

Table of Contents

2015 Commission Summary

2015 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

2015 Commission Summary for Burt County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	172	Median	97.62
Total Sales Price	\$14,268,003	Mean	102.04
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$14,268,003	Wgt. Mean	93.35
Total Assessed Value	\$13,319,300	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$61,482
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$82,954	Avg. Assessed Value	\$77,438

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.99 to 99.17
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.59 to 96.11
95% Mean C.I	97.59 to 106.49
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	10.93
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.49
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.92

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	135	98	98.36
2013	157	98	98.28
2012	145	97	96.94
2011	159	96	96

2015 Commission Summary for Burt County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	23	Median	94.71
Total Sales Price	\$1,674,500	Mean	91.89
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,554,500	Wgt. Mean	89.26
Total Assessed Value	\$1,387,555	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$122,881
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$67,587	Avg. Assessed Value	\$60,328

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.16 to 99.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	82.42 to 96.10
95% Mean C.I	81.58 to 102.20
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.06
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.24
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.57

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	19	100	95.87
2013	20		99.53
2012	27		99.61
2011	39	97	97

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Burt 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	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
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, 2015.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Burt County

Annually, the county conducts a review and market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick up) is completed in a timely fashion. Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process.

Arizona and Oakland Townships plus part of the village of Decatur were inspected as part of the 6 year cycle. Many flooded cabins and homes were revisited to check on completion of repairs that are continuing in the aftermath of the flood of 2011. This process has become more long term than ever anticipated as some repairs are still being completed. Each year, the amount of progress has to be determined. We are having doubts that some repairs will ever be completed.

During the inspection process, the records were reviewed for listing accuracy, property characteristics, and to note the current condition of all improvements. Listers are going on-site for a close up examination of the improvements, photos, and if necessary a measurement of the improvements. Every effort is made to conduct interior inspections of the residences. When property owners are not home, the listers leave questionnaires and make return trips to contact them. If possible, phone appointments are arranged following the return of the questionnaires.

The county completed all pick up and permit work for the residential class,

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Burt County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:														
	Assessor and 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>Tekamah- County seat, full retail, grade school and high school (includes Herman)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Oakland- full retail, grade school and high school (includes Craig)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Lyons- retail, restaurants, grocery, high School (includes Decatur)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Decatur- retail, restaurants, grocery (no school - joined Lyons)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td>Craig- limited retail, bar, no grocery, no school (with Oakland)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> <td>Rural</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Tekamah- County seat, full retail, grade school and high school (includes Herman)	5	Oakland- full retail, grade school and high school (includes Craig)	10	Lyons- retail, restaurants, grocery, high School (includes Decatur)	15	Decatur- retail, restaurants, grocery (no school - joined Lyons)	20	Craig- limited retail, bar, no grocery, no school (with Oakland)	25	Rural
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>														
1	Tekamah- County seat, full retail, grade school and high school (includes Herman)														
5	Oakland- full retail, grade school and high school (includes Craig)														
10	Lyons- retail, restaurants, grocery, high School (includes Decatur)														
15	Decatur- retail, restaurants, grocery (no school - joined Lyons)														
20	Craig- limited retail, bar, no grocery, no school (with Oakland)														
25	Rural														
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.														
	Cost approach and sales study to determine market and depreciation analysis.														
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?														
	Costing tables, multipliers, etc. are from the vendor but depreciation is based on local market information and applied as an economic adjustment.														
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?														
	Yes, they have different economic depreciations.														
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?														
	Sales study from the market with adjustments for accessibility, etc.														
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?														
	N/A														

8.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2011	2003	2011	2010
	5	2011	2003	2011	2011
	10	2009	2003	2009	2009
	15	2013	2003	2013	2013
	20	2012	2003	2012	2012
	25	2009	2003	2009	

The valuation groupings reflect the appraisal cycle of the county as much as unique markets. The county reviews these in separate cycles and applies depreciation based on the local market. The rural residential is an ongoing review by townships. Riverside and Oakland townships were completed in 2014.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Burt County

County Overview

Burt County is located in northeast Nebraska. The Missouri river is the eastern border of the County with the State of Iowa to the east. The County is bordered to the south by Washington County with Cuming to the west and Thurston to the north a small portion of Dodge County is adjacent to the southwest. Tekamah is the county seat and is the largest community in the County. Both U.S. Highways 75 and 77 traverse the county from south to north and there is a bridge crossing the Missouri river at Decatur. The estimated 2012 population for the County is 6,659 with 1,681 estimated to reside in Tekamah. The county has seen a slight decline in population with a relatively flat residential market over the current study period.

Description of Analysis

Residential parcels are valued utilizing six valuation groupings which mirror the assessor locations in the county. Valuation Group 25 consists of the residential parcels outside of any corporate limits.

The sales file consists of 172 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 two points.

Sales Qualification

Burt 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. 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.

Level of Value

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

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Burt County

The County completed a review of the commercial properties in Tekamah for 2014. The county updated all commercial property record cards with new photographs being taken of every commercial parcel in the county and conducted physical inspections for all the properties. The county has continued on with the review cycle by reviewing the commercial properties in Lyons and Decatur Villages for 2015. All record cards have been updated and new photographs taken as the physical inspections were completed in the two small villages. The county continually reviews and verifies sales for the commercial class. The county has converted over to a new CAMA system and has been working through the conversion. The County also completed the pickup and permit work for the commercial class of property.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Burt County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:														
	Assessor, Staff, and Jeff Quist														
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in 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>Tekamah-115 improved parcels. County seat and the commercial hub of Burt County.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Oakland-95 improved commercial parcels. Main street business active.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Lyons-71 commercial improved parcels. Main street business is declining, several vacant storefronts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Decatur-32 improved commercial parcels. Active commercial</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td>Craig-17 improved commercial parcels.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> <td>Rural-37 improved commercial parcels.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Tekamah-115 improved parcels. County seat and the commercial hub of Burt County.	5	Oakland-95 improved commercial parcels. Main street business active.	10	Lyons-71 commercial improved parcels. Main street business is declining, several vacant storefronts.	15	Decatur-32 improved commercial parcels. Active commercial	20	Craig-17 improved commercial parcels.	25	Rural-37 improved commercial parcels.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>														
1	Tekamah-115 improved parcels. County seat and the commercial hub of Burt County.														
5	Oakland-95 improved commercial parcels. Main street business active.														
10	Lyons-71 commercial improved parcels. Main street business is declining, several vacant storefronts.														
15	Decatur-32 improved commercial parcels. Active commercial														
20	Craig-17 improved commercial parcels.														
25	Rural-37 improved commercial parcels.														
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.														
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate value in the commercial class, however, income information and comparable sales are considered when available.														
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.														
	The County relies on sales of similar property across the state and then adjust those to the local market. The County will search the state sales file and rely on their contract appraiser to make any necessary adjustments.														
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?														
	Costing tables, multipliers, etc. are from vendor. The depreciation based on our own local market information (economic)														
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?														
	Yes, several have different economic depreciations.														
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.														
	Sales study of the market														

7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2014	2012	2012	2013
	5	2014	2009	2009	2009
	10	2014	2009	2009	2009
	15	2014	2009	2009	2009
	20	2014	2009	2009	2009
	25	2014	2009	2009	2009

The valuation groups are based on current assessor locations in the county. Each town has its own unique economic depreciation that is based on reviewing th sales and the knowledge we have about that town. Tekamah and Oakland are fairly similar but Tekamah has lost more businessess because it is so easy for people to travel t o Blair, Fremont, or Omaha. Decatur seems to benefit from travel across the bridge to Iowa.

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Burt County

County Overview

Burt County is located in northeast Nebraska. The Missouri river is the eastern border of the County with the State of Iowa to the east. The County is bordered to the south by Washington County with Cuming to the west and Thurston to the north a small portion of Dodge County is adjacent to the southwest. Tekamah is the county seat and is the largest community in the County. Both U.S. Highways 75 and 77 traverse the county from south to north and there is a bridge crossing the Missouri river at Decatur. The estimated 2012 population for the County is 6,659 with 1,681 estimated to reside in Tekamah. The county has seen a slight decline in population with an erratic commercial market over the current study period.

Description of Analysis

The statistical profile for the commercial class of property consists of 23 qualified sales. The calculated median for the sample is 95%. Of the measures of central tendency only the median and mean are in the statutory range with the weighted mean falling slightly below the range. The 23 sales are also not representative of the improved parcel breakdown of the valuation groups. The qualitative measures are within the acceptable range. While the calculated median is within the statutory range it will not be relied on in the determination of a level of value.

