

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 Jefferson County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	160	Median	98.20
Total Sales Price	\$9,933,050	Mean	107.35
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,933,050	Wgt. Mean	93.84
Total Assessed Value	\$9,321,386	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$50,490
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$62,082	Avg. Assessed Value	\$58,259

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.25 to 102.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.67 to 98.02
95% Mean C.I	100.63 to 114.07
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	12.56
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.37
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.04

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	156	94	94.32
2013	155	97	97.07
2012	148	98	98.42
2011	162	98	98

2015 Commission Summary for Jefferson County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	5	Median	103.94
Total Sales Price	\$126,150	Mean	100.80
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$126,150	Wgt. Mean	89.58
Total Assessed Value	\$113,007	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$128,862
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$25,230	Avg. Assessed Value	\$22,601

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	64.47 to 137.13
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.67
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.94
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.16

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	4	100	92.99
2013	9		99.35
2012	13		98.40
2011	24		97

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Jefferson County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	98	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	Valuation Grouping # 11, an adjustment of 9%
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

***A level of value displayed as NEI (not enough information) represents a class of property with insufficient information to determine a level of value.*

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Jefferson County

For 2015, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all residential pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

The county revalued the parcels in neighborhood #3 of Fairbury. In addition, the county updated the costs to 2013 for all of the small towns; in Valuation group #12, including Daykin, Diller, Endicott and Jansen and in Valuation group #15, including Harbine, Reynolds, and Steele City. The county also did an inspection and review process of those 2 valuation groups that utilized Pictometry and Google Earth to discover noticeable changes to the property. When changes were discovered they went to the house with the existing record to verify or update the measurements, description of property characteristics, observations of quality and condition and take new photos. Other houses in the surrounding area were viewed to observe changes in the condition at that time.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:												
	Assessor, and Staff												
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>Fairbury: The largest town; it is analyzed in 3 separate areas for valuation purposes; the main trade and employment center in the county; the county seat; has a K-12 school system.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">08</td> <td>Plymouth: Located closer to a larger trade and employment center (Beatrice); the market for residential properties is unique. The Tri-County School District, a K-12 system is only 2 to 3 miles from Plymouth. The COOP is a very large one and is an important business and employer to the community.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td>Rural: (Including: Rural Res and Res on Agricultural parcels) The locations are scattered across the county; the market for acreages is distinctly different than the market in the small villages. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county. Residences on agricultural parcels and agricultural buildings are associated with this valuation group and valued at the same time.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td>Daykin, Diller, Endicott and Jansen: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have a limited but stable market for residential property; they have somewhat limited infrastructure; they have few school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Harbine, Reynolds, and Steele City: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have no organized market for residential property; they have very limited infrastructure; they have no school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Fairbury: The largest town; it is analyzed in 3 separate areas for valuation purposes; the main trade and employment center in the county; the county seat; has a K-12 school system.	08	Plymouth: Located closer to a larger trade and employment center (Beatrice); the market for residential properties is unique. The Tri-County School District, a K-12 system is only 2 to 3 miles from Plymouth. The COOP is a very large one and is an important business and employer to the community.	11	Rural: (Including: Rural Res and Res on Agricultural parcels) The locations are scattered across the county; the market for acreages is distinctly different than the market in the small villages. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county. Residences on agricultural parcels and agricultural buildings are associated with this valuation group and valued at the same time.	12	Daykin, Diller, Endicott and Jansen: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have a limited but stable market for residential property; they have somewhat limited infrastructure; they have few school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.	15	Harbine, Reynolds, and Steele City: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have no organized market for residential property; they have very limited infrastructure; they have no school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>												
01	Fairbury: The largest town; it is analyzed in 3 separate areas for valuation purposes; the main trade and employment center in the county; the county seat; has a K-12 school system.												
08	Plymouth: Located closer to a larger trade and employment center (Beatrice); the market for residential properties is unique. The Tri-County School District, a K-12 system is only 2 to 3 miles from Plymouth. The COOP is a very large one and is an important business and employer to the community.												
11	Rural: (Including: Rural Res and Res on Agricultural parcels) The locations are scattered across the county; the market for acreages is distinctly different than the market in the small villages. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county. Residences on agricultural parcels and agricultural buildings are associated with this valuation group and valued at the same time.												
12	Daykin, Diller, Endicott and Jansen: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have a limited but stable market for residential property; they have somewhat limited infrastructure; they have few school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.												
15	Harbine, Reynolds, and Steele City: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have no organized market for residential property; they have very limited infrastructure; they have no school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.												
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.												
	The county uses both the Sales Comparison approach to value and Cost Approach to value (replacement cost new less depreciation). The values are reconciled with the Sales Comparison approach carrying the most weight.												
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?												
	Local market information is used to develop the depreciation schedules.												
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?												
	Individual tables are developed based on different locations.												
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?												

Current local sales are used to determine lot and land values. The unit of comparison used for residential lot studies and application is by the square foot.

7. Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?

There are only a scattering of vacant lots found throughout the county. In most of the towns, there is no organized development taking place. There is some development in Fairbury but it is not a common practice for developers to maintain a surplus of vacant lots. To date, no developer has requested a discounted cash flow analysis of the valuation of their lots, and the county does not currently use discounted cash flow techniques to value any vacant lots.

<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
01	2008 & 2013	2008 & 2013	2008 & 2013	2006-2013
08	2005	2005	2005	2008
11	2008	2008	2008	2013 & 2014
12	2013	2013	2013	2009
15	2013	2013	2013	2009

----The depreciation tables are redone whenever the costs are updated. They tend to be the same or nearly the same date as the cost tables.

----2005 for Plymouth, and Diller; 2008 for Fairbury and rural residential; and Dec 2001 for the remainder of County.

----The County is in the process of changing to Dec 2013 costing and adjusting depreciation. during 2014 they recosted valuation groupw 12 and 15 which includes all of the smaller towns. Depreciations were adjusted to maintain values. Lot values were affirmed but not changed.

----Lot sales are analyzed (if sales occur) on an ongoing basis. When the valuation groups are reviewed and re-appraised they verify whether the lot values are holding or if the values need to be adjusted before the improvements are appraised. Going forward, this practice will continue and the lots will be either affirmed or updated whenever the class or subclass is inspected, reviewed and recosted.

----The county has developed the valuation groups partly based on the original assessor locations and partly on the way they organize their work. They typically inspect, review and analyze each town separately. The county has identified characteristics that make each town unique. Those characteristics vary, but are usually related to the population, schools, location, businesses and services in each town. In Valuation groups #12 and #15 where multiple towns are grouped together, the characteristics are considered to be similar. Valuation group #15 has multiple cost dates because some of the small towns were costed at different dates in the past.

----Within the Valuation Group #1 (Fairbury), The work is organized into 3 neighborhoods that are intended to break the town into manageable appraisal zones. Neighborhood #3 was reviewed during 2013 and 2014 and will have new values for use in 2015, so there are 2 cost dates for Valuation Group #1, (Fairbury).

----When the dates for inspection and review, costing, depreciation tables and lot value study are reviewed; typically, residences on agricultural parcels and agricultural buildings are associated with #11, the "Rural" valuation group.

---There has been some inspection and review conducted in various areas in Fairbury every year. The Rural and ag res have been inspected and reviewed over the past 2 years. The costs will be converted to 2013 and all parcels will ve revalued during 2015 for use in 2016.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Jefferson County

County Overview

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of nine villages and small towns. Eight of them range in population from 49 to 409 and exist primarily to support agriculture. Fairbury, with a population of 3,942, is the largest town and county seat. It hosts additional nonagricultural employers and has a more diversified business climate. According to the 2010 Census data cited in the Departments CTL based municipality charts; the county population is 7,547, with 5,206 or 68.98% living within the villages and towns and 2,341 or 31.02% living outside of the municipal areas. The 2015 Abstract Form 45, reports 3,540 residential and 15 recreational parcels, for a class total of 3,555. There are an additional 524 residences located on agricultural parcels.

Description of Analysis

Jefferson County has divided their residential analysis and valuation work into 5 valuation groups. These groups are centered on two individual towns, a group of smaller towns, a group of small villages and rural residential parcels. The characteristics of each Valuation Group are described in in the Residential Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector.

For 2015, the median ratio for the 160 qualified residential sales is 98% and is within the acceptable range; the COD at 29.18 is well above the acceptable range and the PRD at 114.40 is also well above the acceptable range. In the analysis of residential sales the impact of small dollar sales needs to be examined. A review of the COD and PRD for the total sample can often lead to the conclusion that the quality of assessment is not good. It is useful to evaluate the COD and PRD of a slightly trimmed sample of the sales to evaluate the quality of assessment of the bulk of the parcels. The section of the statistical report that examines the "Sale Price" ranges offers the opportunity to do so. By reviewing the analysis of the 110 sales with prices greater than \$29,999, the assessment level and quality of about 69% of the sales is reported. That gives a statistical perspective of the quality of assessment of the majority of the parcels that is not impacted by the volatility if the selling prices of low price property. The median ratio for the trimmed sample is 93% and only had a fractional change since the median is not as volatile a statistic. However, the trimmed COD is 21.05%, the PRD is 104.77. These statistics are still above the desired ranges. When the sales of parcels for less than \$30,000 are excluded it demonstrates how the county's predominant residential parcels are valued. It also shows that the more volatile low dollar sales are responsible for a disproportionate impact on the assessment statistics depicting quality of assessment, particularly the COD and the PRD. In this case the trimmed group was large including 31% of the qualified sales. Even with the exclusion of nearly one third of the sales, the indications of the quality of assessment were still outside the desired range.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Jefferson County

Sales Qualification

During the past year, the Department reviewed the documentation of three years of the county's sale verification process posted in the comments in the sales file. The county has posted comments when required on nearly all of the sales reviewed. In most cases, the comments were complete enough to conclude why the sale was not used or adjusted for the ratio study. There was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process. The county qualified 53% of all of the residential sales, so the Department believes that all available sales were used in the measurement process.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The quality statistics for the county and for the individual valuation groups are troubling. There are questions if the values are equalized throughout the residential class. The quality of assessment reported for 2014 was questionable and the statistics that measure quality of assessment for 2015 are also questionable. While many of the practices have been acceptable, the assessment performance statistics are not. The rural residential valuation grouping is valued below the acceptable range creating inequity among the residential class of property. Therefore, the assessment practices are not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

