

# 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 Richardson County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	186	Median	97.81
Total Sales Price	\$9,715,655	Mean	104.12
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,721,322	Wgt. Mean	98.18
Total Assessed Value	\$9,544,238	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$41,597
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,265	Avg. Assessed Value	\$51,313

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.33 to 102.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.75 to 101.61
95% Mean C.I	99.60 to 108.64
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	15.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.33
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.34

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	156	98	98.20
2012	199	95	95.41
2011	277	96	96
2010	265	97	97

## 2014 Commission Summary for Richardson County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	21	Median	84.95
Total Sales Price	\$2,905,868	Mean	87.35
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,905,868	Wgt. Mean	69.63
Total Assessed Value	\$2,023,241	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$53,796
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$138,375	Avg. Assessed Value	\$96,345

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	72.40 to 96.26
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	60.48 to 78.78
95% Mean C.I	78.76 to 95.94
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.93
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.31
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.92

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	18		94.18
2012	25		97.70
2011	38	94	94
2010	46	96	96



## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Richardson County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>72</b>	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 Richardson County

## RESIDENTIAL - VILLAGES

The county completed a review and reappraisal for the following areas or property types:

- Village of Salem
- Village of Preston
- Village of Rulo
- Village of Barada

### Reappraisal procedures enacted:

Field review and photo inventory of all subject properties was completed.

#### Cost approach

- Market value review of vacant land and update if necessary
- Update physical & functional depreciation on all improvements from observations.
- Review current economic depreciation for area and update if necessary

## AREA UPDATES

- |  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| • Humboldt Residential                 | Land & Buildings 5% market increase |
| • Acreages (rural res) – entire county | Land & Buildings 5% market increase |
| • Reynolds & McDermott res sub         | General listing review & update     |

The County also completed all pickup and permit work for the residential class. This included all new construction as well as observed construction without a permit and then adding or subtracting appropriate market & equalized value for the change within the CAMA system. The county reviewed all sales and completed a statistical analysis for the residential class.

## 2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Richardson County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																				
	Assessor and staff																				
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																				
	<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;">01</td> <td>Falls City- County seat and largest community, trade center for county</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Dawson-population of 150 limited services limited retail</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Humboldt-population 877 Retail, HTRS High School. retail</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Stella-population 151, limited retail and services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Salem- population 111, limited services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td> <td>Rulo-population 112, cafe, limited retail and services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">07</td> <td>Verdon-population 170- limited services and retail</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">08</td> <td>Shubert-population 149- limited services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td>rural residential</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Falls City- County seat and largest community, trade center for county	02	Dawson-population of 150 limited services limited retail	03	Humboldt-population 877 Retail, HTRS High School. retail	04	Stella-population 151, limited retail and services	05	Salem- population 111, limited services	06	Rulo-population 112, cafe, limited retail and services	07	Verdon-population 170- limited services and retail	08	Shubert-population 149- limited services	11	rural residential
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																				
01	Falls City- County seat and largest community, trade center for county																				
02	Dawson-population of 150 limited services limited retail																				
03	Humboldt-population 877 Retail, HTRS High School. retail																				
04	Stella-population 151, limited retail and services																				
05	Salem- population 111, limited services																				
06	Rulo-population 112, cafe, limited retail and services																				
07	Verdon-population 170- limited services and retail																				
08	Shubert-population 149- limited services																				
11	rural residential																				
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																				
	Cost Approach and Market Analysis. The county uses the Cost approach and arrives at market value by making adjustments for items of depreciation.																				
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																				
	The County utilizes local market information in developing the depreciation tables.																				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																				
	Yes, They are reviewed during the reappraisal cycle.																				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																				
	The County completes a market analysis on the vacant land sales and uses an allocation procedure on improved sales to verify the results of the vacant land analysis.																				

7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	01	2012	2012	2012
	02	2011	2011	2011
	03	2010	2010	2010
	04	2011	2011	2011
	05	2013	2013	2013
	06	2013	2013	2013
	07	2008	2008	2008
	08	2008	2008	2008
	11	2008	2008	2008

The County feels that each town has its own unique market and each offer distinct amenities that affect the market values of the residential properties. They also have an appraisal cycle set up to review each location. In their analysis a market study is set up to follow these valuation groups.

# **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Richardson County**

---

## **County Overview**

Richardson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Falls City which is located towards the southeast corner of the County. Richardson is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas and to the east by Missouri. Nemaha County is directly north and Pawnee County is to the west. Richardson County has seen a decline of over a thousand people over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat. The 2012 estimated population is 8,290 which reflects a decline of over 13% since 2000. The residential market trend has increased over the two year study period.

## **Description of Analysis**

Residential parcels are valued utilizing 9 valuation groupings that closely follow the assessor locations or towns in the county. One group reflects the rural residential parcels outside of any corporate limits in the county. The largest of all the valuation groups is 01, (Falls City) which represents over 60% of the residential parcels in the County.

The sales file consists of 186 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and demonstrate support for each other with only the mean being above the range by 4 points. In reviewing the statistical report the effect of low dollar sales on the mean is evident. The mean drops into the range when excluding the sales under 15,000. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median.

