## Preface

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that "taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution." Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1 (1) (1998). 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 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2007). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2007) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual value.

To ensure that the classes of real property are assessed at these required levels of actual value, the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division, hereinafter referred to as the Division, is annually responsible for analyzing and measuring the assessment performance of each county. This responsibility includes requiring the Property Tax Administrator to prepare statistical and narrative reports for the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and the county assessors. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R.S. Supp., 2005):
(2) ... the Property Tax Administrator shall prepare and deliver to the commission and to each county assessor his or her annual reports and opinions.
(3) The annual reports and opinions of the Property Tax Administrator shall contain statistical and narrative reports informing the commission of the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property within the county and a certification of the opinion of the Property Tax

Administrator regarding the level of value and quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in the county.
(4) In addition to an opinion of level of value and quality of assessment in the county, the Property Tax Administrator may make nonbinding recommendations for consideration by the commission.

The narrative and statistical reports contained in the Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator, hereinafter referred to as the R\&O, provide a thorough, concise analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county assessor to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The Property Tax Administrator's opinion of level of value and quality of assessment achieved by each county assessor is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Division regarding the assessment activities during the preceding year. This is done in recognition of the fact that the measurement of assessment compliance, in terms of the concepts of actual value and uniformity and proportionality mandated by Nebraska law, requires both statistical and narrative analysis.

The Division is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2007) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Division prepares an assessment sales ratio study in compliance with acceptable mass appraisal standards. The assessment sales ratio study is the primary mass appraisal performance evaluation tool. From the sales file, the Division prepares statistical analysis from a non-randomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

However, just as the valuation of property is sometimes more art than science, a narrative analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio study. There may be instances when the analysis of assessment practices outweighs or limits the reliability of the statistical inferences of central tendency or quality measures. This may require an opinion of the level of value that is not identical to the result of the statistical calculation. The Property Tax Administrator's goal is to provide statistical and narrative analysis of the assessment level and practices to the Commission, providing the Commission with the most complete picture possible of the true level of value and quality of assessment in each county.

The Property Tax Administrator's opinions of level of value and quality of assessment are stated as a single numeric representation for level of value and a simple judgment regarding the quality of assessment practices. Based on the information collected in developing this report the Property Tax Administrator may feel further recommendations must be stated for a county to assist the Commission in determining the level of value and quality of assessment within a county. These opinions are made only after considering all narrative and statistical analysis provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Division. An evaluation of these opinions must only be made after considering all other information provided in the R\&O.

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp., 2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.
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## 2008 Commission Summary

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 42 | COD | 19.93 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 6,782,680$ | PRD | 107.33 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 6,716,430$ | COV | 29.25 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 5,845,412$ | STD | 27.32 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 159,915$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 18.36 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 139,176$ | Min | 46.72 |
| Median | 92.11 | Max | 210.90 |
| Wgt. Mean | 87.03 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 83.76 to 97.08 |
| Mean | 93.41 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 80.79 to 93.27 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 85.15 to 101.68 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 8.95 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 6.22 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 4.7 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 184,395 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 42 | 92.11 | 19.93 | 107.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 45 | 93.99 | 20.68 | 106.28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 39 | 98.00 | 17.69 | 102.52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 48 | 98.41 | 15.83 | 105.72 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 43 | 98.03 | 14.85 | 105.02 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 49 | 98 | 11.15 | 105.17 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 46 | 98 | 13.26 | 121.26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 54 | 99 | 11.15 | 122.91 |

Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Seward County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Seward County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Seward County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Seward County is $92 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Seward County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
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# Seward County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Residential

1) Reviewed sales
2) Reappraisal of the improvements in the city of Milford.
3) Reanalyzed neighborhoods in Milford and changed some subdivision lot values.
4) Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2007 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2008.
5) Reappraisal of the houses and buildings on properties classified as farms in Range 3.
6) Changed farm home sites and rural residential home sites county wide from 15,000 and 17,000 respectively to 18,000 for the first acre.
7) Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted.
8) Reviewed land values in rural residential subdivisions and revalued Westfork Downs subdivision.
9) Reviewed and revalued lots in several Seward subdivisions.
10) Reviewed, inspected and disqualified special valuation on parcels not primarily used for agricultural and horticultural purposes. Sent disqualification notices and held County Board of Equalization hearings for appeals.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Seward County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Assessor's office Staff |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
|  | Urban: 2002-05, Suburban: 2005, Rural: 1999-05 <br> The Urban properties have been valued using the pricing at the time of the appraisal <br> which varies from 2002 to 2005. But the 2002, 03 and 04 pricing have been updated <br> by current cost multipliers as necessary. The rural pricing on three quarters of the <br> county are on the 1999 pricing with current cost multipliers up to 2003 and one <br> fourth of the county is priced using the 2005 pricing. |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | Urban: 1997, Suburban: 1997, Rural: 1997 <br> The tables in the CAMA program were built from market analysis; the straight line <br> depreciation schedules stay the same. Market analysis is completed each time an <br> area is reappraised with an economic deprecation factor established. Cost tables <br> updated as appraisal work is completed for the area that is being appraised. |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was <br> used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
| Residential properties in Seward County are valued using only the Cost Approach to |  |
| Value and not the Market or Sales Comparison Approaches to value. |  |


| 8. | How are these defined? |
| :--- | :--- |
| Market areas are defined by the same market forces that are used to establish the <br> land values. The neighborhood areas are defined by the combining of similar <br> residential subdivisions. Subdivisions are where the structures are similar in age, <br> quality and basic construction. The towns of Seward and Milford maintains the <br> majority of the neighborhood areas with the small towns generally identified as <br> single areas in addition to several rural subdivisions and the rural improvements are <br> maintained in three rural market areas. |  |
| 9. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? <br> Yes But Seward and Milford would be the exception they being divided into many <br> neighborhood market areas each having differing market influences. |
| 10. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural <br> residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | N/A <br> 11.What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> 001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
|  | None The statutory line does not align with Market Areas established by the county. |
| 12. | Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified <br> and valued in the same manner? |
|  | The rural agricultural related improvements have been appraised separate from the <br> rural residential in the past, but this year this procedure is being changed. The <br> county is in the second year of re-appraising the improvements on agricultural <br> related parcels at the same time as the rural residential. |

## Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 367 |  | 66 | 433 |
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## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The actions of the assessment of this property class are apparent, through the pro-active approach with the appraisal and office staff that many of the goals that were set have been achieved and the results are the continued efforts for better equalization and uniformity within this class of property. The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{7 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 9}$ |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{8 2 0}$ | 607 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 0 2}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{8 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 7 7}$ |
| 2005 | 830 | 571 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 8}$ |
| 2004 | $\mathbf{7 5 2}$ | 534 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 0 1}$ |
| 2003 | 695 | 517 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 3 9}$ |
| 2002 | $\mathbf{7 1 0}$ | 529 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 5 1}$ |
| 2001 | $\mathbf{8 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 0 1}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The sales qualification and utilization for this property class is the sole responsibility of the county assessor. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales is being utilized for the sales study, and would indicate that the county is not excessively trimming the residential sales file.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Seward County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R\&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 94.43 | 2.63 | 96.91 |  |
| 2007 | 96.91 | 1.13 | 98 | 97.01 |
| 2006 | 97.49 | 2.39 | 99.82 | 98.21 |
| 2005 | 92.58 | 9.31 | 101.2 | 98.58 |
| 2004 | 92.22 | 3.57 | 95.51 | 95.23 |
| 2003 | 93 | 2.32 | 95.16 | 95 |
| 2002 | 88 | 6.2 | 93.46 | 95 |
| 2001 | 90 | 2.91 | 92.62 | 94 |

RESIDENTIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the final median for this property class indicates that the two values are similar and support each other.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.09 | 2008 | 2.63 |
| 0.98 | 2007 | 1.13 |
| 2.79 | 2006 | 2.39 |
| 9.77 | 2005 | 9.31 |
| 3.41 | 2004 | 3.57 |
| 5 | 2003 | 2 |
| 6.2 | 2002 | 6.2 |
| 2.67 | 2001 | 2.91 |

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change for this class of property indicates that the two rates are similar. Having a small difference between these two measurements supports the actions of the assessor's office.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95.00 | 92.99 | 94.42 |

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency shown here reflect that the statistics for the qualified sales for this property type are within the acceptable range. There is little difference between the three measures of central tendency which gives reasonable indication this property type is being treated uniformly and proportionately. The median will be the best indication of level of value for this county for this property type.

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 8.73 | 101.53 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential are within the acceptable range as qualitative measures, and indicate a general level of good assessment uniformity for this property class as a whole.

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 576 | 576 | 0 |
| Median | 94.43 | 95.00 | 0.57 |
| Wgt. Mean | 90.93 | 92.99 | 2.06 |
| Mean | 93.04 | 94.42 | 1.38 |
| COD | 10.20 | 8.73 | -1.47 |
| PRD | 102.33 | 101.53 | $-\mathbf{0 . 8}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 7.51 | 26.95 | 19.44 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 249.51 | 249.51 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The statistics for this class of property in this county represent the assessment actions completed for this property class for this assessment year.
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## Seward County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## Commercial

1) Reviewed the sales to see if the 2000 county's comprehensive reappraisal was staying with the current market.
2) Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2007 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2008.
3) Revalued land in the city of Seward.
4) Revalued land and improvements in the city of Milford.
5) Revalued land in Seward on properties classified as apartments.
6) Reviewed Section 42 Housing properties and revalued.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Seward County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contract Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Contract Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contract Appraiser |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 1999 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2000 |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The cost approach is predominantly used for the valuation of the commercial properties in Seward County. If a parcel is called up in a protest an income approach is developed to support the cost approach. |
| 7. | When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The predominant valuation process in this county is to depend on the Cost Approach to Value. The Sales Comparison Approach to value is not developed or used. |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | There are market areas that are defined by land value analysis. Examples would be areas defined as the interstate interchanges. |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | The analysis used to define the land values are use to define the market areas. Rural commercial areas West of Seward and East of Seward and the several and various interstate intersections and market areas within Seward and the Small Towns |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes For the most part but Seward would be the exception it being divided into many |


|  | neighborhood market areas. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural <br> commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | N/A The statutory lines do not align with the Market Areas established by the <br> county. |

12. What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
No The statutory line does not align with Market Areas established by the county.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 |  | 2 | 19 |

# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics 



# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics 



## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008




PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:


## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The actions taken by the assessor are supported by the statistics. This county has met the criteria to achieve an acceptable level of assessment for this class of property. The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property. But the assessor has recognized the need to re-appraise the commercial properties and has begun the process of analysis for the re-appraisal for next year by re-appraising and applying the new values to the land for the commercial properties in Seward and Milford, that lays the ground work for the re-appraisal of the improvements.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 75 | 42 | 56 |
| 2007 | 79 | 45 | 56.96 |
| 2006 | 73 | 39 | 53.42 |
| 2005 | 78 | 48 | 61.54 |
| 2004 | 74 | 43 | 58.11 |
| 2003 | 86 | 49 | 56.98 |
| 2002 | 80 | 46 | 57.5 |
| 2001 | 86 | 54 | 62.79 |

COMMERCIAL: A review of the utilization grid reveals the percent of sales used per the combined efforts of the Department and the County. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales are being utilized for the sales file study period for this property type.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Seward County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R\&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 85.15 | 3.59 | $\mathbf{8 8 . 2}$ |  |
| 2007 | 91.99 | 0.72 | 92.66 | 93.99 |
| 2006 | 93.99 | 2.68 | 96.51 | 98.00 |
| 2005 | 98.41 | 3.02 | 101.38 | 98.41 |
| 2004 | 98.03 | 0.05 | 98.08 | 98.03 |
| 2003 | 96 | -0.11 | 95.89 | 98 |
| 2002 | 98 | 0.66 | 98.65 | 98 |
| 2001 | 98 | 0.28 | 98.27 | 99 |

COMMERCIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median level of value for this class of property indicates that the two values are not similar and do not closely support each other. A more detailed explanation will be with Table IV.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 0 . 5 4}$ | 2008 | $\mathbf{3 . 5 9}$ |
| 5.73 | 2007 | 0.72 |
| -16.94 | 2006 | 2.68 |
| 0 | 2005 | 3.02 |
| 0 | 2004 | 0.05 |
| 8 | 2003 | 0 |
| 0 | 2002 | 0.66 |
| 2.4 | 2001 | 0.28 |

COMMERCIAL: The percent change for this class of property represents a significant difference with the percent change. Land values were significantly increased through a reappraisal of the land for the towns of Seward and Milford which made up the majority of both the parcel counts and the sales counts. But there was significantly more of an impact on the sales than on the overall commercial base. A few of the neighborhoods saw a considerable increase in the appraised value of the land. The information identified through sales of land tended to create a significant increase in the sales file without a corresponding or significant increase in the assessment base.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 2 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 4 1}$ |

COMMERCIAL: The median will be the best indication of level of value for this county for this property type. As demonstrated by the above table there is a spread between the median and the weighted mean. The median level of value is within the acceptable range but the low weighted mean is also reflected in a high PRD and indicates that the higher valued properties (on the average) may be under assessed or the lower valued properties may be over assessed. The appraiser for the county has analyzed the market for this class of property and has made plans for appraisal action. The initial appraisal action implemented this year was the reappraisal of the land values in Seward and Milford, a significant beginning for any appraisal project.

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 19.93 | 107.33 |
| Difference | 0 | 4.33 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range as a qualitative measure but the price-related is outside the range. The price-related differential is over 3 points outside of the acceptable range, as another indicator that follows the weighted mean that is also out of line and was discussed in the narrative in Table V .

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | 0 |
| Median | $\mathbf{8 5 . 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 9 6}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{7 5 . 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 2 6}$ |
| Mean | $\mathbf{8 3 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 3 3}$ |
| COD | 25.31 | 19.93 | $\mathbf{- 5 . 3 8}$ |
| PRD | 109.64 | 107.33 | -2.31 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 5.30 | 46.72 | $\mathbf{4 1 . 4 2}$ |
| Max Sales Ratio | 194.25 | 210.90 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 6 5}$ |

COMMERCIAL: The above statistics support the actions of the assessor for this class of property for this assessment year.

## Seward County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## Agricultural

1) Reviewed the sales.
2) Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres. All sixteen precincts completed for GIS land use layer.
3) Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes as necessary.
4) Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends. Made a slight change moving properties in 3 sections from market area 1 to market area 3.
5) Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry cropland and grassland LCG values in market areas 1 and 3. Changed special valuation and market (recapture) values in market area 2.
6) Changed building site acre from 1,750 to 1,800 .

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Seward County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Deputy Assessor |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Deputy Assessor |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | To the best of the county assessor's office knowledge as long as the parcel is being used predominant and primary agricultural use. Physical inspections are used to verify and document a parcels predominant use. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1974 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 2003 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | Land use is a continuous project with a part of the county being completed each year. Many changes have been made in using the GIS maps as a base and also the NRD is requiring operators to match records with the assessor's office. When other than part of the above mentioned rotation process is not used a physical inspection maybe completed. |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | County Staff |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |


|  | The land use review is a continuous process with new changes completed each year. |
| ---: | :--- |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
|  | There are two market areas that are defined by the topography and accessibility to <br> well water for irrigation. Market Area 1 which has access to well water for irrigation <br> and Market Area 3 has the topography and limited irrigation potential. Market Area <br> 2 is also defined by the topography (which also has limited irrigation potential) and <br> the proximity to the development (non agricultural market influence) from <br> Lancaster County. |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | Yes Part of the county, the market has demonstrated a need for special value. |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 235 | 14 | 269 |

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Seward County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Seward County is $74 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Seward County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Seward County is $71 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Seward County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Recapture Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Seward County is $70 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Seward County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For Seward County 

## Section I: Agricultural Land Correlation:

The actions of the assessor are supported by the statistics. Seward County has met the criteria to achieve quality of assessment and an acceptable level of assessment. The qualified Agricultural Unimproved report containing 57 sales with a Median of 74 is within the acceptable range for the level of value. The qualitative statistic for the coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the qualitative statistic for the price related deferential is some what high. Yet taking this into consideration of the agricultural properties not being a homogeneous grouping of properties will contribute to a greater inconsistency with the quality statistics.

The analysis for the determination for the level and quality of assessment for the unimproved agricultural value (assessed value) is from the analysis of the non-influenced market areas in Seward County, which consists of market areas 1 and 3.

Refer to the following Statistical Analysis:


|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 57 | MEDIAN: | 74 |  | COV: | 21.53 | $\begin{array}{rrrr}\text { 95\% Median C.I.: } & 67.13 \text { to } 75.93 \quad \text { (!: Derived) } \\ \text { 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: } & 68.07 \text { to } 74.48\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | 672 | WGT. MEAN: | 71 |  | STD: | 15.93 |  |  |  |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: |  | 040 | MEAN : | 74 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 11.82 |  | Mean C.I.: 69. | 6 to 78.13 |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: |  | 433 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |  | 193 | COD : | 16.06 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 126.90 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  | 867 | PRD: | 103.82 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 48.52 | Printed: 04/02/2008 16:35:22 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE | count | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 3233 | 5 | 74.48 | 83.52 | 73.76 | 21.73 |  | 113.22 | 64.89 | 126.90 | N/A | 275,400 | 203,138 |
| 3235 | 6 | 67.40 | 74.01 | 71.45 | 11.85 |  | 103.58 | 63.58 | 101.94 | 63.58 to 101.94 | 245,885 | 175,678 |
| 3237 | 6 | 71.00 | 68.94 | 66.18 | 13.01 |  | 104.17 | 52.02 | 86.82 | 52.02 to 86.82 | 283,699 | 187,757 |
| 3287 | 6 | 68.32 | 68.75 | 69.68 | 20.67 |  | 98.66 | 48.52 | 88.42 | 48.52 to 88.42 | 166,034 | 115,697 |
| 3289 | 3 | 58.59 | 77.76 | 65.01 | 35.07 |  | 119.62 | 56.52 | 118.17 | N/A | 265,833 | 172,807 |
| 3291 | 7 | 73.60 | 66.98 | 67.13 | 10.31 |  | 99.78 | 53.22 | 75.93 | 53.22 to 75.93 | 337,657 | 226,655 |
| 3457 | 4 | 76.78 | 81.38 | 81.28 | 13.00 |  | 100.11 | 69.44 | 102.51 | N/A | 379,441 | 308,424 |
| 3459 | 2 | 79.64 | 79.64 | 79.30 | 2.41 |  | 100.43 | 77.72 | 81.56 | N/A | 210,625 | 167,030 |
| 3461 | 5 | 79.64 | 79.18 | 71.15 | 15.38 |  | 111.29 | 56.42 | 95.64 | N/A | 152,310 | 108,368 |
| 3511 | 6 | 84.13 | 80.43 | 81.40 | 11.62 |  | 98.81 | 63.41 | 93.54 | 63.41 to 93.54 | 201,309 | 163,871 |
| 3513 | 1 | 50.21 | 50.21 | 50.21 |  |  |  | 50.21 | 50.21 | N/A | 96,000 | 48,201 |
| 3515 | 6 | 70.04 | 69.05 | 68.49 | 10.41 |  | 100.82 | 55.51 | 80.62 | 55.51 to 80.62 | 437,966 | 299,983 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 57 | 73.60 | 74.00 | 71.27 | 16.06 |  | 103.82 | 48.52 | 126.90 | 67.13 to 75.93 | 269,193 | 191,867 |
| AREA ( | ARKET) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 39 | 73.60 | 75.51 | 72.40 | 16.06 |  | 104.29 | 50.21 | 126.90 | 67.13 to 77.72 | 293,984 | 212,851 |
| 3 | 18 | 71.00 | 70.72 | 67.94 | 16.64 |  | 104.09 | 48.52 | 93.13 | 58.84 to 84.69 | 215,480 | 146,400 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 57 | 73.60 | 74.00 | 71.27 | 16.06 |  | 103.82 | 48.52 | 126.90 | 67.13 to 75.93 | 269,193 | 191,867 |
| STATUS <br> RANGE | IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED <br> COUNT | \& IOL <br> MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| 2 | 57 | 73.60 | 74.00 | 71.27 | 16.06 |  | 103.82 | 48.52 | 126.90 | 67.13 to 75.93 | 269,193 | 191,867 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 57 | 73.60 | 74.00 | 71.27 | 16.06 |  | 103.82 | 48.52 | 126.90 | 67.13 to 75.93 | 269,193 | 191,867 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| DRY | 13 | 73.98 | 75.78 | 73.15 | 13.15 |  | 103.59 | 54.22 | 95.64 | 66.20 to 86.85 | 194,742 | 142,460 |
| DRY-N/A | 20 | 67.40 | 69.98 | 68.43 | 16.93 |  | 102.27 | 48.52 | 93.54 | 58.59 to 76.58 | 221,761 | 151,756 |
| GRASS | 1 | 50.21 | 50.21 | 50.21 |  |  |  | 50.21 | 50.21 | N/A | 96,000 | 48,201 |
| IRRGTD | 9 | 74.23 | 82.64 | 76.41 | 17.04 |  | 108.15 | 60.79 | 126.90 | 69.44 to 101.94 | 249,262 | 190,472 |
| IRRGTD-N/A <br> ALL__ |  | 70.12 | 74.21 | 71.00 | 16.90 |  | 104.52 | 56.52 | 118.17 | 61.14 to 80.62 | 431,270 | 306,204 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For Seward County 

## II. Special Value Correlation

The actions of the assessor are supported by the statistical analysis. Seward County has met the criteria to achieve quality of assessment and an acceptable level of assessment. The qualified Agricultural Unimproved report for Market Area 3 is the analysis that will be used to determine the level of value for the special values (assessed value) which is identified as Market Area 2 in Seward County. This analysis of 18 sales indicates the Median at 71 which is within the acceptable range for the level of value. The qualitative statistics are acceptable for this small sale sample. The qualitative statistics of the price related deferential is above the range with the price coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range.