The apparent level of value for the residential class based solely on the median calculation is 98%. The calculated median for Valuation Grouping #11 (rural residential) is 88.02% and below the desired range. In 2013 it measured about 93% and in 2014, it measured 92%. With a COD of 14.46 and a PRD of 103.02, there seems to be acceptable uniformity in Valuation Grouping #11 even though the residential class and other subclasses do not. The past measurements demonstrate a consistent pattern of increasing values and decreasing ratios indicating the undervaluation of Valuation Grouping #11. The Department believes that the residential class, based on a review of the current and past valuation statistics has a level of value of 98% and within the range but that Valuation Grouping #11 needs to be adjusted by plus 9% to achieve amidrange level of value for that subclass.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Jefferson County

For 2015, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all commercial pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

There was no planned inspection and review of commercial parcels during 2014.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Jefferson 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:			
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>		
	19	Includes all Assessor Locations: All commercial sales in Jefferson County are grouped together for analysis and valuation.		
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.			
	The cost approach is the primary method and is used on all parcels. If sufficient data is available, a Market Approach (sales comparison approach) is used and the two values are correlated for a final value.			
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.			
	The assessor relies heavily on the experience of the current staff when unique commercial property is appraised. The assessor and staff members are familiar with the appraisal techniques, sales and procedures used in other counties. There is an exchange of information among other assessors that have similar parcels. This process helps to determine a value and to value unique property similarly to other like property in nearby jurisdictions. ----If it is necessary for an unusual property, the county would contract with an outside appraiser.			
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?			
	The local market			
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?			
	Yes; but there is only one valuation group in commercial. There will be individual depreciation developed for various uses or groups of like uses and locations within the valuation group. Among the commercial property, the depreciation tends to be driven by both use and location as well as quality and condition.			
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.			
	The county uses sales of vacant land calculated by square foot for the common unit of comparison.			
7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	19	2008	2008	2008
				<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
				2009

----The depreciation tables are redone whenever the costs are updated. They tend to be the same or nearly the same date as the cost tables.

----The 2008 costs are used for the commercial parcels throughout the county.

----Lot sales are analyzed (if sales occur) on an ongoing basis. When the commercial parcels are reviewed and re-appraised they verify whether the lot values are holding or if the values need to be adjusted before the improvements are appraised. Going forward, this practice will continue and the lots will be either affirmed or updated whenever the class or subclass is inspected, reviewed, recosted, and reappraised.

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Jefferson County

County Overview

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of nine municipalities; eight villages and small towns, and the town of Fairbury. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. Fairbury, the county seat, is the predominant location for much of the commercial and industrial property. The Department's "2014 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type" reports that 39% of the commercial valuation is reported in Fairbury, 14% is in Plymouth, 9% in Daykin, 6% in the remaining small towns and 32% is in the non-municipal areas. Fairbury has about 17% of the industrial valuation, Plymouth over 7% and the remaining nearly 76% is in the non-municipal areas of the county. The 2015 Abstract Form 45, reports 509 commercial and 25 industrial parcels, for a class total of 534.

Description of Analysis

Jefferson County uses only one valuation group to analyze and value their commercial property. They do look at individual towns as subclasses and develop separate economic depreciation in separate locations.

The key statistics that are prepared and considered for measurement are as follows: there are 5 qualified sales; the median ratio is 104%; the COD is 19.97; and the PRD is 112.53. Of the 5 qualified sales, 3 are in Fairbury, 1 in Diller and 1 in Reynolds. When the 4 different occupancy codes are reviewed, there are 2 sales in code 406 (storage warehouse); 1 sales in code 344 (office building); 1 sale in code 353 (retail store); and 1 sale in code 386 (mini warehouse). Since there are only 4 occupancy codes, there are still many property types with no representation and those that are represented are insufficient for preparing a viable statistical analysis. In short, there are not sufficient sales to represent or measure either the overall class or any subclass of the commercial property.

Sales Qualification

The Division has reviewed the county's sale verification process and finds that the county has retained an unusually low number of the sales as qualified compared to surrounding counties. There is little possibility that the statistical measurement is representative of the commercial class since there are not sufficient sales to measure the commercial class or any subclass regardless of the verification process.

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Jefferson County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department analyzes each county every other year to systematically review assessment practices. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. While the department will continue to observe the sale qualification process, when it comes to the actual valuation process it is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Level of Value

The statistical calculations alone are not representative of the commercial class and are not considered adequate to indicate the actual level of value. The information available allows that the county has probably achieved an acceptable level of value. The level of value is called at the statutory level of 100%.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Jefferson County

For 2015, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all pickup work of new improvements on agricultural parcels. They also update the land use on all parcels where changes have been reported or observed.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. Following that, they implemented new values for agricultural land throughout the county.

The county has completed the inspection and update process for all agricultural improvements so no additional inspections and reviews were conducted during 2014.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Jefferson 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: 10%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 70%; text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Market Area 1: This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1970's -ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Market Area 2: This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with limited ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1970's -ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Market Area 3: This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes. Area 3 is predominantly grass, some dryland crop and very limited irrigation.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1970's -ongoing</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	1	Market Area 1: This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.	1970's -ongoing	2	Market Area 2: This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with limited ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.	1970's -ongoing	3	Market Area 3: This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes. Area 3 is predominantly grass, some dryland crop and very limited irrigation.	1970's -ongoing
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>												
1	Market Area 1: This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.	1970's -ongoing												
2	Market Area 2: This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with limited ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.	1970's -ongoing												
3	Market Area 3: This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes. Area 3 is predominantly grass, some dryland crop and very limited irrigation.	1970's -ongoing												
		<p>The last time that the assessor's staff could recall a total countywide land use study was in the 1970's. It is the county's practice to update the land use on an ongoing basis. They have always updated land use whenever a change is reported or discovered. They have monitored new well registrations, any available aerial photos including Pictometry and Google Earth and recently have had a significant amount of self reporting of the certified crop acres by the farmers. There is reason to believe that the land use is reasonably current based on those ongoing efforts, and the reported date of the last countywide study is not reflective of the land use in the records in this case.</p>												
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.													
		The county has a strong sale verification and analysis process. This keeps them constantly aware of market trends and changes in agricultural land values.												
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.													
		Agricultural land is identified by its present and predominant use; it is defined in the state statutes as the commercial production of agricultural products. Residential is not used for the commercial production for agricultural products and Recreational is predominantly used for rest and relaxation on an occasional basis. There is currently no land valued as Recreational.												
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?													
		Yes; the first (home site) acre, for both farm home and rural residential home sites is valued the same at \$10,000. This home site acre value is the same throughout the county. The outbuilding site acres are valued at \$2,000 per acre and the excess or yard acres are valued at \$1,500 per acre. The area of the site is determined on a parcel by parcel basis using GIS, Google Earth and FSA data.												

6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.
	Sale verification; information obtained from buyers and sellers is the key technique.
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:
	No

Jefferson County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Jefferson	1	5,055	7,206	4,335	5,845	4,885	n/a	4,461	3,190	6,121
Fillmore	1	6,400	6,300	6,200	6,100	5,800	n/a	5,400	5,250	6,174
Gage	1	6,743	6,796	6,150	6,164	5,301	5,315	4,899	4,876	6,125
Saline	2	6,194	6,199	5,987	5,895	5,492	4,800	4,394	4,156	5,832
Thayer	1	6,500	6,500	6,450	6,200	5,700	5,499	5,500	5,500	6,218
Jefferson	2	4,620	7,173	3,602	4,050	4,035	n/a	3,696	3,190	5,277
Gage	1	6,743	6,796	6,150	6,164	5,301	5,315	4,899	4,876	6,125
Thayer	1	6,500	6,500	6,450	6,200	5,700	5,499	5,500	5,500	6,218
Thayer	2	5,900	5,900	5,700	5,350	4,950	n/a	4,700	4,700	5,357
Jefferson	3	4,875	5,435	3,495	3,500	3,340	n/a	3,060	3,190	4,155
Gage	1	6,743	6,796	6,150	6,164	5,301	5,315	4,899	4,876	6,125
Thayer	2	5,900	5,900	5,700	5,350	4,950	n/a	4,700	4,700	5,357

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Jefferson	1	3,370	5,124	2,820	3,895	3,255	n/a	2,985	1,595	4,062
Fillmore	1	3,855	3,815	3,715	3,665	3,514	n/a	3,223	3,155	3,705
Gage	1	4,200	4,200	3,720	3,600	3,235	3,235	2,565	2,565	3,434
Saline	2	4,696	4,692	4,223	4,144	4,039	3,525	3,520	3,344	4,291
Thayer	1	4,200	4,200	4,050	4,050	3,750	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,988
Jefferson	2	3,080	5,102	2,176	2,530	2,524	n/a	1,850	1,275	3,463
Gage	1	4,200	4,200	3,720	3,600	3,235	3,235	2,565	2,565	3,434
Thayer	1	4,200	4,200	4,050	4,050	3,750	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,988
Thayer	2	3,400	3,400	3,250	3,150	3,000	2,802	2,800	2,750	3,150
Jefferson	3	3,250	3,608	2,185	2,060	1,965	n/a	1,330	1,271	2,402
Gage	1	4,200	4,200	3,720	3,600	3,235	3,235	2,565	2,565	3,434
Thayer	2	3,400	3,400	3,250	3,150	3,000	2,802	2,800	2,750	3,150

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Jefferson	1	1,607	2,046	1,822	1,909	1,075	n/a	1,592	965	1,410
Fillmore	1	1,460	1,441	1,380	1,320	1,326	n/a	1,200	1,200	1,288
Gage	1	1,401	2,037	1,680	1,992	1,617	1,342	1,437	1,003	1,484
Saline	2	1,626	1,852	1,461	1,888	1,821	515	1,580	1,084	1,429
Thayer	1	1,528	1,740	1,502	1,522	1,514	1,409	1,495	1,387	1,482
Jefferson	2	1,644	1,792	1,466	1,470	1,475	n/a	1,318	1,179	1,375
Gage	1	1,401	2,037	1,680	1,992	1,617	1,342	1,437	1,003	1,484
Thayer	1	1,528	1,740	1,502	1,522	1,514	1,409	1,495	1,387	1,482
Thayer	2	1,475	1,520	1,403	1,380	1,456	n/a	1,360	1,316	1,368
Jefferson	3	1,933	1,959	1,399	1,585	1,376	n/a	1,314	1,216	1,326
Gage	1	1,401	2,037	1,680	1,992	1,617	1,342	1,437	1,003	1,484
Thayer	2	1,475	1,520	1,403	1,380	1,456	n/a	1,360	1,316	1,368

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

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Jefferson County

County Overview

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The prevalent crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. The county land use is approximately 26% irrigated land, 42% dry land, 31% grass land and 1% other uses. Jefferson County is bordered on the north by Saline County, on the south by The State of Kansas, on the east by Gage County, and on the west by Thayer County. The agricultural land is valued using three market areas that are more fully described in the survey. Area 1, (the north fourth of the county) is about 58% irrigated crop land; Area 2, (the middle half of the county) has a mix of uses but is about 53% dry crop land; and Area 3, (the south fourth of the county) is about 59% grass land. The 2015 Abstract Form 45, reports 2,907 parcels of agricultural land. There are also 837 sets of farm site improvements located on agricultural parcels.

