

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 Garden County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	53	Median	97.27
Total Sales Price	\$2,625,350	Mean	98.52
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,623,850	Wgt. Mean	95.34
Total Assessed Value	\$2,501,476	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$41,111
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$49,507	Avg. Assessed Value	\$47,198

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.93 to 100.02
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.05 to 99.62
95% Mean C.I	94.09 to 102.95
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	8.04
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.34
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.13

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	54	97	96.97
2013	53	94	94.41
2012	39	98	97.56
2011	35	99	99

2015 Commission Summary for Garden County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	10	Median	97.23
Total Sales Price	\$160,000	Mean	93.73
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$178,000	Wgt. Mean	93.93
Total Assessed Value	\$167,190	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$45,141
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$17,800	Avg. Assessed Value	\$16,719

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	71.82 to 103.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	64.60 to 123.25
95% Mean C.I	76.24 to 111.22
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.48
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.02
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.23

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	7	100	94.08
2013	9		98.74
2012	11		99.80
2011	20	100	100

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Garden County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	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 Garden County

Last fall we received 2014 GIS imagery of all parcels in Garden County. Each parcel was compared to our current records for land use, improvements, and so forth. Notes were made of all changes and were entered in our permits program and were inspected and reviewed. Buildings were priced in CAMA, with appropriate depreciation applied. Last fall, as the final step of our rural residential review, questionnaires were mailed to every rural home owner. The questions included such things as; last update of kitchen, bathrooms, and roofs replaced, and so on. Upon receiving the questionnaires back, the records were updated accordingly. Also, the changes listed on building and zoning permits, along with other sources of discovery, were inspected and priced. Approximately 425 residential pickup items were reviewed and updated.

Doing the above projects completed our six year assessment cycle for all residential properties.

Sales and statistical information for the appropriate two-year sales period were reviewed. Questionnaires from buyers and other information were reviewed and the sales information updated. We had a total of 57 qualified residential sales; 14 in Lewellen, 3 in Lisco, 30 in Oshkosh and 10 rural residential properties. Performing the above mentioned projects brought statistics in all four valuation groupings, within the exception of Lisco, to appropriate ranges. Because there were only three residential sales in Lisco we were unable to get true statistical measures.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Garden County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:												
	Assessor, staff, and on a short-term basis 1 part-time lister as needed.												
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">1</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Oshkosh is the main business hub for Garden County, here is located the hospital, nursing home, bank and school.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">2</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Lewellen, the market is influenced primarily by the proximity to Lake McConaughy. There are some retail businesses, a bank and restaurant.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">3</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Lisco, the market here is very stagnant; when a property does sell typically it will be purchased and used as lodging for the hunters. A small bank is still in operation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">4</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">The rural is a different market for those individuals seeking the amenities of country living.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">AG</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Agricultural outbuildings were reviewed</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Oshkosh is the main business hub for Garden County, here is located the hospital, nursing home, bank and school.	2	Lewellen, the market is influenced primarily by the proximity to Lake McConaughy. There are some retail businesses, a bank and restaurant.	3	Lisco, the market here is very stagnant; when a property does sell typically it will be purchased and used as lodging for the hunters. A small bank is still in operation.	4	The rural is a different market for those individuals seeking the amenities of country living.	AG	Agricultural outbuildings were reviewed
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>												
1	Oshkosh is the main business hub for Garden County, here is located the hospital, nursing home, bank and school.												
2	Lewellen, the market is influenced primarily by the proximity to Lake McConaughy. There are some retail businesses, a bank and restaurant.												
3	Lisco, the market here is very stagnant; when a property does sell typically it will be purchased and used as lodging for the hunters. A small bank is still in operation.												
4	The rural is a different market for those individuals seeking the amenities of country living.												
AG	Agricultural outbuildings were reviewed												
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.												
	The cost approach will carry the most weight and the sales will be used in the development of the depreciation.												
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?												
	Working with a credentialed appraiser to establish new depreciation tables.												
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?												
	Yes												
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?												
	A market analysis of vacant lot sales and/or determining the residual value by subtracting the reproduction cost new less depreciation from the sale price. A square foot price has been developed for residential lots and a per acre breakdown has been established for larger parcels.												
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?												
	All lots are valued the same.												

8.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2013	2012	2010	2012-2013
	2	2013	2012	2010	2012-2013
	3	2013	2012	2010	2012-2013
	4	2013	2012	2010	2012-2013
	AG	2015	2012		2014

For the agricultural outbuildings the 2012 GIS imagery was compared to the 2014 GIS imagery and all changes were noted for on-site inspections. The outbuildings were repriced for 2015.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Garden County

County Overview

Garden County is primarily an agricultural county with a total countywide population of approximately 2060. The residential market is influenced by Oshkosh which is located along the North Platte River and has a population of approximately 884. Oshkosh is also the county seat and the main provider for most job opportunities and services in the area. The rural towns of Lewellen (pop. 224) and Lisco (unincorporated) are smaller with fewer services but may have some influence with those seeking recreational opportunities along the North Platte River. Lewellen may also draw some interest because of its proximity to Lake McConaughy to the east in Keith County.

Description of Analysis

There are 53 qualified sales in the residential sample. Four valuation groupings have been identified with differing market influences but all are supported by the strong agricultural background of the area. Two of the four Valuation Groupings have sufficient sales to demonstrate reliable measures of central tendency and the qualitative measures are reflective of the assessment actions which involved comparing 2012 GIS imagery to 2014 GIS imagery and noting any changes for on-site inspections. Questionnaires were also utilized to gather additional information. All improvements were valued using the Marshall Swift December 2012 cost indexes and new depreciation tables built from the market. Outbuildings were also revalued.

Garden County continues to meet the goals as established in the three year and six year physical inspection and review cycle. The assessor has a documented process for tracking the objectives and accomplishments of the six-year cyclical. Logging which areas are scheduled for review and which have been completed.

Sales Qualification

Garden County has a consistent procedure that is utilized for residential sales verification. A Department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates that a sufficient explanation has been documented to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales sample. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-half of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Garden County was selected for review in 2014. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Garden County

The overall measure of central tendency will be used as the point estimate in determining the level of value for the residential class of property in Garden County. Substratum with sufficient sales will also demonstrate acceptable measures of central tendency and are supported by the qualitative measures which are reflective of the assessment actions.

Level of Value

Based on all available information, the level of value of the residential property in Garden County is 97%.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Garden County

All commercial properties were physically inspected in August and September of last year, and all information entered in CAMA. We also mailed questionnaires for additional information. The current uses of all commercial properties were also reviewed and updated. Susan Lore was hired to assist us in creating a new commercial depreciation table, which was applied to all commercial properties. Appropriate physical and economic depreciation were applied to all records. Approximately forty individual pick-up items were also completed.

The county's commercial sales and statistical information were reviewed and updated with new information. We had eight qualified sales in the three-year sales period, which consisted of a variety of occupancy codes and low dollar sales (which makes depreciation tables very difficult to set). With the implementation of our commercial review, our median is now within the appropriate range.

NARRATIVE FOR GARDEN COUNTY COMMERCIAL DEPRECIATION STUDY AND REVIEW

During the fall of 2014, staff members from the Garden County Assessor's Office inspected, measured and photographed all commercial property located within Garden County. In October, 2014, Susan Lore, Lore Appraisal, began working with the staff and held three days of training concerning Marshall and Swift entry of the data collected during the onsite inspections. The Garden County Assessor's staff entered all the physical inspection data and assisted Susan Lore with gathering any other needed information.

During the time frame of October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2014, there were only ten sales within the county as shown on the draft statistics. One of these sales should be removed as the commercial building was converted into a residential property. The practice in the assessor's office is to send out a questionnaire concerning any property that sells within the current time frame. The assessor actually received 13 questionnaires with the following breakdown, 11 private sales and two listed with real estate agents. Statements on the questionnaires from the buyers indicated that two properties were purchased to be torn down; four were purchased due to the location in Lewellen and one property was involved in a trade.