Refer to the following Statistical Analysis:


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


## SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For Seward County

## Section III: Recapture Value Correlation:

The actions of the assessor are supported by the statistical analysis. Seward County has met the criteria to achieve quality of assessment and an acceptable level of assessment. The qualified Agricultural Unimproved report for Market Area 2 is the analysis that will be used to determine the level of value for the recapture values ( $75 \%$ of market values) in Seward County. This analysis of 18 sales indicates the Median at 70 which is within the acceptable range for the level of value. The qualitative statistics are acceptable for this small of a sale sample. The qualitative statistics of the price related deferential is in the acceptable range with the coefficient of dispersion above the range.

Refer to the following statistical analysis:

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


# METHODOLOGY REPORT OF SPECIAL VALUATION AND RECAPTURE (MARKET) VALUATION PROCEDURES 

## SEWARD COUNTY - 2008

1. Special valuation methodology:

As done in the past, the agricultural values are set according to the agricultural sales that are determined to be arms length by the assessor and by the Nebraska Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. A market study is done based on the enclosed spreadsheets. Each sale is listed and contains the number of acres in each land capability group. New values per acre are substituted for last year's values to calculate new assessed values and ratios. New statistical measurements including the mean, median and aggregate mean, coefficient of dispersion, pricerelated differential and the absolute standard deviation are calculated. The final step is the reconciliation of value. It is the process in which the estimates of value are evaluated and the applicability of the indicated values is weighed. This is a reconciliation of the facts, trends and observations developed in the analysis and a review of the conclusions and the validity and reliability of those conclusions. The market study to arrive at the special value was analyzed using only the uninfluenced sales from the market area 3, which was created in 2002. Area 3 does not have the aquifer lying under it. Area 3 has a slight change in boundaries for 2008, adding $13 / 4$ sections from Area 1. Market Area 3 is most like market Area 2, which has special valuation. The new assessed value (ag/special value) for each land capability group is then applied to all agricultural parcels in area 2.
2. Recapture (market) methodology:

The influenced sales in market area 2 was analyzed based on the sale price divided by the number of acres in the parcel to arrive at an amount paid per acre for each sale in market area 2. The spreadsheet labeled "Market Area 2" shows the sales, acres in each parcel, the 2008 market value, sale price, price per acre and the sales ratio along with the other statistical measurements. The sales showed a change was required in the land capability groups for 2008.

Exhibits attached are:
Exhibit 1: Spreadsheet of the sales in Market Area 3, the uninfluenced area, establishing the special valuations for Market Area 2.

Exhibit 2: Spreadsheet of the sales in Market Area 2 establishing the market, recapture valuations for that area.

Exhibit 1
2008 Area 3 Total Used for Special Values for Area 2
Page 1 of 4

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Bk/Pg | Area | Class | 2485 | 1875 | 2350 | 1875 | 2150 | 2150 | 1600 | 1850 | 1450 | 1825 | 1350 | 1200 | 1200 | 900 | 750 | 2025 |
| 2 |  |  |  | 1A1-1 | 1A1-3 | 1A-1 | 1A-3 | 2A1-1 | 2A-1 | 2A-3 | 3A1-1 | 3A1-3 | 3A-1 | 3A-3 | 4A1-1 | 4A1-3 | 4A-1 | 4A-3 | 1D1-1 |
| 3 | 129-113 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 129-368 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 129-416 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 129-418 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 129-425 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 129-463 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 129-481 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 129-495 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 129-521 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 129-641 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 129-705 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 130-290 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 130-571 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | 130-705 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | 131-284 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 131-744 | 3 | IRR |  | 1.08 |  | 28.9 |  |  | 32.3 |  | 1.45 |  | 15.65 |  | 9.35 |  | 0.17 |  |
| 19 | 131-008 | 3 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  | ACRES | 0 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Exhibit 1
2008 Area 3 Total Used for Special Values for Area 2
Page 2 of 4

|  | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z | AA | AB | AC | AD | AE | AF | AG | AH | AI | AJ | AK | AL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1750 | 1925 | 1715 | 1675 | 1450 | 1675 | 1375 | 1400 | 1200 | 1200 | 1080 | 1900 | 1750 | 1650 | 1050 | 990 | 700 | 650 | 455 |
| 2 | 1D1-3 | 1D-1 | 1D-3 | 2D1-1 | 2D1-3 | 2D-1 | 2D-3 | 3D1-1 | 3D1-3 | 3D-1 | 3D-3 | GB | GB | GB | 4D1-1 | 4D1-3 | 4D | 1G1 | 1G1T1-1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 49 |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  | 18 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 7.95 |  | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 |  | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 32.3 | 3.65 |  |  |
| 6 | 56.05 |  | 49 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 19.5 | 7 |  |  |
| 7 | 17.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.85 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 12.7 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  | 12.1 |  |  |  | 35.9 |  | 8.8 |  | 15.2 |  |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |
| 9 | 18.54 |  | 8.83 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 15.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37.5 | 4 |  |  |
| 10 |  |  | 25.9 |  | 65 |  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.5 |  |  |  |
| 11 | 4.17 |  | 26.6 |  |  |  | 9 |  | 5.99 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.1 |  |  |
| 12 | 99.56 |  | 16.48 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.65 |  | 14.87 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.75 |  |  |
| 13 | 39 |  | 11.38 |  | 3 |  | 11 |  | 2 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  | 8.91 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.5 |  |  |  |
| 15 | 69.3 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |
| 16 | 47 |  | 16.5 |  | 4.35 |  | 4 |  | 10.5 |  | 13.65 |  |  |  |  | 7.5 |  | 0.2 |  |
| 17 | 11.17 |  | 38.55 |  | 10.15 |  |  |  | 15.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.65 |  |  |  |
| 18 | 19.03 |  | 5.16 |  |  |  | 2.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.31 |  |  |
| 19 | 60.75 |  | 33 |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.75 |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | 499 | 0 | 310 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Exhibit 1
2008 Area 3 Total Used for Special Values for Area 2
Page 3 of 4

|  | AM | AN | AO | AP | AQ | AR | AS | AT | AU | AV | AW | AX | AY | AZ | BA | BB | BC | BD | BE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 260 | 1610 | 600 | 1600 | 240 | 575 | 1350 | 1350 | 575 | 525 | 1030 | 450 | 900 | 1325 | 450 | 775 | 775 | 400 | 550 |
| 2 | 1G1T2 | 1G1C-3 | 1G | 1GC-1 | 1GT2 | 2G1 | 2G1C-1 | 2G1C-3 | 2G | 3G1 | 3G1C-1 | 3G | 3GC-3 | GRASS | 4G1 | 4G1C-1 | 4G1C-3 | 4G | 4GC-1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 4 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 10.67 |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.88 |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  |  | 6 |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.07 |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  | 12.4 |  | 4.75 |  |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  | 16.2 |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.85 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 21.65 |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Exhibit 1
2008 Area 3 Total Used for Special Values for Area 2
Page 4 of 4