Description of Analysis

There was a total sample of 48 qualified sales; 36 Jefferson County sales supplemented with 8 additional qualified sales used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in the county. The sample after supplementation was relatively adequate, proportional among study years and nearly representative based on major land uses. Each of the 3 market areas were individually within the 10 percentage point tolerance but the grass in the sales file for the countywide acres was overrepresented. Any comparable sales used were selected from a similar agricultural area, 5 sales within six miles of the subject county, and due to a lack of available comparable sales, 3 sales were needed from beyond 6 miles but within 12 miles.

In this study, the 80% Majority Land Use Tables suggest that the dry land values for the county with 13 sales rounded to 76% are high and the dry land values for Area 2 with 10 sales rounded to 77% are also high. In these samples the distribution among the study years for dry land for the 10 sales in Area 2 is biased toward the earliest 2 study years likely causing a higher median. The Area 2 dry land median of 77.47% with 10 sales has only 2 sales in the most recent study year, and 4 sales in the middle study year and 4 sales in the earliest study year. The bias in Area 2 drives the results in the countywide statistic. The Grass values for the countywide analysis with 12 sales rounded to 68% appear to be low, but Area 3 (the primary area of grass) with 9 of those 12 sales rounds to 71% and well within the range. Area 2 with only 2 sales rounds to a median of 70% and only the countywide median is below the range. All that is really demonstrated is that the small size of the sample spread over 3 market areas produces statistical indicators that are not very reliable and should be used with caution.

The calculated median ratio is 70%; the COD is 18.90 and the PRD is 103.21. The 2014 abstract reports; overall agricultural land increased by 12.02%; irrigated land increased by over 7%, dry

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Jefferson County

land increased by over 16%, and grass land increased by nearly 18%. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values.

Sales Qualification

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The findings, that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process applies to the agricultural sales too. The measurement was done with all available qualified sales.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and unique practices for the analysis of agricultural values. Each year, the county verifies all of the new sales that take place. They update any changes to land use that are discovered or reported. They completely analyze and revalue all agricultural land within their own classification and valuation system. Jefferson County has an analysis process that breaks each sale down to the individual soil type. Values are prepared for each soil type but the majority of the values are the same across most LCGs. The major exception is the soils that classify as 1A, 1D, and 1G. There are 2 different values found in this group of soil types. The soil that drives this group is Crete (CE and CEA) which are two of the dominant soils in the county. The county's analysis continues to establish it as the most desired soil and thus the highest valued soil in the county. The quality of assessment for agricultural land while unique is still deemed acceptable.

Level of Value

For 2015, the apparent level of value of agricultural land is 70% and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. When the 80% MLU tables are reviewed, the indication that dry land for the county and particularly for Area 2 is high is weak. The data in Area 2 with 10 of the 13 total dry sales is biased in its distribution of sales among study years. This bias would tend to produce a higher median ratio and probably has. The indication that grass land throughout the county is a little low is disputed by the indicated level of value for the predominant grass market area. The class of agricultural land is in the range and any indications that any subclass of agricultural land is outside the range is weak. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

**48 Jefferson
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 : 160
 Total Sales Price : 9,933,050
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,933,050
 Total Assessed Value : 9,321,386
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 62,082
 Avg. Assessed Value : 58,259

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 107
 COD : 29.18
 PRD : 114.40

COV : 40.42
 STD : 43.39
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 28.65
 MAX Sales Ratio : 264.86
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.22

95% Median C.I. : 93.25 to 102.08
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.67 to 98.02
 95% Mean C.I. : 100.63 to 114.07

Printed:3/30/2015 3:53:59PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	16	111.33	128.34	108.33	30.01	118.47	66.50	258.92	93.95 to 154.69	39,144	42,404
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	16	84.15	89.85	84.45	20.62	106.39	59.55	142.93	74.22 to 102.86	85,188	71,942
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	22	83.08	87.68	86.14	17.60	101.79	56.15	133.63	76.25 to 97.58	72,207	62,200
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	21	98.11	112.25	96.30	30.53	116.56	45.36	207.01	89.31 to 134.45	57,871	55,729
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	19	98.30	112.59	100.42	36.48	112.12	25.22	224.73	91.01 to 134.63	67,224	67,506
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	19	107.41	126.86	107.28	30.84	118.25	75.31	264.86	94.80 to 125.15	42,974	46,103
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	21	104.01	107.63	94.08	22.36	114.40	57.04	224.02	88.02 to 112.95	68,929	64,850
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	26	90.06	99.58	89.62	31.37	111.11	35.14	219.76	72.17 to 102.26	61,487	55,105
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	75	93.44	103.70	91.14	27.46	113.78	45.36	258.92	87.99 to 102.05	63,909	58,243
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	85	100.27	110.57	96.37	30.72	114.73	25.22	264.86	94.80 to 105.11	60,469	58,272
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	78	92.26	100.81	91.34	28.03	110.37	25.22	224.73	87.95 to 98.30	69,796	63,749
<u>ALL</u>	160	98.20	107.35	93.84	29.18	114.40	25.22	264.86	93.25 to 102.08	62,082	58,259

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	103	100.27	112.07	96.99	29.89	115.55	25.22	264.86	95.42 to 104.01	54,070	52,442
08	9	97.58	113.65	105.21	26.53	108.02	77.40	207.01	82.24 to 134.45	71,111	74,815
11	19	88.02	90.79	88.13	14.46	103.02	67.58	123.95	76.25 to 99.84	131,342	115,752
12	25	93.60	103.10	86.60	37.25	119.05	40.76	262.00	72.17 to 119.14	44,732	38,737
15	4	86.41	76.86	71.60	22.98	107.35	35.14	99.50	N/A	27,500	19,691
<u>ALL</u>	160	98.20	107.35	93.84	29.18	114.40	25.22	264.86	93.25 to 102.08	62,082	58,259

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	160	98.20	107.35	93.84	29.18	114.40	25.22	264.86	93.25 to 102.08	62,082	58,259
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	160	98.20	107.35	93.84	29.18	114.40	25.22	264.86	93.25 to 102.08	62,082	58,259

48 Jefferson
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 : 160
Total Sales Price : 9,933,050
Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,933,050
Total Assessed Value : 9,321,386
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 62,082
Avg. Assessed Value : 58,259

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 107
COD : 29.18
PRD : 114.40

COV : 40.42
STD : 43.39
Avg. Abs. Dev : 28.65
MAX Sales Ratio : 264.86
MIN Sales Ratio : 25.22

95% Median C.I. : 93.25 to 102.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.67 to 98.02
95% Mean C.I. : 100.63 to 114.07

Printed:3/30/2015 3:53:59PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	9	113.69	121.20	112.76	19.30	107.48	87.95	219.76	88.76 to 127.67	3,517	3,965	
Less Than 15,000	23	125.15	141.91	140.27	36.68	101.17	25.22	264.86	101.30 to 169.29	6,878	9,648	
Less Than 30,000	50	115.75	134.57	131.09	37.83	102.65	25.22	264.86	102.05 to 134.63	15,640	20,502	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	151	97.03	106.53	93.78	29.59	113.60	25.22	264.86	91.67 to 102.05	65,572	61,495	
Greater Than 14,999	137	95.42	101.55	93.09	25.68	109.09	35.14	258.92	90.77 to 99.25	71,349	66,420	
Greater Than 29,999	110	93.35	94.98	90.66	21.05	104.77	35.14	207.01	88.46 to 98.29	83,191	75,421	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	9	113.69	121.20	112.76	19.30	107.48	87.95	219.76	88.76 to 127.67	3,517	3,965	
5,000 TO 14,999	14	140.69	155.22	147.15	41.74	105.48	25.22	264.86	94.80 to 232.91	9,039	13,302	
15,000 TO 29,999	27	110.91	128.33	128.76	37.38	99.67	56.15	258.92	91.60 to 150.58	23,104	29,749	
30,000 TO 59,999	41	103.51	105.48	103.92	25.68	101.50	35.14	207.01	93.75 to 112.95	41,778	43,414	
60,000 TO 99,999	42	91.54	91.58	91.68	16.82	99.89	51.75	142.93	84.62 to 98.29	77,396	70,960	
100,000 TO 149,999	15	82.81	84.07	83.23	11.81	101.01	59.90	107.41	75.17 to 95.73	114,367	95,193	
150,000 TO 249,999	9	90.64	84.04	84.98	12.29	98.89	64.99	102.26	67.58 to 98.30	186,778	158,721	
250,000 TO 499,999	3	93.44	86.34	85.91	12.17	100.50	65.74	99.84	N/A	263,667	226,525	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	160	98.20	107.35	93.84	29.18	114.40	25.22	264.86	93.25 to 102.08	62,082	58,259	

48 Jefferson
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 : 5
Total Sales Price : 126,150
Total Adj. Sales Price : 126,150
Total Assessed Value : 113,007
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 25,230
Avg. Assessed Value : 22,601

MEDIAN : 104
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 101
COD : 19.97
PRD : 112.53

COV : 29.03
STD : 29.26
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.76
MAX Sales Ratio : 131.11
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.84

