

# 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 Furnas County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	167	Median	93.00
Total Sales Price	\$9,088,111	Mean	99.21
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,169,111	Wgt. Mean	88.03
Total Assessed Value	\$8,071,160	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$38,350
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$54,905	Avg. Assessed Value	\$48,330

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.89 to 96.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	83.93 to 92.12
95% Mean C.I	93.04 to 105.38
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	10.22
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.46
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.14

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	143	95	95.16
2013	160	97	96.68
2012	156	94	93.99
2011	141	94	94

## 2015 Commission Summary for Furnas County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	30	Median	96.58
Total Sales Price	\$2,080,242	Mean	101.26
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,080,242	Wgt. Mean	71.26
Total Assessed Value	\$1,482,350	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$60,844
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$69,341	Avg. Assessed Value	\$49,412

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	78.30 to 115.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	43.10 to 99.41
95% Mean C.I	84.09 to 118.43
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.72
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.91
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.61

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	24	100	88.87
2013	22		89.84
2012	14		101.24
2011	16		74



## 2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Furnas 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>93</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 Furnas County**

Residential assessment actions include the 6 year physical inspection of three precincts 2-25, 2-24, and 2-23 and the corresponding villages of Wilsonville and Hendley. The assessor and deputy assessor have been working to correct quality and condition ratings as they review property to ensure appraisal uniformity.

A sales study was completed in Cambridge and Arapahoe that indicated they were below the acceptable range. A new depreciation model was created adding more recent sales and then was applied to the population of Cambridge and Arapahoe.

Upon review of the land values in the smaller villages, land values were adjusted to make them more equitable with similar villages and bring the parcels closer to market value. A land study was also completed for the rural residential resulting in the second acre value being raised to \$1,000 per acre.

## 2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Furnas County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>										
	The 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>Arapahoe &amp; Cambridge - these are the largest communities in the county, each have a school system as well as basic medical services and active commercial districts. Each community offers job opportunities that are not found in the rest of the county as well as easy commuting to larger communities. The market for residential property is active and growth is stable.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Beaver City &amp; Oxford - smaller communities with a few basic services; however, there are fewer job opportunities and both communities share a consolidated school system located equal distance between them. The residential real estate market is softer here than it is in group one.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Edison, Hendley, Holbrook &amp; Wilsonville - these are very small communities with little to no services or amenities. The market for residential property is slow and unorganized. There is very little growth annually.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Rural - all parcels not located within the political boundaries of a town. Rural housing continues to be desirable in Furnas County making these properties incomparable to properties within the Villages.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Arapahoe & Cambridge - these are the largest communities in the county, each have a school system as well as basic medical services and active commercial districts. Each community offers job opportunities that are not found in the rest of the county as well as easy commuting to larger communities. The market for residential property is active and growth is stable.	02	Beaver City & Oxford - smaller communities with a few basic services; however, there are fewer job opportunities and both communities share a consolidated school system located equal distance between them. The residential real estate market is softer here than it is in group one.	04	Edison, Hendley, Holbrook & Wilsonville - these are very small communities with little to no services or amenities. The market for residential property is slow and unorganized. There is very little growth annually.	05	Rural - all parcels not located within the political boundaries of a town. Rural housing continues to be desirable in Furnas County making these properties incomparable to properties within the Villages.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>										
01	Arapahoe & Cambridge - these are the largest communities in the county, each have a school system as well as basic medical services and active commercial districts. Each community offers job opportunities that are not found in the rest of the county as well as easy commuting to larger communities. The market for residential property is active and growth is stable.										
02	Beaver City & Oxford - smaller communities with a few basic services; however, there are fewer job opportunities and both communities share a consolidated school system located equal distance between them. The residential real estate market is softer here than it is in group one.										
04	Edison, Hendley, Holbrook & Wilsonville - these are very small communities with little to no services or amenities. The market for residential property is slow and unorganized. There is very little growth annually.										
05	Rural - all parcels not located within the political boundaries of a town. Rural housing continues to be desirable in Furnas County making these properties incomparable to properties within the Villages.										
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>										
	Only the cost approach is 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>										
	Yes, 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>										
	The front foot method is used to establish residential lot values in all of Furnas County, except for properties located at Cross Creek Golf Course and Harvest Meadows Subdivison, both in Cambridge. These lots can be irregularly shaped and have been valued using a price per square foot.										
<b>7.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?</b>										
	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>
	01	2015	2010	2014	2012
	02	2013	2010	2015	2013
	04	2011	2010	2015	2012-15
	05	2011	2010	2015	2010-2015

Lot values in valuation groupings two, four, and five were updated this year. The county assessor reviews 3-4 precincts yearly (1/6th of the county). The county reviews all residential, commercial, and agricultural parcels including towns when they are within that precinct. Valuation grouping one was desk reviewed for 2015 and a new depreciation schedule was developed.

# 2015 Residential Correlation Section for Furnas County

---

## County Overview

The economy in Furnas County is largely agricultural. Within the villages, the size of the population and available amenities, including school systems, will impact the market. There is more demand for housing in Cambridge and Arapahoe and the market there has shown gradual appreciation in recent years. Beaver City and Oxford will also typically have a fair amount of activity in the residential class, but the market in these communities is generally softer. The rest of the villages are very small and the market is unorganized. Four valuation groupings have been established based on these influences.

## Description of Analysis

A comparison of the number of sold parcels in each valuation grouping compared to the number of parcels in the county show that almost all the valuation groupings, are being represented in the sales file in accordance to the make-up of the county. Valuation grouping 04 (small villages) is the exception with a small sample size of only fourteen sales, where almost 30% of the sample consists of sales under \$10,000. The qualitative stats indicate a pattern of regressivity though the statistics are not a conclusive determination of the assessment quality due to the sample size and atypical make-up of sales within the valuation group 04.

In all other valuation groupings, the median statistically fall within the acceptable range. The qualitative statistics are somewhat high, but once analyzed there are many low dollar sales (under \$10,000) adversely affecting the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential. The assessment actions state that Cambridge and Arapahoe were revalued by updating the depreciation model. Lot values were studied and updated in valuation grouping 02 (Beaver City/Oxford), valuation grouping 04 (small villages), and valuation grouping 05 (rural residential). Changes to the sales file and the county's abstract of assessment generally support the reported assessment actions.

## Sales Qualification

A Sales Qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties this year. The review involved analyzing the sale utilization rate and reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the 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.