Due to the very limited amount of sales over a three year time frame, the data collection for the depreciation study was expanded to include sales which had been recorded over the past five years. This only provided an additional five sales.

Using the 14 sales, market driven depreciation was calculated by subtracting the land value from the sales price and dividing that number by the replacement cost new from the 2014 costing program. Since there had not been any sales of vacant commercial land over the past five years, the assessor and the appraiser determined that land value should remain the same as in years previous.

Calculating the market depreciation had mixed results with the most evident fact that the majority of the sales would need to be depreciated at 90% or more. Upon further research, the main fact that came from this market study was that it didn't matter the age or the condition of the property, the buyers in the current market based their decision to buy on their own proposed use of the building. Quite often older buildings were purchased for storage rather than being used for a going concern. As was stated above two of the sales were purchased to tear down with the sales price reflecting that fact and very little if any value attributed to the building on the property.

Using the current sales only, the next step in the study was to enter the new values into a spreadsheet and calculate the sales ratio using the new values. The sales ratio for the current timeframe calculated to 93% which is at the lower end of the range of 92% to 100%. As an

additional test, a spreadsheet was compiled using the expanded 14 sales and these sales calculated a sales ratio of 100%.

It was decided after researching the market further to use the depreciation chart as stated in the Marshall & Swift program for various building occupancies and adding a locational depreciation of 15% for all commercial properties located within Garden County. Since the market depreciation rates were so high, it is the opinion of the appraiser that the office guideline of depreciation no higher than 90% for a habitable house could not be applied to a usable commercial property. After discussion, both the assessor and the appraiser agreed to use depreciation as high as 95% or higher depending on the availability of utilities and other amenities. Many of the older buildings do not have electricity and have had the water shut off.

Commercial properties are somewhat different than residential properties as even though a building may be totally worn out, it may still have a useful life.

By expanding the depreciation study to include sales over the past five years, several properties had sold twice during that timeframe. This fact posed a problem as several duplicate sales sold with the original sales price being low and the second sale without any improvements being much higher. After inspection of the duplicate sales, the amount of increase from original sale to current sale was from 200% to 471%. None of these sales had any improvement and from the physical inspection would indicate a poorer condition at the time of the second sale. In the current market, there was not any evidence that the valuations should increase to this extreme.

SALES RATIO STUDY

The sales ratio study reflects the sales which were recorded within the past three years ending on September 30, 2014. The sales ratio prior to the new replacement costs and depreciation study was 82%. Based on the nine good sales during the timeframe, the new sales ratio is 93%. If the sales ratio study is expanded to include sales for the past five years, the new sales ratio would be 100%.

The breakdown of the sales is as follows: (9 sales within past 3 years)

Sales \$10,000 and below	1
Sales \$10,000 to \$20,000	6
Sales over \$20,000	2

The breakdown of the sales is as follows: (14 sales within past 5 years)

Sales \$10,000 and below	3
Sales \$10,000 to \$20,000	7
Sales over \$20,000	4

Further observation shows that of the 14 expanded sales, nine of the 14 sales had a market driven depreciation of over 90%. The majority of the sales for both the current timeframe and the expanded sales are in the \$10,000 to \$20,000 bracket and when one looks at the market depreciation for these sales, ten sales would require a depreciation rate of more than 90%. Based on this fact and the additional fact that these properties are at the maximum depreciation, the possibility of lowering the value within the accepted sales ratio range is impossible.

With only nine sales within the current timeframe and only 14 sales in the expanded timeframe of five years, and many already depreciated to the maximum, the sales ratio is not an acceptable measure of the level of assessment.

Using either the sales ratio for the nine sales at 93% or the sales ratio for the 14 sales at 100%, both are within the approved range of 92% to 100%. Knowing that most of the sales are already at the maximum depreciation, the acceptable level of assessment cannot be improved. Based on this fact, the appraiser and the assessor chose to work to insure equalization between the commercial properties. One of the days of training was spent examining each of the commercial properties within Garden County and when needed the quality, condition and use were changed to equalize with other similar properties.

By using the process of comparing each individual commercial property and making sure that the quality and condition of similar buildings are equal, the valuation process for the Garden County commercial review is based on equalization rather than level of assessment. The sales ratio is within range but the other measures of the level of assessment are outside of acceptable ranges.

After the commercial review, the appraiser and the assessor are comfortable with the equalization process rather than using the level of assessment measurement.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Garden County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:										
	Assessor and staff.										
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:										
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="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;">1</td> <td>Oshkosh is the main business hub for Garden County, here is located the hospital, nursing home, bank and school.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Lewellen, the market is influenced primarily by the proximity to Lake McConaughy. There is also a bank, eating establishment, and several retail businesses.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Lisco, the market here is very stagnant; when a property does sell typically it will be purchased and used as lodging for the hunters. A bank is maintained in this small community.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>The rural is a different market for those individuals seeking the amenities of country living.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Oshkosh is the main business hub for Garden County, here is located the hospital, nursing home, bank and school.	2	Lewellen, the market is influenced primarily by the proximity to Lake McConaughy. There is also a bank, eating establishment, and several retail businesses.	3	Lisco, the market here is very stagnant; when a property does sell typically it will be purchased and used as lodging for the hunters. A bank is maintained in this small community.	4	The rural is a different market for those individuals seeking the amenities of country living.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>										
1	Oshkosh is the main business hub for Garden County, here is located the hospital, nursing home, bank and school.										
2	Lewellen, the market is influenced primarily by the proximity to Lake McConaughy. There is also a bank, eating establishment, and several retail businesses.										
3	Lisco, the market here is very stagnant; when a property does sell typically it will be purchased and used as lodging for the hunters. A bank is maintained in this small community.										
4	The rural is a different market for those individuals seeking the amenities of country living.										
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.										
	The cost approach will carry the most weight and the sales will be used in the development of the depreciation. There is not sufficient data to put any reliance on the income approach.										
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.										
	A contracted appraiser will be hired to assist in the proper valuation of a property considered to be a unique commercial property. This year Lore Appraisal was hired to do the school and nursing home in Lewellen.										
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?										
	Working with a credentialed appraiser to establish new depreciation tables from the market.										
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?										
	Yes										
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.										
	A market analysis of vacant lot sales and/or determining the residual value by subtracting the reproduction cost new from the sale price. A square foot price has been developed for commercial lots and a per acre breakdown has been established depending on the size of the larger parcels and the amenities.										

7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2014	2012	2014	2014
	2	2014	2012	2014	2014
	3	2014	2012	2014	2014
	4	2014	2012	2014	2014

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Garden County

County Overview

The commercial market in Garden County is not strong, Oshkosh is the main source of jobs, goods and services, Lewellen and Lisco with smaller populations have less to offer. A major employer is the Cabela's, Inc. Distribution Center; it is located on the east edge of Oshkosh and employs approximately 80 people. But most businesses are trying to maintain, a few new businesses may open, and others will be sold and never re-opened or used for storage. Lewellen, Lisco and Oshkosh are all located along highway 26 and supported by the strong agricultural market.

Description of Analysis

The commercial parcels in Garden County are represented by 41 different occupancy codes; 51% of the parcels are in offices, retail, storage warehouses and service repair garages. There have been only 10 commercial sales during this study period, the sample is considered unrepresentative of the population as a whole.

During 2014 and 2015 all commercial properties were reviewed and inspected. Susan Lore, Lore Appraisal, assisted with reviewing the data and establishing depreciation tables and equalization within the commercial class. A document titled "Narrative for Garden county Commercial Depreciation Study and Review" was provided to the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) to explain the appraisal process; it is included in this report following the commercial assessment actions summary.

Garden County continues to meet the goals established in the three year plan and six year physical inspection and review cycle. The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year review process.

Sales Qualification

The Department completed a sales verification review for all counties. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. Measurement was done utilizing all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-half of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Garden County was selected for review in 2014. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Garden County

applied consistently. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

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

Level of Value

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

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Garden County

Last fall we received 2014 GIS imagery for the entire county. This was compared, parcel by parcel, to our current records for land use changes, and so on. The land use was then updated wherever necessary. On the parcels for which we could not determine land use, letters were sent to the owners requesting that they either provide an FSA map or sign the bottom of the letter which would allow us to obtain their FSA maps. Special valuation verification forms were also sent and any changes were made.