## **Sales Qualification**

Richardson County has a consistent procedure for sales verification for the residential sales occurring in the County. A department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. Approximately 55% of the improved residential sales were considered arm-length sales as determined by the county. It has been determined that the county utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and utilizes all information available from the sales file and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median, and it has been confirmed that the assessment practices are acceptable. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

## **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Richardson County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the LOV is determined to be 98% of market value for the residential class of property.



## **2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Richardson County**

**New construction** for the commercial class was completed for the *entire* county by reviewing all building permits as well as observed construction without a permit and then adding or subtracting appropriate market & equalized value for the change within the CAMA system.

The county also conducted a sales analysis and verified sales for the class.

## 2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Richardson County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>		
	Assessor staff		
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>		
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	
	01	Falls City-County seat, trade center for county, manufacturing, retail, all services	
	02	Humboldt-retail, most services, high school	
	03	Remainder of the county- comprised of smaller communities without an organized commercial market,	
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>		
	The cost approach is a basis for value with adjustments in depreciation to arrive at market value.		
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>		
	Along with the cost approach the county relies on sales of similar property outside the county. The county then applies multipliers to adjust to the local market of commercial properties.		
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>		
	The County develops depreciation tables based on the local market.		
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>		
	The County develops depreciations tables for each valuation group as they are reviewed and re-appraised.		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>		
	The county uses a sq. ft method derived from vacant lot sales.		
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>
	01	2008	2008
	02	2008	2008
	03	2008	2008
	Groups 01 and 02 comprise the more populated communities in the county, with each reflecting their own unique market. Grouping 03 is a grouping of convenience where the remainder of the county is combined. The market in this group varies substantially with limited sales to array any statistical data that would provide any confidence in any statistical analysis.		

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Richardson County**

---

### **County Overview**

Richardson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Falls City which is located towards the southeast corner of the County. Richardson is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas and to the east by Missouri. Nemaha County is directly north and Pawnee County is to the west. Richardson County has seen a decline of over a thousand people over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat. The 2012 estimated population is 8,290 which indicate a decline of over 13% since 2000. The commercial market has increased over the three year study period.

### **Description of Analysis**

Commercial properties are measured utilizing three valuation groups. Valuation group (01) represents Falls City, with (02) Humboldt, and (03) representing the remainder of the assessor locations in the county. The statistical profile contains 21 qualified sales for the study period with nine of the qualified sales in valuation group (01).

All three measures of central tendency are below the acceptable range. Of the qualitative statistics the COD is within the range with the PRD is well above the range. Nine occupancies are represented in the sales profile with occupancy code 353 (retail store) having the largest representation in the file as compared to the population and it occurs in all three of the valuation groups. Low dollar sales impact the file with 6 of the 21 sales having a sale price under 15,000.

### **Sales Qualification**

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. Measurement was done using all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

### **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

For measurement purposes the commercial sample is unreliable and does not represent the commercial class as a whole or by sub class.

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Richardson County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on the consideration of all available information and assessment practices, the level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value for the commercial class of property.



## **2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Richardson County**

Irrigated, dry, grass, and timber land values increased approximately 15% overall to reflect the current agricultural market. The quality statistics generated from this change are typical for the volatile agricultural land sales market in these economic times. A land use update was also completed for the entire county. Any required changes to soil and class inventories were enacted.

The county completed all pickup, and permit work for the class.

## 2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Richardson County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>				
	Assessor and staff.				
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><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;">50</td> <td>The entire county is considered as one market area.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	50	The entire county is considered as one market area.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>				
50	The entire county is considered as one market area.				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>				
	They review all areas in the county to determine if there is enough information available to determine if there are characteristics that affect the market differently from one location to the next. Typically they will review the sales /assessment ratio on sales in the various townships in the county to see if the market value is different or tends to trend in one direction or the other. During the review the county remains cognizant of the time frame of the sales as well as the impact of different land uses.				
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>				
	The county puts the most weight on the present use of the parcel. The county uses a sales verification system to inquire of any anticipated changes to the parcel, and the motivation of the buyers.				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>				
	No, farm home site 10,000, rural res 10,600				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>				
	A thorough sales verification process is in place. The county sends out questionnaires on the transfers and asks for the motivation of the buyer in purchasing the property.				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>				
	No				
<b>8.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>				
	The county uses WRP sales from within the county to arrive at values for the parcels.				

## Richardson County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Richardson	50	4,560	4,455	3,973	4,055	3,908	3,860	2,765	2,670	3,982
Pawnee	1	3,010	3,780	N/A	3,120	2,706	N/A	2,305	2,255	3,179
Nemaha	8300	5,540	5,130	5,000	4,900	4,800	4,700	4,650	4,600	4,929

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Richardson	50	3,917	3,835	3,528	3,525	3,398	3,320	2,439	2,320	3,386
Pawnee	1	2,510	3,150	2,566	2,600	2,238	2,000	1,920	1,880	2,435
Nemaha	8300	4,487	4,350	3,649	3,060	2,900	2,800	2,700	2,500	3,167

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Richardson	50	1,112	1,262	981	1,192	1,191	1,123	1,063	839	1,045
Pawnee	1	1,726	1,913	1,208	1,658	1,422	1,382	1,508	1,239	1,470
Nemaha	8300	1,101	1,652	1,386	1,585	1,720	1,258	1,210	931	1,218

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

# **2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Richardson County**

---

## **County Overview**

Richardson County is located in the southeast corner of Nebraska. Richardson is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas and to the east by Missouri. Nemaha County is directly north and Pawnee County is to the west. The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years.

