Table of Contents

2013 Commission Summary

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports
    Residential Assessment Actions
    Residential Assessment Survey
    Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation
    I. Correlation
    II. Analysis of Sales Verification
    III. Measure of Central Tendency
    IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Commercial Reports
    Commercial Assessment Actions
    Commercial Assessment Survey
    Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation
    I. Correlation
    II. Analysis of Sales Verification
    III. Measure of Central Tendency
    IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports
    Agricultural Assessment Actions
    Agricultural Assessment Survey
    Agricultural Land Statistics
    Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
    Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable
    Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation
    I. Correlation
    II. Analysis of Sales Verification
    III. Measure of Central Tendency
    IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

County Reports
    County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
    County Agricultural Land Detail
    County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the Prior Year
        Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL).
    County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps
Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2013 Commission Summary

for Saunders County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	454	Median	96.35
Total Sales Price	$72,429,403	Mean	102.45
Total Adj. Sales Price	$72,351,403	Wgt. Mean	93.49
Total Assessed Value	$67,640,830	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$124,123
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$159,364	Avg. Assessed Value	$148,989

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.62 to 97.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.09 to 95.89
95% Mean C.I	98.92 to 105.98
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	37.61
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.36
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.43

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	381	96	95.76
2011	477	95	95
2010	506	95	95
2009	675	94	94

2013 Commission Summary

for Saunders County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	50	Median	92.93
Total Sales Price	$9,459,336	Mean	99.22
Total Adj. Sales Price	$9,608,077	Wgt. Mean	80.18
Total Assessed Value	$7,704,116	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$137,631
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$192,162	Avg. Assessed Value	$154,082

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	76.21 to 97.44
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	72.16 to 88.21
95% Mean C.I	72.67 to 125.77
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.55

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	32	93	92.51
2011	44	98	98
2010	47	99	99
2009	58	98	98

Opinions

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator
for Saunders County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	69	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Saunders County

All pickup and permit work completed timely

Physical inspection and valuation was established for Lake Allure – new subdivision

Reappraisals were completed for Wolf's Lake and Hidden Cove.

New land values for Spoonhour Subdivision

Revaluation of Thomas Lakes and Willow Point improvements

Reappraisal of Big Sandy improvments

Verified statistical compliance in all areas.

Sales review was completed on the residential sales, questionnaires were sent to buyers and sellers. Follow up phone calls were completed by the appraiser if needed.

Continued process of auditing records following conversion to the Orion system.

Continued physical inspection of rural townships.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Saunders County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**	
	Appraiser and Assistant	
2.	**List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:**	

	Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Consists of all parcels around Ashland Lake and the River Area.
	2	Parcels within the town of Ashland.
	3	Parcels within the town of Ceresco.
	4	East Lake/River which consists of Championship Lake, Rustic Island, Leshara, Happy Farms, and Shunk.
	5	Consists of subdivisions in the North end of the county near Fremont.
	6	Area consists of lakes and rivers around Morse Bluff-Wolfes, Whitetail, and Hidden Cove. Consists of average quality properties with lower values compared to other lakes in the county
	7	Mead and Cedar Bluffs are combined because these two towns each have a K-12 school and are located along major highways which create a similar market.
	8	Small Town Wahoo, which consists of the towns of Ithaca, Leshara, Colon, Swedeburg, Malmo. The market in this area is impacted by the fact that no schools exist in this area.
	9	Unincorporated Areas, which are relatively quiet markets in the towns of Wann, Memphis, and Touhy.
	10	Parcels within the town of Valparaiso.
	11	Pacels within the town of Wahoo.
	12	West Small Towns, which consists of Prague, Morse Bluff, and Weston and have no high school.
	13	All parcels in the Woodcliff subdivision area.
	14	All parcels in the town of Yutan.
	15	Consists of all rural residential parcels in the county.

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.**	
	The cost approach is used in the county with market defined depreciation.	
4	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**	
	2012	
5.	**If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?**	
	The County uses local market information	
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**	
	Yes. Depreciation schedules exist for neighborhoods within many of the valuation	

		groupings.
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**	
	The county updates depreciation tables in conjunction with neighborhood revaluations.	
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**	
	The last lot value study was completed for 2012 in Hidden Cove, Wolf's Lake and Lake Allure.	
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?**	
	The county uses vacant lot sales to determine residential lot values.	

78 Saunders

RESIDENTIAL

<div align="center">

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012   Posted on: 1/23/2013

</div>

Number of Sales : 454	MEDIAN : 96	COV : 37.42	95% Median C.I. : 94.62 to 97.32
Total Sales Price : 72,429,403	WGT. MEAN : 93	STD : 38.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.09 to 95.89
Total Adj. Sales Price : 72,351,403	MEAN : 102	Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.94	95% Mean C.I. : 98.92 to 105.98
Total Assessed Value : 67,640,830			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 159,364	COD : 18.62	MAX Sales Ratio : 626.88	
Avg. Assessed Value : 148,989	PRD : 109.58	MIN Sales Ratio : 23.35	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:53PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	46	97.32	105.53	98.12	17.18	107.55	71.99	232.44	93.53 to 100.67	136,100	133,544
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	29	96.99	104.26	95.79	17.48	108.84	79.84	161.63	88.72 to 108.96	134,817	129,141
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	52	95.61	98.58	94.33	13.90	104.51	32.32	149.89	91.58 to 100.85	163,449	154,183
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	64	97.33	117.10	97.74	31.30	119.81	64.19	626.88	94.36 to 101.17	152,805	149,352
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	60	96.97	101.25	93.93	18.26	107.79	56.60	192.26	91.13 to 102.45	134,464	126,298
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	47	95.82	99.88	84.90	22.69	117.64	23.35	228.35	88.15 to 100.43	164,662	139,796
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	73	94.62	97.08	92.37	12.56	105.10	62.66	213.94	91.92 to 97.89	207,812	191,952
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	83	93.68	98.31	92.97	16.23	105.74	23.71	226.43	92.02 to 98.46	155,723	144,770
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	191	96.99	107.32	96.54	21.11	111.17	32.32	626.88	95.13 to 97.99	148,948	143,791
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	263	95.77	98.92	91.51	16.80	108.10	23.35	228.35	93.13 to 97.16	166,929	152,763
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	205	96.89	105.95	95.51	21.16	110.93	32.32	626.88	95.10 to 98.77	147,592	140,971
_____ALL_____	454	96.35	102.45	93.49	18.62	109.58	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.32	159,364	148,989

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	11	93.04	89.79	89.60	08.80	100.21	68.71	107.95	75.66 to 97.44	302,335	270,903
02	70	96.08	105.86	94.39	22.25	112.15	56.60	626.88	91.63 to 99.39	143,561	135,513
03	26	98.02	104.55	99.44	15.67	105.14	75.87	195.88	91.93 to 108.96	104,999	104,407
05	12	92.58	91.12	90.10	09.49	101.13	74.09	105.73	79.58 to 103.69	217,958	196,378
06	3	95.15	95.51	95.56	01.54	99.95	93.49	97.89	N/A	246,083	235,153
07	19	99.34	108.33	101.35	20.24	106.89	75.75	228.35	89.56 to 124.07	94,786	96,071
08	7	98.62	109.32	93.25	26.75	117.23	77.13	161.70	77.13 to 161.70	84,000	78,333
10	12	97.97	98.46	98.47	08.49	99.99	80.14	115.38	90.43 to 110.06	138,333	136,217
11	130	97.50	104.12	97.04	18.52	107.30	23.71	232.44	94.46 to 100.67	116,780	113,322
12	11	99.20	117.52	119.82	31.98	98.08	57.57	302.67	79.00 to 127.74	71,864	86,106
13	39	92.34	90.25	89.52	09.23	100.82	64.34	110.39	84.30 to 97.20	276,846	247,842
14	22	97.22	100.44	98.66	09.46	101.80	77.78	153.10	93.51 to 106.57	157,114	155,006
15	92	94.72	102.76	89.35	23.70	115.01	23.35	320.36	92.06 to 97.90	202,374	180,817
_____ALL_____	454	96.35	102.45	93.49	18.62	109.58	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.32	159,364	148,989

<div align="center">

County 78 - Page 12

</div>

78 Saunders

RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012   Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 454	MEDIAN : 96	COV : 37.42	95% Median C.I. : 94.62 to 97.32
Total Sales Price : 72,429,403	WGT. MEAN : 93	STD : 38.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.09 to 95.89
Total Adj. Sales Price : 72,351,403	MEAN : 102	Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.94	95% Mean C.I. : 98.92 to 105.98
Total Assessed Value : 67,640,830			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 159,364	COD : 18.62	MAX Sales Ratio : 626.88	
Avg. Assessed Value : 148,989	PRD : 109.58	MIN Sales Ratio : 23.35	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:53PM*

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	454	96.35	102.45	93.49	18.62	109.58	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.32	159,364	148,989
06											
07											
_____ALL_____	454	96.35	102.45	93.49	18.62	109.58	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.32	159,364	148,989

