

# 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 Franklin County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	79	Median	94.06
Total Sales Price	\$3,599,207	Mean	97.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,694,207	Wgt. Mean	91.73
Total Assessed Value	\$3,388,820	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$27,055
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$46,762	Avg. Assessed Value	\$42,896

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.68 to 95.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.57 to 95.89
95% Mean C.I	90.76 to 103.28
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	4.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.79
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.60

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	85	97	96.89
2013	102	97	96.93
2012	113	99	98.54
2011	120	99	99

## 2015 Commission Summary for Franklin County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	Median	92.95
Total Sales Price	\$529,415	Mean	91.31
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$529,415	Wgt. Mean	83.25
Total Assessed Value	\$440,735	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$53,726
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$33,088	Avg. Assessed Value	\$27,546

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	72.75 to 98.82
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	72.82 to 93.68
95% Mean C.I	79.10 to 103.52
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.88
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.47
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.29

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	20	0	78.93
2013	17		81.03
2012	18		93.96
2011	20		95



## 2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Franklin 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>94</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>75</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, 2015.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Franklin County**

A physical review of rural properties was conducted to assess damage from the summer storms.

Pickup work was completed in all towns and rural areas.

A sales study was completed for each valuation grouping; assessments were determined to be within an acceptable range.

## 2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Franklin 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="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>Franklin - largest community in the county, with the most amenities including a school, active main street, and health services. The amenities and job opportunities provide good demand for residential housing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Bloomington, Naponee, Riverton, Upland - very small communities with few amenities</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Campbell, Hildreth - small communities primarily influenced by proximity to Hastings</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Rural Res - all residential parcels not located within the boundaries of a village</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Franklin - largest community in the county, with the most amenities including a school, active main street, and health services. The amenities and job opportunities provide good demand for residential housing.	02	Bloomington, Naponee, Riverton, Upland - very small communities with few amenities	03	Campbell, Hildreth - small communities primarily influenced by proximity to Hastings	10	Rural Res - all residential parcels not located within the boundaries of a village															
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																												
01	Franklin - largest community in the county, with the most amenities including a school, active main street, and health services. The amenities and job opportunities provide good demand for residential housing.																												
02	Bloomington, Naponee, Riverton, Upland - very small communities with few amenities																												
03	Campbell, Hildreth - small communities primarily influenced by proximity to Hastings																												
10	Rural Res - all residential parcels not located within the boundaries of a village																												
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																												
	Cost approach is the approach primarily used																												
<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>																												
	Depreciation tables are developed using local market information																												
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																												
	Yes																												
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																												
	Sales comparison; lots are analyzed by the square foot																												
<b>7.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?</b>																												
	All lots are treated the same; no applications to combine lots have been received																												
<b>8.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th style="width: 25%;"><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1999</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1999</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2013</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1999</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2013</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2013-2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<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>	01	2012	2012	1999	2014	02	2012	2012	1999	2013	03	2012	2012	1999	2014	10	2012	2012	2013	2013-2014
<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>																									
01	2012	2012	1999	2014																									
02	2012	2012	1999	2013																									
03	2012	2012	1999	2014																									
10	2012	2012	2013	2013-2014																									

# **2015 Residential Correlation Section for Franklin County**

---

## **County Overview**

Franklin County is located in south central Nebraska, on the Kansas border. The county has seen a steady decline in population; estimated to be 3,085 by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2013. Franklin is the county seat and largest community. Six smaller communities, with populations ranging from 90 to 375, are also located in the county. The economy is largely agricultural-based, and residential market conditions vary depending on proximity to schools, retail services, and other amenities.

## **Description of Analysis**

Franklin County has identified four valuation groups intended to reflect unique market influences. The largest, Valuation Group 01 (Franklin), represents half of the qualified residential sales in the county. The remainder of the valuation groups is comprised of combinations of the smaller communities and rural residential parcels.

The statistical sampling of 79 qualified sales is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Franklin County. The measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and demonstrate support for each other. The qualitative statistics are slightly above the recommended range; when low dollar sales are removed from the sample the qualitative statistics improve.

## **Sales Qualification**

The county conducts sales verification through sales questionnaires, telephone and personal interviews with buyer and/or seller. The Department annually conducts a sales verification review for all counties. A review of the non-qualified sales roster demonstrated no apparent bias exists in the determination of qualified sales, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county. Approximately fifty-four percent of the improved residential sales were considered by the county to be qualified. It has been determined that the county utilized an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The Department conducts a yearly analysis of counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. This review was conducted in Franklin County in 2014. Based on that review, assessment practices are determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

## **Level of Value**

Based on the analysis of all available information, the level of value of residential property in Franklin County is determined to be 94%.



## **2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Franklin County**

A complete reappraisal of all commercial properties in the county was conducted, resulting in updated values for the 2015 assessment year.

## 2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Franklin County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																		
	Assessor and staff																		
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; 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>Franklin - largest community in the county, with the most amenities, including a school, active main street, and health services. Has the most market activity in the county.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Rest of the county - includes the communities of Bloomington, Campbell, Hildreth, Naponee, Riverton and Upland. There are few commercial properties in the rest of the county. Sales are sporadic in these areas and the market is not organized.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Franklin - largest community in the county, with the most amenities, including a school, active main street, and health services. Has the most market activity in the county.	02	Rest of the county - includes the communities of Bloomington, Campbell, Hildreth, Naponee, Riverton and Upland. There are few commercial properties in the rest of the county. Sales are sporadic in these areas and the market is not organized.									
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																		
01	Franklin - largest community in the county, with the most amenities, including a school, active main street, and health services. Has the most market activity in the county.																		
02	Rest of the county - includes the communities of Bloomington, Campbell, Hildreth, Naponee, Riverton and Upland. There are few commercial properties in the rest of the county. Sales are sporadic in these areas and the market is not organized.																		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>																		
	Cost approach and sales comparison approach are primarily used; income approach is considered when information is available and applicable																		
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>																		
	On staff appraiser uses cost and sales comparison approaches; state sales file query																		
<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>																		
	Depreciation tables are developed using local market information																		
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																		
	Yes																		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>																		
	Sales comparison; lots are analyzed by the square foot																		
<b>7.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1999</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1999</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<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>	01	2014	2012	1999	2014	02	2014	2012	1999	2014
<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>															
01	2014	2012	1999	2014															
02	2014	2012	1999	2014															

# 2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Franklin County

---

## County Overview

The economy in Franklin County is heavily dependent on agriculture; the industry provides the majority of jobs, with other jobs available locally in healthcare and education. The majority of commercial parcels in the county will be inside Franklin. The community is the county seat and is far enough from any larger community that the local population is able to support a variety of basic goods and services; however, there are few commercial sales each year and the market is not organized. In the rest of the county there are few commercial parcels in each town and no other active commercial districts.