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

---

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

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices in which one half of the counties are reviewed each year. This review was conducted in Furnas County during 2014; the review showed that assessment practices had improved since last review in 2011. The county's appraisal techniques were consistent and values were equitably applied to the residential class. The assessor and staff have taken over the review work in-house and are currently working through their first complete review cycle. The small villages and rural residential are in the process of being reviewed and have not been converted to the new appraisal methods used within the county.

### **Level of Value**

Based on the analysis of all available information, the level of value of residential property in Furnas County is 93%



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

The commercial parcels with the three precincts including the villages of Hendley and Wilsonville were reviewed as part of the routine inspection cycle. The areas that were inspected include precincts 2-25, 2-24, and 2-23. The assessor and deputy assessor started reappraising the county in-house this inspection cycle and have discovered errors in the occupancy coding that is used in conjunction with the Marshall & Swift Costing. As a result, in addition to routine physical changes, corrections in costing were made to inspected properties this year and will continue to be made as the current inspection cycle progresses.

The economic depreciation was adjusted on all commercial properties county-wide. The amount of the percentage change overall varies by village due to different economic depreciation being applied by village.

Lot values were revalued within the small villages, Beaver City and Oxford.

## 2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Furnas County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>			
	The assessor and staff			
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>			
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>		
	01	There are no valuation groupings within the commercial class; there are too few sales in a typical study period to warrant stratifying them by location.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>			
	Only the cost approach is used, except for the Section 42 housing which is valued using the income approach.			
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>			
	The county has contracted with the Department of Revenue to conduct an appraisal of the Cambridge Ethanol Plant as well as a new truck stop being constructed in Cambridge. All other commercial property is valued using the cost approach.			
<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>			
	Yes, depreciation tables are developed using local market information.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>			
	n/a			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>			
	All commercial lot values are established using the front foot method.			
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	01	2010	2010	2009
	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>			
	2010-2015			
	The assessor reviews 1/6 of the county every year. All commercial parcels are reviewed with the scheduled precincts that they are located in.			

## **2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Furnas County**

---

### **County Overview**

Furnas's economy is largely dependent of the agricultural industry. Some of the major businesses in the area include Ag Valley Co-op and the Nebraska Corn Processing, an ethanol plant near Cambridge. The majority of the commercial parcels are found in Cambridge and Arapahoe. Cambridge has several employment opportunities but its downtown district is somewhat limited by its proximity to McCook. Arapahoe is further way from any major community and its downtown district reflects the needs of residents in local communities to buy goods and services closer to home; its location along two major highways also influence the market. The other smaller towns in the county have minimal commercial activity and the market is sporadic.

### **Description of Analysis**

Although there are various economic influences in Furnas County, and normally the majority of sales each year occur within Cambridge and Arapahoe, it is difficult to identify those influences. Consequently, there are no defined valuation groupings in the county and valuation adjustments are generally accounted for with land values and economic factors.

A comparison of the number of properties in each occupancy code to the sales file reveals that 66% of the population is within 7 occupancy codes. All 7 occupancy codes appear in the sample but only two codes, retail stores and storage warehouses, reoccur more than once. An analysis of the communities show that although most commercial properties in the county are found in Arapahoe and Cambridge, the majority of the sales (50%) in the sample are in Oxford and Beaver City. For this reason, the sample is considered to be unreliable and will not be used in the measurement of the level of value for commercial within Furnas County.

Although the statistics are not being used to arrive at a level of value, a sales analysis was conducted. The calculated statistics suggest that the county's median is within the acceptable range. The price related differential and weighted mean are being drastically affected by one high dollar sale, once the sale is removed the PRD and weighted mean, although still outside the IAAO acceptable range, become more typical of statistics within a smaller county.

The assessment actions state that the economic depreciation was adjusted countywide on the commercial parcels and that the commercial lots were revalued in all villages except Arapahoe and Cambridge, and three precincts were physically reviewed and any changes were made where warranted. The sales file and the county's abstract of assessment verify these actions.

## **2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Furnas County**

---

### **Sales Qualification**

A Sales Qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties this year. The review involved analyzing the sale utilization rate and reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the 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**

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices in which one half of the counties are reviewed each year. This review was conducted in Furnas County during 2014. The county's appraisal techniques were consistent and values were equitably applied to the commercial class; therefore, the assessment quality of the commercial class is believed to be in compliance with the professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

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



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

The agricultural improvements in three rural townships (2-25, 2-24, 2-23) were reviewed for 2015. New pictures were taken when needed and the property record cards were reviewed for accuracy. Land use was also physically reviewed for all agricultural parcels within these precincts. Only routine maintenance was completed for the rest of the rural improvements. Pick up work was completed on time.

A sales study was completed for agricultural land and adjustments were made to all agricultural land values as warranted. Irrigated land increased 20%, dry land 25% and grass land 35%.

## 2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Furnas County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>							
	The assessor and staff							
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 65%; text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>There are no market areas within Furnas County as there is no discernible difference in the market throughout the county.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010-2015</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	01	There are no market areas within Furnas County as there is no discernible difference in the market throughout the county.	2010-2015
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
01	There are no market areas within Furnas County as there is no discernible difference in the market throughout the county.	2010-2015						
	The county does not have GIS. The county assessor reviews the land use physically when they are reviewing the precincts that are schedule for that year.							
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>							
	n/a							
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>							
	The assessor physically inspects all agricultural parcels for use during the routine inspection cycle. The sales verification process also helps the assessor to identify agricultural land that has been purchased for non-agricultural uses.							
<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, farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued the same.							
<b>6.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>							
	N/A							
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:</b>							
	Yes, Special value applications have been filed in the county; at this time there is no market evidence to warrant a different value for special valuation parcels.							
<b>7a.</b>	<b>What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist?</b>							
	A Sales analysis and verification of sales are done annually to examine if non-agricultural influences exist within the county. Timber along the river are still classified separately. Currently, with the rise in the agricultural market, timber acres are selling similiarly to grass away from the river.							
<b>7b.</b>	<b>Describe the non-agricultural influences present within the county.</b>							
	N/A							
<b>7c.</b>	<b>How many parcels in the county are receiving special value?</b>							
	0							
<b>7d.</b>	<b>Where is the influenced area located within the county?</b>							

	N/A
<b>7e.</b>	<b>Describe the valuation models and approaches used to establish the uninfluenced values.</b>
	N/A