Sales Qualification

The Department completed a sales verification review for all counties. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. Measurement was done utilizing 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 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 subclass.

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.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Burt County

Annually, the county conducts a review and market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural sales. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land. Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick up) is completed in a timely fashion. Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection. The county has conducted an extensive review of the rural properties of the county over the last few years.

The county reviewed Arizona, Decatur, Riverside and Quinnebaugh Townships, so their flood damages can be updated, along with the regular review of all other properties. A letter was sent to all properties that had adjusted values as a result of the flood damage. All owners or tenants have brought in current FSA information and spoke with someone in the office as to the current state of the farm land. Oakland Township was also reviewed thoroughly for 2015. During the inspection process, the records are reviewed for listing accuracy, property characteristics, and to note the current condition of all improvements. Listers are going on-site for a close up examination of the improvements, photos, and if necessary a measurement of the improvements. Every effort is made to conduct interior inspections of the residences.

The county closely monitored agricultural sales throughout 2014 to determine if the strong upward trend of the past 2-3 years would continue. The market has continued to be strong and the land values have seen more increase. The county will be looking at adjustments to the LCG sub-strata as indicated by the market analysis.

The County also completed all pick up work for the agricultural class.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Burt County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:									
	Assessor and 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;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Mainly flat river bottom land (North and Eastern GEO codes)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>More hills and valleys (South and Western GEO codes)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	1	Mainly flat river bottom land (North and Eastern GEO codes)	2014	2	More hills and valleys (South and Western GEO codes)	2014
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>								
1	Mainly flat river bottom land (North and Eastern GEO codes)	2014								
2	More hills and valleys (South and Western GEO codes)	2014								
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.									
	Market areas are determined through market analysis and are delineated by both topography and market activity. Boundaries currently follow township lines.									
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.									
	Parcels less than 20 acres are checked for current use. It is classified accordingly. Some parcels are mixed use with several acres of residential and additional acres being farmed or grazed. Currently do not have a recreational class.									
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?									
	Yes.									
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.									
	We originally checked with Cuming County's sales on Wetland Reserve to have a starting value. Since that time, we have moved them to 100% of market after the Tax Equalization and Review Commission made their ruling. We currently track the sales every year that occur on WRP to see if any adjustments are necessary. All Wetland Reserve Program acres are given their own separate classification (WRP).									
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:									
	Only one on file until 2012. When Oakland school district passed their new bond, a local taxpayer handed out forms at the local coffee shop with the misinformation that filing the greenbelt form would lower their taxes. They were also told that if enough of them filed, we would have to greenbelt the county. At this time, our market is farm ground that is selling for ag purpose and there is no other influence.									

Burt County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Burt	1	6,630	6,305	5,950	5,560	4,458	4,745	4,200	3,445	5,227
Cuming	1	6,221	6,221	5,830	5,842	5,386	5,404	4,556	4,483	5,823
Thurston	2	6,025	6,000	5,900	5,900	5,800	5,650	4,980	4,290	5,760
Burt	2	6,720	6,690	n/a	5,905	5,419	5,565	4,470	3,470	6,200
Cuming	4	6,343	6,361	6,005	5,947	5,568	5,563	4,720	4,739	5,927
Dodge	1	6,297	6,096	5,894	5,700	5,322	5,300	5,097	4,900	5,771
Washington	1	6,270	6,110	5,650	5,595	5,425	4,920	3,970	3,300	5,371

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Burt	1	6,500	6,145	5,655	5,460	4,599	4,600	4,175	3,175	5,005
Cuming	1	5,896	5,899	5,550	5,517	5,070	5,070	4,216	4,158	5,389
Thurston	2	5,400	5,400	4,750	4,750	4,590	4,590	4,400	4,170	4,675
Burt	2	6,690	6,655	6,065	5,845	5,553	5,530	4,435	3,405	5,926
Cuming	4	6,049	6,049	5,700	5,664	5,243	5,071	4,107	4,359	5,575
Dodge	1	6,199	5,992	5,800	5,099	5,230	5,195	4,995	4,797	5,598
Washington	1	6,015	5,904	5,555	5,230	4,905	4,815	3,855	2,912	5,080

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Burt	1	2,723	2,648	2,610	2,190	2,243	2,271	2,193	1,822	2,201
Cuming	1	3,147	2,781	2,733	2,491	2,071	2,184	2,164	1,283	2,379
Thurston	2	1,332	1,378	1,112	1,268	942	968	940	757	956
Burt	2	2,732	2,647	3,027	2,013	2,362	2,200	2,256	1,924	2,283
Cuming	4	3,128	2,910	2,611	2,426	2,239	2,222	1,837	1,430	2,293
Dodge	1	2,337	2,391	2,200	2,272	2,328	2,194	2,130	2,042	2,225
Washington	1	2,120	1,900	1,735	1,545	1,520	1,366	1,301	1,202	1,511

Source: 2015 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

Burt County Assessor's Office

111 N 13th Street, Suite 10

Tekamah, NE 68061

Phone: (402) 374-2926 Fax: (402) 374-2956

Joni L. Renshaw Jeanice Bowers Lori Sadler Dan Magill Jay Johnson Jan Rasmussen
County Assessor Deputy Assessor Clerk Sales /Review Reviewer Clerk/Reviewer

February 26, 2015

Dear Ms. Sorensen:

This correspondence is concerning Burt County being a county needing special valuation procedures. Please see below for our current methodology concerning the few parcels where application has been made for special value.

Burt County Special Valuation Methodology:

- *Due to the application by several taxpayers, Burt County has implemented a special valuation process.*
- *This is reported on lines 43 and 44 of Form 45 of the 2014 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property.*
- *The market analysis that has been performed over the past years has not demonstrated that there are consistently measureable non-agricultural influences in the Burt County market.*
- *In my opinion, the valuations that have been prepared for the agricultural land in Burt County do not reflect any non-agricultural influence. As a result, the special valuation process that is in place in Burt County has identical values for special value and regular assessment value.*
- *This is demonstrated in the county's Abstract on lines 43 and 44 of Form 45.*

I hope this explanation of the situation in Burt County and our methodology will suffice. If you need anything further, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Joni L. Renshaw
Burt County Assessor

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section

Burt County

County Overview

Agricultural land Burt County is divided into two market areas. Area one borders the Missouri River and also borders the southern edge of Thurston County along with a portion of eastern Washington County. 26% of area one is comprised of irrigated land, 55% dry land, and the balance is grass and waste. Area two consists of the southwestern portion of the county and includes approximately 9% irrigated, 78% dry land and the balance of grass and waste. Area two, borders Washington, Dodge and Cuming counties.

Description of Analysis

Analysis of the sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time; the oldest time period is over represented. Adjoining counties have similar land characteristics and the sample was expanded in area one with seven sales and area two with two sales resulting in a total of 87 sales. Area one has 46 sales and area two has 41 sales. Area one has a limited number of irrigated sales and no grass sales. The values established by the county assessor compare to all comparable counties and are determined to be acceptable.

Within area two there was a representative mix of sales by land classification. The sample is skewed in the oldest year time frame. Limited sales were available from adjoining counties to balance the time frame. However, a random selection of sales removed in the oldest time frame has no impact on the statistics which remains within the acceptable range. The values in area two are also comparable to adjoining counties. Area two has no irrigated sales in the file and a limited number of grass sales. With an adequate number of dry land sales the statistics support that the values are acceptable. Both the irrigated and grass values were compared to adjoining counties. The values established by the county assessor compare to all comparable counties and are determined to be acceptable.

Sales Qualification

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties. This involved reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. No apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations and all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

All available evidence supports agricultural land assessments in Burt County are equalized both with subclasses of land in the county and will comparable surrounding counties. Assessments are in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section Burt County

Level of Value

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural class of property; all subclasses are in the acceptable range.

