.32	80.17	96.22	N/A	330,000	279,013
384	2	84.07	84.07	74.95	17.45	112.17	69.40	98.73	N/A	92,500	69,328
386	3	99.67	95.48	99.49	05.76	95.97	84.78	102.00	N/A	748,037	744,191
387	2	76.69	76.69	69.54	14.58	110.28	65.51	87.86	N/A	838,721	583,253
406	88	92.96	94.93	89.23	22.78	106.39	31.28	327.60	86.63 to 97.90	471,982	421,151
407	8	98.29	89.59	72.44	13.82	123.67	57.35	108.83	57.35 to 108.83	5,370,218	3,890,331
412	28	93.21	98.79	91.16	24.72	108.37	56.33	275.86	80.14 to 100.00	1,534,188	1,398,573
418	1	51.99	51.99	51.99	00.00	100.00	51.99	51.99	N/A	11,687,500	6,076,071

28 Douglas
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 682
 Total Sales Price : 835,630,616
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 835,630,616
 Total Assessed Value : 743,851,845
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,225,265
 Avg. Assessed Value : 1,090,692

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 89
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 17.87
 PRD : 109.60

COV : 32.55
 STD : 31.76
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.20
 MAX Sales Ratio : 405.45
 MIN Sales Ratio : 28.70

95% Median C.I. : 95.47 to 97.14
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.74 to 92.29
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.19 to 99.95

Printed:3/28/2014 1:22:01PM

419	17	96.39	96.48	91.15	13.20	105.85	51.70	135.86	88.78 to 109.58	1,464,803	1,335,168
423	2	106.43	106.43	101.86	08.18	104.49	97.72	115.14	N/A	694,767	707,688
426	4	97.55	97.50	98.22	01.11	99.27	96.17	98.74	N/A	417,500	410,085
434	5	100.00	114.87	112.12	15.59	102.45	98.22	166.22	N/A	325,564	365,025
436	3	101.87	151.48	132.37	49.93	114.44	99.99	252.58	N/A	523,000	692,292
442	12	99.79	106.66	106.13	12.72	100.50	84.84	150.59	94.56 to 112.08	125,668	133,366
446	6	98.86	98.47	98.46	02.35	100.01	92.61	101.77	92.61 to 101.77	2,931,269	2,886,139
447	1	68.09	68.09	68.09	00.00	100.00	68.09	68.09	N/A	1,417,300	965,000
459	1	112.28	112.28	112.28	00.00	100.00	112.28	112.28	N/A	500,000	561,384
473	1	189.63	189.63	189.63	00.00	100.00	189.63	189.63	N/A	900,000	1,706,670
502	1	125.65	125.65	125.65	00.00	100.00	125.65	125.65	N/A	30,000	37,695
516	2	87.76	87.76	87.84	00.36	99.91	87.44	88.08	N/A	206,250	181,177
532	1	114.77	114.77	114.77	00.00	100.00	114.77	114.77	N/A	112,000	128,538
577	5	93.76	87.54	86.00	11.34	101.79	65.33	100.00	N/A	154,737	133,069
588	1	110.46	110.46	110.46	00.00	100.00	110.46	110.46	N/A	2,200,000	2,430,090
595	8	95.96	107.04	95.67	20.91	111.88	78.73	171.62	78.73 to 171.62	6,306,626	6,033,458
718	2	93.39	93.39	92.71	01.51	100.73	91.98	94.79	N/A	1,450,000	1,344,267
81	1	130.24	130.24	130.24	00.00	100.00	130.24	130.24	N/A	134,500	175,177
87	1	77.87	77.87	77.87	00.00	100.00	77.87	77.87	N/A	155,000	120,700
88	5	95.15	105.43	104.31	11.22	101.07	94.17	136.27	N/A	143,440	149,618
<u>ALL</u>	<u>682</u>	<u>96.24</u>	<u>97.57</u>	<u>89.02</u>	<u>17.87</u>	<u>109.60</u>	<u>28.70</u>	<u>405.45</u>	<u>95.47 to 97.14</u>	<u>1,225,265</u>	<u>1,090,692</u>