## Furnas County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Furnas	1	5,040	5,040	4,080	3,840	3,000	2,820	2,700	2,700	<b>4,464</b>
Gosper	4	n/a	5,003	4,235	3,535	3,296	n/a	3,037	2,814	<b>4,206</b>
Phelps	2	n/a	5,100	4,700	4,500	4,300	4,100	3,900	3,200	<b>4,592</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>
Red Willow	1	2,970	2,970	2,894	2,786	2,528	2,115	2,029	1,905	<b>2,867</b>
Frontier	1	3,000	2,996	2,928	2,939	2,900	2,900	2,844	2,789	<b>2,968</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Furnas	1	2,000	2,000	1,560	1,560	1,375	1,375	1,250	1,250	<b>1,762</b>
Gosper	4	n/a	1,930	1,799	1,685	1,550	n/a	1,275	1,275	<b>1,786</b>
Phelps	2	n/a	2,500	2,300	2,100	1,900	1,700	1,550	1,450	<b>2,074</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>
Red Willow	1	1,800	1,800	1,740	1,740	1,620	1,560	1,500	1,440	<b>1,740</b>
Frontier	1	1,700	1,700	1,650	1,650	1,600	1,600	1,550	1,550	<b>1,670</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Furnas	1	1,215	1,215	1,150	1,150	945	945	880	880	<b>915</b>
Gosper	4	n/a	1,200	1,064	954	870	n/a	835	835	<b>866</b>
Phelps	2	n/a	1,132	1,075	1,127	1,101	1,000	959	927	<b>952</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>
Red Willow	1	675	675	675	675	675	675	675	675	<b>675</b>
Frontier	1	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	<b>650</b>

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

---

---

---

---

---

Melody Crawford  
Furnas County Assessor  
PO Box 368  
Beaver City NE 68926  
PH. 308-268-3145  
Email: [assessor@furnas.nacone.org](mailto:assessor@furnas.nacone.org)

## **2015 METHODOLOGY FOR FURNAS COUNTY SPECIAL VALUE**

Furnas County no longer implements greenbelt for properties within one mile of, and including the Republican River. Originally, when Special Value was implemented, there were several sales of smaller parcels of timber along the Republican River, to be used recreationally for hunting, with many of these sales being to out of county/state buyers. There have been no recent sales indicating that there is a non-agricultural influence impacting the agricultural land market. Currently, any sales of these timber acres are to local farmers. The primary use of these parcels is agricultural, with occasional leasing for hunting purposes. Therefore, these market areas have been eliminated, and one schedule of values is applied to all parcels of land primarily used for agricultural or horticultural purposes in Furnas County. Timber along the river is still classified separately from grass and values are determined based on timber sales being comparable to grass throughout the rest of Furnas County. Parcels are reviewed on a periodic basis to determine if the land is still being used for agricultural or horticultural purposes.

# 2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Furnas County

---

## County Overview

Furnas County lies in the center of the Republican River Basin. The majority of the county consists of mixed use dry and grass land parcels, with the majority of the irrigated land concentrated along the Republican River. In reviewing the comparability of the adjoining counties, it was determined that all adjacent counties are comparable in terms of soil type, topography, and irrigation potential. There are no influences identified in the comparable counties that are not present in Furnas County.

## Description of Analysis

An analysis of the sales within the county indicated that the sample is disproportionate when stratified by sales date and the majority land use subclasses contained unreliably small samples that were a disproportionate mix of sales. Sales from the comparable counties were brought into the sample to maximize the majority land use samples in a proportionate manner and balance the sample when stratified by sales date.

The statistical sample supports that all land uses have been assessed at a uniform portion of the market value. The 95% majority land use irrigated statistic is small, containing only two sales and is unreliable. In all other majority land use classes, the median falls within the acceptable range. Irrigated, dry and grass land adjustments were at rates that were typical for the area. The values that were set by the assessor blend well with the comparable adjoining counties, collaborating that the assessments are acceptable.

## Sales Qualification

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties. This involved reviewing the non-qualified sales to ensure that the reasons for disqualifying sales were sufficient and documented. No apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations and all arm's length sales were used.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The evidence supports that agricultural values have been established at uniform portions of market value; the quality of assessment is in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

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

---

### **Level of Value**

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



**33 Furnas  
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 : 167  
 Total Sales Price : 9,088,111  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,169,111  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,071,160  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 54,905  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 48,330

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 88  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 28.84  
 PRD : 112.70

COV : 40.99  
 STD : 40.67  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.82  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 300.55  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 32.88

95% Median C.I. : 89.89 to 96.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.93 to 92.12  
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.04 to 105.38

Printed: 4/2/2015 3:24:44PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	16	97.08	100.64	95.13	23.45	105.79	39.67	168.78	79.92 to 117.15	60,781	57,820
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	16	99.10	106.03	96.26	23.72	110.15	58.79	222.00	81.78 to 114.93	39,594	38,113
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	23	96.48	102.68	93.44	26.47	109.89	40.87	171.67	86.57 to 123.30	44,674	41,741
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	20	97.56	108.32	84.99	35.56	127.45	48.52	300.55	75.96 to 125.00	47,175	40,093
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	19	91.33	100.90	88.37	30.48	114.18	41.16	245.93	78.05 to 117.10	56,100	49,575
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	12	95.64	114.09	90.23	33.89	126.44	68.40	283.25	77.83 to 130.61	46,374	41,845
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	25	92.40	96.57	84.00	27.59	114.96	39.24	171.38	81.87 to 110.11	65,367	54,909
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	36	79.89	84.24	83.81	26.97	100.51	32.88	204.20	76.52 to 94.20	64,876	54,376
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	75	96.96	104.47	92.17	27.81	113.34	39.67	300.55	92.33 to 107.39	47,693	43,958
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	92	90.27	94.92	85.38	28.97	111.17	32.88	283.25	81.87 to 94.68	60,784	51,895
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	78	95.69	104.38	90.28	29.52	115.62	40.87	300.55	91.33 to 104.57	47,056	42,483
<u>ALL</u>	167	93.00	99.21	88.03	28.84	112.70	32.88	300.55	89.89 to 96.28	54,905	48,330