11 Burt
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 172
Total Sales Price : 14,268,003
Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,268,003
Total Assessed Value : 13,319,300
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 82,954
Avg. Assessed Value : 77,438

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 102
COD : 17.39
PRD : 109.31

COV : 29.20
STD : 29.80
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.98
MAX Sales Ratio : 303.12
MIN Sales Ratio : 53.05

95% Median C.I. : 95.99 to 99.17
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.59 to 96.11
95% Mean C.I. : 97.59 to 106.49

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:03PM

DATE OF SALE *										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-12 To 31-DEC-12	19	98.20	105.32	96.83	15.15	108.77	75.57	183.58	91.63 to 110.18	88,389	85,585
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	11	97.68	108.34	103.04	13.34	105.14	94.37	184.91	94.43 to 116.99	72,745	74,959
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	18	98.76	110.36	91.71	27.08	120.34	66.81	303.12	84.94 to 115.39	79,194	72,628
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	14	98.37	105.50	99.06	11.22	106.50	90.93	145.60	93.89 to 118.69	80,586	79,826
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	18	98.60	99.00	98.02	04.45	101.00	84.97	114.93	95.99 to 101.20	72,689	71,249
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	23	97.35	99.35	91.20	15.61	108.94	66.04	180.14	90.97 to 103.47	90,652	82,674
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	33	98.17	101.68	91.38	18.92	111.27	56.78	185.68	91.69 to 104.02	88,936	81,267
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	36	89.02	96.43	88.70	23.92	108.71	53.05	218.13	82.76 to 98.74	80,733	71,611
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	62	98.45	107.36	96.87	17.42	110.83	66.81	303.12	96.34 to 101.47	81,182	78,637
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	110	96.94	99.04	91.44	17.36	108.31	53.05	218.13	93.78 to 99.13	83,952	76,762
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	61	98.54	105.53	97.20	14.29	108.57	66.81	303.12	96.77 to 100.09	76,431	74,293
<u>ALL</u>	172	97.62	102.04	93.35	17.39	109.31	53.05	303.12	95.99 to 99.17	82,954	77,438

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	45	96.79	100.14	94.35	12.50	106.14	64.88	180.14	94.23 to 98.67	85,784	80,940
05	34	100.14	103.19	96.96	13.90	106.43	68.54	218.13	95.84 to 108.34	85,591	82,985
10	30	96.93	102.07	93.29	16.44	109.41	70.95	185.68	90.97 to 98.20	59,213	55,239
15	14	100.43	121.93	93.92	42.90	129.82	53.05	303.12	66.04 to 145.60	57,393	53,901
20	5	114.84	121.20	106.26	17.62	114.06	94.95	160.97	N/A	30,000	31,879
25	44	96.32	94.55	89.86	15.56	105.22	53.47	148.13	87.11 to 99.39	108,357	97,371
<u>ALL</u>	172	97.62	102.04	93.35	17.39	109.31	53.05	303.12	95.99 to 99.17	82,954	77,438

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	172	97.62	102.04	93.35	17.39	109.31	53.05	303.12	95.99 to 99.17	82,954	77,438
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	172	97.62	102.04	93.35	17.39	109.31	53.05	303.12	95.99 to 99.17	82,954	77,438

11 Burt
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 172
Total Sales Price : 14,268,003
Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,268,003
Total Assessed Value : 13,319,300
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 82,954
Avg. Assessed Value : 77,438

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 102
COD : 17.39
PRD : 109.31

COV : 29.20
STD : 29.80
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.98
MAX Sales Ratio : 303.12
MIN Sales Ratio : 53.05

95% Median C.I. : 95.99 to 99.17
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.59 to 96.11
95% Mean C.I. : 97.59 to 106.49

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:03PM

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	135.17	135.17	135.17	00.00	100.00	135.17	135.17	N/A	3,000	4,055	
Less Than 15,000	3	183.58	207.29	225.05	30.49	92.11	135.17	303.12	N/A	7,000	15,753	
Less Than 30,000	27	122.09	131.57	125.14	28.05	105.14	53.05	303.12	100.00 to 143.28	19,156	23,971	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	171	97.55	101.84	93.34	17.28	109.11	53.05	303.12	95.99 to 99.13	83,421	77,867	
Greater Than 14,999	169	97.38	100.17	93.16	15.74	107.52	53.05	218.13	95.84 to 98.98	84,302	78,533	
Greater Than 29,999	145	96.73	96.54	92.16	12.94	104.75	53.47	218.13	94.38 to 98.17	94,833	87,394	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	135.17	135.17	135.17	00.00	100.00	135.17	135.17	N/A	3,000	4,055	
5,000 TO 14,999	2	243.35	243.35	240.03	24.56	101.38	183.58	303.12	N/A	9,000	21,603	
15,000 TO 29,999	24	118.34	122.11	120.91	23.54	100.99	53.05	204.67	98.07 to 140.98	20,675	24,998	
30,000 TO 59,999	33	102.56	110.92	109.58	16.91	101.22	56.66	218.13	99.35 to 109.94	41,079	45,014	
60,000 TO 99,999	60	96.78	96.36	95.98	09.61	100.40	64.88	148.13	94.23 to 98.98	77,383	74,273	
100,000 TO 149,999	34	91.11	88.39	87.93	11.36	100.52	53.47	116.23	81.39 to 95.84	123,065	108,206	
150,000 TO 249,999	16	85.52	85.66	84.84	13.61	100.97	59.63	107.79	72.65 to 97.96	188,313	159,765	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	89.83	89.83	89.18	07.26	100.73	83.31	96.34	N/A	277,500	247,480	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	172	97.62	102.04	93.35	17.39	109.31	53.05	303.12	95.99 to 99.17	82,954	77,438	

11 Burt
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 23
Total Sales Price : 1,674,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,554,500
Total Assessed Value : 1,387,555
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 67,587
Avg. Assessed Value : 60,328

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 92
COD : 17.28
PRD : 102.95

COV : 25.95
STD : 23.85
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.37
MAX Sales Ratio : 133.16
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.85

95% Median C.I. : 83.16 to 99.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.42 to 96.10
95% Mean C.I. : 81.58 to 102.20

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:04PM

DATE OF SALE *	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	2	94.80	94.80	94.77	01.14	100.03	93.72	95.87	N/A	102,500	97,138
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	119.64	119.64	109.73	10.83	109.03	106.68	132.60	N/A	42,500	46,635
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	99.00	99.00	99.00	00.00	100.00	99.00	99.00	N/A	21,000	20,790
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	66.64	66.64	70.92	12.92	93.97	58.03	75.25	N/A	89,500	63,478
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	92.61	92.61	92.61	00.00	100.00	92.61	92.61	N/A	160,000	148,175
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	3	94.71	94.07	91.45	02.33	102.86	90.44	97.06	N/A	37,333	34,142
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	107.91	107.91	89.24	21.26	120.92	84.97	130.85	N/A	53,750	47,968
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	98.37	96.83	87.92	07.42	110.13	81.57	109.00	N/A	118,500	104,189
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	4	77.20	79.60	106.96	45.75	74.42	30.85	133.16	N/A	24,000	25,671
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	77.97	77.97	75.03	06.66	103.92	72.78	83.16	N/A	57,500	43,145
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	5	99.00	105.57	99.14	10.04	106.49	93.72	132.60	N/A	62,200	61,667
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	8	91.53	90.49	84.78	14.55	106.74	58.03	130.85	58.03 to 130.85	69,813	59,186
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	10	89.93	86.17	88.43	23.30	97.44	30.85	133.16	57.71 to 109.00	68,500	60,573
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	5	99.00	94.31	84.57	21.41	111.52	58.03	132.60	N/A	57,000	48,203
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	10	95.89	97.79	89.43	09.31	109.35	81.57	130.85	84.97 to 109.00	85,350	76,329
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.71	91.89	89.26	17.28	102.95	30.85	133.16	83.16 to 99.00	67,587	60,328

VALUATION GROUPING	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	89.52	85.85	87.00	12.96	98.68	58.03	99.00	58.03 to 99.00	109,333	95,118
05	9	94.71	101.07	94.61	22.48	106.83	57.71	133.16	75.25 to 132.60	56,722	53,664
10	4	97.97	99.39	93.69	04.84	106.08	92.61	109.00	N/A	46,750	43,799
15	2	93.75	93.75	90.98	03.53	103.04	90.44	97.06	N/A	49,000	44,583
20	1	30.85	30.85	30.85	00.00	100.00	30.85	30.85	N/A	13,000	4,010
25	1	72.78	72.78	72.78	00.00	100.00	72.78	72.78	N/A	90,000	65,500
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.71	91.89	89.26	17.28	102.95	30.85	133.16	83.16 to 99.00	67,587	60,328