Ratio Study

Final Statistics

Confidence Intervals

Douglas
sales 279

Median	70.23%	AAD	21.94%
Mean	77.10%	COD	31.23%
Wt Mean	70.55%	PRD	109.30%

95% Median C.I.: 67.65% to 76.10%
95% Mean C.I.: 73.49% to 80.72%
95% Wt Mean C.I.: 67.42% to 73.68%

Area 1
sales 279

Median	70.23%	AAD	21.94%
Mean	77.10%	COD	31.23%
Wt Mean	70.55%	PRD	109.30%

95% Median C.I.: 67.65% to 76.10%
95% Mean C.I.: 73.49% to 80.72%
95% Wt Mean C.I.: 67.42% to 73.68%

Majority Land Use

95% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
County	16	60.36%	112	67.39%	12	64.74%
Area 1	16	60.36%	112	67.39%	12	64.74%

80% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
County	29	61.58%	171	69.82%	16	65.72%
Area 1	29	61.58%	171	69.82%	16	65.72%

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 194,185	Value : 35,342,895,670	Growth 414,042,200	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	7,709	48,663,400	6,051	123,701,300	2,099	62,131,800	15,859	234,496,500	
02. Res Improve Land	128,734	1,972,473,400	28,822	860,036,000	3,451	176,350,600	161,007	3,008,860,000	
03. Res Improvements	130,464	14,719,743,800	29,428	5,412,721,400	3,682	637,653,900	163,574	20,770,119,100	
04. Res Total	138,173	16,740,880,600	35,479	6,396,458,700	5,781	876,136,300	179,433	24,013,475,600	315,387,400
% of Res Total	77.01	69.71	19.77	26.64	3.22	3.65	92.40	67.94	76.17
05. Com UnImp Land	1,506	212,859,900	406	104,239,400	69	7,623,700	1,981	324,723,000	
06. Com Improve Land	7,002	1,811,395,900	253	155,585,300	101	17,870,700	7,356	1,984,851,900	
07. Com Improvements	7,156	6,315,643,200	262	539,669,800	141	82,198,800	7,559	6,937,511,800	
08. Com Total	8,662	8,339,899,000	668	799,494,500	210	107,693,200	9,540	9,247,086,700	94,300,600
% of Com Total	90.80	90.19	7.00	8.65	2.20	1.16	4.91	26.16	22.78
09. Ind UnImp Land	463	29,898,700	8	1,352,700	28	7,433,200	499	38,684,600	
10. Ind Improve Land	1,736	285,730,800	52	19,160,900	51	8,727,800	1,839	313,619,500	
11. Ind Improvements	1,714	1,209,008,400	52	55,841,600	57	37,509,300	1,823	1,302,359,300	
12. Ind Total	2,177	1,524,637,900	60	76,355,200	85	53,670,300	2,322	1,654,663,400	2,770,800
% of Ind Total	93.76	92.14	2.58	4.61	3.66	3.24	1.20	4.68	0.67
13. Rec UnImp Land	160	440,300	440	1,447,800	87	267,300	687	2,155,400	
14. Rec Improve Land	12	177,600	5	36,000	38	200	55	213,800	
15. Rec Improvements	9	47,900	1	0	191	2,082,600	201	2,130,500	
16. Rec Total	169	665,800	441	1,483,800	278	2,350,100	888	4,499,700	0
% of Rec Total	19.03	14.80	49.66	32.98	31.31	52.23	0.46	0.01	0.00
Res & Rec Total	138,342	16,741,546,400	35,920	6,397,942,500	6,059	878,486,400	180,321	24,017,975,300	315,387,400
% of Res & Rec Total	76.72	69.70	19.92	26.64	3.36	3.66	92.86	67.96	76.17
Com & Ind Total	10,839	9,864,536,900	728	875,849,700	295	161,363,500	11,862	10,901,750,100	97,071,400
% of Com & Ind Total	91.38	90.49	6.14	8.03	2.49	1.48	6.11	30.85	23.44
17. Taxable Total	149,181	26,606,083,300	36,648	7,273,792,200	6,354	1,039,849,900	192,183	34,919,725,400	412,458,800
% of Taxable Total	77.62	76.19	19.07	20.83	3.31	2.98	98.97	98.80	99.62