## Description of Analysis

A complete reappraisal of all commercial parcels was completed for 2015. Based on the described local economics, two valuation groupings have been used within the commercial class to separate sales from Franklin and the rest of the county.

A distribution of occupancy codes in the commercial class was reviewed. There are 39 different occupancy codes within the class; 60% of the parcels are office buildings, retail stores, storage warehouses, light commercial utility, or service repair garages. Only nine occupancy codes are represented within the statistical profile; the sampling of 16 sales within the two valuation groups is not considered a reliable sample for the measurement of the commercial class of real property in Franklin County.

## Sales Qualification

The Department annually conducts a sales verification review for all counties. A review of the non-qualified sales roster demonstrated no apparent bias exists in the determination of qualified sales, and that all arm's length transactions were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department conducts a yearly analysis of counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. This review was conducted in Franklin County in 2014. Based on the review, assessment practices are determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

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

## Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of the commercial property in Franklin County is determined to be at the statutory level of 100%.



## **2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Franklin County**

Land use changes were updated using the CD from the FSA office and information received from the NRD.

All agland was reviewed and values were determined through a sales study.

## 2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Franklin 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="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;">01</td> <td>Area south of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch; some of the irrigated parcels in this area only receive water from the irrigation ditch. When water levels in Harlan County Reservoir are diminished, these parcels cannot be irrigated. In addition to the irrigation difficulties, the topography in Area 1 is generally rougher than Area 2, making farming less desirable. This area does contain good native grasses and is more desirable for grazing than Area 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Area north of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch; the irrigated land in this area is all well-irrigated and is only under restrictions imposed by the Lower Republican Natural Resource District.</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>	01	Area south of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch; some of the irrigated parcels in this area only receive water from the irrigation ditch. When water levels in Harlan County Reservoir are diminished, these parcels cannot be irrigated. In addition to the irrigation difficulties, the topography in Area 1 is generally rougher than Area 2, making farming less desirable. This area does contain good native grasses and is more desirable for grazing than Area 2.	2014	02	Area north of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch; the irrigated land in this area is all well-irrigated and is only under restrictions imposed by the Lower Republican Natural Resource District.	2014
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>								
01	Area south of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch; some of the irrigated parcels in this area only receive water from the irrigation ditch. When water levels in Harlan County Reservoir are diminished, these parcels cannot be irrigated. In addition to the irrigation difficulties, the topography in Area 1 is generally rougher than Area 2, making farming less desirable. This area does contain good native grasses and is more desirable for grazing than Area 2.	2014								
02	Area north of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch; the irrigated land in this area is all well-irrigated and is only under restrictions imposed by the Lower Republican Natural Resource District.	2014								
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>									
	The market areas are divided by the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch and were established based on water availability. The assessor stays informed of water issues in the region in analyzing the market areas. Ratio studies are also conducted annually to ensure the market areas are appropriate.									
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>									
	Sales are reviewed for recreation influence; however, no non-agricultural influences have been identified. The land along the Republican River is mainly comprised of farms that have been in families for over 100 years.									
<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>									
	Yes									
<b>6.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>									
	Non-agricultural influences are monitored through FSA records, GIS analysis, physical inspection, observation, and landowner reporting.									
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:</b>									
	No									

## Franklin County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Franklin	1	3,793	3,799	3,400	3,393	2,750	2,712	2,600	2,591	<b>3,430</b>
Harlan	3	n/a	3,661	2,985	2,570	2,340	n/a	2,340	2,340	<b>3,222</b>
Franklin	2	5,131	5,154	4,774	4,763	4,385	4,084	4,105	4,041	<b>4,876</b>
Adams	4000	6,800	6,700	6,500	6,300	6,100	5,900	5,700	5,500	<b>6,549</b>
Harlan	1	n/a	5,440	4,375	3,790	n/a	n/a	2,520	2,520	<b>4,958</b>
Harlan	2	5,085	4,786	3,962	3,445	2,858	2,617	2,520	2,520	<b>4,105</b>
Kearney	1	n/a	6,799	6,300	6,000	5,000	3,500	3,500	3,500	<b>6,029</b>
Phelps	1	4,896	6,099	5,100	4,697	4,500	4,300	4,200	3,800	<b>5,738</b>
Webster	1	5,255	5,255	5,255	5,120	5,100	5,100	5,065	5,065	<b>5,164</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Franklin	1	2,425	2,425	2,320	2,320	1,925	1,925	1,695	1,695	<b>2,088</b>
Harlan	3	0	2,046	1,720	1,665	n/a	n/a	1,420	1,420	<b>1,888</b>
Franklin	2	3,025	3,025	2,475	2,475	2,175	2,175	2,075	2,075	<b>2,730</b>
Adams	4000	3,500	3,300	3,100	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,700	2,700	<b>3,190</b>
Harlan	1	n/a	2,701	2,405	2,385	n/a	n/a	1,630	1,630	<b>2,516</b>
Harlan	2	2,060	2,034	1,711	1,670	1,440	1,411	1,420	1,420	<b>1,889</b>
Kearney	1	n/a	3,000	2,800	2,750	2,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	<b>2,637</b>
Phelps	1	3,000	3,000	2,900	2,700	2,600	2,500	2,300	2,000	<b>2,848</b>
Webster	1	3,030	3,030	2,760	2,590	2,590	2,590	2,515	2,515	<b>2,801</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Franklin	1	1,300	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	<b>1,207</b>
Harlan	3	n/a	1,002	1,024	1,000	n/a	n/a	1,001	1,001	<b>1,001</b>
Franklin	2	1,300	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	<b>1,209</b>
Adams	4000	1,450	1,450	1,400	1,350	1,300	1,275	1,275	1,275	<b>1,320</b>
Harlan	1	n/a	1,000	1,000	1,000	n/a	n/a	1,000	1,000	<b>1,000</b>
Harlan	2	n/a	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	<b>1,000</b>
Kearney	1	n/a	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	<b>1,300</b>
Phelps	1	1,026	1,340	1,313	1,303	1,144	1,286	1,045	1,011	<b>1,146</b>
Webster	1	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	<b>1,230</b>