11 Burt
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 23
Total Sales Price : 1,674,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,554,500
Total Assessed Value : 1,387,555
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 67,587
Avg. Assessed Value : 60,328

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 92
COD : 17.28
PRD : 102.95

COV : 25.95
STD : 23.85
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.37
MAX Sales Ratio : 133.16
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.85

95% Median C.I. : 83.16 to 99.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.42 to 96.10
95% Mean C.I. : 81.58 to 102.20

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:04PM

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	23	94.71	91.89	89.26	17.28	102.95	30.85	133.16	83.16 to 99.00	67,587	60,328
04											
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.71	91.89	89.26	17.28	102.95	30.85	133.16	83.16 to 99.00	67,587	60,328

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	99.25	99.25	99.25	00.00	100.00	99.25	99.25	N/A	2,000	1,985
Less Than 15,000	8	98.16	94.00	91.60	24.37	102.62	30.85	132.60	30.85 to 132.60	8,875	8,129
Less Than 30,000	11	97.06	93.72	91.87	19.44	102.01	30.85	132.60	57.71 to 130.85	12,273	11,275
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	22	94.22	91.55	89.25	17.95	102.58	30.85	133.16	81.57 to 99.00	70,568	62,980
Greater Than 14,999	15	92.61	90.76	89.15	12.70	101.81	58.03	133.16	81.57 to 97.48	98,900	88,168
Greater Than 29,999	12	91.53	90.21	89.01	14.25	101.35	58.03	133.16	75.25 to 97.48	118,292	105,295
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	99.25	99.25	99.25	00.00	100.00	99.25	99.25	N/A	2,000	1,985
5,000 TO 14,999	7	97.06	93.25	91.38	27.85	102.05	30.85	132.60	30.85 to 132.60	9,857	9,007
15,000 TO 29,999	3	96.69	92.95	92.16	05.46	100.86	83.16	99.00	N/A	21,333	19,662
30,000 TO 59,999	2	95.60	95.60	100.33	39.30	95.29	58.03	133.16	N/A	51,500	51,673
60,000 TO 99,999	4	87.71	88.72	87.88	11.22	100.96	72.78	106.68	N/A	88,125	77,440
100,000 TO 149,999	2	85.56	85.56	84.06	12.05	101.78	75.25	95.87	N/A	117,000	98,355
150,000 TO 249,999	3	93.72	94.60	94.81	01.73	99.78	92.61	97.48	N/A	146,667	139,057
250,000 TO 499,999	1	81.57	81.57	81.57	00.00	100.00	81.57	81.57	N/A	290,000	236,550
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.71	91.89	89.26	17.28	102.95	30.85	133.16	83.16 to 99.00	67,587	60,328

11 Burt
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 23
Total Sales Price : 1,674,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,554,500
Total Assessed Value : 1,387,555
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 67,587
Avg. Assessed Value : 60,328

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 92
COD : 17.28
PRD : 102.95

COV : 25.95
STD : 23.85
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.37
MAX Sales Ratio : 133.16
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.85

95% Median C.I. : 83.16 to 99.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.42 to 96.10
95% Mean C.I. : 81.58 to 102.20

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:04PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	99.25	99.25	99.25	00.00	100.00	99.25	99.25	N/A	2,000	1,985
300	2	78.41	78.41	79.57	04.03	98.54	75.25	81.57	N/A	212,000	168,695
344	3	84.97	80.16	88.05	15.48	91.04	58.03	97.48	N/A	105,833	93,185
350	4	82.70	82.21	84.60	36.76	97.17	30.85	132.60	N/A	68,250	57,736
352	1	133.16	133.16	133.16	00.00	100.00	133.16	133.16	N/A	58,000	77,230
353	2	96.88	96.88	96.81	00.20	100.07	96.69	97.06	N/A	13,000	12,585
384	2	118.77	118.77	109.52	10.18	108.45	106.68	130.85	N/A	42,500	46,548
386	1	90.44	90.44	90.44	00.00	100.00	90.44	90.44	N/A	90,000	81,400
406	6	95.29	89.91	93.32	11.94	96.35	57.71	109.00	57.71 to 109.00	29,000	27,063
419	1	93.72	93.72	93.72	00.00	100.00	93.72	93.72	N/A	105,000	98,405
<u>ALL</u>	<u>23</u>	94.71	91.89	89.26	17.28	102.95	30.85	133.16	83.16 to 99.00	67,587	60,328

11 Burt
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 87
Total Sales Price : 59,551,270
Total Adj. Sales Price : 59,293,270
Total Assessed Value : 43,285,460
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 681,532
Avg. Assessed Value : 497,534

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 73
MEAN : 79
COD : 25.66
PRD : 108.08

COV : 32.74
STD : 25.83
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 184.64
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.49

95% Median C.I. : 65.98 to 78.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.56 to 77.45
95% Mean C.I. : 73.47 to 84.33

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:05PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	13	89.78	91.71	91.20	11.67	100.56	71.83	114.66	77.28 to 108.21	618,334	563,914	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	93.02	110.62	98.14	32.39	112.72	64.32	184.64	78.61 to 139.47	347,877	341,419	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	81.86	75.87	81.73	13.24	92.83	51.83	87.92	N/A	783,556	640,431	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	95.80	97.94	93.27	12.33	105.01	75.13	127.21	N/A	512,113	477,659	
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	12	63.66	70.22	66.14	19.18	106.17	53.97	106.09	58.14 to 84.17	750,481	496,363	
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	9	64.17	68.00	65.60	17.06	103.66	52.29	102.46	54.03 to 77.86	607,251	398,372	
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	3	65.98	66.36	66.33	01.09	100.05	65.46	67.63	N/A	652,800	432,973	
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	55.10	55.10	54.58	14.46	100.95	47.13	63.06	N/A	295,298	161,163	
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	11	65.54	68.37	71.08	10.24	96.19	59.68	88.76	61.08 to 86.22	844,875	600,516	
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	9	62.37	61.25	58.92	12.71	103.95	45.49	73.03	50.55 to 69.68	1,001,561	590,140	
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	3	59.04	60.23	58.74	03.40	102.54	57.81	63.84	N/A	937,933	550,955	
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	64.61	64.40	63.30	04.67	101.74	59.76	68.82	N/A	965,412	611,117	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	35	90.72	97.81	91.59	20.71	106.79	51.83	184.64	85.80 to 95.80	521,587	477,696	
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	26	64.70	67.84	65.59	16.04	103.43	47.13	106.09	59.40 to 68.71	654,617	429,344	
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	26	63.57	64.51	64.13	10.22	100.59	45.49	88.76	59.76 to 67.94	923,758	592,429	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	34	86.05	90.41	79.83	27.31	113.25	51.83	184.64	67.85 to 95.34	565,381	451,319	
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	25	65.46	66.93	68.25	12.05	98.07	47.13	102.46	61.12 to 67.63	692,315	472,491	
<u>ALL</u>	87	69.68	78.90	73.00	25.66	108.08	45.49	184.64	65.98 to 78.23	681,532	497,534	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
1	46	69.76	82.53	72.87	28.27	113.26	50.55	184.64	65.54 to 86.22	703,003	512,266	
2	41	69.68	74.83	73.16	22.69	102.28	45.49	130.91	61.12 to 84.46	657,443	481,005	
<u>ALL</u>	87	69.68	78.90	73.00	25.66	108.08	45.49	184.64	65.98 to 78.23	681,532	497,534	

11 Burt
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 87
Total Sales Price : 59,551,270
Total Adj. Sales Price : 59,293,270
Total Assessed Value : 43,285,460
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 681,532
Avg. Assessed Value : 497,534

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 73
MEAN : 79
COD : 25.66
PRD : 108.08

COV : 32.74
STD : 25.83
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 184.64
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.49

95% Median C.I. : 65.98 to 78.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.56 to 77.45
95% Mean C.I. : 73.47 to 84.33

Printed:3/20/2015 3:46:05PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	1	127.21	127.21	127.21	00.00	100.00	127.21	127.21	N/A	102,500	130,395
1	1	127.21	127.21	127.21	00.00	100.00	127.21	127.21	N/A	102,500	130,395
_____Dry_____											
County	54	68.77	77.87	71.96	22.80	108.21	53.97	180.43	65.46 to 78.23	662,729	476,906
1	25	68.82	82.51	74.65	27.48	110.53	54.03	180.43	64.61 to 90.72	564,827	421,664
2	29	68.71	73.87	70.21	18.76	105.21	53.97	130.91	61.12 to 84.46	747,126	524,529
_____Grass_____											
County	3	51.83	49.87	50.80	04.38	98.17	45.49	52.29	N/A	125,905	63,960
2	3	51.83	49.87	50.80	04.38	98.17	45.49	52.29	N/A	125,905	63,960
_____ALL_____	87	69.68	78.90	73.00	25.66	108.08	45.49	184.64	65.98 to 78.23	681,532	497,534