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 64.47 to 137.13

Printed:3/30/2015 3:54:00PM

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											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	131.11	131.11	131.11	00.00	100.00	131.11	131.11	N/A	13,500	17,700
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	55.84	55.84	55.84	00.00	100.00	55.84	55.84	N/A	40,000	22,335
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	103.94	103.94	103.94	00.00	100.00	103.94	103.94	N/A	45,000	46,772
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	92.28	92.28	92.28	00.00	100.00	92.28	92.28	N/A	25,250	23,300
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14											
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1	120.83	120.83	120.83	00.00	100.00	120.83	120.83	N/A	2,400	2,900
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	3	103.94	96.96	88.13	24.14	110.02	55.84	131.11	N/A	32,833	28,936
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	2	106.56	106.56	94.76	13.40	112.45	92.28	120.83	N/A	13,825	13,100
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	98.11	95.79	88.98	22.15	107.65	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,938	27,527
<u>ALL</u>	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
19	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601
<u>ALL</u>	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601

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	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601
04											
<u>ALL</u>	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601

48 Jefferson
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 : 5
Total Sales Price : 126,150
Total Adj. Sales Price : 126,150
Total Assessed Value : 113,007
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 25,230
Avg. Assessed Value : 22,601

MEDIAN : 104
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 101
COD : 19.97
PRD : 112.53

COV : 29.03
STD : 29.26
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.76
MAX Sales Ratio : 131.11
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.84

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 64.47 to 137.13

Printed:3/30/2015 3:54:00PM

SALE PRICE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	120.83	120.83	120.83	00.00	100.00	120.83	120.83	N/A	2,400	2,900
Less Than 15,000	2	125.97	125.97	129.56	04.08	97.23	120.83	131.11	N/A	7,950	10,300
Less Than 30,000	3	120.83	114.74	106.68	10.71	107.56	92.28	131.11	N/A	13,717	14,633
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	4	98.11	95.79	88.98	22.15	107.65	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,938	27,527
Greater Than 14,999	3	92.28	84.02	83.82	17.37	100.24	55.84	103.94	N/A	36,750	30,802
Greater Than 29,999	2	79.89	79.89	81.30	30.10	98.27	55.84	103.94	N/A	42,500	34,554
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	120.83	120.83	120.83	00.00	100.00	120.83	120.83	N/A	2,400	2,900
5,000 TO 14,999	1	131.11	131.11	131.11	00.00	100.00	131.11	131.11	N/A	13,500	17,700
15,000 TO 29,999	1	92.28	92.28	92.28	00.00	100.00	92.28	92.28	N/A	25,250	23,300
30,000 TO 59,999	2	79.89	79.89	81.30	30.10	98.27	55.84	103.94	N/A	42,500	34,554
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 +											
<u>ALL</u>	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601

OCCUPANCY CODE											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
344	1	55.84	55.84	55.84	00.00	100.00	55.84	55.84	N/A	40,000	22,335
353	1	92.28	92.28	92.28	00.00	100.00	92.28	92.28	N/A	25,250	23,300
386	1	103.94	103.94	103.94	00.00	100.00	103.94	103.94	N/A	45,000	46,772
406	2	125.97	125.97	129.56	04.08	97.23	120.83	131.11	N/A	7,950	10,300
<u>ALL</u>	5	103.94	100.80	89.58	19.97	112.53	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,230	22,601

48 Jefferson
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 : 48
Total Sales Price : 27,916,847
Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,916,847
Total Assessed Value : 18,778,593
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 581,601
Avg. Assessed Value : 391,221

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 69
COD : 18.90
PRD : 103.21

COV : 24.05
STD : 16.70
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.27
MAX Sales Ratio : 125.54
MIN Sales Ratio : 39.95

95% Median C.I. : 60.05 to 75.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.76 to 71.77
95% Mean C.I. : 64.71 to 74.15

Printed:3/30/2015 3:54:01PM

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	7	75.50	77.13	76.29	11.64	101.10	57.62	100.28	57.62 to 100.28	626,579	477,989
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	82.20	89.88	77.30	21.68	116.27	69.57	125.54	N/A	423,842	327,639
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	72.36	72.36	79.24	30.27	91.32	50.46	94.26	N/A	494,592	391,915
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	71.65	66.08	61.52	12.80	107.41	49.55	77.05	N/A	786,979	484,124
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	8	77.96	73.46	73.72	11.83	99.65	48.66	84.65	48.66 to 84.65	838,734	618,300
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	48.55	48.55	48.55	00.00	100.00	48.55	48.55	N/A	302,400	146,813
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	77.88	77.88	77.88	00.00	100.00	77.88	77.88	N/A	360,000	280,370
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	7	65.90	67.14	57.72	17.03	116.32	51.04	87.23	51.04 to 87.23	605,186	349,288
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	2	53.63	53.63	62.55	25.51	85.74	39.95	67.31	N/A	675,550	422,548
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	5	51.31	50.64	50.37	04.29	100.54	46.70	54.30	N/A	488,487	246,034
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	4	73.41	71.18	73.23	13.08	97.20	52.34	85.58	N/A	171,860	125,861
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	4	62.50	65.24	62.14	12.16	104.99	55.23	80.73	N/A	598,940	372,152
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	16	75.02	77.65	73.08	17.33	106.25	49.55	125.54	69.38 to 89.85	589,471	430,792
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	17	73.18	69.65	67.35	15.62	103.41	48.55	87.23	52.32 to 82.36	682,857	459,917
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	15	55.23	60.41	59.15	19.30	102.13	39.95	85.58	51.31 to 70.83	458,449	271,154
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	17	75.93	75.89	72.25	17.09	105.04	48.66	125.54	65.35 to 84.65	691,492	499,597
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	11	65.90	63.97	59.48	18.65	107.55	39.95	87.23	48.55 to 80.90	568,164	337,936
<u>ALL</u>	48	70.20	69.43	67.27	18.90	103.21	39.95	125.54	60.05 to 75.98	581,601	391,221

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	8	72.01	68.40	70.50	11.36	97.02	54.30	79.98	54.30 to 79.98	1,111,103	783,315
2	18	72.04	68.92	65.95	21.32	104.50	39.95	100.28	50.46 to 82.36	504,614	332,780
3	22	70.11	70.22	65.58	19.13	107.08	46.70	125.54	52.32 to 80.90	452,044	296,456
<u>ALL</u>	48	70.20	69.43	67.27	18.90	103.21	39.95	125.54	60.05 to 75.98	581,601	391,221

48 Jefferson
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 : 48
Total Sales Price : 27,916,847
Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,916,847
Total Assessed Value : 18,778,593
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 581,601
Avg. Assessed Value : 391,221

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 69
COD : 18.90
PRD : 103.21

COV : 24.05
STD : 16.70
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.27
MAX Sales Ratio : 125.54
MIN Sales Ratio : 39.95

95% Median C.I. : 60.05 to 75.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.76 to 71.77
95% Mean C.I. : 64.71 to 74.15

Printed:3/30/2015 3:54:01PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	65.35	65.35	65.35	00.00	100.00	65.35	65.35	N/A	1,250,000	816,832
2	1	65.35	65.35	65.35	00.00	100.00	65.35	65.35	N/A	1,250,000	816,832
Dry											
County	6	73.63	70.61	68.53	17.93	103.04	48.55	89.85	48.55 to 89.85	402,400	275,773
1	1	54.30	54.30	54.30	00.00	100.00	54.30	54.30	N/A	700,000	380,082
2	4	80.80	75.00	75.63	14.58	99.17	48.55	89.85	N/A	340,600	257,588
3	1	69.38	69.38	69.38	00.00	100.00	69.38	69.38	N/A	352,000	244,206
Grass											
County	10	61.76	64.50	60.86	19.20	105.98	46.70	87.23	51.31 to 83.31	286,505	174,373
1	1	57.62	57.62	57.62	00.00	100.00	57.62	57.62	N/A	208,052	119,870
2	2	69.79	69.79	65.85	25.00	105.98	52.34	87.23	N/A	77,500	51,034
3	7	65.90	63.97	60.82	16.36	105.18	46.70	83.31	46.70 to 83.31	357,429	217,399
ALL	48	70.20	69.43	67.27	18.90	103.21	39.95	125.54	60.05 to 75.98	581,601	391,221

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	67.46	66.28	66.50	12.13	99.67	49.55	79.38	49.55 to 79.38	1,302,817	866,315
1	3	69.57	67.81	69.14	07.20	98.08	59.41	74.44	N/A	1,570,967	1,086,144
2	3	65.35	64.76	62.48	15.21	103.65	49.55	79.38	N/A	1,034,667	646,485
Dry											
County	13	75.98	69.12	68.69	20.22	100.63	39.95	100.28	48.75 to 83.71	339,812	233,431
1	2	65.14	65.14	58.49	16.64	111.37	54.30	75.98	N/A	434,000	253,865
2	10	77.47	69.88	71.39	21.85	97.88	39.95	100.28	48.55 to 89.85	319,756	228,267
3	1	69.38	69.38	69.38	00.00	100.00	69.38	69.38	N/A	352,000	244,206
Grass											
County	12	68.37	68.74	67.90	20.32	101.24	46.70	94.26	52.34 to 85.58	307,291	208,663
1	1	57.62	57.62	57.62	00.00	100.00	57.62	57.62	N/A	208,052	119,870
2	2	69.79	69.79	65.85	25.00	105.98	52.34	87.23	N/A	77,500	51,034
3	9	70.83	69.74	68.64	18.59	101.60	46.70	94.26	51.31 to 85.58	369,382	253,558
ALL	48	70.20	69.43	67.27	18.90	103.21	39.95	125.54	60.05 to 75.98	581,601	391,221