Richardson County is predominately dry crop land, (72%) with only one per cent irrigated, with the balance of pasture. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted for accuracy of the market area determination.

## **Description of Analysis**

For 2014 there are 64 agricultural sales in the statistical profile. Two measures of central tendency are in the range with only the mean being above the range. The rapidly increasing market, along with the duration of the study period, contributes to the impact on the quality statistics. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use.

The 80% majority land use statistics demonstrate that the level of value is above the range for Richardson County for dry land and grass. For the dry land this subclass is skewed to a larger number of sales in the first year of the study period. In analyzing the grass it is noted the very limited number of sales available for analysis. In comparing the average LCG values with neighboring counties it is noted that the Richardson values for grass are below both the Pawnee and Nemaha counties averages by LCG while the dry land average is higher. The grass values may be skewed by a higher percentage of timbered grass in Richardson than in Pawnee.

## **Sales Qualification**

A department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. It has been determined that the county utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and utilizes all information available from the sales file and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median, and it has been confirmed that the assessment practices are acceptable. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

## **2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Richardson County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the LOV is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural class of property.



**74 Richardson**

**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 : 186  
 Total Sales Price : 9,715,655  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,721,322  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,544,238  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,265  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 51,313

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 104  
 COD : 21.02  
 PRD : 106.05

COV : 30.21  
 STD : 31.45  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.56  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 245.68  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 45.59

95% Median C.I. : 95.33 to 102.16  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.75 to 101.61  
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.60 to 108.64

Printed:3/20/2014 2:17:43PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qrtrs</b>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	100.16	103.36	102.99	13.89	100.36	83.68	161.12	88.13 to 113.87	44,107	45,427
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	19	102.02	111.52	99.74	26.22	111.81	64.06	233.55	84.19 to 123.25	35,911	35,817
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	25	103.26	102.96	99.89	11.85	103.07	70.79	142.22	94.67 to 105.66	47,641	47,587
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	25	96.24	102.93	104.01	20.00	98.96	68.81	213.10	89.20 to 107.18	48,421	50,365
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	21	100.39	102.78	101.52	17.94	101.24	55.31	151.70	85.67 to 110.00	64,976	65,966
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	22	95.92	103.93	98.36	21.39	105.66	61.91	210.70	84.23 to 109.27	43,669	42,954
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	24	96.54	99.14	94.20	25.40	105.24	45.59	214.91	80.30 to 111.05	60,913	57,382
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	36	95.82	106.34	92.77	25.17	114.63	49.11	245.68	87.98 to 102.42	62,024	57,541
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	83	101.07	104.98	101.73	17.97	103.19	64.06	233.55	95.85 to 104.76	44,595	45,365
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	103	96.88	103.42	96.00	23.03	107.73	45.59	245.68	92.92 to 101.17	58,446	56,106
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	90	100.76	104.72	101.49	18.66	103.18	55.31	233.55	96.24 to 103.83	49,426	50,162
<b>ALL</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>97.81</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>98.18</b>	<b>21.02</b>	<b>106.05</b>	<b>45.59</b>	<b>245.68</b>	<b>95.33 to 102.16</b>	<b>52,265</b>	<b>51,313</b>

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	114	97.63	104.27	99.95	18.42	104.32	55.31	233.55	95.53 to 102.42	56,149	56,122
02	8	84.38	93.44	81.63	23.18	114.47	68.65	151.70	68.65 to 151.70	27,175	22,183
03	37	94.58	101.02	90.10	27.90	112.12	45.59	164.86	84.08 to 119.88	37,419	33,715
04	5	105.66	124.63	94.87	29.17	131.37	81.30	213.10	N/A	38,200	36,239
05	1	106.92	106.92	106.92	00.00	100.00	106.92	106.92	N/A	9,000	9,623
06	2	172.06	172.06	131.15	42.79	131.19	98.43	245.68	N/A	22,500	29,509
07	1	68.81	68.81	68.81	00.00	100.00	68.81	68.81	N/A	83,000	57,109
08	4	100.03	99.75	100.93	02.61	98.83	96.24	102.71	N/A	22,500	22,709
11	14	95.41	103.70	101.78	18.77	101.89	78.90	148.85	84.94 to 132.29	92,893	94,547
<b>ALL</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>97.81</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>98.18</b>	<b>21.02</b>	<b>106.05</b>	<b>45.59</b>	<b>245.68</b>	<b>95.33 to 102.16</b>	<b>52,265</b>	<b>51,313</b>

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	181	97.21	103.65	97.91	21.07	105.86	45.59	245.68	94.76 to 102.02	52,991	51,882
06											
07	5	108.04	120.90	118.16	15.86	102.32	98.43	148.85	N/A	26,000	30,721
<b>ALL</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>97.81</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>98.18</b>	<b>21.02</b>	<b>106.05</b>	<b>45.59</b>	<b>245.68</b>	<b>95.33 to 102.16</b>	<b>52,265</b>	<b>51,313</b>

**74 Richardson  
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 : 186  
 Total Sales Price : 9,715,655  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,721,322  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,544,238  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,265  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 51,313

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 104  
 COD : 21.02  
 PRD : 106.05

COV : 30.21  
 STD : 31.45  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.56  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 245.68  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 45.59