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	1,989	18,602,000	371,778,800	0	0	0
19. Commercial	439	129,556,600	1,220,032,800	0	0	0
20. Industrial	45	53,578,200	108,463,300	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	1,989	18,602,000	371,778,800
19. Commercial	0	0	0	439	129,556,600	1,220,032,800
20. Industrial	0	0	0	45	53,578,200	108,463,300
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2,473	201,736,800	1,700,274,900

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	11,796	574	1,165	13,535

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,328	186,154,325	1,328	186,154,325
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	52,200	0	0	1,935	124,690,545	1,936	124,742,745
29. Ag Improvements	28	818,900	3	475,400	643	110,978,900	674	112,273,200
30. Ag Total							2,002	423,170,270

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	0.00	409,900	1	0.00	472,000	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	8.70	52,200	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	26	0.00	409,000	2	0.00	3,400	
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	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	579	624.64	19,885,700	579	624.64	19,885,700	
33. HomeSite Improvements	488	0.00	107,059,100	491	0.00	107,941,000	1,519,400
34. HomeSite Total				491	624.64	127,826,700	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	629	1,171.39	11,757,180	630	1,180.09	11,809,380	
37. FarmSite Improvements	155	0.00	3,919,800	183	0.00	4,332,200	64,000
38. FarmSite Total				183	1,180.09	16,141,580	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				674	1,804.73	143,968,280	1,583,400

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	2,055	74,553.07	279,202,000	2,055	74,553.07	279,202,000
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,983.45	19.67%	8,776,766	19.67%	4,425.00
46. 1A	365.45	3.62%	1,617,116	3.62%	4,425.00
47. 2A1	481.25	4.77%	2,129,531	4.77%	4,425.00
48. 2A	4,490.92	44.54%	19,872,330	44.54%	4,425.00
49. 3A1	1,264.88	12.55%	5,597,094	12.55%	4,425.00
50. 3A	1,069.31	10.61%	4,731,697	10.61%	4,425.00
51. 4A1	211.48	2.10%	935,799	2.10%	4,425.00
52. 4A	215.26	2.14%	952,525	2.14%	4,425.00
53. Total	10,082.00	100.00%	44,612,858	100.00%	4,425.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,370.27	13.54%	27,683,226	13.53%	4,345.69
55. 1D	10,122.91	21.51%	44,016,897	21.51%	4,348.25
56. 2D1	1,173.17	2.49%	5,103,290	2.49%	4,350.00
57. 2D	8,356.47	17.76%	36,350,645	17.77%	4,350.00
58. 3D1	4,961.13	10.54%	21,580,915	10.55%	4,350.00
59. 3D	5,040.73	10.71%	21,909,537	10.71%	4,346.50
60. 4D1	10,298.39	21.88%	44,772,955	21.88%	4,347.57
61. 4D	735.90	1.56%	3,201,152	1.56%	4,349.98
62. Total	47,058.97	100.00%	204,618,617	100.00%	4,348.13
Grass					
63. 1G1	743.18	8.29%	1,783,632	8.29%	2,400.00
64. 1G	1,610.13	17.96%	3,864,320	17.96%	2,400.00
65. 2G1	75.24	0.84%	180,576	0.84%	2,400.00
66. 2G	828.33	9.24%	1,987,980	9.24%	2,399.99
67. 3G1	511.82	5.71%	1,228,368	5.71%	2,400.00
68. 3G	1,426.05	15.91%	3,421,120	15.90%	2,399.02
69. 4G1	2,186.53	24.39%	5,247,660	24.40%	2,399.99
70. 4G	1,582.22	17.65%	3,797,328	17.65%	2,400.00
71. Total	8,963.50	100.00%	21,510,984	100.00%	2,399.84
Irrigated Total					
	10,082.00	13.52%	44,612,858	15.98%	4,425.00
Dry Total					
	47,058.97	63.12%	204,618,617	73.29%	4,348.13
Grass Total					
	8,963.50	12.02%	21,510,984	7.70%	2,399.84
72. Waste	2,946.78	3.95%	442,011	0.16%	150.00
73. Other	5,501.83	7.38%	8,017,520	2.87%	1,457.25
74. Exempt	1,142.17	1.53%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	74,553.08	100.00%	279,201,990	100.00%	3,745.01