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics 2015 Values

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	160	Median :	99	COV :	39.84	95% Median C.I. :	94.80 to 102.86
Total Sales Price :	9,933,050	Wgt. Mean :	96	STD :	43.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	91.58 to 100.09
Total Adj. Sales Price :	9,933,050	Mean :	108	Avg. Abs. Dev :	28.48	95% Mean C.I. :	101.63 to 115.01
Total Assessed Value :	9,519,324						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	62,082	COD :	28.81	MAX Sales Ratio :	264.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	59,496	PRD :	113.03	MIN Sales Ratio :	25.22		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	16	111.33	129.41	112.44	29.05	115.09	66.50	258.92	101.84 to 154.69	39,144	44,012
01/01/2013 To 03/31/2013	16	84.15	90.36	85.35	21.22	105.87	59.55	142.93	74.22 to 102.86	85,188	72,711
04/01/2013 To 06/30/2013	22	85.65	89.06	88.86	17.76	100.23	56.15	133.63	78.19 to 99.47	72,207	64,161
07/01/2013 To 09/30/2013	21	98.11	113.45	98.25	30.38	115.47	45.36	207.01	89.31 to 134.80	57,871	56,861
10/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	19	98.30	113.06	102.25	36.97	110.57	25.22	224.73	91.01 to 134.63	67,224	68,736
01/01/2014 To 03/31/2014	19	107.41	126.86	107.28	30.84	118.25	75.31	264.86	94.80 to 125.15	42,974	46,103
04/01/2014 To 06/30/2014	21	104.01	108.83	95.44	22.18	114.03	57.04	224.02	95.73 to 112.95	68,929	65,782
07/01/2014 To 09/30/2014	26	90.42	101.13	92.75	31.39	109.04	35.14	219.76	76.10 to 103.26	61,487	57,030
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 09/30/2013	75	95.91	104.78	93.32	26.70	112.28	45.36	258.92	89.31 to 102.86	63,909	59,642
10/01/2013 To 09/30/2014	85	101.30	111.45	98.18	30.44	113.52	25.22	264.86	95.42 to 107.41	60,469	59,366
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	78	94.34	101.74	93.22	27.39	109.14	25.22	224.73	88.76 to 99.38	69,796	65,064

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
01	103	100.27	112.07	96.99	29.89	115.55	25.22	264.86	95.42 to 104.01	54,070	52,442
08	9	97.58	113.65	105.21	26.53	108.02	77.40	207.01	82.24 to 134.45	71,111	74,815
11	19	95.94	98.96	96.06	14.47	103.02	73.66	135.11	83.11 to 108.83	131,342	126,169
12	25	93.60	103.10	86.60	37.25	119.05	40.76	262.00	72.17 to 119.14	44,732	38,737
15	4	86.41	76.86	71.60	22.98	107.35	35.14	99.50	N/A	27,500	19,691

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	160	Median :	99	COV :	39.84	95% Median C.I. :	94.80 to 102.86
Total Sales Price :	9,933,050	Wgt. Mean :	96	STD :	43.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	91.58 to 100.09
Total Adj. Sales Price :	9,933,050	Mean :	108	Avg. Abs. Dev :	28.48	95% Mean C.I. :	101.63 to 115.01
Total Assessed Value :	9,519,324						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	62,082	COD :	28.81	MAX Sales Ratio :	264.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	59,496	PRD :	113.03	MIN Sales Ratio :	25.22		

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
01	160	98.87	108.32	95.83	28.81	113.03	25.22	264.86	94.80 to 102.86	62,082	59,496
06											
07											

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
Less Than 5,000	9	113.69	121.20	112.76	19.30	107.48	87.95	219.76	88.76 to 127.67	3,517	3,965
Less Than 15,000	23	125.15	141.91	140.27	36.68	101.17	25.22	264.86	101.30 to 169.29	6,878	9,648
Less Than 30,000	50	118.04	134.78	131.29	37.28	102.66	25.22	264.86	102.05 to 134.63	15,640	20,534
__Ranges Excl. Low \$__											
Greater Than 4,999	151	98.30	107.55	95.78	29.04	112.29	25.22	264.86	93.60 to 102.09	65,572	62,806
Greater Than 15,000	137	97.03	102.68	95.12	25.18	107.95	35.14	258.92	91.60 to 101.67	71,349	67,864
Greater Than 30,000	110	95.69	96.29	92.80	20.48	103.76	35.14	207.01	90.04 to 99.17	83,191	77,206
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	9	113.69	121.20	112.76	19.30	107.48	87.95	219.76	88.76 to 127.67	3,517	3,965
5,000 TO 14,999	14	140.69	155.22	147.15	41.74	105.48	25.22	264.86	94.80 to 232.91	9,039	13,302
15,000 TO 29,999	27	110.91	128.72	129.01	37.73	99.78	56.15	258.92	91.60 to 150.58	23,104	29,807
30,000 TO 59,999	41	103.94	106.14	104.72	25.55	101.36	35.14	207.01	93.75 to 112.95	41,778	43,749
60,000 TO 99,999	42	94.34	92.41	92.45	16.30	99.96	51.75	142.93	88.46 to 98.29	77,396	71,557
100,000 TO 149,999	15	83.41	85.43	84.71	10.99	100.85	59.90	107.41	77.40 to 95.73	114,367	96,883
150,000 TO 249,999	9	90.64	89.06	90.17	13.04	98.77	64.99	111.47	73.66 to 99.47	186,778	168,422
250,000 TO 499,999	3	101.84	92.14	91.59	14.10	100.60	65.74	108.83	N/A	263,667	241,489
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED - ADJUSTED

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
VALUATION GROUPING	11	Total	Increase	9%

What IF

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics 2015 Values

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	19	Median :	96	COV :	18.49	95% Median C.I. :	83.11 to 108.83
Total Sales Price :	2,495,500	Wgt. Mean :	96	STD :	18.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	88.64 to 103.49
Total Adj. Sales Price :	2,495,500	Mean :	99	Avg. Abs. Dev :	13.88	95% Mean C.I. :	90.14 to 107.78
Total Assessed Value :	2,397,218						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	131,342	COD :	14.47	MAX Sales Ratio :	135.11		
Avg. Assessed Value :	126,169	PRD :	103.02	MIN Sales Ratio :	73.66		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	2	103.80	103.80	102.46	01.89	101.31	101.84	105.76	N/A	152,000	155,745
01/01/2013 To 03/31/2013	1	99.38	99.38	99.38		100.00	99.38	99.38	N/A	150,000	149,068
04/01/2013 To 06/30/2013	4	92.40	91.84	91.67	06.33	100.19	83.11	99.47	N/A	142,500	130,626
07/01/2013 To 09/30/2013	3	88.76	101.83	93.30	19.85	109.14	81.94	134.80	N/A	102,833	95,940
10/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	1	108.83	108.83	108.83		100.00	108.83	108.83	N/A	260,000	282,948
01/01/2014 To 03/31/2014											
04/01/2014 To 06/30/2014	3	95.94	101.26	88.49	16.26	114.43	80.52	127.31	N/A	89,333	79,051
07/01/2014 To 09/30/2014	5	91.43	97.55	95.47	21.17	102.18	73.66	135.11	N/A	127,000	121,247
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 09/30/2013	10	97.65	97.99	95.38	10.52	102.74	81.94	134.80	83.11 to 105.76	133,250	127,088
10/01/2013 To 09/30/2014	9	95.94	100.04	96.85	18.65	103.29	73.66	135.11	76.10 to 127.31	129,222	125,148
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	9	95.91	97.90	96.42	11.56	101.53	81.94	134.80	83.11 to 108.83	143,167	138,038

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
11	19	95.94	98.96	96.06	14.47	103.02	73.66	135.11	83.11 to 108.83	131,342	126,169

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	19	Median :	96	COV :	18.49	95% Median C.I. :	83.11 to 108.83
Total Sales Price :	2,495,500	Wgt. Mean :	96	STD :	18.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	88.64 to 103.49
Total Adj. Sales Price :	2,495,500	Mean :	99	Avg. Abs. Dev :	13.88	95% Mean C.I. :	90.14 to 107.78
Total Assessed Value :	2,397,218						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	131,342	COD :	14.47	MAX Sales Ratio :	135.11		
Avg. Assessed Value :	126,169	PRD :	103.02	MIN Sales Ratio :	73.66		

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
01	19	95.94	98.96	96.06	14.47	103.02	73.66	135.11	83.11 to 108.83	131,342	126,169
06											
07											

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	1	127.31	127.31	127.31		100.00	127.31	127.31	N/A	15,000	19,097
__Ranges Excl. Low \$__											
Greater Than 4,999	19	95.94	98.96	96.06	14.47	103.02	73.66	135.11	83.11 to 108.83	131,342	126,169
Greater Than 15,000	19	95.94	98.96	96.06	14.47	103.02	73.66	135.11	83.11 to 108.83	131,342	126,169
Greater Than 30,000	18	95.93	97.38	95.87	13.46	101.58	73.66	135.11	83.11 to 105.76	137,806	132,118
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	1	127.31	127.31	127.31		100.00	127.31	127.31	N/A	15,000	19,097
30,000 TO 59,999	3	105.76	109.81	109.10	14.48	100.65	88.88	134.80	N/A	50,833	55,459
60,000 TO 99,999	4	95.93	104.60	102.87	11.39	101.68	91.43	135.11	N/A	73,750	75,870
100,000 TO 149,999	3	81.94	82.27	82.55	05.15	99.66	76.10	88.76	N/A	124,000	102,364
150,000 TO 249,999	6	91.25	91.27	92.36	13.34	98.82	73.66	111.47	73.66 to 111.47	190,833	176,250
250,000 TO 499,999	2	105.34	105.34	105.36	03.32	99.98	101.84	108.83	N/A	258,000	271,836
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED - ADJUSTED

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
VALUATION GROUPING	11	Total	Increase	9%

What IF

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 7,106	Value : 1,473,040,299	Growth 11,346,165	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	380	943,662	21	149,317	143	819,756	544	1,912,735	
02. Res Improve Land	2,511	7,148,212	29	518,176	530	9,379,293	3,070	17,045,681	
03. Res Improvements	2,519	99,182,889	29	5,733,509	558	58,976,464	3,106	163,892,862	
04. Res Total	2,899	107,274,763	50	6,401,002	701	69,175,513	3,650	182,851,278	3,425,795
% of Res Total	79.42	58.67	1.37	3.50	19.21	37.83	51.37	12.41	30.19
05. Com UnImp Land	62	629,436	1	4,007	20	697,468	83	1,330,911	
06. Com Improve Land	341	3,429,088	8	455,125	31	541,979	380	4,426,192	
07. Com Improvements	348	35,801,000	8	2,033,255	70	16,407,617	426	54,241,872	
08. Com Total	410	39,859,524	9	2,492,387	90	17,647,064	509	59,998,975	1,419,353
% of Com Total	80.55	66.43	1.77	4.15	17.68	29.41	7.16	4.07	12.51
09. Ind UnImp Land	6	16,398	0	0	3	47,696	9	64,094	
10. Ind Improve Land	8	141,394	2	129,962	6	162,987	16	434,343	
11. Ind Improvements	8	1,826,351	2	529,192	6	5,959,224	16	8,314,767	
12. Ind Total	14	1,984,143	2	659,154	9	6,169,907	25	8,813,204	622,942
% of Ind Total	56.00	22.51	8.00	7.48	36.00	70.01	0.35	0.60	5.49
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	9	728,307	9	728,307	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	6	690,837	6	690,837	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	6	774,520	6	774,520	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	15	2,193,664	15	2,193,664	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.21	0.15	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,899	107,274,763	50	6,401,002	716	71,369,177	3,665	185,044,942	3,425,795
% of Res & Rec Total	79.10	57.97	1.36	3.46	19.54	38.57	51.58	12.56	30.19
Com & Ind Total	424	41,843,667	11	3,151,541	99	23,816,971	534	68,812,179	2,042,295
% of Com & Ind Total	79.40	60.81	2.06	4.58	18.54	34.61	7.51	4.67	18.00
17. Taxable Total	3,323	149,118,430	61	9,552,543	815	95,186,148	4,199	253,857,121	5,468,090
% of Taxable Total	79.14	58.74	1.45	3.76	19.41	37.50	59.09	17.23	48.19