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	1	127.21	127.21	127.21	00.00	100.00	127.21	127.21	N/A	102,500	130,395
1	1	127.21	127.21	127.21	00.00	100.00	127.21	127.21	N/A	102,500	130,395
_____Dry_____											
County	73	71.83	80.23	73.43	24.11	109.26	50.55	184.64	67.59 to 78.61	687,605	504,893
1	37	70.02	83.35	73.61	28.16	113.23	50.55	184.64	65.98 to 85.80	661,955	487,247
2	36	73.00	77.02	73.26	20.29	105.13	53.97	130.91	63.29 to 85.48	713,968	523,029
_____Grass_____											
County	3	51.83	49.87	50.80	04.38	98.17	45.49	52.29	N/A	125,905	63,960
2	3	51.83	49.87	50.80	04.38	98.17	45.49	52.29	N/A	125,905	63,960
_____ALL_____	87	69.68	78.90	73.00	25.66	108.08	45.49	184.64	65.98 to 78.23	681,532	497,534

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 6,878	Value : 1,761,835,894	Growth 6,518,816	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	298	1,641,360	5	18,480	27	322,730	330	1,982,570	
02. Res Improve Land	2,053	11,220,370	60	1,413,700	404	11,371,120	2,517	24,005,190	
03. Res Improvements	2,103	116,779,320	63	6,061,495	481	39,912,816	2,647	162,753,631	
04. Res Total	2,401	129,641,050	68	7,493,675	508	51,606,666	2,977	188,741,391	2,976,865
% of Res Total	80.65	68.69	2.28	3.97	17.06	27.34	43.28	10.71	45.67
05. Com UnImp Land	48	229,130	6	59,705	5	209,660	59	498,495	
06. Com Improve Land	322	2,184,870	19	614,550	17	158,385	358	2,957,805	
07. Com Improvements	330	21,158,935	20	3,014,225	24	6,126,465	374	30,299,625	
08. Com Total	378	23,572,935	26	3,688,480	29	6,494,510	433	33,755,925	727,920
% of Com Total	87.30	69.83	6.00	10.93	6.70	19.24	6.30	1.92	11.17
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	4	87,685	0	0	2	497,505	6	585,190	
11. Ind Improvements	4	1,852,335	0	0	2	17,751,445	6	19,603,780	
12. Ind Total	4	1,940,020	0	0	2	18,248,950	6	20,188,970	434,040
% of Ind Total	66.67	9.61	0.00	0.00	33.33	90.39	0.09	1.15	6.66
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	8	76,220	8	76,220	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	33	544,320	33	544,320	
15. Rec Improvements	23	332,765	10	68,950	114	2,796,715	147	3,198,430	
16. Rec Total	23	332,765	10	68,950	122	3,417,255	155	3,818,970	48,665
% of Rec Total	14.84	8.71	6.45	1.81	78.71	89.48	2.25	0.22	0.75
Res & Rec Total	2,424	129,973,815	78	7,562,625	630	55,023,921	3,132	192,560,361	3,025,530
% of Res & Rec Total	77.39	67.50	2.49	3.93	20.11	28.57	45.54	10.93	46.41
Com & Ind Total	382	25,512,955	26	3,688,480	31	24,743,460	439	53,944,895	1,161,960
% of Com & Ind Total	87.02	47.29	5.92	6.84	7.06	45.87	6.38	3.06	17.82
17. Taxable Total	2,806	155,486,770	104	11,251,105	661	79,767,381	3,571	246,505,256	4,187,490
% of Taxable Total	78.58	63.08	2.91	4.56	18.51	32.36	51.92	13.99	64.24

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	1	13,415	571,825	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	13,415	571,825
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	13,415	571,825

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	234	30	123	387

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	89	2,380,670	158	51,910,080	2,110	897,269,285	2,357	951,560,035
28. Ag-Improved Land	20	261,690	83	24,476,410	1,135	470,319,030	1,238	495,057,130
29. Ag Improvements	1	2,000	56	5,365,645	893	63,345,828	950	68,713,473
30. Ag Total							3,307	1,515,330,638

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	14,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	0.69	9,660	37	42.00	588,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	2,000	36	0.00	3,565,190	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.07	8,280	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	3.97	15,880	54	196.24	784,960	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	52	0.00	1,800,455	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	4	3.23	0	134	242.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	1	2.00	8,000	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	13	13.00	182,000	14	14.00	196,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	484	507.00	7,098,000	522	549.69	7,695,660	
33. HomeSite Improvements	483	0.00	37,808,680	520	0.00	41,375,870	0
34. HomeSite Total				534	563.69	49,267,530	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	85	160.77	643,080	86	162.84	651,360	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	836	3,314.02	13,256,090	892	3,514.23	14,056,930	
37. FarmSite Improvements	854	0.00	25,537,148	906	0.00	27,337,603	2,331,326
38. FarmSite Total				992	3,677.07	42,045,893	
39. Road & Ditches	2,591	6,023.00	0	2,729	6,268.23	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	3	4.27	37,080	4	6.27	45,080	
41. Total Section VI				1,526	10,515.26	91,358,503	2,331,326

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	14	927.10	4,520,280	14	927.10	4,520,280
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	9,557.97	21.98%	63,369,370	27.88%	6,630.00
46. 1A	825.90	1.90%	5,207,380	2.29%	6,305.10
47. 2A1	4,227.56	9.72%	25,154,005	11.07%	5,950.01
48. 2A	5,129.25	11.80%	28,518,645	12.55%	5,560.00
49. 3A1	22,454.44	51.64%	100,111,545	44.05%	4,458.43
50. 3A	280.22	0.64%	1,329,670	0.59%	4,745.09
51. 4A1	132.40	0.30%	556,080	0.24%	4,200.00
52. 4A	872.99	2.01%	3,007,475	1.32%	3,445.03
53. Total	43,480.73	100.00%	227,254,170	100.00%	5,226.55
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,759.29	12.62%	76,435,385	16.40%	6,500.00
55. 1D	14,581.97	15.65%	89,607,620	19.22%	6,145.10
56. 2D1	2,892.88	3.11%	16,359,405	3.51%	5,655.06
57. 2D	8,117.76	8.71%	44,322,985	9.51%	5,460.00
58. 3D1	22,299.54	23.94%	102,551,310	22.00%	4,598.81
59. 3D	7,032.57	7.55%	32,349,830	6.94%	4,600.00
60. 4D1	20,520.69	22.03%	85,675,825	18.38%	4,175.09
61. 4D	5,947.13	6.38%	18,882,645	4.05%	3,175.09
62. Total	93,151.83	100.00%	466,185,005	100.00%	5,004.57
Grass					
63. 1G1	546.78	3.32%	1,489,100	4.11%	2,723.40
64. 1G	2,055.80	12.49%	5,443,750	15.03%	2,648.00
65. 2G1	285.80	1.74%	745,870	2.06%	2,609.76
66. 2G	1,178.96	7.16%	2,581,735	7.13%	2,189.84
67. 3G1	1,345.33	8.18%	3,017,375	8.33%	2,242.85
68. 3G	869.00	5.28%	1,973,090	5.45%	2,270.53
69. 4G1	6,558.27	39.85%	14,382,400	39.70%	2,193.02
70. 4G	3,616.50	21.98%	6,590,050	18.19%	1,822.22
71. Total	16,456.44	100.00%	36,223,370	100.00%	2,201.17
Irrigated Total					
	43,480.73	25.77%	227,254,170	30.51%	5,226.55
Dry Total					
	93,151.83	55.20%	466,185,005	62.59%	5,004.57
Grass Total					
	16,456.44	9.75%	36,223,370	4.86%	2,201.17
72. Waste	3,184.28	1.89%	525,555	0.07%	165.05
73. Other	12,479.74	7.40%	14,578,185	1.96%	1,168.15
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	168,753.02	100.00%	744,766,285	100.00%	4,413.35