95% Median C.I. : 95.33 to 102.16  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.75 to 101.61  
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.60 to 108.64

Printed:3/20/2014 2:17:43PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	2	181.20	181.20	181.20	16.28	100.00	151.70	210.70	N/A	4,000	7,248	
Less Than 15,000	37	107.18	124.34	119.47	32.96	104.08	55.50	245.68	96.62 to 131.89	9,091	10,861	
Less Than 30,000	73	105.66	116.76	112.67	28.01	103.63	55.31	245.68	96.88 to 117.55	14,976	16,873	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	184	97.63	103.28	98.11	20.35	105.27	45.59	245.68	94.93 to 102.02	52,790	51,792	
Greater Than 14,999	149	96.88	99.09	97.42	16.74	101.71	45.59	214.91	94.21 to 100.36	62,986	61,358	
Greater Than 29,999	113	95.53	95.95	96.34	14.54	99.60	45.59	148.03	90.83 to 99.02	76,355	73,562	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	181.20	181.20	181.20	16.28	100.00	151.70	210.70	N/A	4,000	7,248	
5,000 TO 14,999	35	106.94	121.09	117.97	30.96	102.64	55.50	245.68	96.24 to 123.25	9,381	11,067	
15,000 TO 29,999	36	101.12	108.97	109.65	22.84	99.38	55.31	214.91	92.76 to 117.55	21,025	23,053	
30,000 TO 59,999	51	94.56	95.10	93.75	18.06	101.44	45.59	148.03	89.20 to 102.42	43,406	40,695	
60,000 TO 99,999	35	96.91	95.12	94.96	10.20	100.17	67.84	120.02	90.74 to 101.07	73,940	70,215	
100,000 TO 149,999	17	99.08	99.30	100.02	12.95	99.28	77.86	139.70	84.23 to 106.66	126,118	126,140	
150,000 TO 249,999	9	94.21	97.62	97.39	13.87	100.24	73.27	147.33	78.90 to 105.97	156,944	152,851	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	96.10	96.10	96.10	00.00	100.00	96.10	96.10	N/A	270,000	259,479	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	186	97.81	104.12	98.18	21.02	106.05	45.59	245.68	95.33 to 102.16	52,265	51,313	

**74 Richardson**

**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 : 21  
 Total Sales Price : 2,905,868  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,905,868  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,023,241  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 138,375  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 96,345

MEDIAN : 85  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 87  
 COD : 17.01  
 PRD : 125.45

COV : 21.59  
 STD : 18.86  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.45  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.54  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.14

95% Median C.I. : 72.40 to 96.26  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.48 to 78.78  
 95% Mean C.I. : 78.76 to 95.94

Printed:3/20/2014 2:17:44PM

**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	3	98.06	95.81	97.33	03.61	98.44	89.37	100.00	N/A	10,056	9,788
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	82.08	82.08	88.75	11.95	92.48	72.27	91.89	N/A	9,375	8,321
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	96.26	107.05	108.81	13.92	98.38	92.34	132.54	N/A	25,900	28,181
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	71.05	71.05	64.95	09.01	109.39	64.65	77.45	N/A	1,182,500	768,056
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	74.93	83.90	82.53	19.93	101.66	65.99	110.78	N/A	39,333	32,460
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	84.56	84.56	84.56	00.00	100.00	84.56	84.56	N/A	46,750	39,533
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	96.02	96.02	96.02	00.00	100.00	96.02	96.02	N/A	25,000	24,005
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	1	72.40	72.40	72.40	00.00	100.00	72.40	72.40	N/A	7,000	5,068
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	4	78.32	73.93	71.84	13.70	102.91	54.14	84.95	N/A	36,250	26,041
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	119.22	119.22	119.22	00.00	100.00	119.22	119.22	N/A	72,500	86,432
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	10	92.12	91.48	66.89	13.42	136.76	64.65	132.54	72.27 to 100.00	249,162	166,666
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	5	84.56	86.46	84.81	15.59	101.95	65.99	110.78	N/A	37,950	32,184
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	6	78.38	81.22	87.15	19.07	93.20	54.14	119.22	54.14 to 119.22	37,417	32,610
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	84.67	87.91	67.25	19.90	130.72	64.65	132.54	65.99 to 110.78	257,945	173,468
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	3	84.56	84.33	87.12	09.31	96.80	72.40	96.02	N/A	26,250	22,869
<u>ALL</u>	21	84.95	87.35	69.63	17.01	125.45	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 96.26	138,375	96,345

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	92.34	91.67	68.06	22.19	134.69	54.14	132.54	64.65 to 119.22	287,967	195,982
02	5	91.89	87.21	85.04	09.67	102.55	72.40	98.06	N/A	21,850	18,582
03	7	84.36	81.91	81.25	08.48	100.81	72.27	100.00	72.27 to 100.00	29,274	23,785
<u>ALL</u>	21	84.95	87.35	69.63	17.01	125.45	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 96.26	138,375	96,345

**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	21	84.95	87.35	69.63	17.01	125.45	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 96.26	138,375	96,345
04											
<u>ALL</u>	21	84.95	87.35	69.63	17.01	125.45	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 96.26	138,375	96,345

**74 Richardson  
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 : 21  
 Total Sales Price : 2,905,868  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,905,868  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,023,241  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 138,375  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 96,345