The 2015 Garden County agland valuations were determined by using the compilation and statistics received from the PAD of all in-county agland sales deemed qualified in the required three-year sales period, the number of acres in each classification of land that sold and the median market value of each classification (at approximately 75%). Because the sales do not indicate any specific market areas, the value for each class (i.e., 3G1, 3G and so forth) will remain the same per class throughout the county. We were also required to use 50 sales from adjoining counties to set our values.

Preliminary stats on the 33 arm's length sales of agland in Garden County showed that our grass, dryland and irrigated land values were all below the acceptable level of assessment for agricultural land. Therefore, using the stats from our sales, and the other counties, values of irrigated land were increased from 32% to 36% per classification; dryland values 9% to 50% and grass values 11% to 13%.

All agricultural pick-up work was also completed. This included any new pivots or other use changes discovered from aeriels, new pivots being reported on personal property, and various other methods of discovery. Approximately 66 agricultural pick-up items were completed.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Garden County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:						
	Assessor and staff.						
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 65%;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Garden County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately eighty-four percent grass land. The remaining land is approximately ten-percent dry, four-percent irrigated and two-percent waste/water.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012-2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	0	Garden County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately eighty-four percent grass land. The remaining land is approximately ten-percent dry, four-percent irrigated and two-percent waste/water.	2012-2014
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>					
0	Garden County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately eighty-four percent grass land. The remaining land is approximately ten-percent dry, four-percent irrigated and two-percent waste/water.	2012-2014					
	In 2012 and in the spring of 2013 GIS Workshop took aerial photos of all rural improvements in Garden County. Many changes and new improvements were discovered. The aerials on the GIS website are 2014. Land use is annually reviewed for changes with the assistance of the NRD, FSA maps, and taxpayers.						
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.						
	Each year the agricultural sales are plotted on a geocode map of the county to determine if there is a potential need for market areas. The sales do not indicate a benefit for different areas.						
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.						
	<p>Agricultural – the parcel will be used primarily for agricultural purpose.</p> <p>Residential – the primary use will be for residential living.</p> <p>Recreational – blinds will be present and agricultural uses such as grazing may occur, but it is believed the primary use of the acres with blinds would have to be recreational, (each blind = 1 acre recreational).</p>						
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?						
	Yes - differences have not been recognized from the market.						
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.						
	Information is obtained from the North Platte Natural Resource District. In Garden County there are three parcels in WRP into perpetuity. Copies of the surveys were obtained and drawn onto the parcels. This land is all valued at 100% of market.						
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:						
	Yes						
7a.	What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist?						

	<p>In each three year sales period, we generally have a very small number of land sales along the North Platte River, these sales are primarily for recreational purposes (goose hunting, etc.). Most of the land along the river however, is used for agricultural purposes. In an attempt to fairly and accurately value this land, we have implemented Special Valuation in Garden County. Questionnaires have been sent out to all landowners along the river. Most who own land near the river, with adjoining accretion and river acres, file a Form 456 (Special Valuation Application). As a rule of thumb, the land owners that have hunting blinds but that also use the land for agricultural purposes (usually cattle grazing) have completed these forms by considering each blind to be one acre of recreational land, and the rest as agricultural land. The acres with blinds are then valued as recreational at 100% of market per sales. There are six parcels that are at 100% of value on all accretion acres. The remaining land is valued as agricultural, if used as such, and is based on approximately 75% of market.</p>
7b.	Describe the non-agricultural influences present within the county.
	Hunting blinds along the river are considered recreational.
7c.	How many parcels in the county are receiving special value?
	114
7d.	Where is the influenced area located within the county?
	Along the North Platte River.
7e.	Describe the valuation models and approaches used to establish the uninfluenced values.
	In the uninfluenced area the agricultural sales will be reviewed. A model will be built on a spreadsheet to analyze the market trends by class and subclass. Purposed values and estimated final statistics will be evaluated.

Garden County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Garden	1	n/a	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,963
Sheridan	1	n/a	1,690	1,625	1,500	1,495	1,480	1,470	1,440	1,556
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Keith	1	n/a	2,101	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Keith	2	n/a	3,000	2,750	2,750	2,650	2,650	2,650	2,650	2,781
Deuel	1	n/a	3,030	2,991	2,978	2,975	2,795	2,695	2,645	2,958
Cheyenne	3	n/a	3,030	3,010	3,000	2,995	2,800	2,700	2,650	2,991
Morrill	2	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Morrill	3	n/a	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,195	2,195	2,195	2,195	2,250
Morrill	3	n/a	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,195	2,195	2,195	2,195	2,250
Box Butte	1	n/a	2,445	2,210	2,458	2,490	2,481	2,484	2,488	2,473

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Garden	1	n/a	795	795	775	775	770	750	750	785
Sheridan	1	n/a	635	605	575	565	535	525	520	573
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Keith	1	n/a	625	n/a	600	600	600	600	600	601
Keith	2	n/a	1,190	1,155	1,140	1,115	1,115	1,115	1,115	1,170
Deuel	1	n/a	970	965	835	835	530	530	525	867
Cheyenne	3	n/a	775	770	720	710	700	685	680	759
Morrill	2	n/a	435	n/a	400	n/a	385	385	385	396
Morrill	3	n/a	500	500	450	450	450	450	450	461
Morrill	3	n/a	500	500	450	450	450	450	450	461
Box Butte	1	n/a	380	n/a	380	380	380	380	380	380

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Garden	1	n/a	397	300	342	318	335	298	291	295
Sheridan	1	n/a	430	430	420	410	410	335	300	334
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	315	315	315	315
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	315	n/a	315	315	315	315	315
Keith	1	n/a	436	n/a	369	338	343	329	327	328
Keith	2	n/a	521	606	464	496	451	413	402	414
Deuel	1	n/a	361	329	326	328	300	312	292	308
Cheyenne	3	n/a	523	492	506	482	445	444	259	399
Morrill	2	n/a	300	300	300	n/a	300	300	300	300
Morrill	3	n/a	385	355	325	300	300	300	300	304
Morrill	3	n/a	385	355	325	300	300	300	300	304
Box Butte	1	n/a	297	285	292	293	287	286	285	286

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

Janet L. Shaul
Garden County Assessor
P O Box 350
Oshkosh, NE 69154
308-772-4464
gcasr1@embarqmail.com

Ruth Sorensen
February 20, 2015
Property Tax Administrator
DOR, Property Assessment Division
P O Box 98919
Lincoln NE 68509-8919

Dear Ms. Sorensen;

Below is information regarding the procedures and methodologies used in Garden County to implement special valuation on qualified parcels of agricultural and horticultural land (per PAT Regulation 11-005.04).

1. *Methodology for determining special valuation of agricultural land (uninfluenced value).*

The 2015 Garden County ag land valuations are determined by using the compilation and statistics received from the PAT of all ag sales deemed qualified in the required three-year sales period, the number of acres in each classification of land that sold, and the median market value of each classification (at approximately 75%). Because the sales do not indicate any specific market areas, the value for each class (i.e. 3G1, 3G, etc.) will remain the same per class throughout the county.

The acceptable level of assessment for agricultural land is from 69% to 75%. Garden County ag sales in the three-year sales period show an overall median of 64%. Under the 80% majority land use, thirteen grass sales showed a median of 66.74%, eleven dryland sales had a median of 69.25% and five irrigated sales had a median of 52.52%. With the inclusion of borrowed sales, the values of all three classes of ag land will probably be raised to be within the acceptable range of values.