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	74	95.68	100.08	89.52	25.65	111.80	41.16	300.55	89.13 to 99.00	68,666	61,470
02	64	92.59	101.89	87.97	31.34	115.82	32.88	283.25	80.81 to 101.24	36,374	31,999
04	14	90.91	90.10	77.47	32.11	116.30	34.55	204.20	49.95 to 115.47	30,286	23,463
05	15	92.12	91.94	85.78	28.01	107.18	39.24	152.39	66.01 to 107.39	89,060	76,399
<u>ALL</u>	167	93.00	99.21	88.03	28.84	112.70	32.88	300.55	89.89 to 96.28	54,905	48,330

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	167	93.00	99.21	88.03	28.84	112.70	32.88	300.55	89.89 to 96.28	54,905	48,330
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	167	93.00	99.21	88.03	28.84	112.70	32.88	300.55	89.89 to 96.28	54,905	48,330

**33 Furnas  
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 : 167  
 Total Sales Price : 9,088,111  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,169,111  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,071,160  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 54,905  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 48,330

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 88  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 28.84  
 PRD : 112.70

COV : 40.99  
 STD : 40.67  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.82  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 300.55  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 32.88

95% Median C.I. : 89.89 to 96.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.93 to 92.12  
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.04 to 105.38

Printed:4/2/2015 3:24:44PM

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	6	171.62	181.00	181.24	26.01	99.87	112.50	283.25	112.50 to 283.25	2,417	4,380	
Less Than 15,000	27	125.00	136.59	115.68	39.58	118.08	39.21	300.55	96.96 to 168.29	9,370	10,840	
Less Than 30,000	65	112.50	119.01	106.35	34.26	111.90	32.88	300.55	95.56 to 125.00	17,057	18,139	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	161	92.40	96.16	87.88	26.55	109.42	32.88	300.55	87.65 to 95.82	56,861	49,968	
Greater Than 14,999	140	91.77	92.00	87.24	22.19	105.46	32.88	245.93	85.68 to 95.00	63,687	55,561	
Greater Than 29,999	102	89.51	86.59	85.51	19.50	101.26	34.55	154.71	80.81 to 93.11	79,024	67,570	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	6	171.62	181.00	181.24	26.01	99.87	112.50	283.25	112.50 to 283.25	2,417	4,380	
5,000 TO 14,999	21	118.72	123.90	111.70	38.76	110.92	39.21	300.55	79.50 to 160.78	11,357	12,686	
15,000 TO 29,999	38	97.05	106.53	103.59	28.25	102.84	32.88	245.93	90.18 to 116.22	22,518	23,326	
30,000 TO 59,999	42	82.50	87.69	88.78	28.02	98.77	34.55	154.71	77.52 to 95.99	46,331	41,130	
60,000 TO 99,999	40	92.67	87.54	87.68	14.02	99.84	39.24	124.09	85.68 to 96.28	75,091	65,843	
100,000 TO 149,999	10	91.36	84.79	84.45	13.52	100.40	59.53	107.39	66.01 to 100.27	121,390	102,516	
150,000 TO 249,999	9	81.65	79.95	79.24	15.58	100.90	45.21	99.30	64.31 to 99.16	179,111	141,929	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	80.13	80.13	80.13	00.00	100.00	80.13	80.13	N/A	285,000	228,380	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	167	93.00	99.21	88.03	28.84	112.70	32.88	300.55	89.89 to 96.28	54,905	48,330	

**33 Furnas  
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 : 30  
 Total Sales Price : 2,080,242  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,080,242  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,482,350  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 69,341  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 49,412

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 101  
 COD : 31.18  
 PRD : 142.10

COV : 45.41  
 STD : 45.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.11  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 285.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 46.83

95% Median C.I. : 78.30 to 115.70  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 43.10 to 99.41  
 95% Mean C.I. : 84.09 to 118.43

Printed: 4/2/2015 3:24:46PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	70.37	70.37	70.37	00.00	100.00	70.37	70.37	N/A	38,000	26,740
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	3	131.52	109.81	72.51	20.80	151.44	57.93	139.97	N/A	54,650	39,625
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	116.35	116.35	116.35	00.00	100.00	116.35	116.35	N/A	10,400	12,100
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	97.00	92.21	96.74	07.92	95.32	78.30	101.33	N/A	9,000	8,707
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	3	106.37	104.01	105.27	08.07	98.80	89.97	115.70	N/A	47,333	49,830
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	4	118.48	124.43	139.31	17.86	89.32	89.05	171.71	N/A	40,750	56,770
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	92.40	92.40	98.47	19.70	93.84	74.20	110.60	N/A	3,750	3,693
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	108.85	147.75	107.96	54.97	136.86	87.68	285.60	N/A	36,125	38,999
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	1	49.17	49.17	49.17	00.00	100.00	49.17	49.17	N/A	49,000	24,095
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	6	67.76	74.59	79.07	29.31	94.33	48.68	111.97	48.68 to 111.97	35,083	27,742
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	81.36	81.36	50.52	42.44	161.05	46.83	115.89	N/A	562,196	284,010
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	8	99.17	99.10	76.81	23.39	129.02	57.93	139.97	57.93 to 139.97	29,919	22,979
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	9	110.60	110.51	122.87	16.56	89.94	74.20	171.71	89.05 to 119.47	34,722	42,662
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	13	87.68	96.18	59.84	43.16	160.73	46.83	285.60	49.17 to 115.89	117,569	70,351
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	7	101.33	103.20	78.02	21.80	132.27	57.93	139.97	57.93 to 139.97	28,764	22,442
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	13	110.60	121.96	118.15	28.10	103.22	74.20	285.60	88.15 to 129.55	35,154	41,535
<u>ALL</u>	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412
<u>ALL</u>	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412

**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	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412
04											
<u>ALL</u>	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412

**33 Furnas  
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 : 30  
 Total Sales Price : 2,080,242  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,080,242  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,482,350  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 69,341  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 49,412

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 101  
 COD : 31.18  
 PRD : 142.10

COV : 45.41  
 STD : 45.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.11  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 285.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 46.83

95% Median C.I. : 78.30 to 115.70  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 43.10 to 99.41  
 95% Mean C.I. : 84.09 to 118.43