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	6	406,453	4,778,277	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	139,365	581,460	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	6	406,453	4,778,277
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	139,365	581,460
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				7	545,818	5,359,737

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	266	37	80	383

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	25,679	2,056	772,466,979	2,057	772,492,658
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	889	365,960,602	889	365,960,602
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	45,470	849	80,684,448	850	80,729,918
30. Ag Total							2,907	1,219,183,178

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	45,470	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	1	0.20	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	18	17.43	174,300	18	17.43	174,300	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	513	521.91	5,218,100	513	521.91	5,218,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	524	0.00	41,769,374	524	0.00	41,769,374	188,205
34. HomeSite Total				542	539.34	47,161,774	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	179	496.72	639,290	179	496.72	639,290	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	784	2,855.87	5,014,995	784	2,855.87	5,014,995	
37. FarmSite Improvements	836	0.00	38,915,074	837	0.00	38,960,544	5,689,870
38. FarmSite Total				1,016	3,352.59	44,614,829	
39. Road & Ditches	2,476	6,689.46	0	2,477	6,689.66	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	42	379.12	461,040	42	379.12	461,040	
41. Total Section VI				1,558	10,960.71	92,237,643	5,878,075

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	26	2,501.45	4,467,562	26	2,501.45	4,467,562

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,377.39	2.67%	6,962,717	2.20%	5,055.01
46. 1A	25,835.73	50.06%	186,171,910	58.94%	7,205.99
47. 2A1	3,064.10	5.94%	13,281,982	4.20%	4,334.71
48. 2A	9,756.76	18.91%	57,024,549	18.05%	5,844.62
49. 3A1	5,773.72	11.19%	28,204,695	8.93%	4,885.01
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	4,498.75	8.72%	20,071,086	6.35%	4,461.48
52. 4A	1,299.70	2.52%	4,146,043	1.31%	3,190.00
53. Total	51,606.15	100.00%	315,862,982	100.00%	6,120.65
Dry					
54. 1D1	667.28	2.79%	2,248,734	2.32%	3,370.00
55. 1D	9,500.89	39.76%	48,680,850	50.16%	5,123.82
56. 2D1	1,055.94	4.42%	2,977,751	3.07%	2,820.00
57. 2D	5,612.92	23.49%	21,862,417	22.53%	3,895.02
58. 3D1	3,649.01	15.27%	11,877,616	12.24%	3,255.02
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,854.02	11.95%	8,519,373	8.78%	2,985.04
61. 4D	552.72	2.31%	881,640	0.91%	1,595.09
62. Total	23,892.78	100.00%	97,048,381	100.00%	4,061.83
Grass					
63. 1G1	200.33	1.85%	321,841	2.11%	1,606.55
64. 1G	770.14	7.11%	1,576,074	10.32%	2,046.48
65. 2G1	777.02	7.17%	1,415,555	9.27%	1,821.77
66. 2G	1,880.40	17.36%	3,589,460	23.50%	1,908.88
67. 3G1	1,684.08	15.55%	1,810,511	11.85%	1,075.07
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	1,967.40	18.17%	3,133,002	20.51%	1,592.46
70. 4G	3,551.15	32.79%	3,427,663	22.44%	965.23
71. Total	10,830.52	100.00%	15,274,106	100.00%	1,410.28
Irrigated Total	51,606.15	59.26%	315,862,982	73.74%	6,120.65
Dry Total	23,892.78	27.43%	97,048,381	22.66%	4,061.83
Grass Total	10,830.52	12.44%	15,274,106	3.57%	1,410.28
72. Waste	760.61	0.87%	174,940	0.04%	230.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	87,090.06	100.00%	428,360,409	100.00%	4,918.59

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,529.44	4.27%	7,065,642	3.74%	4,619.76
46. 1A	14,719.77	41.12%	105,582,822	55.90%	7,172.86
47. 2A1	2,818.33	7.87%	10,152,041	5.37%	3,602.15
48. 2A	7,654.89	21.39%	31,002,315	16.41%	4,050.00
49. 3A1	5,549.44	15.50%	22,391,982	11.85%	4,035.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	2,881.48	8.05%	10,651,153	5.64%	3,696.42
52. 4A	642.20	1.79%	2,048,618	1.08%	3,190.00
53. Total	35,795.55	100.00%	188,894,573	100.00%	5,277.04
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,590.50	4.19%	11,058,738	3.72%	3,080.00
55. 1D	33,746.08	39.34%	172,168,259	57.96%	5,101.87
56. 2D1	5,670.52	6.61%	12,337,185	4.15%	2,175.67
57. 2D	19,147.05	22.32%	48,442,046	16.31%	2,530.00
58. 3D1	15,004.30	17.49%	37,868,316	12.75%	2,523.83
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	7,282.28	8.49%	13,469,689	4.53%	1,849.65
61. 4D	1,329.10	1.55%	1,694,721	0.57%	1,275.09
62. Total	85,769.83	100.00%	297,038,954	100.00%	3,463.21
Grass					
63. 1G1	432.69	1.05%	711,143	1.25%	1,643.54
64. 1G	2,777.00	6.72%	4,975,205	8.76%	1,791.58
65. 2G1	3,046.57	7.38%	4,465,787	7.86%	1,465.84
66. 2G	7,855.62	19.02%	11,549,739	20.33%	1,470.25
67. 3G1	7,085.50	17.16%	10,452,250	18.40%	1,475.16
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	6,849.04	16.59%	9,028,381	15.89%	1,318.20
70. 4G	13,248.58	32.08%	15,617,910	27.50%	1,178.84
71. Total	41,295.00	100.00%	56,800,415	100.00%	1,375.48
Irrigated Total					
	35,795.55	21.57%	188,894,573	34.76%	5,277.04
Dry Total					
	85,769.83	51.69%	297,038,954	54.66%	3,463.21
Grass Total					
	41,295.00	24.89%	56,800,415	10.45%	1,375.48
72. Waste	3,079.66	1.86%	708,324	0.13%	230.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	165,940.04	100.00%	543,442,266	100.00%	3,274.93

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	569.11	16.84%	2,774,414	19.76%	4,875.00
46. 1A	929.74	27.51%	5,053,221	35.98%	5,435.09
47. 2A1	248.67	7.36%	869,103	6.19%	3,495.01
48. 2A	438.16	12.96%	1,533,560	10.92%	3,500.00
49. 3A1	484.80	14.34%	1,619,232	11.53%	3,340.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	537.33	15.90%	1,644,230	11.71%	3,060.00
52. 4A	172.32	5.10%	549,701	3.91%	3,190.00
53. Total	3,380.13	100.00%	14,043,461	100.00%	4,154.71
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,703.77	8.89%	8,787,260	12.03%	3,250.00
55. 1D	7,552.40	24.83%	27,246,954	37.29%	3,607.72
56. 2D1	2,046.00	6.73%	4,469,936	6.12%	2,184.72
57. 2D	7,417.15	24.39%	15,279,330	20.91%	2,060.00
58. 3D1	4,929.82	16.21%	9,686,882	13.26%	1,964.96
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	4,611.24	15.16%	6,132,392	8.39%	1,329.88
61. 4D	1,154.51	3.80%	1,467,205	2.01%	1,270.85
62. Total	30,414.89	100.00%	73,069,959	100.00%	2,402.44
Grass					
63. 1G1	430.88	0.84%	832,989	1.23%	1,933.23
64. 1G	1,531.05	3.00%	2,999,825	4.43%	1,959.33
65. 2G1	1,194.25	2.34%	1,670,523	2.47%	1,398.81
66. 2G	5,234.68	10.25%	8,294,483	12.25%	1,584.53
67. 3G1	6,999.67	13.71%	9,631,913	14.22%	1,376.05
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	9,455.66	18.52%	12,422,929	18.34%	1,313.81
70. 4G	26,220.99	51.35%	31,878,042	47.07%	1,215.75
71. Total	51,067.18	100.00%	67,730,704	100.00%	1,326.31
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	3,380.13	3.93%	14,043,461	9.05%	4,154.71
Dry Total					
Dry Total	30,414.89	35.33%	73,069,959	47.10%	2,402.44
Grass Total					
Grass Total	51,067.18	59.32%	67,730,704	43.66%	1,326.31
72. Waste	1,166.45	1.35%	268,286	0.17%	230.00
73. Other	60.90	0.07%	30,450	0.02%	500.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	86,089.55	100.00%	155,142,860	100.00%	1,802.11

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	90,781.83	518,801,016	90,781.83	518,801,016
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	10.30	23,669	140,067.20	467,133,625	140,077.50	467,157,294
78. Grass	0.00	0	1.50	2,010	103,191.20	139,803,215	103,192.70	139,805,225
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,006.72	1,151,550	5,006.72	1,151,550
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	60.90	30,450	60.90	30,450
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	11.80	25,679	339,107.85	1,126,919,856	339,119.65	1,126,945,535

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	90,781.83	26.77%	518,801,016	46.04%	5,714.81
Dry Land	140,077.50	41.31%	467,157,294	41.45%	3,334.99
Grass	103,192.70	30.43%	139,805,225	12.41%	1,354.80
Waste	5,006.72	1.48%	1,151,550	0.10%	230.00
Other	60.90	0.02%	30,450	0.00%	500.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	339,119.65	100.00%	1,126,945,535	100.00%	3,323.15