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	1	196.52	196.52	196.52	00.00	100.00	196.52	196.52	N/A	13,500	26,530
Less Than 30,000	14	142.62	191.70	187.97	61.65	101.98	54.19	626.88	97.89 to 232.44	21,786	40,951
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	454	96.35	102.45	93.49	18.62	109.58	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.32	159,364	148,989
Greater Than 14,999	453	96.33	102.24	93.47	18.44	109.38	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.20	159,686	149,259
Greater Than 29,999	440	95.80	99.61	93.09	15.94	107.00	23.35	302.67	94.35 to 97.13	163,742	152,426
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	196.52	196.52	196.52	00.00	100.00	196.52	196.52	N/A	13,500	26,530
15,000 TO 29,999	13	127.74	191.33	187.57	69.98	102.00	54.19	626.88	97.89 to 232.44	22,423	42,060
30,000 TO 59,999	39	131.31	132.25	130.48	21.25	101.36	73.07	226.43	110.44 to 147.80	45,653	59,569
60,000 TO 99,999	80	101.75	109.02	107.22	17.91	101.68	62.51	198.61	97.36 to 106.01	81,052	86,905
100,000 TO 149,999	132	95.91	97.01	96.47	12.38	100.56	56.60	302.67	93.39 to 97.89	122,056	117,750
150,000 TO 249,999	110	93.61	93.17	92.45	11.07	100.78	23.71	213.94	91.92 to 96.48	192,136	177,626
250,000 TO 499,999	73	89.11	88.63	88.61	10.56	100.02	62.66	114.15	85.80 to 93.54	309,346	274,106
500,000 TO 999,999	6	76.66	71.01	68.31	22.62	103.95	23.35	93.04	23.35 to 93.04	658,865	450,077
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	454	96.35	102.45	93.49	18.62	109.58	23.35	626.88	94.62 to 97.32	159,364	148,989

Residential Correlation

A. Residential Real Property

Saunders County is located directly north of Lancaster County, south of Dodge County and to the west of Douglas and Sarpy Counties. The eastern and northern county boundaries are defined by the Platte River. There are five high schools in the county. Wahoo is the largest town.

The statistical sampling of 454 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Saunders County. The measures of central tendency offer some support for each other. All valuation groupings are within the acceptable range. The calculated median is 96.35%. The qualitative measures are above the acceptable range due to the fact that Saunders County includes as many sales as possible causing some outliers to remain in the file. The statistics also reflect an influence on the qualitative statistics due to low dollar sales.

Saunders County is diligent in their sales review process. A sales verification document is mailed to the buyer and the seller of each parcel sold. Follow up phone calls were completed by the appraiser if additional information was needed. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified residential sales within the county. It does not appear that any excessive trimming is being done in the sales file.

Saunders County employs an appraisal department consisting of one appraiser and one assistant appraiser. Saunders County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. They plan on completing their six year inspection timely.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Saunders County will be reviewed in 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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. 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.

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Saunders County

All pickup and permit work completed timely

Verified statistical compliance in all areas

Sales review was completed on the commercial sales, questionnaires were sent to buyers and sellers. Follow up phone calls were completed by the appraiser if needed.

Continued process of auditing records following conversion to the Orion system.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Saunders County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Appraiser and staff
2.	**List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
1	Consists of the commercial properties within the town of Ashland. The unique characteristics are tied to the local economic conditions of the area.
2	All commercial properties in the Northern half of the county. These are mostly commercial properties in small towns. The influence is primarily the town of Fremont and Wahoo.
3	South Commercial encompasses the small town and rural commercial parcels in the South half of the county. Proximity to Lincoln and Wahoo are an influence.
4	Consists of the commercial properties within the town of Wahoo. The unique characteristics are tied to the local economic conditions of the area.

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.**
	A market sale approach is used. A cost approach is used with depreciation established from sale information and an income approach is used when sufficient data is available.
3a.	**Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.**
	The county looks outside of the county for comparable sales
4.	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**
	2012
5.	**If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?**
	Depreciation tables are determined using local market information when sufficient information is available.
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	Yes
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**
	Tables are updated in conjunction with neighborhood revaluations.
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**
	Lot values were last changed for Wahoo and Ashland in 2012
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.**
	Vacant sales analysis primarily.

78 Saunders

COMMERCIAL

<div align="center">

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012   Posted on: 1/23/2013

</div>

Number of Sales : 50	MEDIAN : 93	COV : 96.54	95% Median C.I. : 76.21 to 97.44
Total Sales Price : 9,459,336	WGT. MEAN : 80	STD : 95.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.16 to 88.21
Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,608,077	MEAN : 99	Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.70	95% Mean C.I. : 72.67 to 125.77
Total Assessed Value : 7,704,116			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 192,162	COD : 36.26	MAX Sales Ratio : 736.40	
Avg. Assessed Value : 154,082	PRD : 123.75	MIN Sales Ratio : 29.45	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:54PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	68.36	76.98	84.14	21.64	91.49	55.32	102.07	N/A	118,400	99,622
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	92.86	87.70	91.66	06.40	95.68	76.21	94.02	N/A	112,500	103,120
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	78.83	81.88	68.03	27.58	120.36	60.07	109.80	N/A	162,813	110,763
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	60.84	64.63	64.81	18.31	99.72	49.22	95.98	N/A	209,600	135,837
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	77.78	77.78	77.78	00.00	100.00	77.78	77.78	N/A	65,000	50,560
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	100.00	85.77	88.52	14.23	96.89	57.30	100.00	N/A	433,167	383,423
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	7	100.00	102.38	85.61	34.49	119.59	46.33	158.62	46.33 to 158.62	450,795	385,931
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	109.34	261.55	117.20	154.31	223.17	91.12	736.40	N/A	50,175	58,808
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	98.06	94.94	91.54	10.29	103.71	69.89	112.86	69.89 to 112.86	68,167	62,403
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	8	93.59	91.62	83.16	15.41	110.17	44.94	129.48	44.94 to 129.48	135,063	112,315
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	57.00	65.49	47.32	41.96	138.40	29.45	118.51	N/A	192,266	90,974
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	12	84.54	81.29	79.11	20.04	102.76	55.32	109.80	60.22 to 97.44	131,729	104,210
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	16	82.56	85.93	82.28	34.05	104.44	46.33	158.62	54.08 to 100.00	348,004	286,346
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	22	94.36	118.67	76.12	49.03	155.90	29.45	736.40	79.63 to 102.11	111,785	85,094
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	12	69.61	76.15	70.29	26.20	108.34	49.22	109.80	60.07 to 95.98	169,729	119,300
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	15	100.00	139.86	87.65	65.41	159.57	46.33	736.40	77.78 to 130.89	314,717	275,839
_____ALL_____	50	92.93	99.22	80.18	36.26	123.75	29.45	736.40	76.21 to 97.44	192,162	154,082

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	90.75	93.23	87.43	23.43	106.63	60.22	139.52	60.22 to 139.52	484,542	423,632
02	14	95.08	129.91	83.60	67.15	155.39	46.33	736.40	55.32 to 100.00	179,370	149,956
03	5	76.21	91.74	66.73	42.12	137.48	53.69	158.62	N/A	113,200	75,533
04	25	92.86	84.97	74.10	20.79	114.67	29.45	129.48	69.89 to 100.00	144,946	107,411
_____ALL_____	50	92.93	99.22	80.18	36.26	123.75	29.45	736.40	76.21 to 97.44	192,162	154,082

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	87.33	87.33	87.33	00.00	100.00	87.33	87.33	N/A	2,500,000	2,183,190
03	49	93.00	99.47	77.67	36.85	128.07	29.45	736.40	76.21 to 97.44	145,063	112,672
04											
_____ALL_____	50	92.93	99.22	80.18	36.26	123.75	29.45	736.40	76.21 to 97.44	192,162	154,082

78 Saunders

COMMERCIAL

<div align="center">

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012   Posted on: 1/23/2013

</div>

Number of Sales : 50	MEDIAN : 93	COV : 96.54	95% Median C.I. : 76.21 to 97.44
Total Sales Price : 9,459,336	WGT. MEAN : 80	STD : 95.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.16 to 88.21
Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,608,077	MEAN : 99	Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.70	95% Mean C.I. : 72.67 to 125.77
Total Assessed Value : 7,704,116			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 192,162	COD : 36.26	MAX Sales Ratio : 736.40	
Avg. Assessed Value : 154,082	PRD : 123.75	MIN Sales Ratio : 29.45	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:54PM*