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	3,437.23	30.61%	23,098,185	33.18%	6,720.00
46. 1A	2,228.77	19.85%	14,910,500	21.42%	6,690.01
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	2,866.49	25.53%	16,926,705	24.32%	5,905.03
49. 3A1	1,062.60	9.46%	5,758,530	8.27%	5,419.28
50. 3A	1,497.44	13.34%	8,333,370	11.97%	5,565.08
51. 4A1	116.77	1.04%	521,960	0.75%	4,469.98
52. 4A	18.00	0.16%	62,460	0.09%	3,470.00
53. Total	11,227.30	100.00%	69,611,710	100.00%	6,200.22
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,914.84	12.25%	79,710,395	13.83%	6,690.01
55. 1D	29,207.10	30.04%	194,376,130	33.73%	6,655.10
56. 2D1	181.20	0.19%	1,099,005	0.19%	6,065.15
57. 2D	12,228.80	12.58%	71,478,105	12.40%	5,845.06
58. 3D1	11,158.33	11.48%	61,957,540	10.75%	5,552.58
59. 3D	22,172.85	22.81%	122,615,935	21.28%	5,530.00
60. 4D1	9,401.59	9.67%	41,696,835	7.24%	4,435.08
61. 4D	963.21	0.99%	3,279,850	0.57%	3,405.12
62. Total	97,227.92	100.00%	576,213,795	100.00%	5,926.42
Grass					
63. 1G1	359.89	2.77%	983,370	3.31%	2,732.42
64. 1G	2,662.37	20.48%	7,046,160	23.74%	2,646.57
65. 2G1	56.83	0.44%	172,020	0.58%	3,026.92
66. 2G	1,869.86	14.38%	3,764,320	12.68%	2,013.16
67. 3G1	855.75	6.58%	2,021,620	6.81%	2,362.40
68. 3G	1,078.48	8.30%	2,372,930	7.99%	2,200.25
69. 4G1	4,678.65	35.99%	10,556,245	35.56%	2,256.26
70. 4G	1,439.71	11.07%	2,769,575	9.33%	1,923.70
71. Total	13,001.54	100.00%	29,686,240	100.00%	2,283.29
<hr/>					
Irrigated Total	11,227.30	8.98%	69,611,710	10.25%	6,200.22
Dry Total	97,227.92	77.76%	576,213,795	84.84%	5,926.42
Grass Total	13,001.54	10.40%	29,686,240	4.37%	2,283.29
72. Waste	1,055.13	0.84%	158,310	0.02%	150.04
73. Other	2,516.48	2.01%	3,535,795	0.52%	1,405.06
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	125,028.37	100.00%	679,205,850	100.00%	5,432.41

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	2,131.80	11,798,775	52,576.23	285,067,105	54,708.03	296,865,880
77. Dry Land	444.00	2,473,985	10,290.00	57,868,965	179,645.75	982,055,850	190,379.75	1,042,398,800
78. Grass	64.70	118,575	1,891.01	4,489,435	27,502.27	61,301,600	29,457.98	65,909,610
79. Waste	4.91	750	349.27	56,100	3,885.23	627,015	4,239.41	683,865
80. Other	15.33	23,510	633.56	769,975	14,347.33	17,320,495	14,996.22	18,113,980
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	528.94	2,616,820	15,295.64	74,983,250	277,956.81	1,346,372,065	293,781.39	1,423,972,135

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	54,708.03	18.62%	296,865,880	20.85%	5,426.37
Dry Land	190,379.75	64.80%	1,042,398,800	73.20%	5,475.37
Grass	29,457.98	10.03%	65,909,610	4.63%	2,237.41
Waste	4,239.41	1.44%	683,865	0.05%	161.31
Other	14,996.22	5.10%	18,113,980	1.27%	1,207.90
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	293,781.39	100.00%	1,423,972,135	100.00%	4,847.05

2015 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2014 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

11 Burt

	2014 CTL County Total	2015 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2015 form 45 - 2014 CTL)	Percent Change	2015 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	184,476,561	188,741,391	4,264,830	2.31%	2,976,865	0.70%
02. Recreational	3,732,405	3,818,970	86,565	2.32%	48,665	1.02%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	48,657,715	49,267,530	609,815	1.25%	0	1.25%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	236,866,681	241,827,891	4,961,210	2.09%	3,025,530	0.82%
05. Commercial	32,103,205	33,755,925	1,652,720	5.15%	727,920	2.88%
06. Industrial	19,754,930	20,188,970	434,040	2.20%	434,040	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	41,243,728	42,045,893	802,165	1.94%	2,331,326	-3.71%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	93,101,863	95,990,788	2,888,925	3.10%	3,493,286	-0.65%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	329,968,544	337,863,759	7,895,215	2.39%	6,518,816	0.42%
11. Irrigated	233,108,795	296,865,880	63,757,085	27.35%		
12. Dryland	812,122,900	1,042,398,800	230,275,900	28.35%		
13. Grassland	51,808,090	65,909,610	14,101,520	27.22%		
14. Wasteland	593,450	683,865	90,415	15.24%		
15. Other Agland	15,027,435	18,113,980	3,086,545	20.54%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	1,112,660,670	1,423,972,135	311,311,465	27.98%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,442,629,214	1,761,835,894	319,206,680	22.13%	6,518,816	21.67%

Burt County's 3 Year Plan of Assessment June 15, 2014

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

This plan of assessment is required by law, as amended by Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. The former provisions relating to the assessors' 5-year plan of assessment in Neb. Rev. Stat 77-1311(8) were repealed. On or before June 15th each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and present it to the county board of equalization on or before July 31st. The county assessor may amend the plan of assessment, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. The plan shall be updated annually before its adoption. The updates shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the County and shall describe the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete these actions. A copy of the plan and any amendments shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, on or before October 31st each year.

REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
 - 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
 - 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344.
- Reference: Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R.S. Supp 2007)

GENERAL COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Burt County has a total count of 6,857 parcels as reported on the 2014 County Abstract. Per the 2014 County Abstract, Burt County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	2,967	43.27%	12.78%
Commercial	437	6.37%	2.22%
Industrial	6	.09%	1.37%
Recreational	161	2.35%	.27%
Agricultural	3,286	47.92%	83.36%

Agricultural land – 293,610.29 taxable acres

New Property: For assessment year 2014, an estimated 96 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions to the county.

The county handled 1,097 personal property schedules for 2014. The office also processed 371 homestead applications. Approximately 60 permissive exemptions are applied for each year through the County Assessor's Office.

The Burt County Assessor has the required assessor certification, several IAAO educational course certifications and numerous assessor workshops of assessment education. She has a continuing education requirement pursuant to Section 77-414 of 40 hours prior to December 31, 2002 and thereafter, 60 hours of continued education as required within the following 4-year period. She has completed the required IAAO Course 101 – Fundamentals of Real Property Appraisal and IAAO Course 300 – Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal.

The County Assessor's Office has a deputy and two full-time clerks to carry out the responsibilities and duties of the office with the assessor. The deputy has the necessary certification to hold the position and will fulfill the continuing education requirement of 60 hours required within the next 4-year period. The county does have a part-time appraiser and two part-time lister/reviewers for "pickup work" and other needed valuation projects being completed to keep Burt County in line with uniform and proportionate valuations.

The current 2014-2015 budget for the office is being reviewed by the County Board. The general fund request is \$135,532.24 which includes the Assessor, Deputy, and one clerk's salaries. The appraisal budget request is \$125,500.00

which includes the payroll for one regular clerk and three part-time employees. This also funds all cadastral map work, appraisal schooling, GIS system, and data service contracts and fees. The GIS yearly maintenance contract amount had now been added to the appraisal budget for 2013-2014. A new WebGIS is being developed for Burt County by GIS Workshop. The maintenance and support costs on this web hosting will cost \$3,800.00 annually. The aerial photos were flown in the late winter of 2013/2014 by GIS Workshop and will be automatically attached to the GIS maps by parcel number. Work will be done during the summer of 2014 through 2015 to identify any additional buildings that have been added to the county's valuation base. Physical review will be performed once it is determine where these changes have occurred.

PROCEDURES

A procedures manual is in place with continual updating that describes the procedures and operations of the office. The manual adheres to the statutes, regulations and directives that apply to the Assessor's Office. A copy of this is entered into the record at the County Board of Equalization meetings each year as part of the process of hearing protests.