2. *Methodology for determining recapture valuation of agricultural land (market value).*

In 2012 Garden County began assessing all accretion land. In 2010 the County Board passed a resolution in which the owners of deeded land along the river are assessed on the land, accretion and water to the thread (center) of the main channel of the North Platte River. It is now assessed per soil type and use, the same as all other ag land. For the purposes of determining the party obligated for the real estate taxes on accretion land, the county determined that the riparian rule shall apply that when the North Platte River runs between two deeded landowners (patented property), each owner owns from his or her parcel to the center of the river's main channel. Deeds recorded on these sales generally include all land "accreted thereto," to the thread of the main channel.

In each three year sales period, we generally have a very small number of land sales along the North Platte River. These sales are primarily for recreational purposes (goose hunting, etc.). Much of the land along the river, however, is used primarily for agricultural purposes. In an attempt to fairly and accurately value this land, we have implemented Special Valuation in Garden County. Taxpayers who own land near the river, with adjoining accretion and river acres, file a Form 456 (Special Valuation Application). As a rule of thumb, the land owners that have hunting blinds but also use the land for ag purposes (usually cattle grazing) have completed these forms by considering each blind to be one acre of recreational land, and the rest as agricultural land. The acres with blinds are then valued as recreational at 100% of market based on sales. The remaining land is valued as agricultural, *if used as such*, and is based on approximately 75% of market.

Above are the methods Garden County uses to determine valuations for ag properties and recreational properties. The methods were decided on after much market analysis, deliberation and thought, and we feel it is the most equitable and uniform method of dealing with the above addressed land.

Sincerely,

Janet L. Shaul
Garden County Assessor

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Garden County

County Overview

Garden County is on the western edge of the Nebraska Sand Hills. Crescent Lake National Wildlife Refuge (protected in 1931), covers approximately 45,800 acres of this county, it is the largest protected continuous sand-dunes in the United States. The Sand Hill soils are predominantly of the Valentine series. Much of this land is in large ranches with native grasses covering the hills and dry valleys, areas along streams and in sub irrigated valleys are used for hay, and there is some sprinkler irrigation. The North Platte River flows across the southern part of the county, in this area the Loamy soils are better suited for crop production; more of the dry and irrigated cropland will be located in this region. The economy of the county relies heavily on the production of crops and livestock.

Garden County is part of the North Platte Natural Resource District. In western Nebraska ground water is greatly dependent on a series of canals, tributaries, and seasonal irrigation run-off, which recharge the Ogallala aquifer. In 2001 a moratorium on new water well drilling was put into effect.

Description of Analysis

A review of the agricultural sales over the three year study period seemed to indicate a representative sample. However, when examining the irrigated, dry and grass substratum the samples were small and a reasonable degree of certainty could not be placed on the substratum for measurement purposes. Sales were sought from comparable areas surrounding Garden County with similar soils and physical characteristics. The substratum was expanded and the statistical sampling of 77 sales was considered, as much as possible, proportionately distributed and representative of the land uses that exist within the county.

The assessment actions for Garden County reflect the general economic conditions; the values were increased in most all land capability groupings for all three classes of agricultural land (grass, dry and irrigated).

Sales Qualification

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

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The values established by the assessor have created intra-county and inter-county equalization.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Garden County

The calculated statistics demonstrate an acceptable overall level of value. Because Garden County is almost purely grassland the 95% MLU median for substrata grass will be considered as the best indicator of the level of value for the county.

Level of Value

Based on all available information; the level of value of the agricultural land in Garden County is determined to be 74% of market value.

**35 Garden
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 : 53
 Total Sales Price : 2,625,350
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,623,850
 Total Assessed Value : 2,501,476
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 49,507
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,198

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 10.82
 PRD : 103.34

COV : 16.70
 STD : 16.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.52
 MAX Sales Ratio : 145.64
 MIN Sales Ratio : 52.93

95% Median C.I. : 94.93 to 100.02
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.05 to 99.62
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.09 to 102.95

Printed: 4/2/2015 9:54:26AM

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	6	92.46	95.69	92.83	11.22	103.08	82.14	123.44	82.14 to 123.44	60,167	55,855
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	5	101.01	107.23	103.12	07.53	103.99	98.04	131.15	N/A	49,880	51,435
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	7	97.27	107.44	100.59	12.78	106.81	92.55	136.33	92.55 to 136.33	47,500	47,779
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	6	95.59	97.56	98.42	03.71	99.13	93.51	107.26	93.51 to 107.26	40,967	40,319
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	11	96.80	94.42	91.89	08.07	102.75	70.45	111.14	79.40 to 102.70	53,182	48,866
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	4	99.61	102.86	104.78	06.54	98.17	93.50	118.72	N/A	39,125	40,994
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	5	92.72	92.87	93.64	06.64	99.18	80.03	104.92	N/A	51,800	48,505
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	9	101.43	95.48	89.45	18.89	106.74	52.93	145.64	58.36 to 112.37	48,294	43,198
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	24	97.66	101.99	98.31	09.69	103.74	82.14	136.33	94.93 to 101.01	49,529	48,694
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	29	96.80	95.64	92.87	11.75	102.98	52.93	145.64	92.57 to 102.26	49,488	45,959
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	29	97.88	100.42	97.05	08.66	103.47	70.45	136.33	95.42 to 101.01	48,714	47,278
<u>ALL</u>	53	97.27	98.52	95.34	10.82	103.34	52.93	145.64	94.93 to 100.02	49,507	47,198

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	28	98.78	101.62	96.92	10.15	104.85	70.45	145.64	94.98 to 102.70	49,663	48,135
02	14	93.89	93.32	92.91	09.89	100.44	52.93	131.15	83.85 to 99.82	31,000	28,802
03	2	107.32	107.32	105.45	04.71	101.77	102.26	112.37	N/A	36,500	38,488
04	9	95.55	94.99	92.73	13.17	102.44	58.36	118.72	82.14 to 111.14	80,700	74,833
<u>ALL</u>	53	97.27	98.52	95.34	10.82	103.34	52.93	145.64	94.93 to 100.02	49,507	47,198

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	53	97.27	98.52	95.34	10.82	103.34	52.93	145.64	94.93 to 100.02	49,507	47,198
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	53	97.27	98.52	95.34	10.82	103.34	52.93	145.64	94.93 to 100.02	49,507	47,198

**35 Garden
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 : 53
 Total Sales Price : 2,625,350
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,623,850
 Total Assessed Value : 2,501,476
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 49,507
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,198

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 10.82
 PRD : 103.34

COV : 16.70
 STD : 16.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.52
 MAX Sales Ratio : 145.64
 MIN Sales Ratio : 52.93

95% Median C.I. : 94.93 to 100.02
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.05 to 99.62
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.09 to 102.95

Printed:4/2/2015 9:54:26AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	6	115.18	114.18	108.90	20.39	104.85	79.40	145.64	79.40 to 145.64	8,583	9,347	
Less Than 30,000	13	98.04	102.38	97.71	17.20	104.78	52.93	145.64	92.55 to 131.15	16,692	16,309	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	53	97.27	98.52	95.34	10.82	103.34	52.93	145.64	94.93 to 100.02	49,507	47,198	
Greater Than 14,999	47	96.80	96.52	95.06	09.06	101.54	52.93	136.33	94.93 to 99.88	54,731	52,030	
Greater Than 29,999	40	97.04	97.26	95.12	08.70	102.25	58.36	136.33	94.93 to 100.02	60,171	57,236	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	6	115.18	114.18	108.90	20.39	104.85	79.40	145.64	79.40 to 145.64	8,583	9,347	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	94.98	92.26	94.22	10.96	97.92	52.93	112.37	52.93 to 112.37	23,643	22,277	
30,000 TO 59,999	23	99.82	101.40	101.79	08.25	99.62	80.03	136.33	95.55 to 103.80	42,426	43,186	
60,000 TO 99,999	13	95.93	93.65	93.66	06.91	99.99	58.36	105.43	90.00 to 100.02	73,004	68,376	
100,000 TO 149,999	4	84.65	85.19	84.50	10.51	100.82	70.45	101.01	N/A	120,500	101,823	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	53	97.27	98.52	95.34	10.82	103.34	52.93	145.64	94.93 to 100.02	49,507	47,198	