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000	1	736.40	736.40	736.40	00.00	100.00	736.40	736.40	N/A	5,000	36,820
Less Than 15,000	1	736.40	736.40	736.40	00.00	100.00	736.40	736.40	N/A	5,000	36,820
Less Than 30,000	3	158.62	316.37	163.54	143.39	193.45	54.08	736.40	N/A	18,667	30,527
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	49	92.86	86.22	79.84	22.88	107.99	29.45	158.62	76.21 to 95.98	195,981	156,475
Greater Than 14,999	49	92.86	86.22	79.84	22.88	107.99	29.45	158.62	76.21 to 95.98	195,981	156,475
Greater Than 29,999	47	92.86	85.36	79.70	21.46	107.10	29.45	139.52	76.21 to 95.98	203,236	161,969
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	1	736.40	736.40	736.40	00.00	100.00	736.40	736.40	N/A	5,000	36,820
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	2	106.35	106.35	107.37	49.15	99.05	54.08	158.62	N/A	25,500	27,380
30,000 TO 59,999	9	97.44	96.26	96.77	16.59	99.47	55.32	124.14	76.21 to 118.51	42,944	41,559
60,000 TO 99,999	10	99.46	104.19	103.61	17.95	100.56	68.36	139.52	77.78 to 130.89	72,225	74,834
100,000 TO 149,999	12	67.93	71.83	68.57	24.92	104.75	46.33	100.00	53.69 to 94.54	129,730	88,952
150,000 TO 249,999	7	94.02	91.27	90.07	08.42	101.33	60.30	102.11	60.30 to 102.11	182,724	164,581
250,000 TO 499,999	7	60.07	59.37	60.35	21.92	98.38	29.45	100.00	29.45 to 100.00	367,500	221,782
500,000 TO 999,999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	535,000	535,010
1,000,000 +	1	87.33	87.33	87.33	00.00	100.00	87.33	87.33	N/A	2,500,000	2,183,190
_____ALL_____	50	92.93	99.22	80.18	36.26	123.75	29.45	736.40	76.21 to 97.44	192,162	154,082

<div align="center">

County 78 - Page 24

</div>

78 Saunders

COMMERCIAL

<div align="center">

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012   Posted on: 1/23/2013

</div>

Number of Sales : 50	MEDIAN : 93	COV : 96.54	95% Median C.I. : 76.21 to 97.44
Total Sales Price : 9,459,336	WGT. MEAN : 80	STD : 95.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.16 to 88.21
Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,608,077	MEAN : 99	Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.70	95% Mean C.I. : 72.67 to 125.77
Total Assessed Value : 7,704,116			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 192,162	COD : 36.26	MAX Sales Ratio : 736.40	
Avg. Assessed Value : 154,082	PRD : 123.75	MIN Sales Ratio : 29.45	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:54PM*

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	1	95.61	95.61	95.61	00.00	100.00	95.61	95.61	N/A	120,000	114,727
316	1	736.40	736.40	736.40	00.00	100.00	736.40	736.40	N/A	5,000	36,820
341	3	94.02	96.42	96.36	03.15	100.06	93.18	102.07	N/A	180,000	173,440
344	2	94.36	94.36	94.40	00.20	99.96	94.17	94.54	N/A	84,850	80,095
349	1	109.80	109.80	109.80	00.00	100.00	109.80	109.80	N/A	66,250	72,740
350	4	99.63	104.49	74.53	40.42	140.20	60.07	158.62	N/A	143,250	106,760
352	5	91.24	94.63	87.35	17.81	108.33	63.01	129.48	N/A	638,200	557,454
353	8	97.29	101.68	97.86	19.83	103.90	69.89	139.52	69.89 to 139.52	64,250	62,876
381	1	79.63	79.63	79.63	00.00	100.00	79.63	79.63	N/A	130,500	103,920
390	1	29.45	29.45	29.45	00.00	100.00	29.45	29.45	N/A	385,000	113,384
406	4	54.70	58.71	55.15	12.91	106.46	49.22	76.21	N/A	59,875	33,023
423	1	53.69	53.69	53.69	00.00	100.00	53.69	53.69	N/A	110,000	59,060
442	1	46.33	46.33	46.33	00.00	100.00	46.33	46.33	N/A	287,482	133,190
459	6	95.71	85.41	78.66	14.87	108.58	60.22	100.50	60.22 to 100.50	118,524	93,233
466	1	44.94	44.94	44.94	00.00	100.00	44.94	44.94	N/A	280,000	125,830
468	2	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	475,000	475,008
477	3	91.12	85.98	75.89	21.54	113.30	53.96	112.86	N/A	61,667	46,797
490	1	95.98	95.98	95.98	00.00	100.00	95.98	95.98	N/A	150,000	143,965
494	1	57.30	57.30	57.30	00.00	100.00	57.30	57.30	N/A	349,500	200,255
528	2	81.70	81.70	75.22	19.27	108.61	65.96	97.44	N/A	85,000	63,935
531	1	60.84	60.84	60.84	00.00	100.00	60.84	60.84	N/A	481,000	292,630
_____ALL_____	50	92.93	99.22	80.18	36.26	123.75	29.45	736.40	76.21 to 97.44	192,162	154,082

A. Commercial Real Property

Saunders County is located directly north of Lancaster County, south of Dodge County and to the west of Douglas and Sarpy Counties. The eastern and northern county boundaries are defined by the Platte River. There are five high schools in the county. Wahoo is the largest town.

The statistical sampling of 50 qualified commercial sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the commercial class of real property in Saunders County. The calculated median is 92.93%. Of the four valuation groupings, two are out of the acceptable range. These represent the assessor locations of Ashland and South Commercial but a reliable statistical inference would be difficult with so few sales in each of these two areas.

Saunders County is diligent in their sales review process. A sales verification document is mailed to the buyer and the seller of each parcel sold. Follow up phone calls were completed by the appraiser if additional information was needed. The field liaison reviewed all the qualified and non-qualified commercial sales within the county. It does not appear that any excessive trimming is being done in the sales file.

Saunders County employs an appraisal department consisting of one appraiser and one assistant appraiser. Saunders County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. They plan on completing their six year inspection timely.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Saunders County will be reviewed in 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 93% of market value for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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. 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.

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

**Agricultural and/or
Special Valuation Reports**

2013 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Saunders County

All pickup work and permits were completed timely

Ag use changes as per FSA maps provided by property owners were recorded

Spreadsheet analysis of agricultural land was completed and majority land uses were adjusted according to the market and for equalization across county lines

Market areas were analyzed for potential influence and economic trends.

CRP sales were analyzed and adjusted according to the market

Timber designations were realigned and combined to appropriate grass codes

Wetlands and Recreational lands were analyzed and adjusted according to the market

Sales review was completed on the agricultural sales, questionnaires were sent to buyers and sellers. Follow up phone calls were completed by the appraiser if needed.

Continued process of auditing records following conversion to the Orion system.

Continued physical inspection of rural townships.

Ongoing audit of CRP land to determine current use

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Saunders County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**	
	Appraiser and staff	
2.	**List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.**	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Market Area 1 is the entire County except the Todd Valley. This land is primarily dryland with rolling hills.
	2	Market Area 2 consists of the Todd Valley. The land in this area is primarily crop land and relatively level with a low water table.
3.	**Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.**	
	The county monitors the sales activity for agricultural land and forms the boundaries based on similar activity within each area.	
4.	**Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.**	
	The county identifies small tracts of land that sell in the rural areas and does not use them in the agricultural land analysis. The recreational properties are discovered during land use verification.	
5.	**Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?**	
	Yes	
6.	**Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.**	
	Sales are monitored and questionnaires are reviewed to determine the types of influences present. The county also considers sales from uninfluenced areas outside the county as a comparison to the sale prices within Saunders County to gauge the degree of influence.	
7.	**Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.**	
	Applications have been received and the county is determined to be completely influenced.	
8.	**If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.**	
	Saunders County has had sales that are used to determine the value of the Wetland Reserve parcels.	

78   Saunders

AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)
Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012   Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 112	MEDIAN : 69	COV : 32.78	95% Median C.I. : 64.42 to 74.47
Total Sales Price : 47,433,739	WGT. MEAN : 70	STD : 23.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
Total Adj. Sales Price : 47,801,739	MEAN : 73	Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.98	95% Mean C.I. : 68.34 to 77.18
Total Assessed Value : 33,348,561			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 426,801	COD : 26.08	MAX Sales Ratio : 154.92	
Avg. Assessed Value : 297,755	PRD : 104.30	MIN Sales Ratio : 34.94	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:55PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	93.20	100.12	91.21	18.87	109.77	69.53	154.92	79.94 to 117.26	424,128	386,840
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	16	77.90	82.03	81.70	19.01	100.40	39.64	129.71	73.06 to 100.09	339,304	277,218
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	86.93	86.93	84.49	09.69	102.89	78.51	95.34	N/A	337,500	285,170
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	98.36	92.89	94.18	18.50	98.63	59.58	119.42	N/A	306,999	289,130
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	69.02	79.82	72.02	21.73	110.83	57.11	144.80	65.45 to 93.20	372,085	267,984
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	75.34	78.36	79.04	24.48	99.14	47.21	137.05	54.03 to 92.72	462,758	365,746
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	10	59.97	60.81	59.52	13.19	102.17	40.40	79.46	48.25 to 72.43	318,056	189,298
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	7	55.25	51.66	50.49	10.37	102.32	39.34	58.59	39.34 to 58.59	329,607	166,414
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	16	61.97	60.05	60.67	17.70	98.98	34.94	77.77	51.28 to 72.62	652,246	395,709
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	55.91	59.29	59.36	25.04	99.88	35.71	120.83	43.34 to 67.00	460,238	273,203
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	62.50	64.38	62.02	20.82	103.81	45.48	93.36	N/A	544,612	337,794
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	35.44	35.44	35.44	00.00	100.00	35.44	35.44	N/A	248,000	87,880
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	33	86.77	89.46	86.87	19.34	102.98	39.64	154.92	77.95 to 98.36	360,005	312,724
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	44	65.77	70.65	68.77	23.31	102.73	39.34	144.80	59.55 to 70.73	375,716	258,383
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	35	58.04	59.68	60.13	22.48	99.25	34.94	120.83	51.28 to 65.38	554,002	333,138
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	39	77.95	82.77	79.01	21.03	104.76	39.64	144.80	69.05 to 90.69	348,519	275,365
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	44	59.95	63.47	63.83	20.98	99.44	34.94	137.05	55.25 to 69.69	477,593	304,828
_____ALL_____	112	68.94	72.76	69.76	26.08	104.30	34.94	154.92	64.42 to 74.47	426,801	297,755