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

# 2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Franklin County

---

## County Overview

Franklin County is in the Republican River Basin; the county is divided into two market areas which are partly defined by differences in water availability. The majority of area two in the northern part of the county is plains land, with good quality farmland. Moving south, the land transitions from plains to rolling plains and breaks; area one consists entirely of this type of land. Area one is primarily pasture land with good native grasses; the farmland consists of equal amounts of irrigation and dry land. Harlan and Webster counties are considered to be the most comparable to Franklin County. Phelps, Kearney, and Adams counties are characteristically similar to the plains found in northern Franklin County; however, these counties are not subject to the same water restrictions, and therefore only dry and grassland can be considered comparable.

## Description of Analysis

Analysis of the agricultural sales during the three-year study period within the county indicates the sample does not contain a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period. The way the sales are distributed over the study period may cause Franklin County to be compared to a different time standard than others as the oldest year of the study period is underrepresented compared to the second and third years. Sales were sought from comparable areas surrounding Franklin County with similar soils and physical characteristics. Area one has a limited area to draw sales from, resulting in a small and unreliable sample.

The assessment actions in area two and the dry and grass subclasses of area one resulted in values comparable to adjoining counties where the markets have been determined to be similar; however, historical changes in assessed values do not appear to have increased parallel to all other cropland in the county. The newly elected assessor believes the limited water supply in area one has an adverse impact on the market. While the Department believes the irrigated land in area one may be 10% low, there is insufficient data to provide a point estimate. Given the assessor's concerns, both the Department and the assessor will be monitoring the market in the future.

## Sales Qualification

The Department annually conducts a sales verification review for all counties. A review of the non-qualified sales roster demonstrates no apparent bias exists in the determination of qualified sales and that all arm's length transactions were made available for the measurement of real property in the county. Measurement was done utilizing all available information; there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The values established by the assessor have generally created equalization within the county and with surrounding counties. The quality of assessment of agricultural land has been determined to be in compliance with professional mass appraisal standards.

## **2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Franklin County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural property in Franklin County is 75%.



**31 Franklin  
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 : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 3,599,207  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,694,207  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,388,820  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 46,762  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 42,896

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 92  
 MEAN : 97  
 COD : 15.63  
 PRD : 105.77

COV : 29.27  
 STD : 28.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.70  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 279.79  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 57.33

95% Median C.I. : 92.68 to 95.75  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.57 to 95.89  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.76 to 103.28

Printed: 4/1/2015 3:50:25PM

<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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	15	96.11	109.68	97.79	19.76	112.16	70.07	279.79	94.00 to 103.12	45,577	44,569
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	16	94.01	101.85	95.58	12.12	106.56	81.64	179.75	92.68 to 103.13	55,556	53,102
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	11	93.89	95.81	95.71	03.48	100.10	91.60	103.93	91.79 to 99.92	40,364	38,631
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	6	95.69	92.67	89.41	07.13	103.65	67.78	103.62	67.78 to 103.62	42,250	37,776
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	8	76.22	94.04	77.39	33.04	121.51	61.87	154.23	61.87 to 154.23	53,113	41,102
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	8	76.67	84.32	86.24	16.89	97.77	67.10	111.96	67.10 to 111.96	39,563	34,119
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	9	95.10	93.65	94.07	14.14	99.55	64.67	111.76	81.18 to 110.32	48,473	45,597
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	6	83.56	85.01	83.94	16.49	101.27	57.33	120.19	57.33 to 120.19	41,083	34,486
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	48	95.16	101.77	95.58	12.03	106.48	67.78	279.79	93.89 to 97.86	47,293	45,203
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	31	82.44	89.67	85.60	21.35	104.75	57.33	154.23	75.42 to 102.12	45,940	39,325
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	41	94.06	97.36	90.99	12.90	107.00	61.87	179.75	92.68 to 99.07	49,056	44,635
<u>ALL</u>	79	94.06	97.02	91.73	15.63	105.77	57.33	279.79	92.68 to 95.75	46,762	42,896

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	40	95.26	94.02	88.46	12.90	106.29	61.87	130.33	91.79 to 102.12	45,528	40,275
02	15	92.68	97.09	88.76	17.04	109.38	67.10	179.75	81.64 to 97.84	28,133	24,970
03	20	94.54	103.30	97.52	21.85	105.93	57.33	279.79	89.59 to 97.86	49,555	48,325
10	4	95.88	95.33	94.95	03.40	100.40	90.43	99.12	N/A	115,000	109,190
<u>ALL</u>	79	94.06	97.02	91.73	15.63	105.77	57.33	279.79	92.68 to 95.75	46,762	42,896

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	79	94.06	97.02	91.73	15.63	105.77	57.33	279.79	92.68 to 95.75	46,762	42,896
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	79	94.06	97.02	91.73	15.63	105.77	57.33	279.79	92.68 to 95.75	46,762	42,896

**31 Franklin  
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 : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 3,599,207  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,694,207  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,388,820  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 46,762  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 42,896

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 92  
 MEAN : 97  
 COD : 15.63  
 PRD : 105.77

COV : 29.27  
 STD : 28.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.70  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 279.79  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 57.33

95% Median C.I. : 92.68 to 95.75  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.57 to 95.89  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.76 to 103.28