CADASTRAL MAPS

The cadastral maps are updated on a daily basis as sales and other changes arise. The city maps were completed with all information having been proofed by the Assessor's Office staff over the last 3-4 years. The maps are currently in the process of being revised and updated by a local surveyor to improve the readability. We hope to be able to continue on with the rural maps if we are allowed to budget for them.

PROPERTY RECORD CARDS

Regulation 10-004 requires the assessor to prepare and maintain a property record file for each parcel of real property including improvements on leased land in the county. New property record cards have been made for all residential, commercial, agricultural, exempt, and leased improvements. The new cards will contain all the required information including ownership, legal description, classification codes, and tax districts.

REPORT GENERATION

The County Assessor has basic duties and requirements in filing administrative reports with the Property Tax Administrator that may be different than those specified in statute to ensure proper administration of the law. They include the County Real Estate Abstract due March 19th, 3 Year Plan of Assessment to be presented to the county board of equalization by July 31st, and due with the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, by October 31st, Certification of Values to School Districts and Political Subdivisions due August 20th, School District Taxable Value Report due August 25th, generate Tax Roll to be given to the County Treasurer by November 22nd, and Certificate of Taxes Levied Report due December 1st. Taxpayer appeals must be handled during the months of June and July. Regulation 10-002.09 requires tax list corrections created because of undervalued or overvalued real property and omitted real property must be reported to the County Board of Equalization by July 25th. Clerical error may be corrected as needed.

The assessor must do an annual review of all government owned property and if not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, and place on the tax roll. All centrally assessed property valuations must be reviewed after being certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities along with establishing assessment records and tax billing for the tax list. The assessor also manages school district and other entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information. This process includes the input and review of all tax rates for the billing process. We prepare and certify the tax lists/books to the county treasurer for real, personal property, and centrally assessed. The assessor prepares all tax list correction documents for county board approval. The assessor must attend all County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests where information is assembled and provided. The assessor must prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before the Tax Equalization and Review Commission where we also defend the valuation. During TERC Statewide Equalization, we attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

There are many numerous other deadlines that the assessor must meet throughout the year. All administrative reports are prepared by the County Assessor by their due dates and will continue to be done in a timely fashion as part of Burt County's assessment plan.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS

Statutes 77-3510 through 77-3528 require the County Assessor to furnish forms for persons desiring to make application for Homestead Exemption. Applications are furnished and accepted along with an income statement between the dates of February 1st and June 30th of each year. The County Assessor must approve or disapprove the applications based on conformity to law. Notices shall be sent to rejected applicants by July 31st of each year except in the case of change of ownership or occupancy from January 1st through August 15th. Notice will be sent within a reasonable time. Approved applications will be sent to the Tax Commissioner on or before August 1st of each year. The County Assessor and clerical staff will process the applications and place them on the tax roll after their approval by the State based on income.

Per section 77-3506.02, the county assessor is required to certify to the Department of Revenue the average assessed value of single-family residential property in the county and to report the computed exempt amounts pursuant to section 77-3501.01 on or before September 1st each year.

PERSONAL PROPERTY

The Burt County Assessor's office will require that all taxable personal property be lawfully assessed throughout the county according to the requirements of the statutes and regulations. All schedules are to be filed by May 1st to be considered timely. From May 1 to June 30, all schedules received by the office have a 10% penalty applied. After June 30, a 25% penalty is assessed. Postcards are mailed around February 1 to remind taxpayers that it is the beginning of personal property season. Advertisements are placed in the three county newspapers to remind taxpayers of the deadlines and to alert new personal property owners of the requirements for filing a timely schedule with the appropriate information. The taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule is used as a basis for the personal property schedule. Local accountants are provided with their clients' forms when requested, which they compute and return to our office. Legislation has eliminated the 13AG's and the taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule will be our only source of information in the future. We have been requiring them and have close to 95% compliance. The assessor and staff process Personal Property schedules.

REAL PROPERTY

All real property is assessed each year as of January 1, 12:01 a.m. following the statutes. The assessment level of residential and commercial property will be set between 92-100% of actual market value. The agricultural land will be assessed at 69-75% of actual market value. Valuation notices will be sent out on or before June 1st of each year to every owner of record in which the assessed valuation changed from the previous year.

Real property is updated annually through maintenance and "pickup work". We plan to finish by the end of February, to allow time for data entry and completion of value generation. We do sales analysis with assistance of our liaison to determine what assessment actions need to be implemented. This is an ongoing study with all data available on spread-sheets in our computers. Information is updated and areas for adjustment are determined along with the information provided from the current rosters.

The mass appraisal process for valuing properties in the county mainly is performed with the cost approach and market approach. We use the Marshall and Swift costing data supplied through MIPS/County Solutions. We do a depreciation study on an annual basis to determine any actions that may need to be taken. The income approach was applied on the contracted commercial reappraisal. Our part-time appraiser will use the income approach on commercial properties as each area is reviewed. The county plans to accomplish a portion of the required six year inspection process annually and previously was using a system of review that was similar.

Burt County has changed from Northeast Data to MIPS/County Solutions for real estate pricing programs. They will also do our administrative and report programs. The conversion process was very time consuming but has been completed and reviewed for correctness. The conversion to MIPS 2 with the new pricing program was started in July 2013 and is currently being reviewed for correctness. The original MIPS/County Solutions program may no longer be available after 12/31/13 and they will no longer support the system.

Countywide zoning was adopted by the Burt County Board effective February 4, 2000. The Assessor's Office works with the zoning administrator in locating new improvements. We also let the administrator know about improvements that need to have an accompanying permit application where they have failed to file one.

The review process in place in Burt County consists of a physical inspection of all properties that are being revalued. If there was any question as to the

accuracy of the data, the property was remeasured, confirmed, and/or corrected. Additional information was collected that is necessary for the new CAMA software. The quality and condition of the property are noted as well as any other outstanding facts. A new digital photo was taken of each parcel. With the owner's permission and accompaniment, an interior inspection was performed. If permission was denied or there was no response to our door hanger and follow-up calls, we assumed that the interior condition of the property was the same as the exterior, unless there was evidence otherwise.

REG-50-003 requires the county assessor to 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. This plan is given in more detail below.

LEVEL OF VALUE, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2014

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	98.00	23.12	115.54
Commercial	96.00	27.16	133.41
Agricultural Land	71.00	23.08	108.93

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. The Property Assessment Division no longer includes this information or statistical measures as part of their Reports & Opinions.

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED

RESIDENTIAL

2015 – Continue on with our rural revalue with the townships of Arizona and Oakland. All the river frontage properties including all mobile home parks were reviewed for 2014. The rest of Arizona Township will be reviewed for any new improvements, current condition of all improvements, and any after effects of the flooding in 2011. We will also be checking for damage from the wind storms/tornado that occurred in June 2014. There were damages in several townships plus the small town of Craig had some extensive damage on one side of town. We plan to review Decatur Village to continue on with our city residential. We will also continue to work on updating and checking all residential and rural building records in the new MIPS 2 system. We will continue working on depreciation analysis and effective age studies. The COD and PRD will be examined on an annual basis to see if the quality of assessment is

appropriate, and what might be done to improve these numbers. Continue to analyze for uniformity and that levels are within the acceptable ranges.

2016 - Craig and Everett Townships will be reviewed for both residential and farm buildings to determine current condition and valuation. We continue to check for buildings added to parcels without benefit of building permits and report such to the zoning administrator. We will continue on with the review of the city residential in Lyons City.

2017 – Summit and Logan Townships will be reviewed for both residential and farm buildings. We will check the current condition, and as always, watch for any new structures or removal of existing ones. We will also review the city of Tekamah.

COMMERCIAL

The commercial class of property had a complete reappraisal done in 2000 by Great Plains Appraisal Company. The pricing program that was applied was 1999 and all data was entered in the new CAMA 2000 system. Market, income, and cost approach were all applied in valuing the commercial class. In 2010, all commercial data was moved to the windows version of CAMA 2000 along with the implementation of newer pricing. Jeff Quist has been assisting the office with an updated sales analysis and depreciation study. The Tekamah commercial was revalued using the new MIPS 2 CAMA system for 2014. The other four towns and rural commercial will follow. The COD and PRD will be examined to address the quality of the assessments and their uniformity. The office staff will be entering and reviewing all data in the commercial program.