Printed:4/2/2015 3:24:46PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	3	74.20	75.47	69.78	18.77	108.15	55.22	97.00	N/A	3,000	2,093	
Less Than 15,000	8	87.65	108.24	120.37	50.36	89.92	48.68	285.60	48.68 to 285.60	6,488	7,809	
Less Than 30,000	16	113.15	113.18	118.28	27.64	95.69	48.68	285.60	78.30 to 129.55	12,353	14,612	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	27	101.33	104.12	71.26	30.49	146.11	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 116.35	76,713	54,669	
Greater Than 14,999	22	98.74	98.72	70.00	25.33	141.03	46.83	171.71	75.22 to 117.48	92,197	64,540	
Greater Than 29,999	14	87.92	87.63	66.32	26.96	132.13	46.83	171.71	57.93 to 111.97	134,471	89,183	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	74.20	75.47	69.78	18.77	108.15	55.22	97.00	N/A	3,000	2,093	
5,000 TO 14,999	5	110.60	127.91	130.98	49.72	97.66	48.68	285.60	N/A	8,580	11,238	
15,000 TO 29,999	8	118.48	118.12	117.54	10.13	100.49	89.97	139.97	89.97 to 139.97	18,219	21,414	
30,000 TO 59,999	7	87.68	82.80	81.73	16.69	101.31	49.17	111.97	49.17 to 111.97	42,786	34,971	
60,000 TO 99,999	4	102.02	109.01	112.90	34.10	96.55	60.29	171.71	N/A	69,125	78,045	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	82.15	82.15	79.73	29.48	103.04	57.93	106.37	N/A	121,100	96,553	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	1	46.83	46.83	46.83	00.00	100.00	46.83	46.83	N/A	1,064,392	498,485	
<u>ALL</u>	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412	

**33 Furnas  
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 : 30  
 Total Sales Price : 2,080,242  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,080,242  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,482,350  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 69,341  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 49,412

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 101  
 COD : 31.18  
 PRD : 142.10

COV : 45.41  
 STD : 45.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.11  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 285.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 46.83

95% Median C.I. : 78.30 to 115.70  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 43.10 to 99.41  
 95% Mean C.I. : 84.09 to 118.43

Printed:4/2/2015 3:24:46PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
304	1	87.68	87.68	87.68	00.00	100.00	87.68	87.68	N/A	50,000	43,840
341	1	285.60	285.60	285.60	00.00	100.00	285.60	285.60	N/A	10,000	28,560
344	1	49.17	49.17	49.17	00.00	100.00	49.17	49.17	N/A	49,000	24,095
350	2	80.17	80.17	76.67	12.22	104.57	70.37	89.97	N/A	28,000	21,468
353	5	74.20	83.95	50.67	38.13	165.68	46.83	131.52	N/A	226,328	114,673
381	1	75.22	75.22	75.22	00.00	100.00	75.22	75.22	N/A	50,000	37,610
384	1	115.70	115.70	115.70	00.00	100.00	115.70	115.70	N/A	15,000	17,355
406	8	118.48	122.93	144.89	14.56	84.84	78.30	171.71	78.30 to 171.71	22,800	33,035
419	1	106.37	106.37	106.37	00.00	100.00	106.37	106.37	N/A	109,000	115,940
426	1	89.05	89.05	89.05	00.00	100.00	89.05	89.05	N/A	38,000	33,840
442	1	57.93	57.93	57.93	00.00	100.00	57.93	57.93	N/A	133,200	77,165
444	1	96.15	96.15	96.15	00.00	100.00	96.15	96.15	N/A	30,000	28,845
477	1	88.15	88.15	88.15	00.00	100.00	88.15	88.15	N/A	62,500	55,095
521	1	101.33	101.33	101.33	00.00	100.00	101.33	101.33	N/A	20,000	20,265
522	1	48.68	48.68	48.68	00.00	100.00	48.68	48.68	N/A	12,500	6,085
528	1	97.00	97.00	97.00	00.00	100.00	97.00	97.00	N/A	2,000	1,940
530	1	115.89	115.89	115.89	00.00	100.00	115.89	115.89	N/A	60,000	69,535
582	1	60.29	60.29	60.29	00.00	100.00	60.29	60.29	N/A	69,000	41,600
<u>ALL</u>	30	96.58	101.26	71.26	31.18	142.10	46.83	285.60	78.30 to 115.70	69,341	49,412

**33 Furnas**  
**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 : 88  
Total Sales Price : 48,296,474  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 47,903,974  
Total Assessed Value : 38,902,650  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 544,363  
Avg. Assessed Value : 442,076

MEDIAN : 75  
WGT. MEAN : 81  
MEAN : 89  
COD : 34.47  
PRD : 110.04

COV : 73.08  
STD : 65.30  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.02  
MAX Sales Ratio : 632.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.14

95% Median C.I. : 69.85 to 80.38  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.63 to 87.79  
95% Mean C.I. : 75.72 to 103.00

Printed:4/2/2015 3:24:47PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qrtrs</b>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	12	93.78	95.67	107.79	14.73	88.76	51.39	140.36	82.55 to 106.76	402,454	433,807
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	7	124.43	120.62	91.36	33.91	132.03	55.72	202.48	55.72 to 202.48	609,071	556,438
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	66.57	58.48	54.68	19.18	106.95	28.14	72.65	N/A	271,250	148,315
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	9	71.24	75.60	77.82	11.55	97.15	63.63	107.69	66.01 to 84.58	372,778	290,112
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	18	77.45	83.85	80.34	23.25	104.37	31.39	156.56	68.53 to 92.19	664,194	533,637
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	9	69.49	75.34	74.43	22.23	101.22	54.18	125.71	57.16 to 94.08	607,710	452,328
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	5	76.96	185.01	89.44	151.95	206.85	62.24	632.00	N/A	358,680	320,805
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	2	68.39	68.39	69.28	03.36	98.72	66.09	70.69	N/A	730,800	506,278
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	9	69.08	74.36	70.93	24.29	104.84	48.20	124.59	55.84 to 103.02	628,556	445,834
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	10	69.22	81.44	81.06	26.70	100.47	58.71	145.03	58.71 to 114.69	585,914	474,912
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	68.72	74.57	70.94	13.02	105.12	64.07	90.93	N/A	725,000	514,336
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	32	83.57	90.84	90.93	29.68	99.90	28.14	202.48	69.85 to 98.26	422,905	384,532
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	32	76.53	97.27	79.51	43.37	122.34	31.39	632.00	68.53 to 84.39	600,572	477,514
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	24	68.90	76.84	74.69	22.24	102.88	48.20	145.03	63.81 to 79.26	631,364	471,550
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	38	76.07	86.00	80.86	29.72	106.36	28.14	202.48	69.67 to 84.58	543,658	439,600
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	16	70.09	108.75	76.65	65.62	141.88	54.18	632.00	62.24 to 84.39	545,275	417,971
<b>ALL</b>	88	75.48	89.36	81.21	34.47	110.04	28.14	632.00	69.85 to 80.38	544,363	442,076