Printed:4/1/2015 3:50:25PM

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	4	101.53	118.73	100.49	22.37	118.15	92.11	179.75	N/A	25,751	25,876	
Less Than 15,000	15	102.12	120.03	109.11	24.95	110.01	89.83	279.79	93.15 to 128.25	14,394	15,705	
Less Than 30,000	29	96.11	107.44	100.94	18.28	106.44	67.10	279.79	93.15 to 103.12	17,980	18,148	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	75	94.00	95.86	91.48	15.02	104.79	57.33	279.79	92.51 to 95.62	47,883	43,804	
Greater Than 14,999	64	93.86	91.63	90.65	12.56	101.08	57.33	154.23	90.43 to 95.42	54,348	49,269	
Greater Than 29,999	50	93.20	90.98	90.22	13.73	100.84	57.33	154.23	85.06 to 95.10	63,456	57,251	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	4	101.53	118.73	100.49	22.37	118.15	92.11	179.75	N/A	25,751	25,876	
5,000 TO 14,999	11	102.12	120.50	116.97	25.93	103.02	89.83	279.79	92.92 to 142.56	10,264	12,006	
15,000 TO 29,999	14	95.07	93.95	95.16	08.38	98.73	67.10	111.96	86.35 to 102.64	21,821	20,765	
30,000 TO 59,999	27	93.95	94.22	94.78	15.98	99.41	57.33	154.23	77.92 to 103.93	38,833	36,806	
60,000 TO 99,999	17	85.14	85.47	86.13	10.42	99.23	64.55	102.93	77.43 to 94.90	78,153	67,315	
100,000 TO 149,999	5	93.71	90.78	88.92	11.87	102.09	61.87	111.76	N/A	122,140	108,611	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	98.04	98.04	98.04	00.00	100.00	98.04	98.04	N/A	185,000	181,370	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	79	94.06	97.02	91.73	15.63	105.77	57.33	279.79	92.68 to 95.75	46,762	42,896	

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 16  
Total Sales Price : 529,415  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 529,415  
Total Assessed Value : 440,735  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 33,088  
Avg. Assessed Value : 27,546

MEDIAN : 93  
WGT. MEAN : 83  
MEAN : 91  
COD : 15.15  
PRD : 109.68

COV : 25.10  
STD : 22.92  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.08  
MAX Sales Ratio : 160.45  
MIN Sales Ratio : 61.10

95% Median C.I. : 72.75 to 98.82  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.82 to 93.68  
95% Mean C.I. : 79.10 to 103.52

Printed:4/1/2015 3:50:26PM

**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-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	96.67	96.67	96.67	00.00	100.00	96.67	96.67	N/A	30,000	29,000
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	72.75	72.75	72.75	00.00	100.00	72.75	72.75	N/A	30,000	21,825
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	74.58	74.58	74.58	00.00	100.00	74.58	74.58	N/A	115,000	85,770
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	84.33	84.33	86.88	17.19	97.06	69.83	98.82	N/A	42,500	36,925
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	90.50	90.50	90.50	00.00	100.00	90.50	90.50	N/A	3,000	2,715
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	78.64	78.64	68.19	18.59	115.32	64.02	93.25	N/A	35,000	23,868
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	5	102.15	110.30	99.70	14.85	110.63	92.64	160.45	N/A	29,183	29,096
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	1	92.43	92.43	92.43	00.00	100.00	92.43	92.43	N/A	3,500	3,235
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	78.30	78.30	66.22	21.97	118.24	61.10	95.50	N/A	23,500	15,563
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	3	74.58	81.33	78.05	10.69	104.20	72.75	96.67	N/A	58,333	45,532
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	5	90.50	83.28	78.67	12.86	105.86	64.02	98.82	N/A	31,600	24,860
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	8	94.82	100.07	91.56	15.81	109.29	61.10	160.45	61.10 to 160.45	24,552	22,480
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	4	73.67	79.00	78.89	10.47	100.14	69.83	98.82	N/A	57,500	45,361
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	8	93.69	99.91	89.50	15.81	111.63	64.02	160.45	64.02 to 160.45	27,364	24,491
<u>ALL</u>	16	92.95	91.31	83.25	15.15	109.68	61.10	160.45	72.75 to 98.82	33,088	27,546

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	8	97.75	105.03	98.86	11.11	106.24	92.64	160.45	92.64 to 160.45	29,489	29,152
02	8	73.67	77.59	70.71	14.47	109.73	61.10	95.50	61.10 to 95.50	36,688	25,940
<u>ALL</u>	16	92.95	91.31	83.25	15.15	109.68	61.10	160.45	72.75 to 98.82	33,088	27,546

**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	16	92.95	91.31	83.25	15.15	109.68	61.10	160.45	72.75 to 98.82	33,088	27,546
04											
<u>ALL</u>	16	92.95	91.31	83.25	15.15	109.68	61.10	160.45	72.75 to 98.82	33,088	27,546

**31 Franklin  
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 : 16  
 Total Sales Price : 529,415  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 529,415  
 Total Assessed Value : 440,735  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 33,088  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 27,546

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 83  
 MEAN : 91  
 COD : 15.15  
 PRD : 109.68

COV : 25.10  
 STD : 22.92  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.08  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 160.45  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 61.10

95% Median C.I. : 72.75 to 98.82  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.82 to 93.68  
 95% Mean C.I. : 79.10 to 103.52

Printed:4/1/2015 3:50:26PM

<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	
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>												
Less Than 5,000	2	91.47	91.47	91.54	01.06	99.92	90.50	92.43	N/A	3,250	2,975	
Less Than 15,000	8	94.38	103.63	107.31	12.11	96.57	90.50	160.45	90.50 to 160.45	7,563	8,115	
Less Than 30,000	8	94.38	103.63	107.31	12.11	96.57	90.50	160.45	90.50 to 160.45	7,563	8,115	
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>												
Greater Than 4,999	14	93.69	91.29	83.15	16.91	109.79	61.10	160.45	69.83 to 102.15	37,351	31,056	
Greater Than 14,999	8	73.67	78.99	80.15	16.37	98.55	61.10	98.82	61.10 to 98.82	58,614	46,977	
Greater Than 29,999	8	73.67	78.99	80.15	16.37	98.55	61.10	98.82	61.10 to 98.82	58,614	46,977	
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>												
0 TO 4,999	2	91.47	91.47	91.54	01.06	99.92	90.50	92.43	N/A	3,250	2,975	
5,000 TO 14,999	6	98.83	107.69	109.20	14.05	98.62	92.64	160.45	92.64 to 160.45	9,000	9,828	
15,000 TO 29,999												
30,000 TO 59,999	5	72.75	79.83	80.60	17.75	99.04	61.10	98.82	N/A	37,000	29,823	
60,000 TO 99,999	1	64.02	64.02	64.02	00.00	100.00	64.02	64.02	N/A	60,000	38,410	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	84.36	84.36	84.09	11.59	100.32	74.58	94.13	N/A	111,958	94,145	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<b>ALL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>92.95</b>	<b>91.31</b>	<b>83.25</b>	<b>15.15</b>	<b>109.68</b>	<b>61.10</b>	<b>160.45</b>	<b>72.75 to 98.82</b>	<b>33,088</b>	<b>27,546</b>	