|  | BF | BG | BH | BI | BJ | BK | BL | BM | BN | BO | BP | BQ | BR | BS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 315 | 180 | 280 | 160 | 90 | Road | Total | SUB | SUB | VALUATION | Sale Price | Ratio | ABS |  |
| 2 | 4G1T1 | 4G1T2 | 4GT1 | 4GT2 | Shbt/Wst | RR | Acres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 40.35 | 35,651 | 1,600 | 37,251 | 40,000 | 93.13\% | 0.1938 | Dry . 53 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.89 | 115.89 | 177,005 | 0 | 177,005 | 240,000 | 73.75\% | 0 | Dry 1.00 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 7.7 | 1 | 1 | 80 | 91,694 | 1,322 | 93,016 | 123,200 | 75.50\% | 0.0175 | Dry . 88 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 9.8 | 7.25 |  | 162.5 | 218,150 | 2,221 | 220,370 | 260,208 | 84.69\% | 0.1094 | Dry . 85 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 | 38.13 | 51,508 | 0 | 51,508 | 95,000 | 54.22\% | 0.1953 | Dry 1.00 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.47 | 78.47 | 99,984 | 0 | 99,984 | 125,552 | 79.64\% | 0.0588 | Dry . 96 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | 19.31 | 1.42 | 130.77 | 115,963 | 7,806 | 123,769 | 195,190 | 63.41\% | 0.1034 | Dry . 6 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  | 4.21 | 3.22 | 157.83 | 201,144 | 379 | 201,522 | 272,395 | 73.98\% | 0.0023 | Dry .97 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | 0.64 | 3.49 | 58.99 | 82,000 | 58 | 82,057 | 92,800 | 88.42\% | 0.1467 | Dry . 98 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.55 | 145 | 226,694 | 1,952 | 228,646 | 388,600 | 58.84\% | 0.1491 | Dry . 96 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 76.38 | 119,362 | 0 | 119,362 | 137,484 | 86.82\% | 0.1307 | Dry 1.00 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43.91 | 45,446 | 3,075 | 48,521 | 100,000 | 48.52\% | 0.2523 | Dry . 82 |
| 15 | 2.5 |  |  |  | 1 | 1.48 | 119.85 | 166,892 | 2,903 | 169,794 | 326,400 | 52.02\% | 0.2173 | Dry . 92 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.48 | 146.38 | 173,210 | 7,335 | 180,545 | 320,000 | 56.42\% | 0.1733 | Dry . 71 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3.42 | 125 | 162,654 | 180 | 162,834 | 187,500 | 86.84\% | 0.1309 | Dry . 98 |
| 18 |  |  | 11.6 | 10.52 |  | 3.38 | 149.29 | 193,794 | 4,917 | 198,711 | 325,000 | 61.14\% | 0.1261 | Irr . 6 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 160 | 198,736 | 11,360 | 210,096 | 312,000 | 67.34\% | 0.0641 | Dry .79 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 28 | 41 | 34 | 1,829 | 2,359,885 | 45,107 | 2,404,991 | 3,541,329 |  | 0.1218 |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | COD | 16.52 |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEDIAN | 73.75\% |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AGGRE | 67.91\% |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEAN | 70.86\% |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PRD | 104.35\% |  |  |  |
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Exhibit 2
2008 Area 2 Total Market (Recapture) Value
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|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Bk/Pg | Area | Class | 2485 | 1850 | 2350 | 1800 | 2150 | 2150 | 1400 | 1850 | 1375 | 1825 | 1130 | 1200 | 1100 | 900 | 600 | 2025 |
| 2 |  |  |  | 1A1-1 | 1A1-3 | 1A-1 | 1A-3 | 2A1-1 | 2A-1 | 2A-3 | 3A1-1 | 3A1-3 | 3A-1 | 3A-3 | 4A1-1 | 4A1-3 | 4A-1 | 4A-3 | 1D1-1 |
| 3 | 130-230 | 2 | GRASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 130-240 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 130-136 | 2 | GRASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 131-013 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 132-090 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 131-619 | 2 | CRP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 131-213 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 131-117 | 2 | CRP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 129-896 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 132-410 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 129-728 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 129-832 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 131-090 | 2 | GRASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | 132-218 | 2 | GRASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | 131-586 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 131-762 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 129-466 | 2 | GRASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 129-874 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 130-776 | 2 | DRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  | ACRES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z | AA | AB | AC | AD | AE | AF | AG | AH | AI | AJ | AK | AL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1675 | 1925 | 1650 | 1675 | 1375 | 1675 | 1375 | 1400 | 1180 | 1200 | 1030 | 1810 | 1810 | 1800 | 1050 | 990 | 550 | 600 | 420 |
| 2 | 1D1-3 | 1D-1 | 1D-3 | 2D1-1 | 2D1-3 | 2D-1 | 2D-3 | 3D1-1 | 3D1-3 | 3D-1 | 3D-3 | GB | GB | GB | 4D1-1 | 4D1-3 | 4D | 1G1 | 1G1T1-1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.21 | 21.74 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.36 | 36.31 | 54.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.64 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 | 24.5 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.1 | 46.8 | 21.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.5 | 40 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.48 | 24.51 | 15.09 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56 | 13.85 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.91 | 17.34 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.65 | 16.61 | 4.66 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.6 | 45.4 | 41.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.3 | 14 | 30.75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.5 | 40 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 349 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  | AM | AN | AO | AP | AQ | AR | AS | AT | AU | AV | AW | AX | AY | AZ | BA | BB | BC | BD | BE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 240 | 1610 | 550 | 1600 | 220 | 525 | 1350 | 1350 | 525 | 475 | 1030 | 400 | 900 | 1325 | 400 | 775 | 775 | 325 | 550 |
| 2 | 1G1T2 | 1G1C-3 | 1G | 1GC-1 | 1GT2 | 2G1 | 2G1C-1 | 2G1C-3 | 2G | 3G1 | 3G1C-1 | 3G | 3GC-3 | GRASS | 4G1 | 4G1C-1 | 4G1C-3 | 4G | 4GC-1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 |  | 1 | 27.96 |  |  |  |  | 9.3 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.72 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 155.93 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.78 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.21 |  |  |  |  |  | 75.82 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 139.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.39 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29.92 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40.37 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.83 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 843 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  | BF | BG | BH | BI | BJ | BK | BL | BM | BN | BO | BP | BQ | BR | BS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 280 | 160 | 230 | 130 | 70 | Road | Total | SUB | SUB | VALUATION | Sale Price | Ratio | ABS |  |
| 2 | 4G1T1 | 4G1T2 | 4GT1 | 4GT2 | Shbt/Wst | RR | Acres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.74 | 41.2 | 0 | 44,368 | 60,230 | 118,000 | 51.04\% | 0.2005 | Gr . 69 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.95 | 63.12 | 67,740 | 32,754 | 100,494 | 189,360 | 53.07\% | 0.1802 | Dry 60 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 155.93 | 0 | 206,607 | 206,607 | 384,350 | 53.75\% | 0.1734 | Gr 1.00 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 146.15 | 213,703 | 36,809 | 250,511 | 456,250 | 54.91\% | 0.1619 | Dry 80 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 38.64 | 64,428 | 2,650 | 67,078 | 120,000 | 55.90\% | 0.152 | Dry . 94 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78.03 | 2,984 | 100,462 | 112,875 | 163,853 | 68.89\% | 0.0221 | CRP . 68 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 80 | 96,573 | 33,920 | 130,493 | 201,000 | 64.92\% | 0.0617 | Dry . 67 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 22,275 | 184,838 | 207,113 | 320,000 | 64.72\% | 0.0637 | CRP . 59 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.37 | 149.86 | 224,409 | 29,667 | 254,076 | 375,000 | 67.75\% | 0.0334 | Dry . 84 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 120 | 181,565 | 23,188 | 204,753 | 288,000 | 71.09\% | 0 | Dry . 85 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 80 | 88,684 | 39,644 | 128,328 | 180,000 | 71.29\% | 0.002 | Dry . 62 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.63 | 77.48 | 139,029 | 0 | 139,029 | 187,200 | 74.27\% | 0.0317 | Dry 1.00 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 77.75 | 63,629 | 56,313 | 119,942 | 158,000 | 75.91\% | 0.0482 | Gr . 54 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.37 | 21,720 | 53,490 | 75,210 | 97,000 | 77.54\% | 0.0644 | Gr . 75 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 80 | 133,749 | 6,731 | 140,480 | 176,000 | 79.82\% | 0.0872 | Dry . 93 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 155.03 | 228,010 | 32,900 | 260,910 | 298,375 | 87.44\% | 0.1635 | Dry . 83 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 160 | 0 | 209,350 | 209,350 | 224,000 | 93.46\% | 0.2237 | Gr 1.00 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.45 | 73 | 121,053 | 7,288 | 128,341 | 120,000 | 106.95\% | 0.3586 | Dry . 92 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 120 | 181,565 | 23,188 | 204,753 | 171,000 | 119.74\% | 0.4864 | Dry . 85 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 1,905 | 1,851,114 | 1,124,164 | 3,000,570 | 4,227,388 |  | 0.1323 |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | COD | 18.62 |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEDIAN | 71.09\% |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AGGRE | 70.98\% |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEAN | 73.29\% |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PRD | 103.25\% |  |  |  |
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## County 80 - Seward

| Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF) |  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural <br> Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Total <br> Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records |  | Value | Records |  | Value |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |


|  | Total |  | Growth |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | Urban Records | SubUrban <br> Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26. Exempt | 373 | 61 | 116 | 550 |


| Schedule V: Agricultural Records | Urban | Value | SubUrban Records | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Records |  |  |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 7 | 635,728 | 226 | 33,297,254 | 1,806 | 288,530,346 | 2,039 | 322,463,328 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 0 | 0 | 116 | 21,947,699 | 982 | 195,910,341 | 1,098 | 217,858,040 |
| 29. Ag-Improvements | 0 | 0 | 123 | 11,077,206 | 1,097 | 81,851,529 | 1,220 | 92,928,735 |
| 30. Ag-Total Taxable |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,259 | 633,250,103 |

## County 80 - Seward

| Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3 | 3.000 | 54,000 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 81 | 83.000 | 1,494,000 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 80 |  | 8,267,851 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 2 | 126.280 | 256,670 | 2 | 2.000 | 3,600 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 35 | 78.720 | 228,600 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 0 |  | 0 | 119 |  | 2,809,355 |

38. FarmSite Total

| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0.770 |  |  | 583.030 |  |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 91.920 | 0 |  |
|  | Rural |  | Value | Total |  | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 10 | 10.000 | 180,000 | 13 | 13.000 | 234,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 673 | 678.000 | 12,164,000 | 754 | 761.000 | 13,658,000 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 646 |  | 62,778,615 | 726 |  | 71,046,466 | 2,610,661 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 739 | 774.000 | 84,938,466 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 21 | 30.510 | 129,350 | 25 | 158.790 | 389,620 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 317 | 376.850 | 913,033 | 352 | 455.570 | 1,141,633 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1,073 |  | 19,072,914 | 1,192 |  | 21,882,269 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,217 | 614.360 | 23,413,522 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 6,051.780 |  |  | 6,635.580 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 224.250 | 0 |  | 316.170 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 1,956 | 8,340.110 | 108,351,988 | 2,610,661 |


| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3 | 345.020 | 292,211 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 12 | 1,194.550 | 856,319 | 15 | 1,539.570 | 1,148,530 |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 92 | 9,385.470 | 10,262,942 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15,051,229 |
|  | Records | ${ }^{\text {Rural }}{ }_{\text {Acres }}$ | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 787 | 83,306.840 | 80,637,642 | 879 | 92,692.310 | 90,900,584 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 129,922,973 |  |  | 144,974,202 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,007.220 | 7,794,372 | 35,522.820 | 91,980,344 | 38,530.040 | 99,774,716 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 2,140.980 | 5,350,350 | 30,085.230 | 75,127,666 | 32,226.210 | 80,478,016 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 52.050 | 124,920 | 1,386.850 | 3,327,540 | 1,438.900 | 3,452,460 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,175.600 | 2,814,090 | 9,503.800 | 22,764,670 | 10,679.400 | 25,578,760 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 757.580 | 1,583,718 | 12,802.090 | 26,810,235 | 13,559.670 | 28,393,953 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,783.530 | 3,656,247 | 11,856.590 | 24,286,170 | 13,640.120 | 27,942,417 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 475.120 | 613,783 | 8,898.910 | 11,498,833 | 9,374.030 | 12,112,616 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 159.510 | 159,510 | 4,178.620 | 4,178,620 | 4,338.130 | 4,338,130 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 9,551.590 | 22,096,990 | 114,234.910 | 259,974,078 | 123,786.500 | 282,071,068 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 6.670 | 14,674 | 892.490 | 1,950,878 | 9,142.270 | 19,968,274 | 10,041.430 | 21,933,826 |
| 55.1D | 28.300 | 59,430 | 920.120 | 1,929,852 | 11,992.210 | 25,126,041 | 12,940.630 | 27,115,323 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.820 | 45,247 | 982.820 | 1,866,908 | 1,007.640 | 1,912,155 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 297.180 | 562,142 | 3,050.330 | 5,773,352 | 3,347.510 | 6,335,494 |
| 58. 3D1 | 26.960 | 47,180 | 596.370 | 1,039,158 | 7,037.770 | 12,299,710 | 7,661.100 | 13,386,048 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 372.200 | 521,080 | 2,909.920 | 4,071,088 | 3,282.120 | 4,592,168 |
| 60.4D1 | 58.010 | 72,513 | 482.570 | 600,972 | 7,023.340 | 8,652,022 | 7,563.920 | 9,325,507 |
| 61.4D | 6.450 | 4,515 | 120.140 | 84,098 | 1,934.490 | 1,354,143 | 2,061.080 | 1,442,756 |
| 62. Total | 126.390 | 198,312 | 3,705.890 | 6,733,427 | 44,073.150 | 79,111,538 | 47,905.430 | 86,043,277 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 86.100 | 58,012 | 613.380 | 408,994 | 699.480 | 467,006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 118.000 | 85,612 | 782.140 | 552,325 | 900.140 | 637,937 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 58.390 | 33,120 | 991.450 | 571,377 | 1,049.840 | 604,497 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 148.570 | 82,110 | 448.010 | 256,353 | 596.580 | 338,463 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 129.320 | 68,804 | 1,632.670 | 950,913 | 1,761.990 | 1,019,717 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 198.800 | 82,302 | 413.830 | 178,771 | 612.630 | 261,073 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 316.640 | 155,798 | 2,737.490 | 1,351,814 | 3,054.130 | 1,507,612 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 831.000 | 283,473 | 6,882.440 | 2,459,429 | 7,713.440 | 2,742,902 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,886.820 | 849,231 | 14,501.410 | 6,729,976 | 16,388.230 | 7,579,207 |
| 72. Waste | 7.000 | 630 | 158.310 | 14,248 | 1,638.230 | 147,455 | 1,803.540 | 162,333 |
| 73. Other | 2.300 | 207 | 11.070 | 996 | 154.870 | 13,401 | 168.240 | 14,604 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 210.320 |  | 210.320 |  |
| 75. Total | 135.690 | 199,149 | 15,313.680 | 29,694,892 | 174,602.570 | 345,976,448 | 190,051.940 | 375,870,489 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
2

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 115.590 | 214,257 | 290.280 | 543,452 | 405.870 | 757,709 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 51.690 | 96,919 | 214.160 | 400,727 | 265.850 | 497,646 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.620 | 16,992 | 134.920 | 215,422 | 145.540 | 232,414 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 1,600 | 282.790 | 449,464 | 283.790 | 451,064 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 17.860 | 25,897 | 134.810 | 195,477 | 152.670 | 221,374 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 10.800 | 14,580 | 72.330 | 94,047 | 83.130 | 108,627 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 34.430 | 41,316 | 50.670 | 60,804 | 85.100 | 102,120 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 17.780 | 13,336 | 46.570 | 34,929 | 64.350 | 48,265 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 259.770 | 424,897 | 1,226.530 | 1,994,322 | 1,486.300 | 2,419,219 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 944.760 | 1,639,772 | 3,334.130 | 5,797,860 | 4,278.890 | 7,437,632 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 987.920 | 1,694,503 | 5,170.790 | 8,850,785 | 6,158.710 | 10,545,288 |
| 56.2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 473.930 | 686,456 | 4,253.400 | 6,163,618 | 4,727.330 | 6,850,074 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 265.210 | 364,669 | 2,858.270 | 3,922,490 | 3,123.480 | 4,287,159 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 981.270 | 1,176,868 | 6,823.860 | 8,170,982 | 7,805.130 | 9,347,850 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 312.220 | 342,093 | 4,720.870 | 5,085,870 | 5,033.090 | 5,427,963 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 937.590 | 920,388 | 6,248.460 | 6,182,008 | 7,186.050 | 7,102,396 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 231.050 | 161,735 | 1,875.100 | 1,312,570 | 2,106.150 | 1,474,305 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 5,133.950 | 6,986,484 | 35,284.880 | 45,486,183 | 40,418.830 | 52,472,667 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 48.150 | 36,286 | 170.110 | 154,449 | 218.260 | 190,735 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 93.310 | 59,744 | 657.010 | 597,557 | 750.320 | 657,301 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 416.480 | 290,057 | 3,020.790 | 2,642,980 | 3,437.270 | 2,933,037 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 89.200 | 66,913 | 1,434.750 | 1,209,249 | 1,523.950 | 1,276,162 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 288.940 | 177,986 | 3,971.650 | 2,744,897 | 4,260.590 | 2,922,883 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 393.430 | 237,651 | 6,891.630 | 4,359,188 | 7,285.060 | 4,596,839 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 648.110 | 352,057 | 6,676.830 | 3,752,255 | 7,324.940 | 4,104,312 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 985.270 | 399,722 | 14,619.520 | 5,576,670 | 15,604.790 | 5,976,392 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,962.890 | 1,620,416 | 37,442.290 | 21,037,245 | 40,405.180 | 22,657,661 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 111.360 | 10,023 | 1,620.640 | 149,578 | 1,732.000 | 159,601 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 9.430 | 849 | 42.140 | 3,793 | 51.570 | 4,642 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 1.020 |  | 58.700 |  | 59.720 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 8,477.400 | 9,042,669 | 75,616.480 | 68,671,121 | 84,093.880 | 77,713,790 |

Exhibit 80 - Page 88

## County 80 - Seward <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 699.570 | 1,309,223 | 1,488.870 | 2,778,438 | 2,188.440 | 4,087,661 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 269.990 | 502,935 | 909.310 | 1,697,536 | 1,179.300 | 2,200,471 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 25.970 | 41,552 | 98.090 | 156,944 | 124.060 | 198,496 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 278.910 | 442,506 | 870.110 | 1,387,676 | 1,149.020 | 1,830,182 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 102.990 | 147,212 | 364.690 | 528,806 | 467.680 | 676,018 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 51.610 | 69,675 | 342.730 | 462,689 | 394.340 | 532,364 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.120 | 83,994 | 223.200 | 267,840 | 294.320 | 351,834 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 60.150 | 45,115 | 52.240 | 39,187 | 112.390 | 84,302 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,560.310 | 2,642,212 | 4,349.240 | 7,319,116 | 5,909.550 | 9,961,328 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 24.000 | 42,000 | 1,663.640 | 2,901,485 | 7,621.090 | 13,208,269 | 9,308.730 | 16,151,754 |
| 55.1D | 22.340 | 38,314 | 2,288.380 | 3,908,600 | 7,039.220 | 12,024,871 | 9,349.940 | 15,971,785 |
| 56. 2D1 | 23.000 | 33,350 | 197.180 | 284,413 | 1,022.870 | 1,482,428 | 1,243.050 | 1,800,191 |
| 57. 2D | 24.330 | 33,454 | 907.650 | 1,235,637 | 2,789.450 | 3,800,116 | 3,721.430 | 5,069,207 |
| 58. 3D1 | 15.450 | 18,540 | 1,260.970 | 1,508,668 | 5,405.700 | 6,482,435 | 6,682.120 | 8,009,643 |
| 59.3D | 6.700 | 7,236 | 165.530 | 177,632 | 1,336.910 | 1,443,865 | 1,509.140 | 1,628,733 |
| 60.4D1 | 2.000 | 1,980 | 1,374.590 | 1,340,198 | 6,654.270 | 6,532,551 | 8,030.860 | 7,874,729 |
| 61.4D | 5.450 | 3,815 | 222.880 | 156,016 | 632.430 | 442,701 | 860.760 | 602,532 |
| 62. Total | 123.270 | 178,689 | 8,080.820 | 11,512,649 | 32,501.940 | 45,417,236 | 40,706.030 | 57,108,574 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.110 | 22,624 | 251.660 | 212,032 | 292.770 | 234,656 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 76.890 | 39,942 | 385.230 | 296,352 | 462.120 | 336,294 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 94.750 | 56,229 | 825.720 | 499,873 | 920.470 | 556,102 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 44.520 | 21,563 | 375.940 | 234,034 | 420.460 | 255,597 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 127.210 | 66,513 | 807.000 | 502,846 | 934.210 | 569,359 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.330 | 6,449 | 111.090 | 65,667 | 125.420 | 72,116 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 250.900 | 111,834 | 1,463.100 | 782,858 | 1,714.000 | 894,692 |
| 70.4G | 2.000 | 320 | 624.910 | 199,769 | 2,587.680 | 971,968 | 3,214.590 | 1,172,057 |
| 71. Total | 2.000 | 320 | 1,274.620 | 524,923 | 6,807.420 | 3,565,630 | 8,084.040 | 4,090,873 |
| 72. Waste | 10.000 | 900 | 467.710 | 42,098 | 1,111.220 | 100,014 | 1,588.930 | 143,012 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 59.000 | 5,310 | 52.650 | 4,739 | 111.650 | 10,049 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 135.270 | 179,909 | 11,442.460 | 14,727,192 | 44,822.470 | 56,406,735 | 56,400.200 | 71,313,836 |