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	10,082.00	44,612,858	10,082.00	44,612,858
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	47,058.97	204,618,617	47,058.97	204,618,617
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	8,963.50	21,510,984	8,963.50	21,510,984
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,946.78	442,011	2,946.78	442,011
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,501.83	8,017,520	5,501.83	8,017,520
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,142.17	0	1,142.17	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	74,553.08	279,201,990	74,553.08	279,201,990

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	10,082.00	13.52%	44,612,858	15.98%	4,425.00
Dry Land	47,058.97	63.12%	204,618,617	73.29%	4,348.13
Grass	8,963.50	12.02%	21,510,984	7.70%	2,399.84
Waste	2,946.78	3.95%	442,011	0.16%	150.00
Other	5,501.83	7.38%	8,017,520	2.87%	1,457.25
Exempt	1,142.17	1.53%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	74,553.08	100.00%	279,201,990	100.00%	3,745.01

2014 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2013 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

28 Douglas

	2013 CTL County Total	2014 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2014 form 45 - 2013 CTL)	Percent Change	2014 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	23,555,265,285	24,013,475,600	458,210,315	1.95%	315,387,400	0.61%
02. Recreational	2,733,300	4,499,700	1,766,400	64.63%	0	64.63%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	152,688,245	127,826,700	-24,861,545	-16.28%	1,519,400	-17.28%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	23,710,686,830	24,145,802,000	435,115,170	1.84%	316,906,800	0.50%
05. Commercial	9,120,791,475	9,247,086,700	126,295,225	1.38%	94,300,600	0.35%
06. Industrial	1,645,360,800	1,654,663,400	9,302,600	0.57%	2,770,800	0.40%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,272,305	16,141,580	-1,130,725	-6.55%	64,000	-6.92%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	10,783,424,580	10,917,891,680	134,467,100	1.25%	97,135,400	0.35%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	34,494,111,410	35,063,693,680	569,582,270	1.65%	414,042,200	0.45%
11. Irrigated	38,555,170	44,612,858	6,057,688	15.71%		
12. Dryland	170,985,450	204,618,617	33,633,167	19.67%		
13. Grassland	18,529,905	21,510,984	2,981,079	16.09%		
14. Wasteland	149,340	442,011	292,671	195.98%		
15. Other Agland	3,870,470	8,017,520	4,147,050	107.15%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	232,090,335	279,201,990	47,111,655	20.30%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	34,726,201,745	35,342,895,670	616,693,925	1.78%	414,042,200	0.58%

**Douglas County Assessor
2014 - 2016 Three Year
Plan of Assessment**

Introduction

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), The county assessor shall, on or before June 15 each year, prepare a plan of assessment which shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make 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. The plan shall be presented to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 each year. The county 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 on or before October 31 each year.

Source: Laws 2005, LB 263, § 9; Laws 2007, LB334, § 64. Operative date July 1, 2007.