MEDIAN : 85  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 87  
 COD : 17.01  
 PRD : 125.45

COV : 21.59  
 STD : 18.86  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.45  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.54  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.14

95% Median C.I. : 72.40 to 96.26  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.48 to 78.78  
 95% Mean C.I. : 78.76 to 95.94

Printed:3/20/2014 2:17:44PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											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	4	80.82	83.48	82.24	13.87	101.51	72.27	100.00	N/A	2,792	2,296	
Less Than 15,000	6	80.89	83.76	83.14	14.16	100.75	72.27	100.00	72.27 to 100.00	4,111	3,418	
Less Than 30,000	11	89.37	85.35	86.98	11.69	98.13	65.99	100.00	72.27 to 98.06	12,311	10,708	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	17	84.95	88.27	69.58	17.90	126.86	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 98.06	170,276	118,474	
Greater Than 14,999	15	84.95	88.79	69.51	18.42	127.74	54.14	132.54	74.93 to 98.06	192,080	133,515	
Greater Than 29,999	10	84.76	89.56	68.78	21.72	130.21	54.14	132.54	64.65 to 119.22	277,045	190,545	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	4	80.82	83.48	82.24	13.87	101.51	72.27	100.00	N/A	2,792	2,296	
5,000 TO 14,999	2	84.33	84.33	83.89	14.15	100.52	72.40	96.26	N/A	6,750	5,663	
15,000 TO 29,999	5	91.89	87.26	87.84	09.52	99.34	65.99	98.06	N/A	22,150	19,456	
30,000 TO 59,999	6	88.65	97.10	93.12	16.67	104.27	77.45	132.54	77.45 to 132.54	43,325	40,345	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	74.93	82.76	84.72	28.95	97.69	54.14	119.22	N/A	66,833	56,622	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	1	64.65	64.65	64.65	00.00	100.00	64.65	64.65	N/A	2,310,000	1,493,514	
<u>ALL</u>	21	84.95	87.35	69.63	17.01	125.45	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 96.26	138,375	96,345	

<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	65.99	65.99	65.99	00.00	100.00	65.99	65.99	N/A	20,000	13,198	
313	1	64.65	64.65	64.65	00.00	100.00	64.65	64.65	N/A	2,310,000	1,493,514	
325	1	84.56	84.56	84.56	00.00	100.00	84.56	84.56	N/A	46,750	39,533	
341	1	119.22	119.22	119.22	00.00	100.00	119.22	119.22	N/A	72,500	86,432	
344	2	105.00	105.00	97.39	26.24	107.81	77.45	132.54	N/A	43,100	41,976	
350	3	84.95	85.38	80.32	08.37	106.30	74.93	96.26	N/A	43,833	35,209	
353	8	90.86	88.18	95.81	12.77	92.04	72.27	110.78	72.27 to 110.78	14,146	13,553	
430	1	84.36	84.36	84.36	00.00	100.00	84.36	84.36	N/A	25,000	21,089	
470	1	91.89	91.89	91.89	00.00	100.00	91.89	91.89	N/A	15,750	14,473	
528	2	76.10	76.10	67.06	28.86	113.48	54.14	98.06	N/A	42,500	28,500	
<u>ALL</u>	21	84.95	87.35	69.63	17.01	125.45	54.14	132.54	72.40 to 96.26	138,375	96,345	

**74 Richardson**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**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 : 64  
Total Sales Price : 30,171,133  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,677,800  
Total Assessed Value : 22,063,562  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 479,341  
Avg. Assessed Value : 344,743

MEDIAN : 72  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 76  
COD : 27.13  
PRD : 105.49

COV : 33.53  
STD : 25.44  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.58  
MAX Sales Ratio : 155.53  
MIN Sales Ratio : 35.54

95% Median C.I. : 63.34 to 77.25  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.87 to 76.97  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.64 to 82.10

Printed:3/20/2014 2:17:45PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	91.01	96.38	89.60	19.83	107.57	60.88	155.53	63.34 to 122.55	334,193	299,446
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	76.37	81.45	73.57	21.24	110.71	42.69	122.26	68.47 to 115.08	757,700	557,408
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	74.06	74.06	100.30	43.63	73.84	41.75	106.36	N/A	469,000	470,403
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	75.74	75.74	75.74	00.00	100.00	75.74	75.74	N/A	732,000	554,400
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	70.33	71.62	70.20	13.88	102.02	56.65	96.92	N/A	810,900	569,220
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	77.32	79.27	73.85	23.87	107.34	48.49	113.19	48.49 to 113.19	302,500	223,404
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	6	61.06	63.62	63.50	13.23	100.19	52.01	82.19	52.01 to 82.19	230,333	146,254
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	66.24	61.32	66.04	22.48	92.85	35.54	77.25	N/A	698,988	461,611
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	11	58.25	63.39	59.18	25.00	107.11	38.58	129.69	40.77 to 75.03	541,618	320,544
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	115.27	115.27	115.27	00.00	100.00	115.27	115.27	N/A	105,120	121,167
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	7	72.95	71.99	72.47	29.21	99.34	44.59	109.98	44.59 to 109.98	289,043	209,466
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	61.76	61.76	61.76	00.00	100.00	61.76	61.76	N/A	378,709	233,879
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	23	84.99	87.70	80.60	23.39	108.81	41.75	155.53	74.34 to 95.96	528,931	426,338
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	21	70.13	69.56	68.78	20.09	101.13	35.54	113.19	57.11 to 77.25	478,450	329,071
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	20	62.68	68.91	63.17	30.11	109.09	38.58	129.69	50.73 to 74.78	423,246	267,364
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	17	74.34	77.35	74.60	21.58	103.69	41.75	122.26	62.85 to 96.92	737,870	550,469
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	27	62.79	66.66	63.51	24.27	104.96	35.54	129.69	55.28 to 75.16	442,620	281,125
<u>ALL</u>	64	72.16	75.87	71.92	27.13	105.49	35.54	155.53	63.34 to 77.25	479,341	344,743