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	88	75.48	89.36	81.21	34.47	110.04	28.14	632.00	69.85 to 80.38	544,363	442,076
<b>ALL</b>	88	75.48	89.36	81.21	34.47	110.04	28.14	632.00	69.85 to 80.38	544,363	442,076

**33 Furnas**  
**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 : 88  
Total Sales Price : 48,296,474  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 47,903,974  
Total Assessed Value : 38,902,650  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 544,363  
Avg. Assessed Value : 442,076

MEDIAN : 75  
WGT. MEAN : 81  
MEAN : 89  
COD : 34.47  
PRD : 110.04

COV : 73.08  
STD : 65.30  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.02  
MAX Sales Ratio : 632.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.14

95% Median C.I. : 69.85 to 80.38  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.63 to 87.79  
95% Mean C.I. : 75.72 to 103.00

Printed:4/2/2015 3:24:47PM

**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	2	78.19	78.19	69.69	24.08	112.20	59.36	97.02	N/A	729,420	508,318
1	2	78.19	78.19	69.69	24.08	112.20	59.36	97.02	N/A	729,420	508,318
<b>Dry</b>											
County	10	70.51	75.10	75.04	21.60	100.08	55.84	107.69	57.16 to 92.77	383,125	287,504
1	10	70.51	75.10	75.04	21.60	100.08	55.84	107.69	57.16 to 92.77	383,125	287,504
<b>Grass</b>											
County	10	69.53	80.04	77.42	25.93	103.38	48.20	145.03	63.63 to 124.43	435,341	337,025
1	10	69.53	80.04	77.42	25.93	103.38	48.20	145.03	63.63 to 124.43	435,341	337,025
<b>ALL</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>75.48</b>	<b>89.36</b>	<b>81.21</b>	<b>34.47</b>	<b>110.04</b>	<b>28.14</b>	<b>632.00</b>	<b>69.85 to 80.38</b>	<b>544,363</b>	<b>442,076</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	15	69.67	78.24	73.50	22.38	106.45	55.72	145.68	59.36 to 93.69	911,363	669,863
1	15	69.67	78.24	73.50	22.38	106.45	55.72	145.68	59.36 to 93.69	911,363	669,863
<b>Dry</b>											
County	15	69.85	73.82	71.35	18.45	103.46	54.18	107.69	58.71 to 90.71	394,883	281,768
1	15	69.85	73.82	71.35	18.45	103.46	54.18	107.69	58.71 to 90.71	394,883	281,768
<b>Grass</b>											
County	14	69.98	77.66	78.12	23.16	99.41	48.20	145.03	63.63 to 94.08	387,265	302,522
1	14	69.98	77.66	78.12	23.16	99.41	48.20	145.03	63.63 to 94.08	387,265	302,522
<b>ALL</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>75.48</b>	<b>89.36</b>	<b>81.21</b>	<b>34.47</b>	<b>110.04</b>	<b>28.14</b>	<b>632.00</b>	<b>69.85 to 80.38</b>	<b>544,363</b>	<b>442,076</b>



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 6,115</b>	<b>Value : 970,454,140</b>	<b>Growth 2,151,285</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>	376	1,049,490	16	46,340	21	17,635	413	1,113,465	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,917	5,542,665	58	740,655	187	2,501,505	2,162	8,784,825	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,919	70,873,340	59	5,626,925	194	12,736,895	2,172	89,237,160	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,295	77,465,495	75	6,413,920	215	15,256,035	2,585	99,135,450	895,440
<b>% of Res Total</b>	88.78	78.14	2.90	6.47	8.32	15.39	42.27	10.22	41.62
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	81	471,735	5	8,875	6	22,210	92	502,820	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	292	772,815	11	71,445	6	25,030	309	869,290	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	309	19,882,645	13	1,130,380	9	1,139,580	331	22,152,605	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	390	21,127,195	18	1,210,700	15	1,186,820	423	23,524,715	371,950
<b>% of Com Total</b>	92.20	89.81	4.26	5.15	3.55	5.04	6.92	2.42	17.29
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	5	155,295	0	0	3	640,005	8	795,300	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	9,615	1	6,145	1	303,000	3	318,760	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	633,375	1	614,335	1	520,000	3	1,767,710	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	6	798,285	1	620,480	4	1,463,005	11	2,881,770	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	54.55	27.70	9.09	21.53	36.36	50.77	0.18	0.30	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	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,295	77,465,495	75	6,413,920	215	15,256,035	2,585	99,135,450	895,440
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	88.78	78.14	2.90	6.47	8.32	15.39	42.27	10.22	41.62
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	396	21,925,480	19	1,831,180	19	2,649,825	434	26,406,485	371,950
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	91.24	83.03	4.38	6.93	4.38	10.03	7.10	2.72	17.29
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,691	99,390,975	94	8,245,100	234	17,905,860	3,019	125,541,935	1,267,390
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	89.14	79.17	3.11	6.57	7.75	14.26	49.37	12.94	58.91

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	2	48,215	304,970	0	0	0
19. Commercial	5	331,640	3,514,675	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	145,305	10,968,645	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	2	48,215	304,970
19. Commercial	0	0	0	5	331,640	3,514,675
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	145,305	10,968,645
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				<b>8</b>	<b>525,160</b>	<b>14,788,290</b>

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	9	830,640	9	830,640	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	9	830,640	9	830,640	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	291	3	342	636

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	8	249,480	0	0	2,458	620,914,290	2,466	621,163,770
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	15,080	0	0	597	181,040,435	598	181,055,515
29. Ag Improvements	1	5,185	0	0	620	41,857,095	621	41,862,280
30. Ag Total							<b>3,087</b>	<b>844,081,565</b>