Real Property

Douglas County consists of the following breakdown of real property parcels in 2013:

Type	# of parcels	Value
Residential	181,133	\$23,940,265,100
Commercial/Industrial	12,347	\$12,319,538,100
Agricultural	1,996	\$ 375,590,028
Exempt	17,460	
State Assessed	983	
Total	213,919	\$36,635,393,228

This total includes tax increment financing of which represents 2,290 parcels totaling \$1,679,453,300 in value.

Assessment Calendar

Date	Activity
January 1	Assessment Date
January 15	Preliminary Values Set
February	Informal Hearings
March 7	Transfer Values to Clerk & Error Reports
March 25	Reports and Opinions to State – Abstract & Sales File
Mar – May	Data Collection & TERC cases reviewed
Jun – Jul	BOE
Aug – Oct	Data Collection
Nov – Dec	Building Permits & Set Values

Staffing and Budget

The office's appraisal staff currently consists of 28 individuals including the Chief Field Deputy. There is also 4 clerical support staff assigned to the department. In preparing the three year plan, there are two major hurdles that hamper the completion of the statutory mandate of inspecting all properties every six years. The first constraint is the lack of adequate funding of appraisal functions which results in an overly high work load of the appraisers. (See budget comparisons later in this report.) The residential appraisers have an average of over 16,000 parcels assigned to each appraiser, while the commercial appraisers have an average of around 3700 parcels each. (This appraiser workload is about double that recommended by the International Association of Assessing Officers – IAAO)

The second major drain on the appraisal staff has been the high number of protests to both the Board of Equalization and the Tax Equalization Review Commission. The protest process has taken a high amount of staff time. Our staff prepares a BOE packet for the Board for each protest, which will also serve as evidence for TERC if the property is appealed. When an individual files a TERC protest, our office performs an interior inspection, prepares the required TERC documentation as well as having the appraiser or supervisor attend the hearing along with the County Attorney's designee. This is different than some of the other counties who have the BOE staff defend their values. The breakdown for value changes and protests for the last six years are as follows:

Year	Value Changes	BOE Protests	% of changes	TERC Protests	% of BOE
2007	83,940	10,551	12.57	1,171	11.10
2008	54,964	5,905	10.74	811	13.73
2009	32,198	4,800	14.91	958	19.96
2010	61,000	5,455	8.94	1,032	18.92
2011	27,000	5196	19.24	1,044	20.09
2012	48,410	4419	9.13	1,028	21.34

Last year the office requested an additional \$500,000 to meet this year's new State mandates. The County Board committed \$250,000 to our offices for these purposes in the 2012-13 budget. The Assessor's Office submitted a 2013-14 budget of \$3,201,299 that is the same as the 2012-13 budget with additional to cover required salary increases. We have also requested the additional \$250,000 which was not granted last year. This supplemental request was for the purpose of accomplishing the new State mandates.

2012 Valuation Statistics

Despite these constraints, the office values all properties every year. This is accomplished through the use of the Office's Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal system and extensive use of statistical analysis. The Cost Approach to value is utilized primarily for new construction and unique properties; the Sales Comparison Approach is used in valuing residential properties, while the Income Approach is utilized in valuing commercial, industrial and Multiple Commercial properties.

The results of the 2013 reappraisal of the County's properties are illustrated below.

The 2013 Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator Statistics were as follows:

	# of Sales	Ratio	COD	PRD
Residential	12,175	96	8.99	102.83
Commercial	616	96	19.40	112.98
Agricultural		75		

For 2013, the Assessors Office reviewed all 213,000 parcels and made 52,973 value changes. There were 48,720 residential changes and 33,385 (69%) of these were decreases. The remaining neighborhoods were within the acceptable value range set by the State.

Real Property Inspection Cycle 2013 – 2016

Commercial

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.03 (2007), On or before March 19 of each year, each county assessor shall conduct a systematic inspection and review by class or subclass of a portion of the taxable real property parcels in the county for the purpose of achieving uniform and proportionate valuations and assuring that the real property record data accurately reflects the property. The county assessor shall adjust the value of all other taxable real property parcels by class or subclass in the county so that the value of all real property is uniform and proportionate. The county assessor shall determine the portion to be inspected and reviewed each year to assure that all parcels of real property in the county have been inspected and reviewed no less frequently than every six years.