## County 80 - Seward
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Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 11,371.670 | 25,164,099 | 119,810.680 | 269,287,516 | 131,182.350 | 294,451,615 |
| 77.Dry Land | 249.660 | 377,001 | 16,920.660 | 25,232,560 | 111,859.970 | 170,014,957 | 129,030.290 | 195,624,518 |
| 78.Grass | 2.000 | 320 | 6,124.330 | 2,994,570 | 58,751.120 | 31,332,851 | 64,877.450 | 34,327,741 |
| 79.Waste | 17.000 | 1,530 | 737.380 | 66,369 | 4,370.090 | 397,047 | 5,124.470 | 464,946 |
| 80.Other | 2.300 | 207 | 79.500 | 7,155 | 249.660 | 21,933 | 331.460 | 29,295 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 1.020 | 0 | 269.020 | 0 | 270.040 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 270.960 | 379,058 | 35,233.540 | 53,464,753 | 295,041.520 | 471,054,304 | 330,546.020 | 524,898,115 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 80 - Seward

Market Area:

| Value | \% of Value | Average Assessed Value |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |


| Dry: |
| :--- |
| 1D1 $10,041.430$ $20.96 \%$ $21,933,826$ $25.49 \%$ $2,184.332$ <br> 1D $12,940.630$ $27.01 \%$ $27,115,323$ $31.51 \%$ $2,095.363$ <br> 2D1 $1,007.640$ $2.10 \%$ $1,912,155$ $2.22 \%$ $1,897.656$ <br> 2D $3,347.510$ $6.99 \%$ $6,335,494$ $7.36 \%$ $1,892.598$ <br> 3D1 $7,661.100$ $15.99 \%$ $13,386,048$ $15.56 \%$ $1,747.274$ <br> 3D $3,282.120$ $6.85 \%$ $4,592,168$ $5.34 \%$ $1,399.146$ <br> 4D1 $7,563.920$ $15.79 \%$ $9,325,507$ $10.84 \%$ $1,232.893$ <br> 4D $2,061.080$ $4.30 \%$ $1,442,756$ $1.68 \%$ 700.000 <br> Dry Total $47,905.430$ $100.00 \%$ $86,043,277$ $100.00 \%$ $1,796.106$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 699.480 | $4.27 \%$ | 467,006 | $6.16 \%$ | 667.647 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 900.140 | $5.49 \%$ | 637,937 | $8.42 \%$ | 708.708 |
| 2G1 | $1,049.840$ | $6.41 \%$ | 604,497 | $7.98 \%$ | 575.799 |
| 2G | 596.580 | $3.64 \%$ | 338,463 | $4.47 \%$ | 567.338 |
| 3G1 | $1,761.990$ | $10.75 \%$ | $1,019,717$ | $13.45 \%$ | 578.730 |
| 3G | 612.630 | $3.74 \%$ | 261,073 | $3.44 \%$ | 426.151 |
| 4G1 | $3,054.130$ | $18.64 \%$ | $1,507,612$ | $19.89 \%$ | 493.630 |
| 4G | $7,713.440$ | $47.07 \%$ | $2,742,902$ | $36.19 \%$ | 355.600 |
| Grass Total | $16,388.230$ | $100.00 \%$ | $7,579,207$ | $100.00 \%$ | 462.478 |
|  | $123,786.500$ | $65.13 \%$ | $282,071,068$ | $75.04 \%$ | $2,278.690$ |
| Irrigated Total | $47,905.430$ | $25.21 \%$ | $86,043,277$ | $22.89 \%$ | $1,796.106$ |
| Dry Total | $16,388.230$ | $8.62 \%$ | $7,579,207$ | $2.02 \%$ | 462.478 |
| Grass Total | $1,803.540$ | $0.95 \%$ | 162,333 | $0.04 \%$ | 90.007 |
| Waste | 168.240 | $0.09 \%$ | 14,604 | $0.00 \%$ | 86.804 |
| Other | 210.320 | $0.11 \%$ |  |  | $1,977.725$ |
| Exempt | $190,051.940$ | $100.00 \%$ | $375,870,489$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $123,786.500$ | $94.36 \%$ | $282,071,068$ | $95.80 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $47,905.430$ | $37.13 \%$ | $86,043,277$ | $43.98 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $16,388.230$ | $25.26 \%$ | $7,579,207$ | $22.08 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,803.540$ | $35.19 \%$ | 162,333 | $34.91 \%$ |
| Other | 168.240 | $50.76 \%$ | 14,604 | $49.85 \%$ |
| Exempt | 210.320 | $77.88 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $190,051.940$ | $57.50 \%$ | $375,870,489$ | $71.61 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 80 - Seward

Market Area: 2
\% of Acres*

| Acres | \% of Acres |
| ---: | ---: |
| 405.870 | $27.31 \%$ |
| 265.850 | $17.89 \%$ |
| 145.540 | $9.79 \%$ |
| 283.790 | $19.09 \%$ |
| 152.670 | $10.27 \%$ |
| 83.130 | $5.59 \%$ |
| 85.100 | $5.73 \%$ |
| 64.350 | $4.33 \%$ |
| $1,486.300$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| 1D1 | $4,278.890$ | $10.59 \%$ | $7,437,632$ | $14.17 \%$ | $1,738.215$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1D | $6,158.710$ | $15.24 \%$ | $10,545,288$ | $20.10 \%$ | $1,712.255$ |
| 2D1 | $4,727.330$ | $11.70 \%$ | $6,850,074$ | $13.05 \%$ | $1,449.036$ |
| 2D | $3,123.480$ | $7.73 \%$ | $4,287,159$ | $8.17 \%$ | $1,372.558$ |
| 3D1 | $7,805.130$ | $19.31 \%$ | $9,347,850$ | $17.81 \%$ | $1,197.654$ |
| 3D | $5,033.090$ | $12.45 \%$ | $5,427,963$ | $10.34 \%$ | $1,078.455$ |
| 4D1 | $7,186.050$ | $17.78 \%$ | $7,102,396$ | $13.54 \%$ | 988.358 |
| 4D | $2,106.150$ | $5.21 \%$ | $1,474,305$ | $2.81 \%$ | 700.000 |
| Dry Total | $40,418.830$ | $100.00 \%$ | $52,472,667$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,298.223$ |

40,418.830 100.00\%

Average Assessed Value*
Value $\quad$ \% of Value*
757,709 31.32\%
1,866.876
1,871.905

| 232,414 | $20.57 \%$ | $1,871.905$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |

$451,064 \quad 18.65 \% \quad 1,589.428$
$221,374 \quad 9.15 \% \quad 1,450.016$
$108,627 \quad 4.49 \% \quad 1,306.712$
$102,120 \quad 4.22 \%$
2.00\%
100.00\%

1,627.678

Dry:

Grass:

| 1G1 | 218.260 | $0.54 \%$ | 190,735 | $0.84 \%$ | 873.888 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 750.320 | $1.86 \%$ | 657,301 | $2.90 \%$ | 876.027 |
| 2G1 | $3,437.270$ | $8.51 \%$ | $2,933,037$ | $12.95 \%$ | 853.304 |
| 2G | $1,523.950$ | $3.77 \%$ | $1,276,162$ | $5.63 \%$ | 837.404 |
| 3G1 | $4,260.590$ | $10.54 \%$ | $2,922,883$ | $12.90 \%$ | 686.027 |
| 3G | $7,285.060$ | $18.03 \%$ | $4,596,839$ | $20.29 \%$ | 630.995 |
| 4G1 | $7,324.940$ | $18.13 \%$ | $4,104,312$ | $18.11 \%$ | 560.320 |
| 4G | $15,604.790$ | $38.62 \%$ | $5,976,392$ | $26.38 \%$ | 382.984 |
| Grass Total | $40,405.180$ | $100.00 \%$ | $22,657,661$ | $100.00 \%$ | 560.761 |
| Irrigated Total | $1,486.300$ | $1.77 \%$ | $2,419,219$ | $3.11 \%$ | $1,627.678$ |
| Dry Total | $40,418.830$ | $48.06 \%$ | $52,472,667$ | $67.52 \%$ | $1,298.223$ |
| Grass Total | $40,405.180$ | $48.05 \%$ | $22,657,661$ | $29.16 \%$ | 560.761 |
| Waste | $1,732.000$ | $2.06 \%$ | 159,601 | $0.21 \%$ | 92.148 |
| Other | 51.570 | $0.06 \%$ | 4,642 | $0.01 \%$ | 90.013 |
| Exempt | 59.720 | $0.07 \%$ |  |  | 9 |
| Market Area Total | $84,093.880$ | $100.00 \%$ | $77,713,790$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $1,486.300$ | $1.13 \%$ | $2,419,219$ | $0.82 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $40,418.830$ | $31.33 \%$ | $52,472,667$ | $26.82 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $40,405.180$ | $62.28 \%$ | $22,657,661$ | $66.00 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,732.000$ | $33.80 \%$ | 159,601 | $34.33 \%$ |
| Other | 51.570 | $15.56 \%$ | 4,642 | $15.85 \%$ |
| Exempt | 59.720 | $22.12 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $84,093.880$ | $25.44 \%$ | $77,713,790$ | $14.81 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 80 - Seward

Market Area:

| Value | $\%$ of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4,087,661 | 41.04\% | 1,867.842 |
| 2,200,471 | 22.09\% | 1,865.912 |
| 198,496 | 1.99\% | 1,600.000 |
| 1,830,182 | 18.37\% | 1,592.819 |
| 676,018 | 6.79\% | 1,445.471 |
| 532,364 | 5.34\% | 1,350.012 |
| 351,834 | 3.53\% | 1,195.413 |
| 84,302 | 0.85\% | 750.084 |
| 9,961,328 | 100.00\% | 1,685.632 |