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.00	1,000	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	5,185	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	1	1.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	27	27.05	270,500	27	27.05	270,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	325	336.30	3,363,000	325	336.30	3,363,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	333	0.00	17,804,965	333	0.00	17,804,965	0
34. HomeSite Total				<b>360</b>	<b>363.35</b>	<b>21,438,465</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	20	42.28	42,280	20	42.28	42,280	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	517	1,516.53	1,514,260	518	1,517.53	1,515,260	
37. FarmSite Improvements	608	0.00	24,052,130	609	0.00	24,057,315	883,895
38. FarmSite Total				<b>629</b>	<b>1,559.81</b>	<b>25,614,855</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,341	7,491.92	0	2,342	7,492.92	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>989</b>	<b>9,416.08</b>	<b>47,053,320</b>	<b>883,895</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	3,946.92	5.88%	19,892,480	6.64%	5,040.00
46. 1A	41,431.51	61.73%	208,814,795	69.71%	5,040.00
47. 2A1	4,225.70	6.30%	17,240,860	5.76%	4,080.00
48. 2A	4,829.07	7.20%	18,543,630	6.19%	3,840.00
49. 3A1	2,353.90	3.51%	7,061,700	2.36%	3,000.00
50. 3A	1,090.30	1.62%	3,074,645	1.03%	2,820.00
51. 4A1	4,167.22	6.21%	11,251,490	3.76%	2,700.00
52. 4A	5,067.93	7.55%	13,683,415	4.57%	2,700.00
53. Total	67,112.55	100.00%	299,563,015	100.00%	4,463.59
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	995.20	0.52%	1,990,400	0.59%	2,000.00
55. 1D	121,190.88	63.60%	242,381,620	72.20%	2,000.00
56. 2D1	8,119.27	4.26%	12,666,065	3.77%	1,560.00
57. 2D	3,573.42	1.88%	5,574,540	1.66%	1,560.00
58. 3D1	17,802.92	9.34%	24,479,025	7.29%	1,375.00
59. 3D	544.43	0.29%	748,590	0.22%	1,375.00
60. 4D1	24,743.52	12.99%	30,929,425	9.21%	1,250.00
61. 4D	13,569.31	7.12%	16,961,650	5.05%	1,250.00
62. Total	190,538.95	100.00%	335,731,315	100.00%	1,762.01
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	201.00	0.12%	244,215	0.16%	1,215.00
64. 1G	13,330.59	7.83%	16,196,685	10.40%	1,215.00
65. 2G1	2,996.54	1.76%	3,446,020	2.21%	1,150.00
66. 2G	1,598.97	0.94%	1,838,815	1.18%	1,150.00
67. 3G1	2,706.80	1.59%	2,557,930	1.64%	945.00
68. 3G	149.22	0.09%	141,015	0.09%	945.01
69. 4G1	32,844.25	19.29%	28,902,950	18.55%	880.00
70. 4G	116,442.50	68.39%	102,469,415	65.77%	880.00
71. Total	170,269.87	100.00%	155,797,045	100.00%	915.00
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	67,112.55	15.23%	299,563,015	37.58%	4,463.59
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	190,538.95	43.24%	335,731,315	42.12%	1,762.01
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	170,269.87	38.64%	155,797,045	19.55%	915.00
72. Waste	6,521.29	1.48%	489,105	0.06%	75.00
73. Other	6,188.74	1.40%	5,447,765	0.68%	880.27
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	440,631.40	100.00%	797,028,245	100.00%	1,808.83

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	44.50	204,780	0.00	0	67,068.05	299,358,235	67,112.55	299,563,015
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	30.24	55,260	0.00	0	190,508.71	335,676,055	190,538.95	335,731,315
<b>78. Grass</b>	4.00	3,520	0.00	0	170,265.87	155,793,525	170,269.87	155,797,045
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	6,521.29	489,105	6,521.29	489,105
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	6,188.74	5,447,765	6,188.74	5,447,765
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>78.74</b>	<b>263,560</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>440,552.66</b>	<b>796,764,685</b>	<b>440,631.40</b>	<b>797,028,245</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	67,112.55	15.23%	299,563,015	37.58%	4,463.59
<b>Dry Land</b>	190,538.95	43.24%	335,731,315	42.12%	1,762.01
<b>Grass</b>	170,269.87	38.64%	155,797,045	19.55%	915.00
<b>Waste</b>	6,521.29	1.48%	489,105	0.06%	75.00
<b>Other</b>	6,188.74	1.40%	5,447,765	0.68%	880.27
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>440,631.40</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>797,028,245</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,808.83</b>

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

33 Furnas

	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	91,644,075	99,135,450	7,491,375	8.17%	895,440	7.20%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	21,268,865	21,438,465	169,600	0.80%	0	0.80%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>112,912,940</b>	<b>120,573,915</b>	<b>7,660,975</b>	<b>6.78%</b>	<b>895,440</b>	<b>5.99%</b>
05. Commercial	20,877,335	23,524,715	2,647,380	12.68%	371,950	10.90%
06. Industrial	2,740,145	2,881,770	141,625	5.17%	0	5.17%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	24,502,590	25,614,855	1,112,265	4.54%	883,895	0.93%
08. Minerals	1,153,080	830,640	-322,440	-27.96	0	-27.96
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>49,273,150</b>	<b>52,851,980</b>	<b>3,578,830</b>	<b>7.26%</b>	<b>1,255,845</b>	<b>4.71%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>162,186,090</b>	<b>173,425,895</b>	<b>11,239,805</b>	<b>6.93%</b>	<b>2,151,285</b>	<b>5.60%</b>
11. Irrigated	251,274,320	299,563,015	48,288,695	19.22%		
12. Dryland	267,993,285	335,731,315	67,738,030	25.28%		
13. Grassland	115,134,210	155,797,045	40,662,835	35.32%		
14. Wasteland	489,510	489,105	-405	-0.08%		
15. Other Agland	4,023,485	5,447,765	1,424,280	35.40%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>638,914,810</b>	<b>797,028,245</b>	<b>158,113,435</b>	<b>24.75%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>801,100,900</b>	<b>970,454,140</b>	<b>169,353,240</b>	<b>21.14%</b>	<b>2,151,285</b>	<b>20.87%</b>

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

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Nebr. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 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 levels of value and the 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 Revenue, Property Assessment Division 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:

- 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 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 ( R.S.Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Furnas County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Minerals	8	.13	.14
Residential	2587	42.61	11.42
Commercial	419	6.90	2.61
Industrial	11	.18	.34
Recreational	0	0	0
Agricultural	3082	50.77	85.48
Special Value	0	0	0

Agricultural land – 440,691.01 taxable acres. 15.50% irrigated, 42.97% dry, 38.64% grassland, 1.48% waste and 1.40% timber.