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
50	64	72.16	75.87	71.92	27.13	105.49	35.54	155.53	63.34 to 77.25	479,341	344,743
<u>ALL</u>	64	72.16	75.87	71.92	27.13	105.49	35.54	155.53	63.34 to 77.25	479,341	344,743

<b>95%MLU By Market Area</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Dry</u>											
County	4	65.63	68.12	69.32	18.07	98.27	49.72	91.48	N/A	538,676	373,418
50	4	65.63	68.12	69.32	18.07	98.27	49.72	91.48	N/A	538,676	373,418
<u>Grass</u>											
County	2	64.27	64.27	73.75	21.07	87.15	50.73	77.80	N/A	267,500	197,290
50	2	64.27	64.27	73.75	21.07	87.15	50.73	77.80	N/A	267,500	197,290
<u>ALL</u>	64	72.16	75.87	71.92	27.13	105.49	35.54	155.53	63.34 to 77.25	479,341	344,743

**74 Richardson**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**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 : 64  
 Total Sales Price : 30,171,133  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,677,800  
 Total Assessed Value : 22,063,562  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 479,341  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 344,743

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 72  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 27.13  
 PRD : 105.49

COV : 33.53  
 STD : 25.44  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.58  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 155.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.54

95% Median C.I. : 63.34 to 77.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.87 to 76.97  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.64 to 82.10

Printed:3/20/2014 2:17:45PM

**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
<u>    Dry    </u>											
County	32	76.06	79.65	72.49	26.78	109.88	38.58	155.53	62.79 to 88.12	541,314	392,404
50	32	76.06	79.65	72.49	26.78	109.88	38.58	155.53	62.79 to 88.12	541,314	392,404
<u>    Grass    </u>											
County	4	76.29	70.96	75.80	10.76	93.61	50.73	80.53	N/A	218,750	165,804
50	4	76.29	70.96	75.80	10.76	93.61	50.73	80.53	N/A	218,750	165,804
<u>    ALL    </u>	64	72.16	75.87	71.92	27.13	105.49	35.54	155.53	63.34 to 77.25	479,341	344,743



**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

**Records : 8,978**

**Value : 1,165,345,854**

**Growth 4,263,869**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	757	2,700,297	12	513,197	24	232,912	793	3,446,406	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	3,021	8,459,206	72	1,534,251	345	7,220,028	3,438	17,213,485	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	3,048	122,113,020	72	5,460,356	355	28,626,049	3,475	156,199,425	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,805	133,272,523	84	7,507,804	379	36,078,989	4,268	176,859,316	1,867,334
<b>% of Res Total</b>	89.15	75.36	1.97	4.25	8.88	20.40	47.54	15.18	43.79
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	127	1,016,291	23	673,351	10	125,740	160	1,815,382	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	394	3,210,515	23	791,491	20	345,754	437	4,347,760	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	407	18,794,655	24	1,766,475	24	1,486,000	455	22,047,130	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	534	23,021,461	47	3,231,317	34	1,957,494	615	28,210,272	388,840
<b>% of Com Total</b>	86.83	81.61	7.64	11.45	5.53	6.94	6.85	2.42	9.12
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	1	30,400	9	1,115,000	0	0	10	1,145,400	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	3	102,715	6	655,100	0	0	9	757,815	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	4	1,213,022	6	2,834,106	0	0	10	4,047,128	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	5	1,346,137	15	4,604,206	0	0	20	5,950,343	49,780
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	25.00	22.62	75.00	77.38	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.51	1.17
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	4	71,327	13	300,733	17	372,060	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	12	588,665	12	588,665	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	14	1,005,847	14	1,005,847	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	4	71,327	27	1,895,245	31	1,966,572	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	12.90	3.63	87.10	96.37	0.35	0.17	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,805	133,272,523	88	7,579,131	406	37,974,234	4,299	178,825,888	1,867,334
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	88.51	74.53	2.05	4.24	9.44	21.24	47.88	15.35	43.79
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	539	24,367,598	62	7,835,523	34	1,957,494	635	34,160,615	438,620
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	84.88	71.33	9.76	22.94	5.35	5.73	7.07	2.93	10.29
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	4,344	157,640,121	150	15,414,654	440	39,931,728	4,934	212,986,503	2,305,954
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	88.04	74.01	3.04	7.24	8.92	18.75	54.96	18.28	54.08

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	6	189,957	1,114,976	3	403,721	16,096,279
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	9	593,678	17,211,255
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				9	593,678	17,211,255

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	41	5,869,360	41	5,869,360	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	5	0	87	4,320,350	92	4,320,350	0
25. Total	0	0	5	0	128	10,189,710	133	10,189,710	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	377	74	317	768