2015 - We will review all commercial properties in Decatur Village and apply the new updated pricing. We may start the review of commercial in Lyons City if time and deadlines will allow. We did have enough sales information in 2014 to establish a level of value on the commercial but continue to have a very limited number. We will be working with the new MIPS 2 pricing system which will have 2012 pricing.

2016 – The review of the commercial properties will continue with completion of Lyons and continue on with Oakland. We will continue to monitor the COD and PRD to see if we are improving our quality of assessments. Our smaller communities have such a wide variance in commercial sales; we may never be able to achieve really tight numbers. Our liaison, along with the Department of Revenue – Property Assessment Division, is working to compile more commercial data that may help the smaller counties have more information to determine our levels of value and be able to compare our sales with other counties.

2017 – We will finish the review of the commercial properties in Oakland if necessary. We will do the small village of Craig and possibly start on the rural commercial if time will allow it. We will also conduct another study on vacant lots if any sales are available.

AGRICULTURAL

Burt County will study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values will be set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute. The new level has been implemented as changed by the Legislature in 2006. Burt County currently has implemented two market areas and will continue to monitor the market activity to be assured that the market areas are needed. Market areas were adjusted in 2006 with Logan and Everett Townships being moved from Area 2 to Area 1 as their sales showed it was needed. We will continue to review and locate sales of Solomon and Luton soils in Map Area 2 as it is becoming a problem on the west side of the county as well as on the east. We have adjusted both dry and irrigated acres within these soil types. It is classified as 3A1 and 3D1 which falls in with some of the Monona and Moody that are bringing higher prices on the market. We have separated our Solomon and Luton and call them “gumbo” in our current computer pricing program. The problem is in finding enough sales to verify value as it is not very desirable and there are not a lot of sales. We will also be looking at Forney and Albaton as they are a type of “gumbo” as well although not as heavy. The value on these soils is no longer comparable with the Monona and Moody when it comes to sales.

We are implementing wetland reserve pricing on the acres that have been converted and verified as such with the Farm Service Agency. We were originally told that there could be as many as 3,000 acres with the wetland reserve easement. With additional acres still being added, over 3,776 acres have already been converted. This land is actually no longer considered agland once it is implemented and goes on at 100% of market as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

In 2010, we implemented the new numeric identifiers from the Natural Resource Conservation Service on our soil surveys. The new numeric system combined several mapping symbols for similar soils, reducing the total number of soils and creating more uniformity across the state. We will be reviewing all of our soil maps for any changes, especially along the county's boundaries where changes were made to blend soil types. The Natural Resource Conservation

Service will not be publishing a book this time. We are implementing a new GIS system to be able to obtain the 2008 soil maps and to assist in determining acres of each soil type on individual parcels. We started with the areas that had experienced changes in classification first as those changes had to be completed for the 2010 tax year. Completion of the total GIS project will probably extend into 2014. Lower Elkhorn Natural Resource District has offered some assistance in the completion of the land use phase as they will need it in determining the number of irrigated acres currently in Burt County. We will have our land maps and administrative information on a WebGIS in the latter part of 2014 that is being hosted and maintained by GIS Workshop. No decision has been made as to the availability to the public or what information will be online.

2015 – Besides continuing the study of all agricultural sales on the required 3-year sale period, we will continue to monitor flood damaged land. We had over 4,300 acres of agland that was adjusted in 2012 due to the damages incurred during the flood of 2011. Some was lowered to 4A, 4D, 4G, or even down to waste. We will need to keep in contact with the individual landowners or ag producers to see how the land is responding to their efforts to return it to its former productivity. We have requested their most current FSA Farm Summary Report (Form 578) to see how it compares with the previous years. They will have to let us know of continuing issues with problem areas so we can address them. We have many parcels covered with deep enough sand that they may never be farmed again. We will also monitor these parcels. We will track any sales that occur on these damaged parcels to see if we can better determine the current market value.

2016 – Review data from the GIS program now that the land use is almost complete along with the current aerial maps from 2012-2013. We may still request new farm summary reports from agland owners if we have any questions that cannot be determined from our GIS system. All those individuals will be contacted about providing us with that information. We need to be watching for land to be removed from CRP with contracts coming up for renewal. We will continue to monitor sales in the northwest corner of the county to see if an additional market area needs to be implemented. We have even considered moving all of the county back into one map area if sales would indicate it was possible. We will be collecting and studying all sales data we can find on wetland reserve acres to establish its current value. We will continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute.

2017 – Review all information that we have been able to obtain on land in the CRP program. Implement a study on the available sales data to determine how CRP land compares to both dryland and grassland sales. We hope to be

able to use our new GIS system maps to assist in updating areas that were affected by the flooding and seeing if they are being renovated and put back into full farming capabilities. Continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute.

All school land was valued according to soil and use for 2014. Current soil survey is dated 2008 and is required by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. All school land was updated with the new soil survey and numeric designations.

New aerial photos were taken of the rural properties for use in 2015. They will be used to assist in the review of the rural properties as well as a physical inspection of the parcel. Plans have been completed to review two to three townships a year for the next six years. All outbuildings have been measured again, and their condition verified. Each home has been physically inspected or a detailed questionnaire was left for completion. We are implementing the 2012 CAMA software during this review and are monitoring the market activity to ensure that the quality and level of assessment are uniform. We are continuing on with our 6 year review cycle of rural land, residences, and outbuildings.

Small tracts continue to be a concern in our sales study. Buyers purchase as much as 20-40 acres to build a home in the country. A home may be located on 1-2 acres but the remainder acres are used as farmland. Some are grazing cattle or allowing the nearest neighbor to farm along with his operation. New legislative statute LB 777 clarified the definition of agricultural and horticultural land versus land associated with a building or enclosed structure. This legislation was needed to support our procedure for valuing these properties. We did raise our homesite value to 14,000 and our building site value to 2,500 for 2008. As we reviewed and studied our rural sales, we found we needed to adjust the building site value from the 3,500 established for 2010 to 4,000 in 2013. We left our home and building sites at their current value for 2014 but will continue to monitor this as sales occur.

SALES REVIEW

Effective January 1, 2009, the prescribed Real Estate Transfer Statement (Form 521) will be a single part form, rather than a multi-part form. The register of deeds shall forward the completed statement to the county assessor. The assessor shall process the statement and submit the original single part Real Estate Transfer

Statement to the Department of Revenue according to the instructions of the Property Tax Administrator. See *Neb. Rev. Stat. §76-214*.

The County Assessor shall forward the completed "original" single part Form 521 to the Tax Commissioner on or before the fifteenth of the second month following the month the deed was recorded. This data is to be provided to the Property Assessment Division electronically in 2011 and the county is currently doing so. The office makes every effort to file them as timely as possible. Two full-time employees help with the completion of the 521's and filling out of the supplemental sheets after the review of all transfer statements by the assessor. Verification of all sales is done primarily with a questionnaire that is mailed first to the seller. If additional information is needed, we may call whoever might be able to provide that information. All sales are reviewed with the property card out in the field to see if any major improvements or changes have occurred. A new photo is taken at that time. The office maintains sales books for residential, commercial, small tracts, and farms. All agricultural sales are maintained on a spreadsheet to allow for setting value according to market. The sales review process will continue to be a part of the assessment plan with sales being disallowed as non-qualified based on statutes.

CONCLUSION

The office will continue to do studies annually to determine if values are within range and determine what type of revaluations are needed. We hope to be able to complete the above-mentioned projects for better assessment and data control in the office. The end result should create better efficiency and improved assessment and appraisal practices. It is important that we follow these requirements set forth by law and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, to prove to the State and our taxpayers that the assessment in our county is being done well.

This process will be accomplished with the current amount of \$135,532.24 for our general budget and the requested \$125,500.00 for the appraisal budget in 2014-2015.

I attest this to be true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Joni L. Renshaw
Burt County Assessor

6/20/14

2015 Assessment Survey for Burt County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	Part-time for commercial
3.	Other full-time employees:
	3
4.	Other part-time employees:
	2
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$135,532.24
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$135,532.24
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$125,500.00
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$17,500.00
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,500.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$6,000.00

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS/County Solutions
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS/County Solutions
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor/staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes. http://burt.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor/ staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS/County Solutions

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?
	Decatur, Lyons, Oakland, Tekamah
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	No
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	N/A
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	None
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

2015 Certification for Burt County

This is to certify that the 2015 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 Burt County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