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

Current Resources

A. Assessor’s Office staff includes:

Melody Crawford, Assessor

Bobbi Noel, Deputy

Sherry Thooft, Office Clerk

The Assessor and Deputy both hold Assessor’s Certificates and will attend necessary training to obtain hours needed to keep certificates current. The high cost of approved training is a budgetary concern for Furnas County

Appraisal budget was combined with the regular Assessor budget for 2012-2013. We will no longer be using our contracted appraiser. Assessor and staff have taken over review work and former ½ time office clerk is now full-time.

Beginning July 1, 2012 Assessor and staff are responsible for gathering information on any new improvements and additions or alterations to existing improvements from Building Permits, County-wide zoning permits and any Assessor notes. Rotating review work involves looking at all improvements on each parcel , checking as to measurements of buildings, quality of construction, depreciation percentage and all information shown in Assessor’s records for accuracy. Inspection of the interior of houses is done whenever possible. Will also physically inspect all ag land to check for proper land use classification

B Cadastral Maps and aerial photos are in need of replacement, as they are both nearing 40 years old. A proposal was reviewed in 2013 from GIS Workshop. County Board felt the cost would not fit into the upcoming budget as courthouse renovations are planned. For 2014, the Assessor's office is using AgriData program to measure Furnas County.

C Property Record Cards contain Cama pricing sheets and pictures, Lot size drawing, MIPS county solutions yearly values.

D We are on the new MIPS PC based system for both the Administration usage and the CAMA pricing for the 2014 tax year. This system is more efficient with all information for each parcel in one place, on one computer system.

E Furnas County is on line with parcel and tax information with Nebraska Assessors Online. We feel this is very beneficial for taxpayers, realtors, appraisers, etc., to have 24 hour access to our information.

### Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

- A Both Assessor and Deputy Assessor handle transfers each month.  
A verification form is mailed out.
- B. Office pulls property record cards for review of information.
- C. All sales are entered in Property Assessment Division's sales file. Reports and sales studies are developed from this information
- D. Approaches to Value
  - 1) Market Approach: Sales comparison,
  - 2) Cost Approach: Marshall Swift manual - Commercial 2010, Residential 2010.
  - 3) Land valuation studies are used to establish market areas and agricultural land. Based on studies, special value, market areas and greenbelt along the Republican River was eliminated for 2010.
- E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation
- F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.
- G. Notices and Public Relations

### Level of value, Quality, and Uniformity of assessment year 2013:

Property Class	Median	Cod*	PRD*
Residential	95	24.86	110.97
Commercial	100	NA	NA
Agricultural Land	70	36.71	111.16

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

## Assessment actions Planned for Assessment year 2015

### **2015 Assessment year Assessor & Office Staff**

#### Residential

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2015.
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct and verify sales.
3. Update files from review work such as date of inspection.
4. Review residential lot values.
5. Get the review work ready for the next year.

#### Commercial

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2015
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
3. Update files from review work such as date of inspection.
4. Review lot values.
5. Get the review work ready for the next year.

#### Agricultural

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2015
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
3. Use Agri Data to update land use, as well as review of three rural precincts for land use.

### **Review By Assessor & Staff**

1. Complete pickup work using Building Permits, County wide zoning and Assessors notes.
2. Complete door to door review of Wilsonville, Hendley, and rural improvements in those areas of the county. New pictures are taken when needed. Ag land use will be reviewed in the areas of the county where improvements are scheduled for review.
3. Review all property protests with the Commissioners
4. Attend Board of Equalization hearings

## Assessment actions Planned for Assessment year 2016

### **2016 Assessment year Assessor & Office Staff**

#### **Residential**

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2016.
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct and verify sales.
3. Update files from review work such as date of inspection.
4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

#### **Commercial**

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2016
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
3. Update files from review work such as date of inspection.
4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

#### **Agricultural**

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2016
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
3. Use Agri Data to update land use, as well as review of three rural precincts for land use.

#### **Review By Assessor & Staff**

1. Complete pickup work using Building Permits, County wide zoning and Assessors notes.
2. Complete door to door review of Beaver City and rural improvements in two rural precincts of the county. New pictures are taken when needed. Ag land use will be reviewed in the areas of the county where improvements are scheduled for review.
3. Review all property protests with the Commissioners
4. Attend Board of Equalization hearings

## Assessment actions Planned for Assessment year 2017

### **2017 Assessment year Assessor & Office Staff**

#### **Residential**

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2017.
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct and verify sales.
3. Update files from review work such as date of inspection.
4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

#### **Commercial**

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2017
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
3. Update files from review work such as date of inspection.
4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

#### **Agricultural**

1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2017
2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
3. Use Agri Data to update land use, as well as Appraiser review of four rural precincts for land use.

#### **Review By Assessor & Staff**

1. Complete pickup work using Building Permits, County wide zoning and Assessors notes.
2. Complete door to door review rural improvements in four rural precincts of the county. New pictures are taken when needed. Ag land use will be reviewed in the areas of the county where improvements are scheduled for review.
3. Review all property protests with the Commissioners
4. Attend Board of Equalization hearings

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare the following Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PAD rosters & 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 Lands & 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 approximately 460 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemption: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
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 approximately 225 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing – 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 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.
10. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections- prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval
12. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests-assemble and provide information

13. TERC Appeals- prepare information attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation
14. TERC Statewide Equalization- attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain 60 hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor: Melody L. Crawford      Date: June 15, 2014

## 2015 Assessment Survey for Furnas County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$104,443
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	n/a
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$650 for the appraisal of oil and gas minerals and \$850 for mileage
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	n/a
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$2,400 for the rental of computers, the budget for the CAMA system is maintained in the county general fund.
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$800
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	n/a
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	0

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS PC System V2
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS PC System V2
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	the Assessor
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	n/a
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	n/a
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS PC System 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>
	Arapahoe, Beaver City, Cambridge, and Oxford
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

### D. Contracted Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Pritchard & Abbott are contracted with annually for the appraisal of oil and gas mineral interests. The county also has a contract with the Department of Revenue for the valuation of two unique commercial properties within the county.
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	None
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	None

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes, for oil and gas minerals and for two unique commercial parcels.
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	The county does not specify requirements or qualifications. Pritchard & Abbott widely considered to be experts in the field of oil and mineral valuations.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes



# 2015 Certification for Furnas 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 Furnas 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