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

48 Jefferson

	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	176,565,709	182,851,278	6,285,569	3.56%	3,425,795	1.62%
02. Recreational	1,992,736	2,193,664	200,928	10.08%	0	10.08%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	45,632,079	47,161,774	1,529,695	3.35%	188,205	2.94%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	224,190,524	232,206,716	8,016,192	3.58%	3,614,000	1.96%
05. Commercial	58,676,088	59,998,975	1,322,887	2.25%	1,419,353	-0.16%
06. Industrial	8,190,262	8,813,204	622,942	7.61%	622,942	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	40,728,699	44,614,829	3,886,130	9.54%	5,689,870	-4.43%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	107,595,049	113,427,008	5,831,959	5.42%	7,732,165	-1.77%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	331,785,573	346,094,764	14,309,191	4.31%	11,346,165	0.89%
11. Irrigated	483,909,431	518,801,016	34,891,585	7.21%		
12. Dryland	402,119,729	467,157,294	65,037,565	16.17%		
13. Grassland	118,631,272	139,805,225	21,173,953	17.85%		
14. Wasteland	930,979	1,151,550	220,571	23.69%		
15. Other Agland	449,540	30,450	-419,090	-93.23%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	1,006,040,951	1,126,945,535	120,904,584	12.02%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,337,826,524	1,473,040,299	135,213,775	10.11%	11,346,165	9.26%

**2014 Plan of Assessment for Jefferson County
Assessment Years 2015, 2016, and 2017
Date: June 12, 2014**

Yellow highlighted areas were amended on October 2, 2014

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. Section 77-1311.02, on or before June 15 each year, the county 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. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112 (Reissue September 2010).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201.

General Description of Real Property in Jefferson County:

Per 2013 County Abstract, Jefferson County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels
Residential	3642	51%
Commercial	506	8%
Industrial	25	<1%
Recreational	16	<1%
Agricultural	2891	41%
T.I.F.	8	
Exempt	381	
Game & Parks	26	

Agricultural land – 339,106.31 acres

New Property: For assessment year 2014, an estimated 126 building permits and 36 improvement information statements were filed for new property construction/additions, demolitions, land use changes, etc., in the county. The office mailed out 407 Homestead Exemptions to applicants who filed the previous year and 1,220 Personal Property post cards were mailed.

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

The Jefferson County Assessor's office staff currently consists of the assessor, 1 full time lister/GIS specialist, 2 full time employees and 1 part time employee. Office budget for 2013 -2014 was \$152,694. This was the third consecutive year that the budget was decreased from the previous year. Employee benefits, such as health insurance, retirement, etc., are funded by county general rather than through the assessor's budget. Official estimation for 2014-2015 fiscal year budget was \$ 154,910. After submitting my initial budget request, I found out that several offices had hired new personnel at a salary greater than my employee of two and a half years. I requested the board increase my employee's salary to that of the newly hired personnel, which the board agreed to. Board proposed and adopted a budget of \$155,394.

The Assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of approved continuing education by December 31, 2014 in order to be eligible to receive approval from the Property Tax Administrator for re-certification. This certificate is required in order to file for or hold the position of Assessor or Deputy Assessor. The cost of this education includes registration fees, lodging, meals, transportation and any supplies needed. (Section 77-702, R.S. Supp., 2002 and 77-414, R.S. Supp., 2003.)

Reg.-71-006.02A – Assessors assuming office on or after January 1, 2003, shall, within four years from the date of assuming the office, complete IAAO course 101 - Fundamentals of Real Property Appraisal, and IAAO course 300 – Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal, or the equivalent thereof.

B. Cadastral Maps

Cadastral maps were revised in 1984 by a survey engineer and books printed. Ownership changes are updated with each group of transfer statements. Parcel line changes are also updated as needed when transfers are worked. We are in the process of producing new cadastral books using GIS mapping. Each book will contain one precinct with one page for each section showing ownership information. Following Reg-10-004.04 - .004.03G is our goal. By completing the project within the office, we are saving the County money. Due to budgeting restraints for staff and the time involved, this is an ongoing project.

Current year certified FSA maps have been requested from the land owner each time there has been a land use change reported or discovered and also if a protest has been made on a rural property.

Aerial photos were flown by Pictometry November – December 2012 and April 2014. A six year contract was signed September 2010 with Pictometry International Corporation. The contract will run through the fall of 2015 and include 2 flights. As the November-December 2012 photos were not completely loaded into the system until after the first of the 2013, the ability to do a split screen change print and the change finder not being available until spring 2013, the 2012 aerial photos were not used for the 2013 assessment year. The April 2014 photos became available to the assessor's office June 12, 2014. This was too late to use for the 2014 tax year. It was felt by the emergency manager that April would work better for his office and others that use Pictometry and did not consult with the assessor. The concern is that a lot of construction takes place in the spring, summer and fall. By taking aerial photos in April we will be missing out on a lot of new construction in 2014 for the 2015 tax year. The office has utilized Google, GIS and FSA photos as tools in the assessment process as well as on site inspections. It is felt these are more helpful to the office than Pictometry is, at this time.

County wide zoning regulations were adopted August 1, 2001 and amended March 12, 2013. The villages of Plymouth, Diller and Jansen also have zoning as does Fairbury. Permits are to be dropped off, emailed or mailed to the Assessor's office in a timely manner. Even though Jansen has zoning, they **do not** issue permits.

C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards are kept for taxable residential, commercial, industrial, improvements on leased land, TIF, partially exempt, permissive exempt, government exempt and centrally assessed parcels. Each card has legal description, book and page of last deed recorded in the last 5 years, current owner name and address, situs address of parcel, cadastral map book and page, current property classification code, tax district

code and the current plus one or more years of assessed land value and improvements. The exception for the assessed value would be for properties that receive an exemption.

Each record card with buildings contains a photo, sketch of the house, and aerial photographs, if available.

A cost approach, income summary and comparable approach are included if applicable. Also found within each card is land size (square footage or acres) and value.

All taxable property record cards are also entered into the computer CAMA system. The Assessment Administration system is MIPS/County Solutions which is provided and supported by NACO. This system links with the CAMA system and also the GIS system that will eventually replace our old cadastral maps. Our property record card information has been made accessible through www.nebraskataxesonline.us since 2006. Parcel information became available through www.nebraskaassessoronline.us in January of 2014. Updates to this information will be made yearly after tax rolls have been certified to the County Treasurer in the fall.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property

Real estate transfer statements, plus a copy of the deed, are given to the Assessor's Office by the Register of Deeds. Appropriate real estate cards are pulled from the files to be changed to the new owners' name and address. Sales worksheets are filled out with the information needed for the PAD's sales file. Sales history is added to the real estate card, and the administrative computer program and CAMA program is changed for new owner, address and sales history. Alphabetical index file and cadastral maps are updated for ownership. Sales questionnaires are sent to new property owners of most transactions. CAMA system is updated and sales are added to sales file. Sales sheets for the sales books are run and added to current book of sales. Properties that require a split are done on the GIS system before any other changes are made. Copy of real estate card and transfer are made to be used when personnel physically go to the property and inventories the information that is on the card as to what was actually there when the sale took place. Any differences are noted and brought back to the Assessor's office to correct the sales file. Real estate cards are tabbed for the next year to correct information. This on sight verification may also determine whether the sale was an arms-length transaction or not. New pictures are taken of the improvements or lot for each residential and commercial property. Income data is collected, if applicable. Rural land sales are categorized on a computer program as to number of acres of each soil type, classification and percent that each soil type attributes to the sale price.

Building permits are received from the Jefferson County zoning manager, the Fairbury zoning administrator, and the village clerks of Plymouth and Diller. Letters are sent every August to remind all village clerks to forward permits to the office and

what should be reported if a permit is not required. Unfortunately, we have had little cooperation. The County Assessor and staff inspect small towns, by driving each street and alley of the town to verify if any changes have been made. The appropriate real estate cards are tabbed for review that we receive a permit, improvement information statement or discover changes for.

B. Data Collection

All cards tabbed for new structures, additions, changes or demolition are physically inspected by the County Assessor and staff between September and February of the assessment year. The property record card is used for listing additions or changes to buildings so data may be updated. New structures are measured and all the components needed to produce a new cost approach on our CAMA program are noted at the time of inspection. Commercial properties are listed and measured by qualified personnel who also collect income data. New or corrected sketches are made and digital pictures are taken. The County Assessor approves the final value before it is placed on the property record card or computer administrative program.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

Sales studies are done in the office and compared to the sales analysis provided by the Property Assessment Division. Between these two sales studies and knowledge of the current sales not within the sales study, the Assessor determines where and what changes need to be made to valuation for the current assessment year. This is to stay in compliance with the laws of Nebraska and to have a fair and equitable assessment of real estate within Jefferson County.

D. Approaches to Value

The Assessor and County Board of Commissioners/Equalization hire qualified personnel to do mass appraisal within the County. The personnel hired use the counties sales studies and comparisons to do a market approach that is in compliance with the IAAO standards. Cost approach is done on the CAMA system using Marshall-Swift pricing and the current depreciation study at the time of the appraisal. The hired personnel also do income approach. They collect the income and expense data to be entered in the counties CAMA system and run an analysis from the market.

Land valuation studies are done within the County using a spreadsheet program developed in the Assessor's office to analyze land valuations and check established market areas within the County.

New statistics are ran using the same sales in our sales study to determine a cost approach to value. These statistics verify the fact that county valuations are in compliance with the laws of Nebraska.

On or before June 1 of each year, notices are mailed to all land owners that have had either an increase or decrease in value from the previous assessment year. Any changes made after March 19th are made by the County Board of Equalization. Approximately 3,455 Notice of Valuation Changes were mailed for the 2014 assessment year.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2014:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	94%	29.95	112.42
Commercial	100%	22.40	110.51
Agricultural	71%	18.80	100.37

For assessment years 2011, 2012 and 2013, the PAD recommended to TERC that a level of value for commercial property be rendered “not enough information” to establish statistics. 2014 Commercial Correlation Section Level of Value stated the statistical calculations alone are not representative of the commercial class and are not considered adequate to indicate the actual level of value. The information available allows that the county has probably achieved an acceptable level of value. The level of value is called at the statutory level of 100%.