**35 Garden
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 : 10
 Total Sales Price : 160,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 178,000
 Total Assessed Value : 167,190
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 17,800
 Avg. Assessed Value : 16,719

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 94
 COD : 16.33
 PRD : 99.79

COV : 26.09
 STD : 24.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.88
 MAX Sales Ratio : 143.55
 MIN Sales Ratio : 49.72

95% Median C.I. : 71.82 to 103.50
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.60 to 123.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 76.24 to 111.22

Printed: 4/2/2015 9:54:27AM

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											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	143.55	143.55	143.55	00.00	100.00	143.55	143.55	N/A	32,000	45,935
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	103.03	103.03	103.03	00.00	100.00	103.03	103.03	N/A	15,000	15,455
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	92.60	92.60	92.60	00.00	100.00	92.60	92.60	N/A	5,000	4,630
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13											
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	1	97.86	97.86	97.86	00.00	100.00	97.86	97.86	N/A	18,000	17,615
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	3	100.11	94.04	94.28	08.32	99.75	78.52	103.50	N/A	13,500	12,728
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	71.82	72.71	67.21	21.75	108.18	49.72	96.59	N/A	22,500	15,123
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	123.29	123.29	130.62	16.43	94.39	103.03	143.55	N/A	23,500	30,695
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	1	92.60	92.60	92.60	00.00	100.00	92.60	92.60	N/A	5,000	4,630
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	7	96.59	85.45	80.29	15.00	106.43	49.72	103.50	49.72 to 103.50	18,000	14,453
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	123.29	123.29	130.62	16.43	94.39	103.03	143.55	N/A	23,500	30,695
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	92.60	92.60	92.60	00.00	100.00	92.60	92.60	N/A	5,000	4,630
<u>ALL</u>	10	97.23	93.73	93.93	16.33	99.79	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,800	16,719

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	71.82	88.36	90.84	43.55	97.27	49.72	143.55	N/A	27,833	25,283
02	6	97.23	95.35	95.84	06.28	99.49	78.52	103.50	78.52 to 103.50	12,750	12,220
04	1	100.11	100.11	100.11	00.00	100.00	100.11	100.11	N/A	18,000	18,020
<u>ALL</u>	10	97.23	93.73	93.93	16.33	99.79	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,800	16,719

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	10	97.23	93.73	93.93	16.33	99.79	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,800	16,719
04											
<u>ALL</u>	10	97.23	93.73	93.93	16.33	99.79	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,800	16,719

**35 Garden
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 : 10
 Total Sales Price : 160,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 178,000
 Total Assessed Value : 167,190
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 17,800
 Avg. Assessed Value : 16,719

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 94
 COD : 16.33
 PRD : 99.79

COV : 26.09
 STD : 24.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.88
 MAX Sales Ratio : 143.55
 MIN Sales Ratio : 49.72

95% Median C.I. : 71.82 to 103.50
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.60 to 123.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 76.24 to 111.22

Printed:4/2/2015 9:54:27AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Low \$ Ranges												
Less Than 5,000	1	97.86	97.86	97.86	00.00	100.00	97.86	97.86	N/A	18,000	17,615	
Less Than 15,000	4	95.23	93.12	93.21	07.94	99.90	78.52	103.50	N/A	11,375	10,603	
Less Than 30,000	8	97.23	93.00	92.41	08.35	100.64	71.82	103.50	71.82 to 103.50	14,250	13,168	
Ranges Excl. Low \$												
Greater Than 4,999	9	96.59	93.27	93.48	18.12	99.78	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,778	16,619	
Greater Than 14,999	6	98.35	94.14	94.17	21.79	99.97	49.72	143.55	49.72 to 143.55	22,083	20,797	
Greater Than 29,999	2	96.64	96.64	96.63	48.55	100.01	49.72	143.55	N/A	32,000	30,923	
Incremental Ranges												
0 TO 4,999	1	97.86	97.86	97.86	00.00	100.00	97.86	97.86	N/A	18,000	17,615	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	92.60	91.54	90.16	09.00	101.53	78.52	103.50	N/A	9,167	8,265	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	98.35	92.89	91.88	08.83	101.10	71.82	103.03	N/A	17,125	15,734	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	96.64	96.64	96.63	48.55	100.01	49.72	143.55	N/A	32,000	30,923	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
ALL	10	97.23	93.73	93.93	16.33	99.79	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,800	16,719	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
0	1	103.03	103.03	103.03	00.00	100.00	103.03	103.03	N/A	15,000	15,455	
134	1	143.55	143.55	143.55	00.00	100.00	143.55	143.55	N/A	32,000	45,935	
344	1	71.82	71.82	71.82	00.00	100.00	71.82	71.82	N/A	19,500	14,005	
353	1	49.72	49.72	49.72	00.00	100.00	49.72	49.72	N/A	32,000	15,910	
384	1	78.52	78.52	78.52	00.00	100.00	78.52	78.52	N/A	12,500	9,815	
406	2	98.05	98.05	99.87	05.56	98.18	92.60	103.50	N/A	7,500	7,490	
477	1	96.59	96.59	96.59	00.00	100.00	96.59	96.59	N/A	16,000	15,455	
528	1	97.86	97.86	97.86	00.00	100.00	97.86	97.86	N/A	18,000	17,615	
852	1	100.11	100.11	100.11	00.00	100.00	100.11	100.11	N/A	18,000	18,020	
ALL	10	97.23	93.73	93.93	16.33	99.79	49.72	143.55	71.82 to 103.50	17,800	16,719	

35 Garden
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 : 77
Total Sales Price : 35,010,175
Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,390,295
Total Assessed Value : 21,884,822
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 446,627
Avg. Assessed Value : 284,218

MEDIAN : 69
WGT. MEAN : 64
MEAN : 72
COD : 24.52
PRD : 113.20

COV : 30.37
STD : 21.88
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.03
MAX Sales Ratio : 138.08
MIN Sales Ratio : 36.25

95% Median C.I. : 61.17 to 76.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.73 to 68.55
95% Mean C.I. : 67.15 to 76.93

Printed: 4/2/2015 9:54:28AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qrtrs											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	86.12	86.36	85.55	05.52	100.95	78.88	94.32	N/A	242,019	207,057
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	5	77.07	79.01	73.33	25.04	107.75	36.25	104.74	N/A	324,700	238,095
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	12	76.22	73.97	67.61	13.92	109.41	47.65	104.67	60.95 to 79.83	584,913	395,438
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	6	91.56	90.52	73.05	23.21	123.92	53.77	138.08	53.77 to 138.08	211,025	154,153
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	10	68.71	74.93	68.25	24.95	109.79	53.51	124.15	53.85 to 93.77	588,940	401,968
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	6	68.99	68.50	68.35	12.47	100.22	54.69	79.45	54.69 to 79.45	411,825	281,468
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	8	62.81	67.69	62.29	24.60	108.67	42.89	118.70	42.89 to 118.70	337,500	210,225
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	64.29	64.29	59.84	10.08	107.44	57.81	70.77	N/A	294,000	175,919
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	80.97	84.91	61.53	28.86	138.00	47.79	129.90	N/A	179,463	110,421
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	2	54.00	54.00	55.37	10.59	97.53	48.28	59.71	N/A	201,750	111,700
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	11	56.35	65.98	53.81	27.52	122.62	46.29	125.38	47.39 to 83.94	752,301	404,808
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	7	48.36	53.17	54.11	14.02	98.26	42.62	69.46	42.62 to 69.46	352,656	190,837
Study Yrs											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	27	78.57	80.42	70.69	18.73	113.76	36.25	138.08	71.34 to 87.90	402,840	284,773
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	26	64.71	70.40	66.47	21.37	105.91	42.89	124.15	60.16 to 77.69	448,014	297,774
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	24	55.40	64.40	54.39	28.03	118.40	42.62	129.90	48.32 to 74.84	494,386	268,909
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	33	77.07	78.03	68.87	21.47	113.30	36.25	138.08	65.55 to 84.67	478,728	329,707
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	20	65.17	71.04	64.29	23.19	110.50	42.89	129.90	60.16 to 77.69	323,840	208,206
ALL	77	69.46	72.04	63.64	24.52	113.20	36.25	138.08	61.17 to 76.40	446,627	284,218