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	12,900	333	51,273,360	2,366	507,160,502	2,700	558,446,762
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	135	31,014,223	1,061	313,207,251	1,196	344,221,474
29. Ag Improvements	1	1,025	135	4,085,728	1,075	35,414,652	1,211	39,501,405
30. Ag Total							3,911	942,169,641

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	1.95	19,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	64	64.96	651,860	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	69	62.96	2,644,279	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	4.30	12,900	16	25.53	62,390	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	108	247.78	785,669	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	1,025	128	0.00	1,441,449	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	442.89	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	16	16.84	149,965	18	18.79	169,465	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	615	629.41	6,247,596	679	694.37	6,899,456	
33. HomeSite Improvements	617	576.40	19,689,568	686	639.36	22,333,847	1,957,915
34. HomeSite Total				<b>704</b>	<b>713.16</b>	<b>29,402,768</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	133	2,151.14	1,554,853	150	2,180.97	1,630,143	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	908	1,937.81	5,710,416	1,016	2,185.59	6,496,085	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,011	0.00	15,725,084	1,140	0.00	17,167,558	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,290</b>	<b>4,366.56</b>	<b>25,293,786</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,094.76	0	0	5,537.65	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.01	0	0	0.01	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,994</b>	<b>10,617.38</b>	<b>54,696,554</b>	<b>1,957,915</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	14	691.48	278,337	14	691.48	278,337

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	31.99	49.09%	122,681	52.28%	3,834.98
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	23.09	35.44%	78,506	33.46%	3,400.00
59. 3D	10.08	15.47%	33,466	14.26%	3,320.04
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	65.16	100.00%	234,653	100.00%	3,601.18
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	7.70	74.40%	9,860	74.70%	1,280.52
68. 3G	2.65	25.60%	3,339	25.30%	1,260.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	10.35	100.00%	13,199	100.00%	1,275.27
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	65.16	83.29%	234,653	94.57%	3,601.18
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	10.35	13.23%	13,199	5.32%	1,275.27
72. Waste	2.72	3.48%	272	0.11%	100.00
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	78.23	100.00%	248,124	100.00%	3,171.72

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 50

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	532.07	11.76%	2,426,240	13.47%	4,560.00
46. 1A	483.98	10.70%	2,156,130	11.97%	4,455.00
47. 2A1	658.06	14.55%	2,614,605	14.51%	3,973.20
48. 2A	781.71	17.28%	3,169,836	17.60%	4,055.00
49. 3A1	1,591.50	35.18%	6,219,107	34.52%	3,907.70
50. 3A	102.76	2.27%	396,655	2.20%	3,860.01
51. 4A1	353.28	7.81%	976,819	5.42%	2,765.00
52. 4A	20.54	0.45%	54,841	0.30%	2,669.96
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>4,523.90</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>18,014,233</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,982.01</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	18,370.00	7.91%	71,951,084	9.15%	3,916.77
55. 1D	36,506.18	15.73%	140,001,346	17.81%	3,835.00
56. 2D1	16,228.41	6.99%	57,258,801	7.29%	3,528.31
57. 2D	15,010.29	6.47%	52,906,202	6.73%	3,524.66
58. 3D1	69,515.25	29.95%	236,233,978	30.06%	3,398.30
59. 3D	47,126.01	20.30%	156,458,369	19.91%	3,320.00
60. 4D1	25,322.00	10.91%	61,755,549	7.86%	2,438.81
61. 4D	4,047.03	1.74%	9,389,100	1.19%	2,320.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>232,125.17</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>785,954,429</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,385.91</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	5,627.07	7.14%	6,255,019	7.60%	1,111.59
64. 1G	6,729.78	8.54%	8,490,737	10.31%	1,261.67
65. 2G1	3,302.88	4.19%	3,239,361	3.93%	980.77
66. 2G	3,094.48	3.93%	3,687,919	4.48%	1,191.77
67. 3G1	16,515.45	20.95%	19,675,135	23.89%	1,191.32
68. 3G	5,787.99	7.34%	6,501,598	7.90%	1,123.29
69. 4G1	12,516.84	15.88%	13,301,902	16.15%	1,062.72
70. 4G	25,243.00	32.03%	21,188,309	25.73%	839.37
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>78,817.49</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>82,339,980</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,044.69</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>4,523.90</b>	<b>1.39%</b>	<b>18,014,233</b>	<b>2.03%</b>	<b>3,982.01</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>232,125.17</b>	<b>71.53%</b>	<b>785,954,429</b>	<b>88.59%</b>	<b>3,385.91</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>78,817.49</b>	<b>24.29%</b>	<b>82,339,980</b>	<b>9.28%</b>	<b>1,044.69</b>
72. Waste	8,011.78	2.47%	800,603	0.09%	99.93
73. Other	1,058.18	0.33%	115,718	0.01%	109.36
74. Exempt	2,782.79	0.86%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>324,536.52</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>887,224,963</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,733.82</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	272.96	1,125,470	4,250.94	16,888,763	4,523.90	18,014,233
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	21,088.41	71,676,573	211,101.92	714,512,509	232,190.33	786,189,082
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	7,298.48	7,892,145	71,529.36	74,461,034	78,827.84	82,353,179
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	640.56	64,056	7,373.94	736,819	8,014.50	800,875
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	99.20	9,920	958.98	105,798	1,058.18	115,718
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	27.96	0	2,754.83	0	2,782.79	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29,399.61</b>	<b>80,768,164</b>	<b>295,215.14</b>	<b>806,704,923</b>	<b>324,614.75</b>	<b>887,473,087</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	4,523.90	1.39%	18,014,233	2.03%	3,982.01
<b>Dry Land</b>	232,190.33	71.53%	786,189,082	88.59%	3,385.97
<b>Grass</b>	78,827.84	24.28%	82,353,179	9.28%	1,044.72
<b>Waste</b>	8,014.50	2.47%	800,875	0.09%	99.93
<b>Other</b>	1,058.18	0.33%	115,718	0.01%	109.36
<b>Exempt</b>	2,782.79	0.86%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>324,614.75</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>887,473,087</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,733.93</b>