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

Residential:

Review the Village of Plymouth, all Northgate Additions to Fairbury, houses built since 2000 for basement finish, and machine sheds with living area. House sheets for all improved properties will be ran with the 2013 costing.

Areas that show a need for adjustment, based on their statistics, will be reviewed and valuations changed according to sales study. All pick up work of reported or discovered changes to parcels will be physically reviewed. Photos, sketches, etc., will be updated as needed.

Begin review of Daykin, Diller, Jansen, and Endicott.

Commercial:

Commercial property statistics will be reviewed and analyzed to determine any changes that need to be made. New construction and changes reported on improvement statements, city permits, rural permits or discovered will be physically reviewed. Photos will be taken and sketches updated as needed. Review all storage facilities in the county.

Agricultural Land:

Verification of rural sales is done by phone, in person, letters and questionnaires with buyer, seller, auctioneer or realtor and occasionally an attorney may be contacted. A yearly review of all agricultural sales within the study period as set forth by TERC and PAD is done to determine any changes in land value according to the market in Jefferson County. The study of agricultural land sales is done by breaking each sale down by total number of acres, soil type and land use in each parcel sold. Using this study the weighted average value per acre is determined. If there were no sales of a certain type of soil, the value is determined by using values within the same land classification. Our three neighborhoods are also reviewed to determine if changes in area lines need to be made to keep equality in the valuations for Jefferson County. All land use changes reported are verified and files are changed to reflect current land use. New FSA maps are requested from property owners and the GIS system and County Solutions are changed accordingly.

Update GIS maps to most current flight taken by FSA aerial if new ones are available.

The GIS program is also being utilized to produce current cadastral maps in a user friendly format.

Pickup work is done annually with an on sight inspection of each reported improvement or demolition. Unreported improvements that come to the attention of the County Assessor are visually inspected, if possible, and also reported to the Zoning Manager. Requests by real estate owners to review property are also done at this time. Digital pictures are taken as needed and added to the CAMA system. All new or changed improvements are listed and entered into the Assessor's CAMA system and priced out using the Marshall Swift pricing.

No special value has been determined in Jefferson County at this time.

Staff will continue updating and correcting information on GIS layers and will probably add more layers and information as it is collected.

All parcels with improvements, residential, commercial and rural, will be reviewed for errors when we completed the V2 conversion in September 2013. Review aerial photos taken by Pictometry in fall 2013. Print a new aerial photo for each rural card and note any discrepancies from what we have on the real estate card.

Assessment Actions Planned for 2016

Residential:

Complete review of Daykin, Diller, Jansen and Endicott. Physically inspect and list all new or changed construction and update all records accordingly.

Commercial:

Review Fairbury commercial properties and depreciation factors.

Run new cost sheets.

Study sales statistics.

Staff will help review sales and valuations and to do pickup work of all new or changed construction by physically inspecting, listing and updating all records.

Agricultural Land:

Review sales study to determine changes of valuations per soil type and land use.

Review neighborhood boundaries.

Make all known changes to land use.

Physical inspections of all pickup work and change all records accordingly.

Run new irrigation listing for Jefferson County from Internet.

Continue updating the GIS system.

Print maps on GIS to replace old cadastral maps, land ownership and parcel lines.

Begin review of rural outbuildings and houses.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2017

Residential:

Review Fairbury Area 1 and 2. Physically inspect and list all new or changed construction and update all records accordingly.

Review statistics to determine what if other areas, villages or subclasses may need to be reviewed.

Commercial:

Review small town/village commercial properties and depreciation factors.

Review sales study statistics.

Staff to help with physical review and to do pickup work

Land Agricultural:

Study sales statistics.

Update valuations according to sales analysis.

Do pickup work by physically inspecting, listing and changing records.

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

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership changes are continuous projects that usually take about 1 to 2 weeks. Records that need to be split take longer than just a change of ownership. Changes to a record card have to be changed on the CAMA program, the PC Admin V2 program (former County Solutions), the GIS program if there is a split or combination, the cadastral books, the alphabetical index cards, and the Register of Deeds program (for all transfers filed in the deed book or miscellaneous book) before the card may be refiled. Each transfer statement has to have a sales worksheet filled out if there are doc stamps of a \$2.25 or more or total purchase price is \$100 or more. This is all done electronically using our PC Admin V2 (former County Solutions) program which is linked with the Property Assessment Divisions computer system.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports with the Property Tax Administrator as required by statute/regulation:

Abstract of Assessment for Real Property

Assessor Survey

Sales information, rosters& annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract to PAD

Certify taxable valuations and growth value (if applicable) to political subdivisions and a copy of each to the County Clerk

School District Taxable Value Report

Homestead Exemption Certification of Average Assessed Value of a Single-Family residential Property

Amended Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate (as needed)

Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) and a copy for the County Treasurer

Three Year Plan of Assessment

3. Administer annual personal property filings. For 2013 there were 1037 schedules on the tax roll and 1,220 post cards were sent out for 2014. Update computer to anyone that the office feels may need to file a return and contact MIPS, Inc. to print the post cards approximately 7 to 10 days before you want to mail them out. Prepare notices of change, unsigned schedule notices, reminder of schedules due, and penalty notices. Assist people in the online filing of schedules as needed. Contact personal property owner or tax preparer if more information is needed regarding the filed personal property. Obtain the federal depreciation worksheet, whenever possible, to verify all equipment reported for personal property.

4. Permissive Exemption Application (Form 451) or Statement of Reaffirmation of Tax Exemption (Form 451A) are prepared and mailed to the previous years' applicant. Reminder notices are mailed on or about Dec 1 to any applicant that has not returned their form. Review and make recommendations to county board.

5. Taxable Government Owned Property – make an annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax on or before March 1st of each year and attend protest hearing if entity files a protest.
6. Homestead Exemption Applications and Income Statements – 425 applications were mailed out for 2014 to people who had filed in 2013. For 2013 we had 384 approved applications and 40 disapproved. Taxpayer assistance is given at the counter and over the phone. Applications are processed as to ownership and verified that forms are filled out properly. The Assessor approves or disapproves the owner/occupancy requirements and signs the application. Original exemption form and income statement are forwarded to PAD. A copy of the exemption application and income statement are returned to applicant after the current valuation is entered on the form. Assessor's office retains a copy of the application only. As per REG-45-008.03, the county assessor mails a notice on or before April 1 to claimants who are the owners of a homestead which has been granted a homestead exemption in the preceding year unless the claimant has already filed the certification or application for the current year or the county assessor has reason to believe there has been a change of circumstances so that the claimant no longer qualifies.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records for each subdivision taxed to each company and tax billing for tax list given the County Treasurer.
8. Tax Increment Financing (T.I.F.) – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Two parcels for each TIF property, one real estate card with the base value and one for the excess value of the property are maintained. Copies of the applications are forwarded to PAD and county treasurer.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax list to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval and file with County Clerk and County Treasurer.
12. County Board of Equalization – attends county board of equalization meetings/hearings for valuation protests; permissive exemptions; assemble and provide information on behalf of the assessor's office.
13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC and defend valuation as determined by the Assessor. If the taxpayer is appealing a valuation set by the County Board of Equalization, the board will defend the value.

14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings by phone, website or in person, to defend values as determined by the Assessor, if applicable, and/or implement orders of the TERC, which requires an amended abstract be filed with the PAD.

16. Pull real estate cards; make copies; answer inquiries via phone, in person, mail and email from realtors, appraisers, lending institutions, property owners, lawyers, other county offices, surveyors and the general public. As more people are searching for information online at www.nebraskataxesonline.us, we field many questions on how to search for assessor data. We must be able to communicate the steps in finding the data via phone or email. In 2014 we also went online with www.nebraskaassessoronline.us. This allowed more of our parcel data information to be available to the public.

17. Attend Southeast District Assessor’s meetings, NACO meetings & conferences, Nebraska Assessor’s Workshops and other meetings/classes that provide hours of continuing education credit to keep my Assessor’s certificate current as required by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Regulations. (Reg-71-006 and Reg-71-007)

18. Miscellaneous tasks, duties, and obligations, not mentioned previously, are performed to keep the office functioning.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature *Vicki L. Haskell* Date June 12, 2014
Vicki L. Haskell

To keep the office functioning and somewhat “equalized” with other offices, the following is planned.

1. The office will have carpeting (like in the county treasurer’s office) installed in the area behind the counter for fiscal year 2013-2014.
2. The office will have laminate flooring (like on the ground floor/basement) installed in the area in front of the counter for fiscal year 2013-2014.

Costs for the flooring will be paid out of the same fund as the offices that had their floors refinished the summer of 2013.

3. The office expects maintenance/janitorial staff to –

- a. clean window blinds every 6 months with a minimum of every year
- b. dust (Swiffer is ok) all furniture and equipment including desks, shelves, computers, phones, counters, filing cabinets, etc. every 2 weeks on payday with a minimum of once a month
- c. clean all ceiling fans every month with a minimum of every 3 months
- d. clean air conditioner filters every month with a minimum of every 2 months
- e. clean out air conditioner drain hose every 6 months with a minimum of once a year

I feel this will help keep the annoyance of itchy eyes, watering eyes, sneezing, coughing, etc. to a minimum. I have allergies as do some of my staff, and dust is an irritant.

2015 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$154,910
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$155,394 --all health care, retirement and social security costs are paid from county general.
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$50,000 controlled by commissioners for projects and other appraisal contracts; this has been true in past years and new assessor expects it to still be available.
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	0; computer costs now come entirely from the county general budget
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,500; --This fund is also for all dues (IAAO, S.E. Assessors Association, and NACO), newspaper subscriptions and other publications, Marshal Swift books and updates, and any newspaper ads from the assessor's office.
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$18,280.49

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	County Solutions
2.	CAMA software:
	County Solutions --Also uses the Apex sketch program.
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
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	No; but there is public access to the records through NACO's Taxes On Line, and Assessors Online.
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and Staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Diller, Fairbury, and Plymouth; the village of Jansen now has zoning within the village limits but not into the suburban area. They do not issue building permits.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	August of 2001; Jansen 2013

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	MIPS/County Solutions –administrative and appraisal software maintenance The county also has Pictometry in use in several offices and available to the assessor.

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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

2015 Certification for Jefferson 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 Jefferson County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