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	77	69.46	72.04	63.64	24.52	113.20	36.25	138.08	61.17 to 76.40	446,627	284,218
ALL	77	69.46	72.04	63.64	24.52	113.20	36.25	138.08	61.17 to 76.40	446,627	284,218

35 Garden
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 : 77
 Total Sales Price : 35,010,175
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,390,295
 Total Assessed Value : 21,884,822
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 446,627
 Avg. Assessed Value : 284,218

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 64
 MEAN : 72
 COD : 24.52
 PRD : 113.20

COV : 30.37
 STD : 21.88
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.03
 MAX Sales Ratio : 138.08
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.25

95% Median C.I. : 61.17 to 76.40
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.73 to 68.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.15 to 76.93

Printed:4/2/2015 9:54:28AM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	2	65.40	65.40	53.95	34.42	121.22	42.89	87.90	N/A	386,523	208,532
0	2	65.40	65.40	53.95	34.42	121.22	42.89	87.90	N/A	386,523	208,532
Dry											
County	31	69.46	75.27	64.17	28.23	117.30	45.28	138.08	60.95 to 83.94	249,532	160,115
0	31	69.46	75.27	64.17	28.23	117.30	45.28	138.08	60.95 to 83.94	249,532	160,115
Grass											
County	28	74.27	67.39	64.13	17.21	105.08	36.25	98.78	56.35 to 77.69	477,730	306,369
0	28	74.27	67.39	64.13	17.21	105.08	36.25	98.78	56.35 to 77.69	477,730	306,369
ALL	77	69.46	72.04	63.64	24.52	113.20	36.25	138.08	61.17 to 76.40	446,627	284,218

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	6	56.63	60.18	54.27	21.31	110.89	42.89	87.90	42.89 to 87.90	591,645	321,102
0	6	56.63	60.18	54.27	21.31	110.89	42.89	87.90	42.89 to 87.90	591,645	321,102
Dry											
County	32	70.12	76.79	64.50	29.54	119.05	45.28	138.08	60.95 to 84.34	243,105	156,813
0	32	70.12	76.79	64.50	29.54	119.05	45.28	138.08	60.95 to 84.34	243,105	156,813
Grass											
County	33	74.15	69.64	65.16	19.11	106.88	36.25	118.70	57.81 to 77.69	563,519	367,186
0	33	74.15	69.64	65.16	19.11	106.88	36.25	118.70	57.81 to 77.69	563,519	367,186
ALL	77	69.46	72.04	63.64	24.52	113.20	36.25	138.08	61.17 to 76.40	446,627	284,218

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 4,496	Value : 507,032,569	Growth 1,253,669	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	74	180,587	11	31,779	22	48,334	107	260,700	
02. Res Improve Land	640	1,969,950	73	813,310	144	1,954,420	857	4,737,680	
03. Res Improvements	643	21,683,580	75	3,661,925	167	10,437,940	885	35,783,445	
04. Res Total	717	23,834,117	86	4,507,014	189	12,440,694	992	40,781,825	399,120
% of Res Total	72.28	58.44	8.67	11.05	19.05	30.51	22.06	8.04	31.84
05. Com UnImp Land	14	34,005	4	19,841	2	7,500	20	61,346	
06. Com Improve Land	111	442,210	10	221,137	16	446,531	137	1,109,878	
07. Com Improvements	118	4,476,445	10	892,810	18	952,980	146	6,322,235	
08. Com Total	132	4,952,660	14	1,133,788	20	1,407,011	166	7,493,459	101,537
% of Com Total	79.52	66.09	8.43	15.13	12.05	18.78	3.69	1.48	8.10
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	717	23,834,117	86	4,507,014	189	12,440,694	992	40,781,825	399,120
% of Res & Rec Total	72.28	58.44	8.67	11.05	19.05	30.51	22.06	8.04	31.84
Com & Ind Total	132	4,952,660	14	1,133,788	20	1,407,011	166	7,493,459	101,537
% of Com & Ind Total	79.52	66.09	8.43	15.13	12.05	18.78	3.69	1.48	8.10
17. Taxable Total	849	28,786,777	100	5,640,802	209	13,847,705	1,158	48,275,284	500,657
% of Taxable Total	73.32	59.63	8.64	11.68	18.05	28.68	25.76	9.52	39.94

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	30	37,070	30	37,070	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	7	41,978	7	41,978	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	37	79,048	37	79,048	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	68	3	25	96

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	476	31	2,632,948	2,744	342,976,693	2,776	345,610,117
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	54	2,397,713	557	80,380,965	611	82,778,678
29. Ag Improvements	1	60,985	26	1,248,885	498	28,979,572	525	30,289,442
30. Ag Total							3,301	458,678,237

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	2.99	4,485	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	16	19.00	135,515	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	16	0.00	814,250	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	11.55	9,350	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	23	68.78	158,365	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	60,985	25	0.00	434,635	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	63	86.47	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	1	4.82	14,730	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	83	86.50	259,000	86	89.49	263,485	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	314	401.04	2,887,003	330	420.04	3,022,518	
33. HomeSite Improvements	314	0.00	19,490,780	330	0.00	20,305,030	0
34. HomeSite Total				416	509.53	23,591,033	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	56	122.51	184,952	59	134.06	194,302	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	449	1,378.19	3,160,201	472	1,446.97	3,318,566	
37. FarmSite Improvements	480	0.00	9,488,792	506	0.00	9,984,412	753,012
38. FarmSite Total				565	1,581.03	13,497,280	
39. Road & Ditches	1,412	4,633.13	0	1,475	4,719.60	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	2	39.79	52,227	3	44.61	66,957	
41. Total Section VI				981	6,854.77	37,155,270	753,012

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	8	1,699.46	674,740
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	8	1,699.46	3,126,858
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	111	25,557.01	13,457,527	119	27,256.47	14,132,267
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3,579.12	9.27%	7,158,240	9.44%	2,000.00
47. 2A1	1,819.24	4.71%	3,638,480	4.80%	2,000.00
48. 2A	4,676.99	12.11%	9,353,980	12.34%	2,000.00
49. 3A1	272.16	0.70%	544,320	0.72%	2,000.00
50. 3A	12,664.84	32.79%	24,696,546	32.57%	1,950.01
51. 4A1	10,768.77	27.88%	20,999,202	27.69%	1,950.01
52. 4A	4,842.00	12.54%	9,441,975	12.45%	1,950.02
53. Total	38,623.12	100.00%	75,832,743	100.00%	1,963.40
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	66,733.56	63.26%	53,053,225	64.03%	795.00
56. 2D1	135.58	0.13%	107,786	0.13%	795.00
57. 2D	19,929.00	18.89%	15,445,068	18.64%	775.00
58. 3D1	242.18	0.23%	187,692	0.23%	775.01
59. 3D	11,106.19	10.53%	8,551,793	10.32%	770.00
60. 4D1	5,355.07	5.08%	4,016,409	4.85%	750.02
61. 4D	1,990.06	1.89%	1,492,611	1.80%	750.03
62. Total	105,491.64	100.00%	82,854,584	100.00%	785.41
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,318.83	0.38%	1,316,193	0.51%	396.58
65. 2G1	532.56	0.06%	159,768	0.06%	300.00
66. 2G	7,028.08	0.80%	2,404,578	0.93%	342.14
67. 3G1	1,777.73	0.20%	564,480	0.22%	317.53
68. 3G	39,221.00	4.48%	13,157,418	5.10%	335.47
69. 4G1	116,066.82	13.27%	34,576,289	13.41%	297.90
70. 4G	707,015.73	80.81%	205,620,085	79.76%	290.83
71. Total	874,960.75	100.00%	257,798,811	100.00%	294.64
Irrigated Total					
	38,623.12	3.69%	75,832,743	17.99%	1,963.40
Dry Total					
	105,491.64	10.08%	82,854,584	19.66%	785.41
Grass Total					
	874,960.75	83.60%	257,798,811	61.16%	294.64
72. Waste	17,903.89	1.71%	895,396	0.21%	50.01
73. Other	9,623.92	0.92%	4,141,433	0.98%	430.33
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	1,046,603.32	100.00%	421,522,967	100.00%	402.75