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

74 Richardson

	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	165,377,131	176,859,316	11,482,185	6.94%	1,867,334	5.81%
02. Recreational	913,414	1,966,572	1,053,158	115.30%	0	115.30%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	30,852,441	29,402,768	-1,449,673	-4.70%	1,957,915	-11.04%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>197,142,986</b>	<b>208,228,656</b>	<b>11,085,670</b>	<b>5.62%</b>	<b>3,825,249</b>	<b>3.68%</b>
05. Commercial	27,457,221	28,210,272	753,051	2.74%	388,840	1.33%
06. Industrial	4,889,442	5,950,343	1,060,901	21.70%	49,780	20.68%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	22,885,660	25,293,786	2,408,126	10.52%	0	10.52%
08. Minerals	8,717,560	10,189,710	1,472,150	16.89	0	16.89
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>63,949,883</b>	<b>69,644,111</b>	<b>5,694,228</b>	<b>8.90%</b>	<b>438,620</b>	<b>8.22%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>261,092,869</b>	<b>277,872,767</b>	<b>16,779,898</b>	<b>6.43%</b>	<b>4,263,869</b>	<b>4.79%</b>
11. Irrigated	11,694,843	18,014,233	6,319,390	54.04%		
12. Dryland	657,442,042	786,189,082	128,747,040	19.58%		
13. Grassland	69,034,738	82,353,179	13,318,441	19.29%		
14. Wasteland	1,283,555	800,875	-482,680	-37.60%		
15. Other Agland	-3,690,282	115,718	3,806,000			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>735,764,896</b>	<b>887,473,087</b>	<b>151,708,191</b>	<b>20.62%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>996,857,765</b>	<b>1,165,345,854</b>	<b>168,488,089</b>	<b>16.90%</b>	<b>4,263,869</b>	<b>16.47%</b>

Office of Richardson County Assessor  
Pamela G. Vice  
1700 Stone St.  
Falls City, NE 68355  
Phone (402) 245-4012  
Fax (402) 245-4899  
[richcoassessor@sentco.net](mailto:richcoassessor@sentco.net)

## ***2014 Three Year Plan of Assessment***

### **2014**

- Reappraise residential properties in villages of Salem, Rulo, Preston, & Barada - totaling approximately 546 properties
- Complete an agricultural land use update and market study using GIS data and physical inspections
- Start reappraisal of rural (4000 class) & rural-res class (4500) in Barada, Ohio, Arago, Salem, Falls City, Jefferson, & Rulo townships – totaling approximately 864 properties. NOTE: This will be done as time allows
- Review all classes for level of assessment
- Do all-county new construction (pickup work) valuation
- Do sales review – all classes

### **2015**

- Reappraise residential properties in villages of Humboldt & Verdon - totaling approximately 661 properties
- Finish reappraisal of rural (4000 class) & rural-res class (4500) in Barada, Ohio, Arago, Salem, Falls City, Jefferson, & Rulo townships – totaling approximately 864 properties.
- Start reappraisal of rural (4000 class) & rural-res class (4500) in Franklin, Porter, East & West Muddy, Humboldt, Grant, Liberty, Speiser, and Nemaha townships – totaling approximately 824 properties. NOTE: This will be done as time allows
- Review all classes for level of assessment
- Do all-county new construction (pickup work) valuation
- Do sales review – all classes

## 2016

- Finish (if necessary) reappraisal of rural (4000 class) & rural-res class (4500) in Franklin, Porter, East & West Muddy, Humboldt, Grant, Liberty, Speiser, and Nemaha townships – totaling approximately 824 properties.
- Start reappraisal of all-county commercial and industrial properties
- Review all classes for level of assessment
- Do all-county new construction (pickup work) valuation
- Do sales review – all classes

Respectfully submitted,

---

**Pamela G. Vice**

**Richardson County Assessor**

---

**Date**

## 2014 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	200,000
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	197,081
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	59,000      43,000 of this is the salary for one full time employee and 16,000 is for the Pritchard & Abbott for mineral appraisal.
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	0
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	29,094
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	Funded out of County General
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	0

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes, <a href="http://www.richardson.assessor.gisworkshop.com/">http://www.richardson.assessor.gisworkshop.com/</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Falls City, and Humboldt
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	Unsure of date,

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Prichard & Abbott- mineral interests
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	ASI for Terra Scan

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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



# 2014 Certification for Richardson 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 Richardson County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