| Dry: |
| :--- |
| 1D1 $9,308.730$ $22.87 \%$    <br> 1D $9,349.940$ $22.97 \%$ $16,151,754$ $28.28 \%$ $1,735.118$ <br> 2D1 $1,243.050$ $3.05 \%$ $15,971,785$ $27.97 \%$ $1,708.223$ <br> 2D $3,721.430$ $9.14 \%$ $1,800,191$ $3.15 \%$ $1,448.204$ <br> 3D1 $6,682.120$ $16.42 \%$ $5,069,207$ $8.88 \%$ $1,362.166$ <br> 3D $1,509.140$ $3.71 \%$ $8,009,643$ $14.03 \%$ $1,198.667$ <br> 4D1 $8,030.860$ $19.73 \%$ $1,628,733$ $2.85 \%$ $1,079.245$ <br> 4D 860.760 $2.11 \%$ $7,874,729$ $13.79 \%$ 980.558 <br> Dry Total $40,706.030$ $100.00 \%$ 602,532 $1.06 \%$ 700.000 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 292.770 | $3.62 \%$ | 234,656 | $5.74 \%$ | 801.502 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 462.120 | $5.72 \%$ | 336,294 | $8.22 \%$ | 727.720 |
| 2G1 | 920.470 | $11.39 \%$ | 556,102 | $13.59 \%$ | 604.150 |
| 2G | 420.460 | $5.20 \%$ | 255,597 | $6.25 \%$ | 607.898 |
| 3G1 | 934.210 | $11.56 \%$ | 569,359 | $13.92 \%$ | 609.455 |
| 3G | 125.420 | $1.55 \%$ | 72,116 | $1.76 \%$ | 574.996 |
| 4G1 | $1,714.000$ | $21.20 \%$ | 894,692 | $21.87 \%$ | 521.990 |
| 4G | $3,214.590$ | $39.76 \%$ | $1,172,057$ | $28.65 \%$ | 364.605 |
| Grass Total | $8,084.040$ | $100.00 \%$ | $4,090,873$ | $100.00 \%$ | 506.043 |
|  | $5,909.550$ | $10.48 \%$ | $9,961,328$ | $13.97 \%$ | $1,685.632$ |
| Irrigated Total | $40,706.030$ | $72.17 \%$ | $57,108,574$ | $80.08 \%$ | $1,402.951$ |
| Dry Total | $8,084.040$ | $14.33 \%$ | $4,090,873$ | $5.74 \%$ | 506.043 |
| Grass Total | $1,588.930$ | $2.82 \%$ | 143,012 | $0.20 \%$ | 90.005 |
| Waste | 111.650 | $0.20 \%$ | 10,049 | $0.01 \%$ | 90.004 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | $56,400.200$ | $100.00 \%$ | $71,313,836$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  | $1,264.425$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $5,909.550$ | $4.50 \%$ | $9,961,328$ | $3.38 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $40,706.030$ | $31.55 \%$ | $57,108,574$ | $29.19 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $8,084.040$ | $12.46 \%$ | $4,090,873$ | $11.92 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,588.930$ | $31.01 \%$ | 143,012 | $30.76 \%$ |
| Other | 111.650 | $33.68 \%$ | 10,049 | $34.30 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $56,400.200$ | $17.06 \%$ | $71,313,836$ | $13.59 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 80 - Seward


| Total | $330,546.020$ | $524,898,115$ | $330,546.020$ | $100.00 \%$ | $524,898,115$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,587.972$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates


## 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

|  | 2007 CTL <br> County Total | 2008 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2008 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 600,948,775 | 631,292,417 | 30,343,642 | 5.05 | 14,527,741 | 2.63 |
| 2. Recreational | 1,322,609 | 1,322,609 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 83,419,543 | 84,938,466 | 1,518,923 | 1.82 | *---------- | 1.82 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 685,690,927 | 717,553,492 | 31,862,565 | 4.65 | 14,527,741 | 2.53 |
| 5. Commercial | 99,412,689 | 107,439,491 | 8,026,802 | 8.07 | 4,472,435 | 3.58 |
| 6. Industrial | 16,427,285 | 17,027,046 | 599,761 | 3.65 | 0 | 3.65 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 22,923,333 | 23,413,522 | 490,189 | 2.14 | 2,610,661 | -9.25 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 138,763,307 | 147,880,059 | 9,116,752 | 6.57 | 4,472,435 | 3.35 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 824,454,234 | 865,433,551 | 40,979,317 | 4.97 | 21,610,837 | 2.35 |
| 11. Irrigated | 269,950,494 | 294,451,615 | 24,501,121 | 9.08 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 187,030,761 | 195,624,518 | 8,593,757 | 4.59 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 30,282,795 | 34,327,741 | 4,044,946 | 13.36 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 366,429 | 464,946 | 98,517 | 26.89 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 22,827 | 22,827 | 6,468 | 28.33 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 487,653,306 | 524,898,115 | 37,244,809 | 7.64 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,312,107,540 | 1,390,331,666 | 78,224,126 | 5.96 | 21,610,837 | 4.31 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
# Seward County 2007 Plan of Assessment For years 2008, 2009 \& 2010 

Requirements:
Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the Assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned to the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan if necessary, after the county board approves the budget. 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 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes or 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 it's recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Assessment Statistics for 2007:

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential | $97.01 \%$ | 7.55 | 100.65 |
| Commercial | $93.99 \%$ | 20.68 | 106.28 |
| Agricultural Land |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Unimproved | $71.07 \%$ | 15.49 | 104.65 |
| $\quad$ Special Value | $72.23 \%$ | 14.92 | 104.57 |
| $\quad$ Recapture Value | $71.54 \%$ | 26.25 | 100.51 |

Median: The middle placement when the assessment/sales ratios are arrayed from high to low (or low to high)
COD: (Coefficient of Dispersion) The average absolute deviation divided by the median
PRD: (Price Related Differential) The mean ratio divided by the aggregate ratio
Aggregate: The sum of the assessed values divided by the sum of the sales prices
Average Absolute Deviation: Each ratio minus the median, summed and divided by the number of sales
Mean: The sum of the ratios divided by the number of sales.

## Office Staff and Budget Information

Seward County Assessor's Office currently employs 2 full time personnel, 1 temporary part time person and a part time contract Appraiser besides the Assessor and Deputy Assessor. Information pertaining to budget and staffing is included in the survey given to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. Staff salaries are included in the office's budget presented to the County Board each year.

## Goals

The main goal for the Seward County Assessor's Office is doing the best job possible in a professional manner to maintain fair and equitable values in meeting the statutory statistical requirements with the resources available.

## Procedures Manual

Procedures have been established in the office and are updated as needed. The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Regulations and Directives as approved by the Attorney General and signed by the Governor is filed in the office.

## Responsibilities

Record Maintenance
Property record cards are maintained for every parcel of real property including improvements on leased land. The cards are updated annually to include any changes made to the assessment information of the property. The record cards contain current owner name and address, legal description, book and page number of the last deed of record and any changes of record of ownership. Also included is situs address, pictures of improvement or main structure, sketches, cadastral map book and page numbers, tax district codes, valuation information and other codes created that are relevant to the specific parcel.

The office maintains a cadastral map system. The current cadastral maps were done in May 1966. They have been kept up to date with name changes, separations and new subdivisions. Seward County has implemented a GIS system. The office staff has completed identifying each parcel and attaching the parcel identification number used in the Terra Scan CAMA system. A land use layer is nearing completion. A flood plane layer has been added. Other layers will be developed in the future.

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:
Prepare annually and file the following Administrative Reports

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Personal Property
- Assessor Survey
- Certification of Values to Political Subdivision
- School District Taxable Value Report
- Sales information including rosters \& annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
- Certification of Taxes Levied Report
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss
- Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands \& Funds
- Annual Plan of Assessment Report

Homestead Exemptions - Homestead Exemption applications are accepted in the office from February $1^{\text {st }}$ through June 30. They are verified that the applicant is owner/occupant. Applications along with an income statement and a doctor's certification of disability (where appropriate) is forwarded to the Nebraska Department of Revenue by August 1 for income verification. The State returns a roster in October of approved (with a percentage) and disapproved for final processing.

Personal Property - All depreciable tangible personal property which is used in a trade or business for the production of income, and which has a determinable life of longer than one year is filed on or before May 1. After May $1^{\text {st }}$ but before August $1^{\text {st }}$ a 10 percent penalty is applied and on August $1^{\text {st }}$ and after a 25 percent penalty is applied. Every year for two weeks in February and April advertisements are published in the local newspapers and a weekly news supplement for non-subscribers. Out of county filers receive the actual schedule in the mail to review, correct and return. All in county filers receive a mailer reminding it is time to file their personal property. This office documents at least 4-6 reminders to those who need to file personal property.

Permissive Exemptions - Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to the county board.

Taxable Government Owned Property - Annual review of government owned property not used public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

Centrally Assessed Properties - Review the valuations as certified by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. Establish and maintain assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.

Tax Districts and Tax Rates - Maintain school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information including the input of tax rates used for tax billing.

Tax Lists - Prepare and certify the tax lists to the county treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed properties.

Tax List Corrections - Prepare tax list correction documents for the county board's approval.
County Board of Equalization - Attend county board of equalization meetings including meetings for valuation protests. Prepare documentation for the board for the hearings.

TERC (즌 Equalization and Review Commission) Appeals - Prepare the information and attend the taxpayer appeals hearings before TERC. Testify in defense of the county's valuation.

TERC Statewide Equalization - Attend the hearings if applicable to the county, to testify in defense of the county's values, and to implement TERC's orders.

Education - Attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain the required hours of continuing education to maintain the assessor certification.

Real Property: A four-year comprehensive countywide reappraisal of all classes of real property was started for assessment year 1997 and completed for assessment year 2000. The county contracted with an appraisal company for this project. The reappraisal consisted of visiting every property, re-measuring, new photographs of the main structure and interior inspections of homes where permitted. New property record cards were made. The following is a list of what properties were complete in each year.

1997 - Residential properties in the towns of Seward and Milford
1998 - Residential properties in the towns of Beaver Crossing, Bee, Garland, Goehner, Pleasant Dale, Staplehurst, Tamora, Utica and all the acreages
1999 - All improvements on properties classified as farm (residences and outbuildings)
2000-All commercial and industrial properties in the county.
An annual analysis will be done and areas prioritized for reappraisal accordingly. Reviews of properties will be done along with a market analysis to establish physical and economic depreciation. New pricing will be applied. Adequate funding will be needed to support the continuation of this process.

For assessment year 2001 the following was reappraised: Bee and Milford residential.
For assessment year 2002, the following was reappraised:

- Seward residential land and changed some boundaries on some neighborhoods and added some new ones.
- Reappraised the residential properties in the towns of Cordova, Pleasant Dale, and Staplehurst including new lot values.
- Re-priced acreage land in the county. Also, Range 4 houses received a 5\% increase and Range 3 received a 3\% increase.
- Approximately 550 building and development permits were picked up along with approximately 70 recounts of agricultural land due to use changes or requests.
- Ag Land: Established a $3^{\text {rd }}$ Market Area and expanded Market Area 2 by 8 sections. Market Area 1 is an area defined as such as it lies over an aquifer. It will recognize the possibility of irrigation potential.
Market Area 2 is an area defined as Range 4 (six miles wide adjacent to Lancaster County). It was expanded for 2002 by 8 sections, 2 miles closer to Seward and 2 miles on either side of Highway 34. Area 2 is a special valuation area.
Market Area 3 is an area defined as such as it does not lie over an aquifer. The probability of irrigation will more than likely be limited to ponds and rivers. The ag values established in this area set the special valuations in Area 2.