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	1,524.80	2,984,234	37,098.32	72,848,509	38,623.12	75,832,743
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	245.36	189,473	105,246.28	82,665,111	105,491.64	82,854,584
78. Grass	1.64	476	3,881.95	1,144,928	871,077.16	256,653,407	874,960.75	257,798,811
79. Waste	0.00	0	90.94	4,550	17,812.95	890,846	17,903.89	895,396
80. Other	0.00	0	739.23	385,031	8,884.69	3,756,402	9,623.92	4,141,433
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	1.64	476	6,482.28	4,708,216	1,040,119.40	416,814,275	1,046,603.32	421,522,967

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	38,623.12	3.69%	75,832,743	17.99%	1,963.40
Dry Land	105,491.64	10.08%	82,854,584	19.66%	785.41
Grass	874,960.75	83.60%	257,798,811	61.16%	294.64
Waste	17,903.89	1.71%	895,396	0.21%	50.01
Other	9,623.92	0.92%	4,141,433	0.98%	430.33
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	1,046,603.32	100.00%	421,522,967	100.00%	402.75

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

35 Garden

	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	40,159,399	40,781,825	622,426	1.55%	399,120	0.56%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	23,080,658	23,591,033	510,375	2.21%	0	2.21%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	63,240,057	64,372,858	1,132,801	1.79%	399,120	1.16%
05. Commercial	7,279,269	7,493,459	214,190	2.94%	101,537	1.55%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	13,164,444	13,497,280	332,836	2.53%	753,012	-3.19%
08. Minerals	254,558	79,048	-175,510	-68.95	0	-68.95
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	20,698,271	21,069,787	371,516	1.79%	854,549	-2.33%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	83,938,328	85,509,602	1,571,274	1.87%	1,253,669	0.38%
11. Irrigated	56,461,302	75,832,743	19,371,441	34.31%		
12. Dryland	72,745,230	82,854,584	10,109,354	13.90%		
13. Grassland	229,843,111	257,798,811	27,955,700	12.16%		
14. Wasteland	448,700	895,396	446,696	99.55%		
15. Other Agland	3,783,125	4,141,433	358,308	9.47%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	363,281,468	421,522,967	58,241,499	16.03%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	447,219,796	507,032,569	59,812,773	13.37%	1,253,669	13.09%

2014 Plan of Assessment for Garden County Assessment Years 2015, 2016 and 2017

Date: June 16, 2014

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Nebraska 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 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 of Commissioners. 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.” Nebraska 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;
- 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 Garden County:

Per the 2014 County Information, Garden County consists of 4,486 parcels with the following real property types:

<u>No. of Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Base Of Real Estate</u>
-----------------------	---------------------------	---

Residential	982	21.89	8.91
Commercial	168	3.74	1.61
Agricultural	3,299	73.54	89.42
Mineral	37	.82	.06

Garden County has 1,046,641.45 acres of assessed agricultural land (with GIS acre counts); 3.66% consists of irrigated land, 83.55% consists of grassland, 10.16% is dryland, and 2.63% is waste, water, etc. Garden County has a State Game Refuge which lies 110 yards back from the river banks of the North Platte River (NE Statute 37-706). In the northern half of the county lies Crescent Lake National Wildlife refuge. It is a Federal refuge consisting of approximately 46,637 acres.

New Property: For assessment year 2014, several building permits and/or Information Statements and zoning permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. The 2014 yearly pickup work incorporated these permits, which included newly constructed buildings, removed/deteriorated improvements, updating any land uses, etc.

Current Resources:

A. *Staff/Budget/Training:*

The Assessor’s staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor and one clerk. We will submit a budget for around \$90,000 (not fully determined yet) for the office and around \$30,000 (not determined yet) for appraisal work. The assessor and deputy obtain the sixty hours of required hours of training necessary to retain assessor’s certification.

B. *Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos:*

The Garden County Cadastral Maps were prepared in the 1970’s (as closely as we can determine). The assessor and staff keep ownership current, and all split outs are updated on the maps. In 2008 we contracted with GIS Workshop in Lincoln, Nebraska for a GIS system with the new numerical soil survey. We have been working since that time on entering parcel IDs, ownership lines, land use, etc. in our administrative system to update our land records. For 2012 this process has been completed and rolled into our records.

C. *Property Record Cards:*

The Garden County Assessor’s property record cards are very complete, detailed and current. The record cards contain the following:

- Owner’s name and address
- 911 address (situs)
- Parcel identification number
- Pricing sheets of houses, garages and out buildings which include all information and notes about each improvement, Replacement Cost New with depreciation applied for current condition, location, etc. Current values are shown and necessary information showing how the values are derived
- Numbered photos depicting each improvement

- Sketches of all buildings
- Cadastral map page and aerial map number
- Tax district code which includes all districts to which each parcel pays taxes
(school, county, community college, Natural Resource District, ESU District,
Ag Society, Airport Authority, Fire and Cemetery Districts, etc.)
- School District number, Fire District and Cemetery District (i.e. 1f3c3)
- PAD's six digit school codes
- Aerial photo for all rural parcels of land and of improvements
- Aerial photo of land
- Notes concerning inspections
- A summary sheet with a correlation statement explaining the three approaches to value (updated yearly)

D. *Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration:*

The Garden County Assessor's office has contracted with MIPS/County Solutions for CAMA pricing and an administrative package. This works very well. We have also contracted with GIS Workshop for a GIS system, which was implemented in 2012.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. *Discover, List and Inventory all property:*

The appropriate paperwork for Real Estate Transfers is completed as soon as possible after they are brought to our office by the County Clerk's personnel. Ownership changes, etc. are completed in the computer, on the property record card and folder, in the real estate books, in the cadastral map, on index cards, on a tablet of changes for the Treasurer's office, and in GIS if applicable.

Methods of discovering changes in real estate include county zoning permits, city building permits, information from realtors and appraisers, reports by taxpayers and neighbors, ongoing inspections by staff as we travel throughout the county, and a variety of other sources. New pivots listed on Personal Property Schedules indicate newly irrigated land.

B. *Data Collection:*

We perform extensive pick-up work each year. Data and information are collected by two staff members, with guidance from Jerry Knoche, our contracted appraiser, when needed. In accordance with Nebraska Statute 77-1311.03 the county is working toward reviewing all parcels of real property no less frequently than every six years. Further, properties are reviewed as deemed necessary from analysis of the market.

C. *Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions:*

We monitor sales of each classification of property; sales studies are ongoing, and are used extensively for valuation updates each year. This information is also used to prepare depreciation tables. We prepare spread sheets of residential, commercial and

agricultural sales each year based on the qualified sales rosters. We also prepare maps with ag sales plotted to indicate any potential market areas of value, etc. We run miscellaneous “what-ifs” to determine the most appropriate percentage increases/decreases to apply, if needed, to bring values within the required statistical ranges.

D. *Approaches to Value:*

1) *Market Approach; sales comparisons:*

As mentioned above we perform extensive sales studies, and the market approach is shown by the current adjusted valuations.

2) *Cost Approach; cost manual used and date of manual and latest depreciation study:*

The date of the Marshall & Swift manual used on all residential improvements is 2005. However, we recently started using the MIPS V2 program, and the CAMA program with it uses 2012 pricing. Our records have the Replacement Cost New of improvements, with depreciation applied for the current condition, location, etc. This reflects the cost approach.

3) *Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market:*

In a rural county like Garden County, for most properties the income approach is not applicable or workable.

4) *Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land:*

As stated above, we complete extensive sales studies, prepare various spread sheets of sales, plat all sales on a map of the county to indicate any potential areas of market, etc. We also run various “what if’s” using numerous potential changes in values to different classes of land to determine the most equitable and appropriate overall increases/decreases in values to achieve the required statistics for levels of values.