<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	
326	1	96.67	96.67	96.67	00.00	100.00	96.67	96.67	N/A	30,000	29,000	
344	3	102.15	121.58	121.58	19.02	100.00	102.15	160.45	N/A	10,000	12,158	
353	2	92.84	92.84	93.04	00.44	99.79	92.43	93.25	N/A	6,750	6,280	
406	4	81.24	79.77	69.72	17.60	114.41	61.10	95.50	N/A	22,250	15,513	
442	2	68.39	68.39	66.93	06.39	102.18	64.02	72.75	N/A	45,000	30,118	
470	1	74.58	74.58	74.58	00.00	100.00	74.58	74.58	N/A	115,000	85,770	
471	1	98.82	98.82	98.82	00.00	100.00	98.82	98.82	N/A	50,000	49,410	
494	1	94.13	94.13	94.13	00.00	100.00	94.13	94.13	N/A	108,915	102,520	
526	1	90.50	90.50	90.50	00.00	100.00	90.50	90.50	N/A	3,000	2,715	
<b>ALL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>92.95</b>	<b>91.31</b>	<b>83.25</b>	<b>15.15</b>	<b>109.68</b>	<b>61.10</b>	<b>160.45</b>	<b>72.75 to 98.82</b>	<b>33,088</b>	<b>27,546</b>	

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 66  
Total Sales Price : 36,527,993  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 36,527,993  
Total Assessed Value : 27,951,020  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 553,454  
Avg. Assessed Value : 423,500

MEDIAN : 75  
WGT. MEAN : 77  
MEAN : 82  
COD : 27.49  
PRD : 107.49

COV : 33.12  
STD : 27.24  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.62  
MAX Sales Ratio : 176.77  
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.75

95% Median C.I. : 69.77 to 84.90  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.55 to 82.49  
95% Mean C.I. : 75.68 to 88.82

Printed: 4/1/2015 3:50:27PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	9	100.78	101.76	100.82	22.31	100.93	62.63	139.85	71.09 to 132.50	386,400	389,570
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	93.45	102.70	90.11	31.09	113.97	67.86	176.77	69.99 to 150.94	388,747	350,305
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	103.92	103.92	103.92	00.00	100.00	103.92	103.92	N/A	224,000	232,775
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	85.51	85.51	85.51	00.00	100.00	85.51	85.51	N/A	500,000	427,536
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	13	81.62	82.71	76.79	18.93	107.71	56.22	121.82	64.55 to 98.19	559,219	429,436
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	6	65.19	62.77	62.50	14.59	100.43	49.04	74.89	49.04 to 74.89	628,160	392,627
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2	80.25	80.25	84.02	25.06	95.51	60.14	100.36	N/A	332,400	279,297
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	79.06	79.06	78.29	03.38	100.98	76.39	81.72	N/A	806,000	631,043
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	59.75	60.39	57.23	10.98	105.52	51.52	70.53	N/A	1,049,575	600,689
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	11	59.75	67.64	64.04	22.66	105.62	45.88	110.43	52.63 to 96.27	636,220	407,453
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	5	78.94	75.07	88.15	24.92	85.16	40.75	104.85	N/A	469,000	413,429
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	86.73	89.22	97.49	23.51	91.52	59.88	121.05	N/A	656,782	640,280
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	20	98.81	101.48	95.05	24.77	106.76	62.63	176.77	74.04 to 110.23	385,016	365,960
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	23	74.89	76.97	73.29	19.75	105.02	49.04	121.82	64.55 to 83.89	578,939	424,309
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	23	60.09	70.81	70.09	27.54	101.03	40.75	121.05	57.35 to 78.94	674,438	472,727
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	24	84.40	91.21	81.75	24.48	111.57	56.22	176.77	69.99 to 103.92	478,857	391,489
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	14	66.56	66.91	64.22	16.63	104.19	49.04	100.36	51.52 to 76.39	731,719	469,943
<u>ALL</u>	66	75.00	82.25	76.52	27.49	107.49	40.75	176.77	69.77 to 84.90	553,454	423,500

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
1	18	76.92	81.97	75.49	30.45	108.58	40.75	132.50	57.77 to 103.92	268,806	202,931
2	48	74.94	82.36	76.68	26.13	107.41	49.04	176.77	67.86 to 84.90	660,198	506,214
<u>ALL</u>	66	75.00	82.25	76.52	27.49	107.49	40.75	176.77	69.77 to 84.90	553,454	423,500

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 66  
 Total Sales Price : 36,527,993  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 36,527,993  
 Total Assessed Value : 27,951,020  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 553,454  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 423,500

MEDIAN : 75  
 WGT. MEAN : 77  
 MEAN : 82  
 COD : 27.49  
 PRD : 107.49

COV : 33.12  
 STD : 27.24  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.62  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 176.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.75

95% Median C.I. : 69.77 to 84.90  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.55 to 82.49  
 95% Mean C.I. : 75.68 to 88.82