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	77	66.79	71.34	68.10	27.07	104.76	34.94	154.92	60.45 to 72.62	378,852	258,017
2	35	74.65	75.91	72.36	23.23	104.91	35.71	137.05	60.36 to 86.20	532,291	385,180
_____ALL_____	112	68.94	72.76	69.76	26.08	104.30	34.94	154.92	64.42 to 74.47	426,801	297,755

78 Saunders

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Number of Sales : 112	MEDIAN : 69	COV : 32.78	95% Median C.I. : 64.42 to 74.47
Total Sales Price : 47,433,739	WGT. MEAN : 70	STD : 23.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
Total Adj. Sales Price : 47,801,739	MEAN : 73	Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.98	95% Mean C.I. : 68.34 to 77.18
Total Assessed Value : 33,348,561			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 426,801	COD : 26.08	MAX Sales Ratio : 154.92	
Avg. Assessed Value : 297,755	PRD : 104.30	MIN Sales Ratio : 34.94	*Printed:3/29/2013 1:45:55PM*

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	6	82.60	81.38	80.75	13.15	100.78	54.03	100.20	54.03 to 100.20	370,080	298,832
1	1	100.20	100.20	100.20	00.00	100.00	100.20	100.20	N/A	250,000	250,504
2	5	79.01	77.61	78.28	11.13	99.14	54.03	90.33	N/A	394,096	308,498
_____Dry_____											
County	43	69.53	75.66	69.59	24.45	108.72	35.71	154.92	65.38 to 76.78	394,941	274,836
1	28	67.84	76.04	69.20	26.77	109.88	43.34	154.92	60.07 to 76.78	380,246	263,116
2	15	70.73	74.93	70.25	20.59	106.66	35.71	120.83	65.38 to 89.73	422,373	296,711
_____Grass_____											
County	4	57.44	56.27	58.05	32.38	96.93	34.94	75.27	N/A	245,000	142,223
1	4	57.44	56.27	58.05	32.38	96.93	34.94	75.27	N/A	245,000	142,223
_____ALL_____	112	68.94	72.76	69.76	26.08	104.30	34.94	154.92	64.42 to 74.47	426,801	297,755

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	16	74.62	75.90	70.60	19.69	107.51	51.28	103.53	60.36 to 90.33	685,731	484,115
1	6	69.56	77.83	71.91	18.30	108.23	62.50	100.76	62.50 to 100.76	778,879	560,122
2	10	78.76	74.75	69.62	18.16	107.37	51.28	103.53	54.03 to 90.33	629,842	438,510
_____Dry_____											
County	58	70.01	78.40	73.09	27.38	107.27	35.71	154.92	66.09 to 78.35	370,366	270,717
1	41	69.53	78.72	71.86	28.51	109.55	43.34	154.92	61.62 to 86.77	348,195	250,204
2	17	70.73	77.62	75.55	24.69	102.74	35.71	137.05	58.59 to 92.20	423,836	320,190
_____Grass_____											
County	10	49.30	52.69	54.08	24.30	97.43	34.94	75.27	37.36 to 74.47	229,323	124,024
1	9	48.07	52.93	54.31	27.11	97.46	34.94	75.27	37.36 to 74.47	239,804	130,227
2	1	50.52	50.52	50.52	00.00	100.00	50.52	50.52	N/A	135,000	68,200
_____ALL_____	112	68.94	72.76	69.76	26.08	104.30	34.94	154.92	64.42 to 74.47	426,801	297,755

Saunders County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Saunders	1	5,118	4,902	4,700	4,250	4,100	3,702	2,808	2,600	3,969
Butler	1	4,800	4,500	4,397	3,964	3,848	3,308	2,495	2,244	4,233
Seward	1	5,200	5,100	4,900	4,600	4,400	N/A	3,400	3,000	4,737
Lancaster	1	6,000	6,000	6,000	5,993	4,875	4,854	2,999	2,998	5,468
Sarpy	1	4,720	4,580	4,250	3,850	3,670	3,400	2,550	2,100	3,958
Cass	54	4,800	4,640	4,080	4,080	3,310	3,310	3,010	2,380	4,277
Colfax	1	4,410	4,120	4,020	3,880	3,530	3,300	2,800	2,500	3,797
Washington	1	4,740	4,620	4,275	3,890	3,775	3,420	2,655	2,210	4,015
Saunders	2	5,249	4,834	4,750	4,511	4,249	3,750	2,995	3,000	4,878
Dodge	1	5,265	4,895	4,550	4,230	3,704	3,655	3,400	3,170	4,399

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Saunders	1	4,709	4,500	4,300	3,850	3,700	3,300	2,417	2,229	3,283
Butler	1	4,525	4,350	4,150	3,747	3,650	3,199	2,300	2,100	3,578
Seward	1	3,500	3,500	3,100	3,100	2,600	N/A	2,200	2,000	2,991
Lancaster	1	3,748	3,750	3,371	3,373	3,000	3,000	2,625	2,625	3,264
Sarpy	1	4,400	4,300	3,950	3,600	3,400	3,150	2,400	1,950	3,606
Cass	54	3,770	3,740	3,590	3,210	3,030	3,030	3,120	2,570	3,393
Colfax	1	3,888	3,733	3,598	3,398	3,295	2,996	2,226	1,805	3,193
Washington	1	4,550	4,465	4,200	3,640	3,415	3,350	2,580	1,945	3,824
Saunders	2	4,898	4,699	4,500	4,050	3,900	3,489	2,807	2,641	4,396
Dodge	1	4,870	4,530	4,215	3,920	3,285	3,170	2,875	2,365	4,001

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Saunders	1	1,619	1,389	1,926	1,866	2,125	1,135	1,214	1,062	1,427
Butler	1	1,819	2,170	2,183	1,790	1,961	1,886	1,735	1,639	1,807
Seward	1	1,062	1,196	978	939	966	1,800	948	821	926
Lancaster	1	2,355	2,539	2,087	2,162	1,816	1,829	1,430	1,366	1,802
Sarpy	1	1,817	1,680	1,595	1,458	1,405	1,270	1,131	1,038	1,359
Cass	54	1,230	1,230	1,040	1,040	1,020	1,020	980	740	989
Colfax	1	1,250	1,250	1,150	1,150	1,085	1,085	975	975	1,082
Washington	1	1,845	1,645	1,510	1,345	1,319	1,185	1,130	1,020	1,366
Saunders	2	1,826	1,569	1,446	1,707	1,371	1,225	1,256	986	1,459
Dodge	1	1,549	1,643	1,405	1,508	1,661	1,381	1,387	1,204	1,455

Source: 2013 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

2013

Methodology for Special Valuation

Saunders County

The State Assessment office for Saunders County submits this report pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.004. The following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The following non-agricultural influences have been identified: Residential and Recreational. The office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the State Assessment office for Saunders County by any interested person.

A.   Identification of the influenced area:

The assumption is made that there is influence on agricultural sales in Saunders County. There are five market areas. There are two areas of special valuation for Saunders County.

Area 1 is the northwestern part of the county. Area 1 has least productive soils in the county and the least influence from sales other than ag. Area 1 has some irrigation but it is limited in both quality and quantity. Area 1 has some pasture grass, CRP and hay production. However, most of the land is row crop production.

Area 2 is Todd Valley. Todd Valley is the old Platte River bed. This silted-in area has created an excellent agricultural production area. The Todd Valley area wanders throughout the county and is totally surrounded by the other market areas in the county. Topographically, Todd Valley is mainly a flat area consisting of better quality soils with unlimited irrigation. Area 2 consists of mostly row crop production of corn and soybeans.

Area 3 is the southern and southwestern part of the county. Area 3 has more irrigation than Area 1 and is the largest geographical area of the county.

Area 4 is the land bordering the Platte River.

Area 5 is the area directly northeast of Todd Valley lying south and west of the Platte River. They are combined for special valuation purposes. They are second only to Todd Valley in irrigation usage and quality soils.