For the assessment year 2003, the following changes were made: Residential:

- Reappraisal of the towns of Garland, Goehner and land in Beaver Crossing
- Range 3 \& 4 acreages - increase in land values
- Range 3 acreage houses - increased $3 \%$
- Countywide increased improved site by an additional 2000 valuation
- Reviewed new subdivisions in Seward, recalculated discount cash flow and re-priced some to reflect current market trends
- Completed pickup work - 376 parcels including building permits on new construction Commercial:
- Reviewed and analyzed sales to see if the comprehensive 2000 reappraisal was staying with the current market
- Revalued land in the towns of Garland, Goehner and Beaver Crossing
- Reviewed neighborhoods in Seward and re-neighborhooded 2 areas
- Completed pickup work - 34 parcels including building permits on new construction Ag Land:
- Reviewed and analyzed sales to verify Market Areas follow the market trends
- Changed irrigated values in Market Area 1
- Verified land use changes using FSA records and maps. Also verified using contact with property owners and inspection of the property
- Reclassified wetlands into it's own class and valuation
- Started to reclassify CRP into it's own class and valuation
- Completed pickup work on ag improvements and building permits (rural homes and out buildings) - 64

For the assessment year 2004, the following changes were made:
Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the towns of Bee, Utica and improvements only in Beaver Crossing.
- Reappraisal of the acreages in Range 4
- Reappraisal of the platted rural subdivisions in Range 4
- Reviewed new subdivisions in Seward, recalculated discount cash flow and priced some to reflect current market trends
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction
- Completed inspections on rural sites, both farms and acreages in the north half of the county (8 precincts) except about two-thirds of A Precinct due to running out of time. Inspected and updated properties for new construction, changes in construction including condition and removal or buildings. Commercial:
- Reviewed sales to see if the 2000 county's comprehensive reappraisal was staying with the current market.
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Agricultural Land:
- Reviewed sales and verified Market Areas still follow the market trends
- Verified land use changes using FSA records and maps, form 13AG (Nebraska Sales and Use Tax Exemption Certificate) along with contact with property owners. Completed such changes and recounted acres on 110 properties.
- Reviewed and made changes for the properties enrolled in CRP as needed.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value.
- Revalued the market (recapture) value as needed to comply with the required level of value.

For assessment year 2005, the following changes were made: Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the towns of Seward and Milford
- Reappraisal of the acreages in Range 3 (Precincts B, G, J and 0)
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction
- Completed inspections on rural sites, both farms and acreages in the south half of the county. Picked up unreported improvements.
- Increased by five percent (5\%) the houses on properties classified as farms in the east half of the county.
Commercial:
- Reviewed sales
- Completed pickup work

Agricultural land:

- Reviewed sales
- Verified land use changes, completed changes.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties in CRP.
- Verified Market Areas still follow the market trends.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value.
- Started to create the land use layer in the GIS program.

For assessment year 2006, the following changes were made:
Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the acreages in the west half of the county. (Completes a 3 year process of county-wide acreage reappraisal)
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2005 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2006
- Increased by five percent (5\%) the houses on properties classified as farms in the west half of the county
- Appraisal update on residential properties in the towns of Garland, Goehner, Grover and Pleasant Dale
- Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted and reclassified some neighborhoods in Seward as the market analysis indicated.
Commercial:
- Reviewed the sales
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2005 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2006
- Reviewed and revalued tower sites on improvements on leased land (IOLL)
- Revalued land in Garland, Goehner, Grover and Pleasant Dale
- Reappraisal of the apartment buildings in Seward, Milford and Pleasant Dale

Agricultural Land:

- Reviewed the sales
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes as necessary
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry cropland LCG values in the Market Area 1. Changed 1D1, 1D and 3D1 in Market Area 3
- Analyzed and changed market/recapture values in all the LCG's in the special valuation Market Area 2

For assessment year 2007, the following changes were made:
Residential:

- Reviewed sales
- Reappraisal of the villages of Garland, Pleasant Dale and Staplehurst
- Reanalyzed neighborhoods in Milford and changed 5 of them
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2006 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2007.
- Reappraisal of the houses and buildings on properties classified as farms in Range 4
- Changed farm home sites county wide from 12,000 to 15,000 for the first acre.
- Reviewed and recalculated cash flow discounts on new subdivisions that were discounted.
- Picked up improvements at Horseshoe Bend Lake in 15-10-3

Commercial:

- Reviewed sales
- Completed pickup work and building permits on new construction. Reviewed parcels that were a partial valuation for 2006 and changed according to completion as of January 1, 2007.
- Re-Neighborhooded and repriced land at the Seward and I80 Interchange.

Agricultural land:

- Reviewed sales
- Verified land use changes using GIS, FSA records and maps along with contact with property owners and physical inspections. Completed such changes and recounted acres. Fifteen out of sixteen precincts completed for GIS land use layer.
- Reviewed and accounted for the properties enrolled in the CRP and WRP programs and made changes as necessary.
- Verified the existing market areas still follow the market trends.
- Revalued agricultural land as needed to comply with the required level of value. Changed various irrigated and dry cropland LCG values in Market Area 1. Changed Various irrigated LCG values in Market Areas 2 \& 3 .
- Analyzed and changed market/recapture values in the special valuation Market Area 2.

Agricultural land is reviewed every year and values established to maintain the ratios and statistics mandated by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. An annual study will be conducted to see if the current market continues to support the areas.

The office utilizes the Terra Scan administrative and CAMA system using the Marshall Swift costs. We download digital camera photos into the system. Eight by ten color aerial photos were taken during 2000 and 2001. The aerial photos were scanned into the computer and attached to the property record card.

Pickup work, the collection of data relating to new construction, remodeling, additions, alterations and removals of existing buildings or structures along with zoning and annexation is done on a continuous year round basis. Parcels are flagged if the value is to be added for the following year to be changed during the appropriate time frame.

RCN (replacement cost new). The cost approach is used in setting our values. An income analysis is only used occasionally for commercial property to substantiate the cost approach.

The real estate transfer statements, form 521 , are processed on a continual basis.
The assessment plans for year 2008 are as follows:
Residential:

- Reappraisal of the houses and buildings classified as farms in Range 3
- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize other areas that need adjustments. Possible percentage adjustments as budget restraints, personnel limitations and time factors allow keeping values within acceptable range of value.
- Review and analyze and recalculate newer subdivisions in Seward that already have land values set using discount cash flow. Set values in new subdivisions using a discount cash flow.
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.

Commercial:

- Complete pickup work and building permits on new construction.
- Review and analyze the sales.
- Reappraise Seward.

Ag Land:

- Review and analyze sales for market trends
- Review and analyze the 3 market areas
- Revalue land as needed to comply with the required level of value
- Continue to monitor land use changes, using FSA records, maps, owner information and inspection of properties
GIS:
- Continue with digital land use identification and further building of a GIS system for Seward County

The assessment plans for year 2009 are as follows:
Residential:

- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize areas that need appraisal review.
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction.
- Revalue houses and buildings classified as farms in Range 2

Commercial:

- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize areas that need appraisal review
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction

Agricultural Land:

- Review and analyze sales and analyze market areas
- Review and keep current on CRP and other farm programs
- Monitor and keep current with land use changes

GIS:

- Continue with building of the GIS system adding additional layers.

The assessment plans for year 2010 are as follows:
Residential:

- Prioritize areas that need review and analyze sales
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction
- Revalue houses and buildings classified as farms in Range 1


## Commercial:

- Review and analyze sales. Prioritize areas that need appraisal and review
- Complete pickup work, including building permits on new construction

Agricultural Land:

- Review and analyze sales and market areas
- Review and keep current with CRP and other farm programs
- Monitor and keep current with land use changes

GIS:

- Continue with building the GIS system adding additional layers

I respectfully submit this plan of assessment and request the resources needed to continue with maintaining up-to-date, fair and equitable assessments in achieving the statutory required statistics.

## Date

Marilyn Hladky<br>Seward County Assessor

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Seward County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
|  | 0 |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | 2 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 1 Temporary part-time |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | 227,000 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | Yes 2,000 each year is put into a sinking fund for server replacement and additional $\$ 2,000$ will be put into the sinking fund to fund a personal property program, $\$ 23,100$ is in the budget for data processing, Terra Scan maintenance agreement, GIS and website maintenance through GIS Workshop. The part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system is not separated. |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | $222,750$ |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | 39,000 which is included in the assessor's budget |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | 1200 |


| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget <br> The funding is included in the appraisal work budget <br> 12.Other miscellaneous funds13. Total budget <br>  222,750 <br>  Was any of last year's budget not used: <br>  600 Approximately |
| ---: | :--- |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
| TerraScan |  |
| 2. | CAMA software |
|  | TerraScan |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
|  | Yes The cadastral maps were purchased in 1966 and are still maintained by the <br> County Assessor's office. |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
| 5. | Assessment Staff <br> Does the county have GIS software? <br> the county is moving to using GIS maps with GIS Workshop. The GIS maps are in <br> the replacing the cadastral maps at this time. |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? <br> GIS Workshop maintains the programming and the maps are maintained by the <br> county assessor office staff. |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | TerraScan |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | If so, is the zoning countywide? <br> Yes |
| 3. | What municipalities in the county are zoned? <br> Beaver Crossing, Garland, Goehner, Milford, Pleasant Dale, Seward*, Utica <br> *County Seat |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
|  | 1973 And the comprehensive plan was updated in 1995. The county board <br> conducted a total review of the comprehensive plan, which has been updated and <br> was adopted in 2007. |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Jon Fritz does all commercial \& industrial valuations including pickup work, sales <br> and maintenance. Assists in residential market studies and has been doing <br> reappraisal of towns and rural areas as needed. Jon assists in other requests from the <br> assessor, including difficult to value properties. |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | TerraScan software package for administrative and CAMA including Marshall and <br> Swift. GIS Workshop maintains and supports the GIS software ESRI updates. |

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:
-Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

- One copy to the Seward County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875098.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


[^0]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7.