Printed:4/1/2015 3:50:27PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	8	71.29	77.19	69.45	17.53	111.14	51.52	130.64	51.52 to 130.64	802,755	557,548
1	1	78.94	78.94	78.94	00.00	100.00	78.94	78.94	N/A	80,000	63,150
2	7	69.77	76.94	69.33	18.60	110.98	51.52	130.64	51.52 to 130.64	906,005	628,177
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	14	72.38	82.24	72.17	33.66	113.95	49.04	176.77	56.22 to 98.19	525,688	379,391
2	14	72.38	82.24	72.17	33.66	113.95	49.04	176.77	56.22 to 98.19	525,688	379,391
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	13	74.04	81.50	71.93	30.39	113.30	45.88	132.50	57.77 to 110.23	306,640	220,579
1	10	82.27	84.15	74.55	33.45	112.88	45.88	132.50	50.13 to 121.82	244,480	182,250
2	3	74.04	72.66	67.79	07.77	107.18	63.35	80.60	N/A	513,841	348,343
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<b>82.25</b>	<b>76.52</b>	<b>27.49</b>	<b>107.49</b>	<b>40.75</b>	<b>176.77</b>	<b>69.77 to 84.90</b>	<b>553,454</b>	<b>423,500</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	14	71.29	77.35	68.74	22.60	112.53	51.52	130.64	56.14 to 105.67	836,176	574,751
1	1	78.94	78.94	78.94	00.00	100.00	78.94	78.94	N/A	80,000	63,150
2	13	69.77	77.23	68.67	23.86	112.47	51.52	130.64	56.14 to 105.67	894,343	614,105
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	17	64.55	78.75	70.81	32.64	111.21	49.04	176.77	57.35 to 85.51	504,896	357,526
2	17	64.55	78.75	70.81	32.64	111.21	49.04	176.77	57.35 to 85.51	504,896	357,526
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	19	74.89	80.38	76.55	22.90	105.00	45.88	132.50	63.35 to 93.45	420,080	321,565
1	12	72.99	82.24	74.23	31.92	110.79	45.88	132.50	57.77 to 110.23	260,067	193,045
2	7	75.80	77.18	78.04	08.54	98.90	63.35	92.55	63.35 to 92.55	694,389	541,884
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<b>82.25</b>	<b>76.52</b>	<b>27.49</b>	<b>107.49</b>	<b>40.75</b>	<b>176.77</b>	<b>69.77 to 84.90</b>	<b>553,454</b>	<b>423,500</b>



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 4,811</b>	<b>Value : 1,025,396,392</b>	<b>Growth 4,551,715</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	416	450,970	0	0	0	0	416	450,970	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,217	2,538,835	0	0	0	0	1,217	2,538,835	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,225	40,631,072	0	0	7	762,905	1,232	41,393,977	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,641	43,620,877	0	0	7	762,905	1,648	44,383,782	148,280
<b>% of Res Total</b>	99.58	98.28	0.00	0.00	0.42	1.72	34.25	4.33	3.26
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	103	158,275	0	0	15	24,875	118	183,150	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	204	533,420	0	0	13	68,100	217	601,520	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	215	12,691,190	3	1,468,580	14	4,060,480	232	18,220,250	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	318	13,382,885	3	1,468,580	29	4,153,455	350	19,004,920	304,735
<b>% of Com Total</b>	90.86	70.42	0.86	7.73	8.29	21.85	7.27	1.85	6.69
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	3	10,630	0	0	0	0	3	10,630	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	5	23,405	0	0	0	0	5	23,405	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	5	194,970	0	0	0	0	5	194,970	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	8	229,005	0	0	0	0	8	229,005	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	140,910	1	140,910	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	1	89,510	1	89,510	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	230,420	1	230,420	44,670
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.02	0.98
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,641	43,620,877	0	0	8	993,325	1,649	44,614,202	192,950
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	99.51	97.77	0.00	0.00	0.49	2.23	34.28	4.35	4.24
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	326	13,611,890	3	1,468,580	29	4,153,455	358	19,233,925	304,735
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	91.06	70.77	0.84	7.64	8.10	21.59	7.44	1.88	6.69
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,967	57,232,767	3	1,468,580	37	5,146,780	2,007	63,848,127	497,685
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	98.01	89.64	0.15	2.30	1.84	8.06	41.72	6.23	10.93

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	2	1,378,200	2	1,378,200	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	2	1,378,200	2	1,378,200	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	261	0	304	565

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	76	1,170,690	0	0	1,990	681,842,260	2,066	683,012,950
28. Ag-Improved Land	15	230,755	0	0	679	220,119,625	694	220,350,380
29. Ag Improvements	10	409,860	0	0	726	56,396,875	736	56,806,735
30. Ag Total							2,802	960,170,065

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	1.69	8,000	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	10	5.00	28,005	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	7	0.00	285,445	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	0.36	180	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	3	12.79	12,290	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	9	0.00	124,415	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	3	9.64	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	182	176.51	640,100	185	178.20	648,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	462	458.26	4,638,600	472	463.26	4,666,605	
33. HomeSite Improvements	467	0.00	34,275,435	474	0.00	34,560,880	280,620
34. HomeSite Total				<b>659</b>	<b>641.46</b>	<b>39,875,585</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	100	336.74	232,160	101	337.10	232,340	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	514	2,091.02	1,289,355	517	2,103.81	1,301,645	
37. FarmSite Improvements	652	0.00	22,121,440	661	0.00	22,245,855	3,773,410
38. FarmSite Total				<b>762</b>	<b>2,440.91</b>	<b>23,779,840</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,092	5,941.41	0	2,095	5,951.05	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	1	0.64	2,500	1	0.64	2,500	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,421</b>	<b>9,034.06</b>	<b>63,657,925</b>	<b>4,054,030</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	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	2,927.81	16.42%	11,103,810	18.16%	3,792.53
46. 1A	4,733.26	26.55%	17,979,860	29.40%	3,798.62
47. 2A1	3,884.39	21.79%	13,205,265	21.60%	3,399.57
48. 2A	2,899.23	16.26%	9,838,420	16.09%	3,393.46
49. 3A1	596.65	3.35%	1,640,810	2.68%	2,750.04
50. 3A	1,258.58	7.06%	3,413,245	5.58%	2,711.98
51. 4A1	680.54	3.82%	1,769,425	2.89%	2,600.03
52. 4A	847.94	4.76%	2,197,015	3.59%	2,591.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>17,828.40</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>61,147,850</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,429.80</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	707.29	3.83%	1,715,180	4.45%	2,425.00
55. 1D	7,085.12	38.36%	17,181,460	44.55%	2,425.01
56. 2D1	1,124.39	6.09%	2,608,575	6.76%	2,319.99
57. 2D	1,111.18	6.02%	2,577,995	6.68%	2,320.05
58. 3D1	194.20	1.05%	373,835	0.97%	1,925.00
59. 3D	565.10	3.06%	1,087,805	2.82%	1,924.98
60. 4D1	4,479.54	24.25%	7,592,830	19.69%	1,695.00
61. 4D	3,203.50	17.34%	5,430,095	14.08%	1,695.05
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>18,470.32</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>38,567,775</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,088.09</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	283.67	0.38%	368,775	0.41%	1,300.01
64. 1G	4,658.59	6.22%	6,056,100	6.70%	1,299.99
65. 2G1	953.99	1.27%	1,144,775	1.27%	1,199.99
66. 2G	2,636.30	3.52%	3,163,645	3.50%	1,200.03
67. 3G1	3.97	0.01%	4,765	0.01%	1,200.25
68. 3G	4,357.59	5.82%	5,229,105	5.78%	1,200.00
69. 4G1	17,711.50	23.64%	21,253,755	23.51%	1,200.00
70. 4G	44,316.02	59.15%	53,180,290	58.83%	1,200.02
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>74,921.63</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>90,401,210</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,206.61</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>17,828.40</b>	<b>15.60%</b>	<b>61,147,850</b>	<b>32.08%</b>	<b>3,429.80</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>18,470.32</b>	<b>16.16%</b>	<b>38,567,775</b>	<b>20.24%</b>	<b>2,088.09</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>74,921.63</b>	<b>65.54%</b>	<b>90,401,210</b>	<b>47.43%</b>	<b>1,206.61</b>
72. Waste	3,091.22	2.70%	464,300	0.24%	150.20
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1.86	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>114,311.57</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>190,581,135</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,667.21</b>