B.   Describe the highest and best use of the properties in the influenced area, and how this was determined:

Residential acreages, rural suburbs and recreational usage are the highest and best use of properties in Saunders County. There are several highways connecting the county to Lincoln, Omaha and Fremont. Highways 77, 63 and 92 run through these areas making it easily accessible for outside residential use. The Platte River provides opportunities for recreational uses such as fishing, boating and hunting. Saunders County's close proximity to Omaha, Fremont, Lincoln places influences on sales with future development in mind.

C. **Describe the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates, and explain why and how they were selected:**

Two methods of valuation were analyzed for determining special valuation. Comparable sales of farm ground from uninfluenced counties and an income valuation method using cash rents and a cap rate from the market were considered. Sales of farm ground from uninfluenced counties were selected as the most accurate and reliable method of special valuation for Saunders County cropland.

D. **Describe which market areas were analyzed, both in the County and in any county deemed comparable:**

Comparable sales from Butler County, Cass County, Saline County, Johnson County, Nemaha County and Otoe County were examined. Butler County sales were given the most consideration.

E. **Describe any adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

No adjustments were made to sales for any reason.

F. **Describe any estimates of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach. Include estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share:**

We have not studied rents for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

G. **Describe the typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

H.   **Describe the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

I.   **Describe any other information used in supporting the estimate of actual and special value. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

No other information was used.

Cathy Gusman   Terry Kubik
Assessment Administration Manager   State Appraiser
For Saunders County   For Saunders County

**Agricultural and/or
Special Valuation Correlation**

A. Agricultural Land

Saunders County is comprised of approximately 23% irrigated land, 61% dry crop land and 13% grass/pasture land. Saunders County is part of the Loess Uplands Major Land Resource Area. The average annual precipitation in this area is 23 to 30 inches. The dominant soil order in this MLRA is Mollisols. Saunders County is included in both the Lower Platte North and Lower Platte South Natural Resource Districts. In previous years Saunders County was determined to be fully influenced by nonagricultural factors. For 2013, only the eastern portion of the county has been determined to be influenced.

There are five market areas in Saunders County. Area One is the northwest portion of the county and Area Three is the southwest portion of the county. For measurement purposes these two market areas will be combined into Area One since they have the same assessed values. Area Two is made up of the Todd Valley region of Saunders County. Areas Four and Five are the eastern side of the county and the river. All sales in these two areas are deemed fully influenced and will not be included in the measurement of agricultural land in the county.

There is a statistical sampling of 77 qualified agricultural sales located in Area One. The calculated median is 66.79%. A further look at the statistics reveals that the irrigated and dry 80% majority land use fall within the range at 69.56% and 69.53% respectively. The grass calculated median of the 80% majority land use comes in at 48.07%, which is pulling the overall calculated median of the area lower. Saunders County increased their grass LCGs 25% to 77% in order to equalize across county lines. Butler County has been identified to have the most comparable soils, topography and water availability. A review of the values between Saunders and Butler show the values have achieved inter-county equalization.

Area Two is comprised of a statistical sampling of 35 qualified agricultural sales. The calculated median is 74.65%. Dodge County is the only county adjoining this market area. A review of the 80% majority land use shows the majority of sales fall within the Dry classification coming in with seventeen sales at 70.73%. There are ten irrigated sales with a calculated median of 78.76%. An analysis of these irrigated sales show the majority of the irrigated sales are in the oldest two years skewing the statistics higher. Saunders County increased their irrigated LCGs 25% to 34%. A review of the values in Dodge County shows that Saunders County has achieved inter-county equalization.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

There will be no non-binding recommendation made for the agricultural class of property in Saunders County.

A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

A review of the agricultural land values in Saunders County in areas that have other non-agricultural influence indicates the assessed values used are similar to other areas in the County where no non-agricultural influences exist. Therefore, it is the opinion of Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land in Saunders County is 69%; which is the same as the overall level of value for the agricultural class of property.

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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. 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.

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : **15,660**   Value : **2,797,385,828**   Growth **20,982,021**   Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	434	4,546,620	212	4,952,480	403	20,193,210	1,049	29,692,310	
02. Res Improve Land	4,347	78,950,960	1,204	68,870,500	1,837	106,421,150	7,388	254,242,610	
03. Res Improvements	4,347	326,208,445	1,204	171,270,695	1,837	267,430,391	7,388	764,909,531	
04. Res Total	4,781	409,706,025	1,416	245,093,675	2,240	394,044,751	8,437	1,048,844,451	13,769,809
% of Res Total	56.67	39.06	16.78	23.37	26.55	37.57	53.88	37.49	65.63
05. Com UnImp Land	101	1,836,730	17	580,360	14	750,570	132	3,167,660	
06. Com Improve Land	598	12,387,290	71	1,736,460	54	2,954,450	723	17,078,200	
07. Com Improvements	598	76,710,941	71	12,570,741	54	8,146,965	723	97,428,647	
08. Com Total	699	90,934,961	88	14,887,561	68	11,851,985	855	117,674,507	3,000,117
% of Com Total	81.75	77.28	10.29	12.65	7.95	10.07	5.46	4.21	14.30
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	3	177,230	21	1,629,210	24	1,806,440	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	1	32,000	14	974,390	15	1,006,390	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	1	28,230	14	379,700	15	407,930	
16. Rec Total	0	0	4	237,460	35	2,983,300	39	3,220,760	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	10.26	7.37	89.74	92.63	0.25	0.12	0.00
Res & Rec Total	4,781	409,706,025	1,420	245,331,135	2,275	397,028,051	8,476	1,052,065,211	13,769,809
% of Res & Rec Total	56.41	38.94	16.75	23.32	26.84	37.74	54.13	37.61	65.63
Com & Ind Total	699	90,934,961	88	14,887,561	68	11,851,985	855	117,674,507	3,000,117
% of Com & Ind Total	81.75	77.28	10.29	12.65	7.95	10.07	5.46	4.21	14.30
17. Taxable Total	5,480	500,640,986	1,508	260,218,696	2,343	408,880,036	9,331	1,169,739,718	16,769,926
% of Taxable Total	58.73	42.80	16.16	22.25	25.11	34.95	59.58	41.82	79.93

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban Records	Value Base	Value Excess	SubUrban Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	25	27,900	673,580	0	0	0
19. Commercial	8	1,410,380	18,848,400	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Rural Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Total Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	25	27,900	673,580
19. Commercial	1	20,540	58,460	9	1,430,920	18,906,860
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				34	1,458,820	19,580,440

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	384	96	149	629

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban Records	Value	SubUrban Records	Value	Rural Records	Value	Total Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	889,060	430	81,446,830	4,173	928,424,290	4,604	1,010,760,180
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	95,400	147	42,372,220	1,487	405,997,340	1,635	448,464,960
29. Ag Improvements	15	109,210	156	16,915,370	1,554	151,396,390	1,725	168,420,970
30. Ag Total							6,329	1,627,646,110

2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	28,000	102	111.00	2,836,000
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	73,660	102	0.00	13,065,260
34. HomeSite Total						
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	14	24.99	115,650
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	140	340.81	1,588,570
37. FarmSite Improvements	14	0.00	35,550	149	0.00	3,850,110
38. FarmSite Total						
39. Road & Ditches	0	4.12	0	0	758.99	0
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	11	11.00	278,000	11	11.00	278,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,107	1,159.40	28,847,700	1,210	1,271.40	31,711,700	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,107	0.00	119,212,180	1,210	0.00	132,351,100	3,512,335
34. HomeSite Total				**1,221**	**1,282.40**	**164,340,800**	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	221	1,133.73	3,505,400	235	1,158.72	3,621,050	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,394	3,990.44	17,297,160	1,534	4,331.25	18,885,730	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,461	0.00	32,184,210	1,624	0.00	36,069,870	699,760
38. FarmSite Total				**1,859**	**5,489.97**	**58,576,650**	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,583.96	0	0	9,347.07	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	601.28	901,920	0	601.28	901,920	
41. Total Section VI				**3,080**	**16,720.72**	**223,819,370**	**4,212,095**

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

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

	Rural				Total		
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	705.18	1,208,060		10	705.18	1,208,060

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban				SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	1	193.07	889,060		522	32,936.95	134,041,730
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0