E. *Reconciliation of Final Value and Documentation:*

The market is analyzed based on the standard approach to valuation, with the final value based on the most appropriate method.

Our property record cards have all necessary information to show values, how values were arrived at, etc. On improved parcels we have the Replacement Cost New of improvements and physical, locational and any functional depreciations appropriate for the final values. Each file with improvements contains a correlation section that summarizes the results of each approach to value that has been completed for each parcel. We have appraisal information with depreciation tables, cost tables, etc. easily available for anyone who wishes to view it.

F. *Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions:*

All assessment actions are taken with the assessment sales ratio studies in mind, to insure that the actions taken result in the proper valuations to meet the required statistics.

G. *Notices and Public Relations:*

Notice of Valuation Changes are mailed to property owners on or before June 1st of each year, along with a letter explaining all value changes, statistics, etc. These are mailed to the last known address of property owners. After notices have been mailed, the assessor and staff are available to answer any questions or concerns from the taxpayers.

The assessor and staff believe in keeping the public informed of laws and requirements of the office. Articles are put in the paper about homestead exemptions, personal property filing deadlines, budgets of all taxing entities to inform taxpayers where their tax dollars go, etc.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Coefficient of Dispersion</u>	<u>Price Related Differential</u>
Residential	97	14.17	105.32
Commercial	94	11.28	100.94
Agricultural	70	23.21	107.83

For more information regarding statistical measures, see the 2014 DOR PAD Garden County Reports and Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

Residential:

In 2008 we implemented a countywide residential reappraisal. For 2009 we adjusted the economic depreciation in Lewellen due to a decreased market. Every year we monitor residential sales and make appropriate adjustments. Each year we also inspect/appraise any properties for which building permits or Information Statements were completed, along with any other changes that came to our attention.

In 2011/2012 we started the six year review cycle again; residential properties in Oshkosh were reviewed, pictures taken and questionnaires completed and signed by the owner/occupants.

The aerial photos of all rural improvements in the county we had been using were taken in March of 2005. Therefore, new aerials were again taken by GIS Workshop late 2012 and early 2013. These photos were compared to the old ones, and changes were noted. All new information was entered into our CAMA pricing program and implemented began in 2013. In 2013 we continued the review with Lewellen and Lisco residential parcels being inspected, pictures taken, etc. This info was entered into CAMA, and any big changes were marked for 2013 pickup work. The rest was implemented for 2014.

In May 2013 we started using the MIPS V2 administrative and CAMA programs. Our info from the older 2005 Marshall & Swift pricing was rolled over into 2012 pricing. Much of our time was spent building new depreciation tables and implementing them on all residential properties. Lore Appraisal was hired to assist in creating new depreciation tables.

In 2014 we finalized on-site inspections and pricing of the changes found in the recent aerial photos.

For 2015 we plan to continue preparing and mailing questionnaires to all rural home owners to gather information on home interiors, changes, etc. All changes will be repriced and updated. This, along with the above actions, will conclude the rural Review. In August, 2008, our contracted appraiser, Jerry Knoche, trained our staff in listing property

Commercial:

All commercial properties were inspected, and Jerry created a depreciation table using qualified sales in the appropriate time frame.

Effective ages of improvements were determined using appropriate price per square foot figures derived from sales. All commercial properties were repriced with current information and using the applicable effective ages and depreciations. All commercial lots were repriced with recent information. New values were implemented in 2009. Since that time sales have been monitored, and this process will continue each year.

Agricultural Land:

Our primary focus in 2013 was the final implementation of GIS into our records with coding adjustments, etc. On June 23, 2008 the Garden County Board of Commissioners signed a contract with GIS Workshop to obtain a GIS system for the Assessor's office. This was the first step toward implementing the new soil survey. We added parcel ID numbers in 2009 and in 2010 through 2012 we entered land use information, including sites, roads, etc. This info was rolled into all real estate records in 2012, and the values were set using this updated information. For 2013 we continued to review this program and correct any errors, etc. All arm's length sales are very closely studied. Statistical measures from the three prior years' sales (in the appropriate sales periods) were reviewed; grass values continue to be within the required range. The Dryland median was low, so all dryland values were raised by around 5%. Values for irrigated land continue to be extremely low, and irrigated land continues to sell for higher prices. Therefore, all classes of irrigated land values were increased by as much as 55%.

For 2014 reviewed sales and statistical measures on all classes of land, etc. Irrigated, dryland and grass values were all increased. Land use changes (i.e. new pivots, etc. on personal property schedules and elsewhere) were updated on land records.

For 2015 we will continue to review sales and statistical measures on all classes of land, etc. and any indications of value changes will be considered and implemented. We will continue to monitor land use changes, new pivots, etc. on personal property schedules and elsewhere, and update land records accordingly. We should be receiving 2014 GIS photos of all ag land in early 2015, so will begin the process of comparing them to our current records to assure land use is accurate/updated.

Special Value:

As with agricultural land, sales will be monitored. Because we have so few sales of riverland in each three-year sales period, any changes in value are hard to determine and/or justify.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:

We will continue doing pickup work on residential and commercial properties. We will continue to monitor land use changes, sales, etc., and value all classes of property accordingly. We will update sales to the current study period for the coming year, and

review sales transactions and questionnaires, etc. to determine which sales warrant an onsite review.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2017:

We will continue the above.

Other Functions Performed by the Assessor's Office, But Not Limited to:

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership change.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Real Estate Abstract
 - b. Assessed Value Update showing the current value of real estate in sales
 - c. Assessor Survey
 - d. Report Sales information for PA&T rosters
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - 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
 - k. Average Residential Value for Homestead Exemption purposes
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 550 schedules; prepare subsequent notice for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: 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 150 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Send "Notice Valuation Change" notices for all properties on which values changed by June 1st.
8. Centrally Assessed: review of valuations of entities as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
9. Certify total valuations of real estate, personal property and centrally assessed companies to all taxing entities by August 20th.
10. Annual Inventory: update report designating personal property of the Assessor's office by August 25th each year.
11. Tax Increment Financing: management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.

12. 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.
13. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
14. County Board of Equalization: attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
15. TERC Appeals: prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
16. TERC Statewide Equalization: attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
17. Education: Assessor and/or Deputy Assessor: attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Anyone currently holding an assessor's certificate is required to obtain a minimum of 60 hours every 4 years.
18. Prepare, maintain and update a Garden County Procedures Manual.
19. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval when necessary.

Conclusion

The main goal for Garden County is equalization and uniformity of valuation of all property in the county. The first step is to assure good record keeping and constant analysis of sales information.

The Garden County Assessor and staff strive very diligently to complete all duties and responsibilities required of the office, while doing so within the budget we are allowed.

We run an efficient, user-friendly office which both serves the public and obeys the Nebraska Statutes, Regulations, and Directives that we are obligated to follow. I believe we do so in a very appropriate, congenial manner.

Respectfully submitted:

Janet L. Shaul, Garden County Assessor

Date

We hereby accept the

**2014 Plan of Assessment for Garden County
Assessment Years 2015, 2016 and 2017**

As presented to us by Janet L. Shaul, Garden County Assessor, on July 8, 2014 per Nebraska Department Of Property Assessment and Taxation Directive 05-04 and Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02.

Garden County Board of Equalization:

Robert Radke, Chairperson

Date: _____

Casper Corfield

Randall Dormann

2015 Assessment Survey for Garden County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1 (he is also the zoning administrator)
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1 - estimate about three weeks a year
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 119,750
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	none
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	Currently there is \$ 54,090 in this fund; a levy will no longer be assessed to replenish it. GIS and computer supplies are also purchased out of this fund.
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$ 10,000
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 1,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$ 108,750
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$ 4,107 due to no deputy

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Oshkosh and Lewellen
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1998 - rural

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Lore Appraisal - as needed. There are no contracts.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	MIPS

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Only as needed.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	No
	No
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Will need to be credentialed.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Not applicable.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	Not applicable.

2015 Certification for Garden 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 Garden 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