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	882.18	0.93%	4,526,180	0.98%	5,130.68
46. 1A	65,138.45	68.53%	335,732,150	72.45%	5,154.13
47. 2A1	2,379.63	2.50%	11,359,250	2.45%	4,773.54
48. 2A	4,525.84	4.76%	21,557,515	4.65%	4,763.21
49. 3A1	1,027.63	1.08%	4,505,745	0.97%	4,384.60
50. 3A	480.01	0.51%	1,960,505	0.42%	4,084.30
51. 4A1	7,322.25	7.70%	30,055,635	6.49%	4,104.70
52. 4A	13,289.28	13.98%	53,701,565	11.59%	4,040.97
53. Total	95,045.27	100.00%	463,398,545	100.00%	4,875.56
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	159.21	0.33%	481,610	0.36%	3,025.00
55. 1D	31,248.65	64.63%	94,527,510	71.63%	3,025.01
56. 2D1	1,297.56	2.68%	3,211,435	2.43%	2,474.98
57. 2D	3,006.09	6.22%	7,440,135	5.64%	2,475.02
58. 3D1	568.07	1.17%	1,235,550	0.94%	2,175.00
59. 3D	358.19	0.74%	779,055	0.59%	2,174.98
60. 4D1	5,393.28	11.16%	11,191,145	8.48%	2,075.02
61. 4D	6,315.87	13.06%	13,105,490	9.93%	2,075.01
62. Total	48,346.92	100.00%	131,971,930	100.00%	2,729.69
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	18.77	0.02%	24,405	0.02%	1,300.21
64. 1G	7,775.74	8.52%	10,108,480	9.16%	1,300.00
65. 2G1	1,489.74	1.63%	1,787,685	1.62%	1,200.00
66. 2G	2,155.16	2.36%	2,586,195	2.34%	1,200.00
67. 3G1	712.41	0.78%	854,890	0.78%	1,200.00
68. 3G	5,118.58	5.61%	6,142,320	5.57%	1,200.00
69. 4G1	14,547.08	15.94%	17,456,580	15.83%	1,200.01
70. 4G	59,451.85	65.14%	71,343,265	64.68%	1,200.02
71. Total	91,269.33	100.00%	110,303,820	100.00%	1,208.55
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	95,045.27	40.21%	463,398,545	65.64%	4,875.56
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	48,346.92	20.45%	131,971,930	18.69%	2,729.69
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	91,269.33	38.61%	110,303,820	15.63%	1,208.55
72. Waste	1,711.13	0.72%	256,710	0.04%	150.02
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	236,372.65	100.00%	705,931,005	100.00%	2,986.52

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	171.62	786,095	0.00	0	112,702.05	523,760,300	112,873.67	524,546,395
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	168.50	412,710	0.00	0	66,648.74	170,126,995	66,817.24	170,539,705
<b>78. Grass</b>	123.99	152,540	0.00	0	166,066.97	200,552,490	166,190.96	200,705,030
<b>79. Waste</b>	10.82	1,625	0.00	0	4,791.53	719,385	4,802.35	721,010
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1.86	0	1.86	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>474.93</b>	<b>1,352,970</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>350,209.29</b>	<b>895,159,170</b>	<b>350,684.22</b>	<b>896,512,140</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	112,873.67	32.19%	524,546,395	58.51%	4,647.20
<b>Dry Land</b>	66,817.24	19.05%	170,539,705	19.02%	2,552.33
<b>Grass</b>	166,190.96	47.39%	200,705,030	22.39%	1,207.68
<b>Waste</b>	4,802.35	1.37%	721,010	0.08%	150.14
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	1.86	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>350,684.22</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>896,512,140</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,556.47</b>

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

### 31 Franklin

	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	43,798,285	44,383,782	585,497	1.34%	148,280	1.00%
02. Recreational	170,005	230,420	60,415	35.54%	44,670	9.26%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	39,654,930	39,875,585	220,655	0.56%	280,620	-0.15%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>83,623,220</b>	<b>84,489,787</b>	<b>866,567</b>	<b>1.04%</b>	<b>473,570</b>	<b>0.47%</b>
05. Commercial	17,439,500	19,004,920	1,565,420	8.98%	304,735	7.23%
06. Industrial	163,600	229,005	65,405	39.98%	0	39.98%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	20,286,380	23,779,840	3,493,460	17.22%	3,773,410	-1.38%
08. Minerals	1,392,454	1,378,200	-14,254	-1.02	0	-1.02
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>39,281,934</b>	<b>44,391,965</b>	<b>5,110,031</b>	<b>13.01%</b>	<b>4,078,145</b>	<b>2.63%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>122,905,154</b>	<b>128,884,252</b>	<b>5,979,098</b>	<b>4.86%</b>	<b>4,551,715</b>	<b>1.16%</b>
11. Irrigated	434,065,875	524,546,395	90,480,520	20.84%		
12. Dryland	138,288,495	170,539,705	32,251,210	23.32%		
13. Grassland	159,906,905	200,705,030	40,798,125	25.51%		
14. Wasteland	721,685	721,010	-675	-0.09%		
15. Other Agland	2,500	0	-2,500	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>732,985,460</b>	<b>896,512,140</b>	<b>163,526,680</b>	<b>22.31%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>855,890,614</b>	<b>1,025,396,392</b>	<b>169,505,778</b>	<b>19.80%</b>	<b>4,551,715</b>	<b>19.27%</b>