	Rural				Total		
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	5,432	390,412.16	1,436,990,750		5,955	423,542.18	1,571,921,540
44. Market Value	0	0	0		0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail   Market Area   1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,121.54	10.32%	5,740,000	13.31%	5,117.96
46. 1A	755.92	6.96%	3,705,660	8.59%	4,902.19
47. 2A1	2,686.46	24.73%	12,626,870	29.28%	4,700.19
48. 2A	1,811.22	16.67%	7,697,740	17.85%	4,250.03
49. 3A1	223.00	2.05%	914,300	2.12%	4,100.00
50. 3A	527.69	4.86%	1,953,280	4.53%	3,701.57
51. 4A1	3,678.87	33.86%	10,328,920	23.95%	2,807.63
52. 4A	59.70	0.55%	155,220	0.36%	2,600.00
53. Total	10,864.40	100.00%	43,121,990	100.00%	3,969.11
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,256.33	1.83%	5,915,700	2.63%	4,708.72
55. 1D	3,397.01	4.96%	15,286,570	6.79%	4,500.01
56. 2D1	17,025.29	24.85%	73,208,760	32.54%	4,300.00
57. 2D	6,182.57	9.02%	23,802,980	10.58%	3,850.01
58. 3D1	543.98	0.79%	2,012,730	0.89%	3,700.01
59. 3D	9,121.91	13.31%	30,102,320	13.38%	3,300.00
60. 4D1	29,556.20	43.13%	71,448,220	31.76%	2,417.37
61. 4D	1,439.04	2.10%	3,207,320	1.43%	2,228.79
62. Total	68,522.33	100.00%	224,984,600	100.00%	3,283.38
Grass					
63. 1G1	933.78	7.55%	1,511,370	8.56%	1,618.55
64. 1G	484.42	3.92%	672,640	3.81%	1,388.55
65. 2G1	2,045.10	16.53%	3,939,410	22.31%	1,926.27
66. 2G	311.68	2.52%	581,470	3.29%	1,865.60
67. 3G1	1,189.20	9.61%	2,526,880	14.31%	2,124.86
68. 3G	2,400.74	19.41%	2,724,490	15.43%	1,134.85
69. 4G1	2,524.64	20.41%	3,065,630	17.36%	1,214.28
70. 4G	2,478.96	20.04%	2,633,410	14.92%	1,062.30
71. Total	12,368.52	100.00%	17,655,300	100.00%	1,427.44
Irrigated Total	10,864.40	11.57%	43,121,990	15.07%	3,969.11
Dry Total	68,522.33	72.99%	224,984,600	78.63%	3,283.38
Grass Total	12,368.52	13.17%	17,655,300	6.17%	1,427.44
72. Waste	2,128.29	2.27%	380,610	0.13%	178.83
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,115.68	1.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	93,883.54	100.00%	286,142,500	100.00%	3,047.85

2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail   Market Area   2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	31,733.75	62.22%	166,581,850	66.95%	5,249.36
46. 1A	843.92	1.65%	4,079,900	1.64%	4,834.46
47. 2A1	7,131.42	13.98%	33,871,210	13.61%	4,749.57
48. 2A	1,731.97	3.40%	7,813,200	3.14%	4,511.16
49. 3A1	5,915.36	11.60%	25,136,740	10.10%	4,249.40
50. 3A	530.87	1.04%	1,990,780	0.80%	3,750.03
51. 4A1	2,284.37	4.48%	6,842,690	2.75%	2,995.44
52. 4A	831.85	1.63%	2,495,550	1.00%	3,000.00
53. Total	51,003.51	100.00%	248,811,920	100.00%	4,878.33
Dry					
54. 1D1	15,334.06	49.85%	75,100,240	55.55%	4,897.61
55. 1D	1,502.80	4.89%	7,061,580	5.22%	4,698.95
56. 2D1	4,757.46	15.47%	21,406,210	15.83%	4,499.50
57. 2D	1,692.86	5.50%	6,856,130	5.07%	4,050.03
58. 3D1	3,105.79	10.10%	12,111,420	8.96%	3,899.63
59. 3D	809.90	2.63%	2,825,470	2.09%	3,488.67
60. 4D1	2,741.11	8.91%	7,693,310	5.69%	2,806.64
61. 4D	813.83	2.65%	2,149,170	1.59%	2,640.81
62. Total	30,757.81	100.00%	135,203,530	100.00%	4,395.75
Grass					
63. 1G1	702.77	23.33%	1,283,030	29.18%	1,825.68
64. 1G	155.57	5.16%	244,050	5.55%	1,568.75
65. 2G1	495.30	16.44%	716,250	16.29%	1,446.09
66. 2G	173.81	5.77%	296,620	6.75%	1,706.58
67. 3G1	642.36	21.32%	880,640	20.03%	1,370.94
68. 3G	219.19	7.28%	268,490	6.11%	1,224.92
69. 4G1	341.50	11.34%	428,850	9.75%	1,255.78
70. 4G	282.27	9.37%	278,370	6.33%	986.18
71. Total	3,012.77	100.00%	4,396,300	100.00%	1,459.22
Irrigated Total	51,003.51	59.85%	248,811,920	64.05%	4,878.33
Dry Total	30,757.81	36.10%	135,203,530	34.80%	4,395.75
Grass Total	3,012.77	3.54%	4,396,300	1.13%	1,459.22
72. Waste	437.82	0.51%	77,610	0.02%	177.26
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	12,914.87	15.16%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	85,211.91	100.00%	388,489,360	100.00%	4,559.10

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail   Market Area   3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,630.44	13.97%	13,415,250	17.63%	5,100.00
46. 1A	1,158.96	6.16%	5,679,310	7.46%	4,900.35
47. 2A1	3,697.37	19.64%	17,377,660	22.84%	4,700.01
48. 2A	4,053.11	21.53%	17,225,770	22.64%	4,250.01
49. 3A1	1,212.37	6.44%	4,971,920	6.53%	4,100.99
50. 3A	586.41	3.12%	2,172,320	2.86%	3,704.44
51. 4A1	4,844.76	25.74%	13,575,820	17.84%	2,802.17
52. 4A	640.52	3.40%	1,665,350	2.19%	2,600.00
53. Total	18,823.94	100.00%	76,083,400	100.00%	4,041.84
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,307.60	5.26%	29,645,700	7.52%	4,700.00
55. 1D	6,605.81	5.51%	29,726,210	7.54%	4,500.01
56. 2D1	26,060.27	21.74%	112,066,590	28.43%	4,300.29
57. 2D	11,750.92	9.80%	45,241,120	11.48%	3,850.01
58. 3D1	6,860.73	5.72%	25,384,620	6.44%	3,699.99
59. 3D	3,130.20	2.61%	10,327,860	2.62%	3,299.42
60. 4D1	54,493.42	45.46%	131,523,140	33.36%	2,413.56
61. 4D	4,659.97	3.89%	10,330,730	2.62%	2,216.91
62. Total	119,868.92	100.00%	394,245,970	100.00%	3,288.98
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,721.93	6.39%	2,757,240	7.44%	1,601.25
64. 1G	1,194.52	4.43%	1,750,630	4.72%	1,465.55
65. 2G1	2,111.19	7.84%	4,130,200	11.14%	1,956.34
66. 2G	1,669.59	6.20%	2,633,670	7.10%	1,577.44
67. 3G1	4,075.03	15.13%	6,933,990	18.70%	1,701.58
68. 3G	3,941.36	14.63%	5,893,100	15.89%	1,495.19
69. 4G1	5,832.63	21.65%	6,759,990	18.23%	1,159.00
70. 4G	6,389.16	23.72%	6,220,830	16.78%	973.65
71. Total	26,935.41	100.00%	37,079,650	100.00%	1,376.61
Irrigated Total	18,823.94	11.11%	76,083,400	14.98%	4,041.84
Dry Total	119,868.92	70.75%	394,245,970	77.61%	3,288.98
Grass Total	26,935.41	15.90%	37,079,650	7.30%	1,376.61
72. Waste	3,797.44	2.24%	579,400	0.11%	152.58
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	554.46	0.33%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	169,425.71	100.00%	507,988,420	100.00%	2,998.30

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail   Market Area   4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	771.40	10.57%	3,934,140	13.12%	5,100.00
46. 1A	196.10	2.69%	960,890	3.21%	4,900.00
47. 2A1	499.20	6.84%	2,346,240	7.83%	4,700.00
48. 2A	2,729.72	37.39%	11,603,030	38.70%	4,250.63
49. 3A1	1,140.41	15.62%	4,675,660	15.60%	4,099.98
50. 3A	1,156.18	15.84%	4,277,870	14.27%	3,700.00
51. 4A1	416.82	5.71%	1,167,100	3.89%	2,800.01
52. 4A	390.30	5.35%	1,014,780	3.38%	2,600.00
53. Total	7,300.13	100.00%	29,979,710	100.00%	4,106.74
Dry					
54. 1D1	503.35	2.92%	2,373,270	3.81%	4,714.95
55. 1D	756.71	4.39%	3,426,600	5.50%	4,528.29
56. 2D1	2,452.38	14.24%	10,560,330	16.94%	4,306.16
57. 2D	5,768.99	33.49%	22,123,380	35.49%	3,834.88
58. 3D1	2,422.80	14.06%	8,995,420	14.43%	3,712.82
59. 3D	2,332.68	13.54%	7,754,100	12.44%	3,324.12
60. 4D1	2,522.02	14.64%	6,066,440	9.73%	2,405.39
61. 4D	468.73	2.72%	1,040,020	1.67%	2,218.80
62. Total	17,227.66	100.00%	62,339,560	100.00%	3,618.57
Grass					
63. 1G1	312.63	2.82%	458,770	3.00%	1,467.45
64. 1G	100.27	0.90%	152,270	1.00%	1,518.60
65. 2G1	281.49	2.54%	473,950	3.10%	1,683.72
66. 2G	2,478.62	22.34%	4,126,020	27.02%	1,664.64
67. 3G1	3,358.93	30.27%	4,492,680	29.43%	1,337.53
68. 3G	3,069.60	27.66%	3,873,320	25.37%	1,261.83
69. 4G1	461.56	4.16%	609,210	3.99%	1,319.89
70. 4G	1,034.19	9.32%	1,081,470	7.08%	1,045.72
71. Total	11,097.29	100.00%	15,267,690	100.00%	1,375.80
Irrigated Total	7,300.13	19.67%	29,979,710	27.75%	4,106.74
Dry Total	17,227.66	46.42%	62,339,560	57.69%	3,618.57
Grass Total	11,097.29	29.90%	15,267,690	14.13%	1,375.80
72. Waste	1,490.99	4.02%	463,690	0.43%	310.99
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,409.15	3.80%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	37,116.07	100.00%	108,050,650	100.00%	2,911.16