The inspection cycle consist of having an appraiser physically inspect each improved parcel in the County every 6 years. Due to a shortage of vehicles available to the appraisal staff, this may entail the staff working in a team of two at times. The extent of the physical inspection is based upon the completeness of our data. Some areas may need to have the current information reviewed with the staff taking a front and rear photo of each property, while other areas may need to have the data completely re-listed to include re-measuring the improvements. Some commercial properties need to have interior inspections completed to determine usage and finished versus unfinished areas. While Pictometry was purchased two years ago and is helpful in verifying some measurements and identifying missing characteristics such as decks and swimming pools, it can't be substituted for an on-site inspection. An on-site inspection is important to verify quality of construction and to determine the condition of the property. This is especially important for areas of the County with older properties since property conditions can change over a short period of time.

There are currently 9,421 improved commercial/Industrial/Multiple Commercial parcels. In the last three years the commercial staff has inspected 6,483 parcels, in the next three years they will need to inspect the remaining 2,938 parcels.

The past three years the commercial department has listed the industrial, office and apartments in the County. The priority for the next three years will be to list and analysis all retail properties, finish up analysis, listing and model development for offices and apartments not addressed this last year.

A major drain on the commercial department has been the amount of commercial properties that have filed TERC protests. Out of an average of a thousand cases filed every year half of them are commercial properties. Unlike the residential department these cases are prepared and attended by either the supervisor and or staff. This also includes cases where the BOE's appraisers have changed the Assessor's value. The office has attempted to work the BOE in having the BOE hiring their appraisers to represent the large and complex cases. The Assessor's office assists the County Attorney's office with the TERC cases by having the Office Manager maintain the TERC database.

Another priority this last year has been to list the permissive exempt properties. Two staff members have completed over 500 inspections of these properties. Most of these properties have never been inspected. The goal is get all properties both taxable and exempt listed. This has been beneficial this year due to several of these properties have become taxable, and were able to be valued without an additional inspection.

Residential

There are currently 164,057 improved residential properties in the County. In the past three years the residential staff has inspected a total of 77,365 parcels leaving 86,692 parcels to be inspected the next three years to complete the requirement of inspecting all properties every six years. This means an average of 28,897 parcels need to be inspected each of the next three years. The residential staff consists of 10 appraisers and 6 listers. The requirement to inspect all parcels within the 6 year time frame has been especially difficult to accomplish due to the amount of appraisal time spent on tax appeals. The current staff of appraisers spends an average of two months a year working on Board appeals. This last year a separate hearing department has been created with a supervisor and two real estate appraisers to work the residential TERC cases. Another constraint that the office has faced in completing inspections is the shortage of county provided vehicles. The office is hoping to increase the amount of vehicles for appraisal staff if additional budget is granted this year.

2014 Assessment Survey for Douglas County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	2
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	19 appraisers and listers
3.	Other full-time employees:
	4 administrative, 4 GIS, 6 Personal Property, 6 Real Estate Records, 4 TERC Department
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$3,378,084
7.	
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$1,508,932 (salaries)
9.	
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$246,184
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$13,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	0

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	County Clerk's Office—IMS Mainframe System
2.	CAMA software:
	Colorado Customware
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	GIS Department within the Assessor's Office
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	dcassessor.org
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor's Office
8.	Personal Property software:
	Colorado Customware

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All municipalities in the county are zoned
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Over 45 years ago

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	N/A
2.	GIS Services:
	In-house
3.	Other services:
	N/A

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	N/A
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	N/A
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	N/A
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	N/A
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	N/A

2014 Certification for Douglas County

This is to certify that the 2014 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 Douglas County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