**2014 Plan of Assessment for Franklin County  
Assessment Years 2015, 2016, and 2017  
Date: June 15, 2014**

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (Herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the level of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

**Real Property Assessment Requirements:**

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows: Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R.S. Supp 2007)

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

General Description of Real Property in Franklin County:

Per the 2014 County Abstract, Franklin County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	1,646	34%	8%
Commercial	350	7%	3%
Industrial	8	0.5%	.05
Recreational	1	0.5%	.05
Agricultural	2,794	58%	88%
Special Value			

Agricultural land -taxable acres 350,678

Other pertinent facts: 91% of Franklin County is agricultural and of that 32% Irrigated, 19% Dry, 48% Pasture, 1% Waste, 6% Residential, 3% Commercial, Industrial, and Recreational, 1 % Exempt.

New Property: For assessment year 2014, an estimated 95 building permits and / or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2014 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

- A. Staffing consists of a Deputy and a Clerk. The Assessor and Deputy, and Clerk take the training that is necessary to keep their certificates current. The budget for 2013-2014 was \$103,918.
- B. A new set of cadastral maps were printed in 2008. Ownership and splits are kept current. In 2000 we purchased a GIS program for the all property in the county.
- C. The property record cards are color coded for Agricultural, Residential, Commercial, Improvements on Leased Land and Exempt. The cards that have Residential, Commercial, Industrial, or Agricultural improvements have a CAMA pricing sheet, current photo, and a sketch of the house or business. All rural cards have a print-out showing the number of acres, land use and current value per acre, improvement values and the prior year value; they also have an outbuilding printout that shows the building dimensions, depreciation and value.
- D. The software for pricing the improvements is MIPS. The Assessment Administration programming is from MIPS. GIS Workshop provides the programming and support for our GIS system.
- E. We have a Web site for property record information access. The address is [nebraskataxesonline.us](http://nebraskataxesonline.us) or [nebraskaassessorsonline.us](http://nebraskaassessorsonline.us), or <http://franklin.gisworkshop.com/#>

**Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

- A. The real estate transfers are photo copied as they are brought in from the Clerk's office to make a sales book that is available to the public. From the information on the real estate transfer statements the name on the real estate card, and the counter book are all changed and a sheet for the sales book is made. Building permits are received from the zoning manager and from the towns that have building permit ordinances. All sales are reviewed.
- B. Drive by reviews of the residential properties in town will be done on an annual basis. New photos will be taken every two years, or as the property is altered.
- C. Assessment sales ratio studies are done annually with new sales added, and old sales deleted.
- D. The market approach and the cost approach are used mainly for our residential properties; all three approaches are used on the commercial. Our information to determine value is arrayed by age, quality, size, location, condition and the amenities to the property. Land valuation studies are done by land usage. Sales are plotted by township and usage to determine market areas
- E. Reconciliation of final value and documentation is done by doing a ratio study using the sales in the sales file.
- F. Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Franklin County is in compliance to state statutes.
- G. Notices of valuation are mailed to every real estate owner each year. These notices show the number of acres of irrigated, dry, pasture and waste on the ag land notices.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2014:**

Property Class	Median	COD*	PRD*
Residential	97.00%	14.13%	108.14%
Commercial	NEI	37.69%	124.84%
Agricultural Land	73.00%	30.72%	116.23%
Special Value Agland			

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2014 Reports & Opinions.

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

- 1 Residential properties will be reviewed and any new information discovered will be added or deleted from the property. New pictures will be taken when the property is updated.
- 2 Commercial properties will be reviewed and repriced. New pictures will be taken.
- 3 Ag Land use will be checked using the information available from the FSA and NRD offices.
- 4 An inventory and pictures will be taken of all of the exempt property.

Assessment Action Planned for the Assessment Year 2016:

Residential properties will be reviewed and any new information discovered will be added to or deleted from the property. New pictures will be taken as the property is changed.

Commercial properties will be reviewed and updated as necessary.

Ag Land use will be checked using the information available from the FSA and NRD offices.

.Assessment Action Planned for the Assessment Year 2017

: Residential properties will be reviewed and any new information discovered will be added to or deleted from the property.

Commercial properties will be reviewed and updated as necessary.

Ag Land use will be checked using the information available from the FSA and NRD offices. Agricultural improvements will be checked.

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, and Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to P A&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update w/abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Land & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - J. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 825 schedules; prepare subsequent notices of incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied as required. Postcard notices are mailed to all persons or businesses filing schedules in the previous year. We added the personal property schedules to the new program from MIPS for 2013 which will allow electronic filing of personal property schedules. We had a 30% participation.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board. **Applications are mailed to those that have an application on file.**
5. Taxable Government Owned Property -annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer 250 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance. **Pre printed forms are mailed to the previous year's applicants.**
7. Centrally Assessed -review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service

entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates -management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

9. Tax lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed

10. Tax List Corrections -prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

11. County Board of Equalization -attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests -assemble and provide information. View all properties protested.

12. TERC Appeals -prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation

13. TERC Statewide Equalization -attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

14. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education -attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

**Conclusion**

A request for \$111,677.48 for the Assessor's office and \$71,805.00 for the Appraisal Fund was submitted to the Franklin County Board of Supervisors for Approval for the 2014-2015 budget year.

The Franklin County Assessor's office will work to maintain an efficient and professional office.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2015 Assessment Survey for Franklin County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	1 (part-time)
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	-
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	-
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$111,679
7.	
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	-
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$71,805
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	Budgeted through the county general fund
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,500
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	-
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$3,510

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS PC v2
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS PC v2
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 franklin.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor and staff and vendor
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS PC v2

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Franklin and Hildreth
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	-
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop, Inc.
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	-

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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



# 2015 Certification for Franklin 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 Franklin County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