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail   Market Area   5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	844.00	8.34%	4,307,700	11.00%	5,103.91
46. 1A	338.80	3.35%	1,666,980	4.26%	4,920.25
47. 2A1	3,440.45	34.01%	16,177,910	41.30%	4,702.27
48. 2A	755.99	7.47%	3,216,180	8.21%	4,254.26
49. 3A1	24.00	0.24%	98,400	0.25%	4,100.00
50. 3A	591.60	5.85%	2,188,920	5.59%	3,700.00
51. 4A1	3,949.39	39.04%	11,068,360	28.26%	2,802.55
52. 4A	171.00	1.69%	444,600	1.14%	2,600.00
53. Total	10,115.23	100.00%	39,169,050	100.00%	3,872.28
Dry					
54. 1D1	955.56	4.51%	4,505,290	6.28%	4,714.82
55. 1D	784.53	3.70%	3,544,800	4.94%	4,518.37
56. 2D1	6,334.43	29.91%	27,293,990	38.06%	4,308.83
57. 2D	2,030.90	9.59%	7,826,330	10.91%	3,853.63
58. 3D1	83.00	0.39%	308,700	0.43%	3,719.28
59. 3D	2,024.95	9.56%	6,684,910	9.32%	3,301.27
60. 4D1	8,808.15	41.59%	21,209,860	29.57%	2,407.98
61. 4D	154.77	0.73%	344,330	0.48%	2,224.79
62. Total	21,176.29	100.00%	71,718,210	100.00%	3,386.72
Grass					
63. 1G1	167.40	11.02%	307,560	13.94%	1,837.28
64. 1G	76.95	5.07%	120,370	5.46%	1,564.26
65. 2G1	181.12	11.92%	322,500	14.62%	1,780.59
66. 2G	153.70	10.12%	271,320	12.30%	1,765.26
67. 3G1	244.51	16.09%	443,780	20.12%	1,814.98
68. 3G	335.13	22.06%	315,550	14.31%	941.57
69. 4G1	334.96	22.05%	385,430	17.47%	1,150.67
70. 4G	25.40	1.67%	39,350	1.78%	1,549.21
71. Total	1,519.17	100.00%	2,205,860	100.00%	1,452.02
Irrigated Total	10,115.23	30.46%	39,169,050	34.62%	3,872.28
Dry Total	21,176.29	63.77%	71,718,210	63.38%	3,386.72
Grass Total	1,519.17	4.57%	2,205,860	1.95%	1,452.02
72. Waste	395.92	1.19%	62,690	0.06%	158.34
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	129.88	0.39%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	33,206.61	100.00%	113,155,810	100.00%	3,407.63

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	119.05	566,050	10,264.78	47,026,010	87,723.38	389,574,010	98,107.21	437,166,070
77. Dry Land	88.64	390,410	19,144.20	68,443,010	238,320.17	819,658,450	257,553.01	888,491,870
78. Grass	0.00	0	2,856.75	3,597,710	52,076.41	73,007,090	54,933.16	76,604,800
79. Waste	0.00	0	709.02	212,100	7,541.44	1,351,900	8,250.46	1,564,000
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	1,576.93	0	14,547.11	0	16,124.04	0
82. Total	207.69	956,460	32,974.75	119,278,830	385,661.40	1,283,591,450	418,843.84	1,403,826,740

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	98,107.21	23.42%	437,166,070	31.14%	4,456.00
Dry Land	257,553.01	61.49%	888,491,870	63.29%	3,449.74
Grass	54,933.16	13.12%	76,604,800	5.46%	1,394.51
Waste	8,250.46	1.97%	1,564,000	0.11%	189.57
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	16,124.04	3.85%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	418,843.84	100.00%	1,403,826,740	100.00%	3,351.67

2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2012 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

78   Saunders

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	992,328,946	1,048,844,451	56,515,505	5.70%	13,769,809	4.31%
02. Recreational	1,898,430	3,220,760	1,322,330	69.65%	0	69.65%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	165,841,031	164,340,800	-1,500,231	-0.90%	3,512,335	-3.02%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	**1,160,068,407**	**1,216,406,011**	**56,337,604**	**4.86%**	**17,282,144**	**3.37%**
05. Commercial	111,896,364	117,674,507	5,778,143	5.16%	3,000,117	2.48%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	55,870,180	58,576,650	2,706,470	4.84%	699,760	3.59%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	**167,766,544**	**176,251,157**	**8,484,613**	**5.06%**	**3,699,877**	**2.85%**
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	**1,327,834,951**	**1,393,559,088**	**65,724,137**	**4.95%**	**20,982,021**	**3.37%**
11. Irrigated	323,515,340	437,166,070	113,650,730	35.13%		
12. Dryland	646,183,400	888,491,870	242,308,470	37.50%		
13. Grassland	58,856,750	76,604,800	17,748,050	30.15%		
14. Wasteland	1,443,770	1,564,000	120,230	8.33%		
15. Other Agland	859,830	0	-859,830	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	**1,030,859,090**	**1,403,826,740**	**372,967,650**	**36.18%**		
17. Total Value of all Real Property	**2,358,694,041**	**2,797,385,828**	**438,691,787**	**18.60%**	**20,982,021**	**17.71%**
(Locally Assessed)						

2012 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
FOR
SAUNDERS COUNTY
By Cathy Gusman and Terry Kubik

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. 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 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 (2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Saunders County: Per the 2012 County Abstract, Saunders County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	**8,325**	**53.51%**	**42.36%**
Commercial	**855**	**5.50%**	**4.89%**
Recreational	**29**	**.19%**	**.06%**
Agricultural	**424**	**2.72%**	**2.98%**

| Special Value | 5,915 | 38.02% | 49.68% |
| Game & Parks | 10 | .06% | .03% |

Agricultural land - taxable acres **419,38.75**

Other pertinent facts: *43.22% of Saunders County value comes from agricultural parcels. 62.50% of the agricultural acres are in dry farming, 31.62% is irrigated and 5.74% is in grasslands. The county consists of two smaller cities and 13 villages. The commercial properties are limited to mainly small operations.*

New Property: For assessment year 2012 an estimated 500 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2012 Reports & Opinion, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

1 Assessment Manager, 1 Assessment Assistant, 2 Assessment Clerks, 1 Appraiser I and 1 Appraiser Assistant II. The Assessment Manager is also shared with Dodge County effective January 1, 2011.

The total budget for Saunders County for 2009/2010 was $379,755. Included in the total is $21,842 dedicated to the Orion CAMA/assessment administration package, $106,872 for appraisal work with continuing education dedication included in the total budget.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor is working on educational hours required. This is the second year of the 4 year requirement. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field.

The assessment staff at this time does not have continuing education requirements. The staff has voluntarily taken classes such as Windows, Orion user education and webinars, as well as IAAO classes.

Along with voluntary educational classes, Appraisers attend classes throughout the year to maintain current licenses.

B. Cadastral Maps
The Saunders County cadastral maps were up-dated in June of 1989. The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards
The property record cards in Saunders County were new in 1990. Ownership transfers are no longer being kept up to date on paper property record cards. Changes in the property structures are no longer being kept current on the property record cards. A

concentrated effort towards a "paperless" property record card is in effect. Saunders County Assessment Office went on-line in June of 2006 with the property record information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

The provider for our CAMA and assessment administration is provided by Orion by Tyler Technologies. Saunders County went live with the Orion CAMA and assessment administration software in May of 2011. Currently, Saunders County recently signed a contract with GIS Workshop to begin setting up GIS for the county. GIS will be available July 1, 2013. Agridata program is also used to assist with new soil conversion.

E. Web based – property record information access

Property record cards are available online**.**

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.

Step 1-Building permits are gathered from all the permitting entities, separated into separate categories (rural, towns, etc), entered into the computer system and a plan of action is developed based on the number and location of each permit.

Step 2-A complete review of the readily accessible areas of the improvement is conducted. Measurements and photos are taken; and physical characteristics are noted at the time of inspection.

Step 3-Inspection data is entered into the CAMA system, using marshal and swift cost tables; and market data; a value is generated for each property inspected.

Step 4-The value generated for each property is compared to similar properties in the area, for equalization purposes.

Step 5-Permits are closed and notes are made in the file to roll the value for the following assessment year.

B. Data Collection.

All relevant sales are gathered, analyzed, and separated into groupings. These groupings are properties in similar areas with similar characteristics, purchased at similar rates. A study is conducted to determine if there are patterns, or similarities in sales prices etc, market areas are then developed. Once the market area is determined sales data is analyzed to ascertain what aspects of real property affects value. This information is carefully studied and a model is created to assist in determining property values. At the conclusion of the value generation, a ratio study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations. Individual property information is gathered in the same manner as

properties that have building permits.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

Part of market analysis and data collection. Market areas are reviewed on a yearly basis.

1) Approaches to Value;

All three approaches are considered when determining market values. The extent each approach is used depends upon the property type and market data available. The cost approach is most heavily relied upon in the initial evaluation process. All relevant sales are gathered, and analyzed to develop a market generated depreciation table. The market approach is used to support the value generated by the cost approach, broken down price per square foot. Commercial properties are valued in a manner similar to residential properties; however each classification is broken down into a value per square foot in the initial stage of valuation.   Comparable agricultural sales from non-influenced counties are used to determine land values. The income approach is used to support agricultural land values in special value areas, properties under rent restrictions, and used to affirm property values for small downtown commercial shops, apartment complexes and income producing properties that are commonly leased or where lease information is available.

2) Market Approach; sales comparisons, See above

3) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,

06/07 for residential and 06/04 for commercial

4) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

See above

5) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

All relevant sales are gathered, analyzed, and separated into groupings. These groupings are properties in similar areas with similar characteristics, purchased at similar rates. When setting agricultural land values, sales are gathered from the entire county. A study is conducted to determine if there are patterns, or similarities in soil classification, sales prices etc. Market areas are then developed and values generated using sales from each market area. Once the market area is determined sales data is analyzed to ascertain what aspects of real property affects value. This information is carefully studied and a model is created to assist in determining property values. At the conclusion of the value generation, a ratio study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations.

Special value generation: Sales from comparable areas from non-influenced

counties are used to set agricultural values. To support this value, a study is conducted to determine market rental rates for each market area. This information is compared to the study conducted by the Bruce Johnson from the University of Nebraska (using land and funds information). Using market rent information, a rent value is assigned to each soil classification. A capitalization rate is supplied by the Department of Revenue. Using this capitalization rate and the market rental rates, a value is generated for each property in the market area. At the conclusion of the value generation, a comparison study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations.

D. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation   See above

E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.   See above

F. Notices and Public Relations

A new valuation notice is mailed to any property that experiences a valuation change on or before June 1 of each year. The protest process then begins. In the beginning of the process, informal meetings are conducted with individual taxpayers to discuss individual property valuations. Information is provided to each taxpayer both written and verbal, explaining current property valuations. Next step in the process, written and verbal communication is presented to the county boards. A portion of those values need to be later defended in an informal court situation at the Tax Equalization & Review Commission. A more in-depth report is supplied for this process and verbal testimony presented defending each property value in question. On occasion written communication or an explanation of a property value is prepared for the Governor's office or a State Senator.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2012:

Property Class	Median	COD*	PRD*
Residential	96	16.98	105.99
Commercial	93	20.80	105.24
Agricultural Land	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Value Agland	69	N/A	N/A

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2012 Reports & Opinions.

Saunders County recently converted to the Orion software system provided by Tyler Technologies out of Plano, Texas. The appraisal conversion will take quite some time to clean up to make this a usable tool. Workable sketches did not convert very well and most will have to be re-sketched. Our previous vendor did not have the appraisal data connect directly with Marshall and Swift, but replicated it. Our current vendor connects directly with Marshall and Swift and will require each building in the county to be reviewed in the system to have new values calculate with the new system.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: Review residential parcels in Cedar Bluffs, Yutan, Ceresco, Wolf's Lake, Hidden Cove and continue a review of rural acreages in 2014.

Commercial: Review commercial properties in Yutan and Mead

Agricultural & Special Value-Agland: Analyze market areas and review the marginal difference between the agricultural land value and the uninfluenced ag land value.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: Continue with the review of rural acreages and the residential properties in Wahoo as well as the surrounding sub-divisions.

Commercial: Review the commercial properties in Wahoo and the surrounding sub-divisions. Review of gravel pits. Review any commercial properties at lake sub-divisions.

Agricultural & Special Value-Agland: Analyze market areas and review the marginal difference between the agricultural land value and the uninfluenced ag land value.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: Review residential properties in Ashland and the surrounding sub-divisions. Review all lake properties.

Commercial: Review commercial properties in Fremont Subs, Ashland, and the surrounding sub-divisions.

Agricultural Land: Begin review of rural properties, including homes and outbuildings. It will continue into the 2016 year**.**

Special Value – Agland: Verify ag use on agricultural properties.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system.

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes

Deeds are received daily from the Register of Deeds office. Sales are updated in the computer and in the cadastral maps. Splits and new subdivisions are also completed in the computer system, cadastral maps updated for ownership and parcel size accordingly. The County Surveyor provides assistance to the office when needed.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:

    a. Real Property Abstract
    b. Assessor Survey
    c. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
    d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
    e. School District Taxable Value Report
    f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
    g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
    h. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
    i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 1534 personal property returns, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.

Reminder personal property postcards are mailed each year to those that filed a return the prior year, as well as any new businesses/agricultural equipment owners that are discovered by the assessment office. Notice was given in 2010 to all preprinted recipients that due to budgetary constraints, this would be the last year that preprinted returns would be sent and a postcard reminder would be sent in the future as access to blank forms is available on the Department of Revenue website.

4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

Saunders County currently has 82 approved permissive exemption applications on file.

5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

Reminder notices are sent annually each year to political subdivisions who own property to notify them of their requirements on new or updated contracts for leases they may have.

6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 773 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.

   The Saunders County Board of Equalization annually extends the filing deadline for those applicants that request an extension for homestead exemptions as allowed by Nebraska Statute 77-3512.

7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

   Information provided by PAD is reviewed and verified for accuracy in balancing with the county.

8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.

   Saunders County has 7 Tax Increment Financing projects throughout the county; one in Mead and seven in Wahoo. The projects affect 32 parcels in the county. Currently, one project previously in bankruptcy is to have transferred ownership, although the transfer has not been filed with the Register of Deeds, one is partially complete and it does not appear that the project will be completed due to economic factors.

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

   The assessor works with both the Treasurer and the Clerk to ensure accuracy.

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

    The Saunders County Treasurer and Assessor are not on the same computer systems. A conversion must be done each year with the two vendors for the tax list and tax bills to be completed.

11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

    Tax list corrections are prepared and given to the County Clerk to be put on the Board of Equalizations agenda. Assessment manager or representative meets with the Board during the meeting and offers explanation of correction(s)

12. County Board of Equalization - attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.

Due to budgetary constraints, this year Saunders County is asking each protester if they would like to request a referee hearing, or allow Saunders County Board of Equalization with assistance from the assessment office to determine whether a change in the valuation is warranted or not for their property. A representative from the appraisal staff or the assessment manager sits in on referee hearings at the time of protest. The appraisal staff assists the referees as requested on information needed for protests. Assessor and head appraiser attend the final hearings of all protests, providing any additional information as requested by the Board.

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

The appraiser meets with the County Attorney prior to the hearing to prepare exhibits and work on case matters.

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

Appraiser and assessment manager works directly with liaison and applicable staff members from PAD in preparation of evidence to bring forward to the commission.

15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc.

Assessment manager is currently working on education requirements to maintain her assessor certification**.**

Conclusion:

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Cathy Gusman   _7-12-2012_   _Terry Kubik_   _7-12-2012_
Saunders County Assessment Manager   Saunders County Appraiser

2013 Assessment Survey for Saunders County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	**Deputy(ies) on staff:**
	0
2.	**Appraiser(s) on staff:**
	1 and 1 appraiser assistant
3.	**Other full-time employees:**
	2
4.	**Other part-time employees:**
	0
5.	**Number of shared employees:**
	Assessment manager is shared with Dodge County
6.	**Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:**
	$379,755
7.	**Adopted budget, or granted budget *if different from above*:**
8.	**Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:**
	$106,872
9.	**If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:**
	n/a
10.	**Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:**
	$21,842
11.	**Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:**
	n/a
12.	**Other miscellaneous funds:**
	0
13.	**Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:**
	0

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	**Administrative software:**
2.	**CAMA software:**
	Orion
3.	**Are cadastral maps currently being used?**
	Yes
4.	**If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?**
	Assessment Staff
5.	**Does the county have GIS software?**
	No

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	n/a
8.	Personal Property software:
	Orion

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Ashland, Cedar Bluffs, Ceresco, Colon, Ithaca, Leshara, Mead, Memphis, Morse Bluff, Prague, Valparaiso, Wahoo, Weston, and Yutan
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Zoning was originally implemented in 1966, but the comprehensive plan has been updated since originally implemented.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	GIS Services:
3.	Other services:
	Agri Data Inc is contracted for counting the acres of the various soils as the county worked to implement the most recent soil survey from the USDA.

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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

2013 Certification for Saunders County

This is to certify that the 2013 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Saunders County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator