

# **Table of Contents**

## **2014 Commission Summary**

## **2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator**

### **Residential Reports**

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Correlation

### **Commercial Reports**

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Correlation

### **Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports**

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Correlation
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable

### **Statistical Reports**

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

### **County Reports**

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

### **Certification**

### **Maps**

- Market Areas

### **Valuation History Charts**



## 2014 Commission Summary for Garfield County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	50	Median	96.20
Total Sales Price	\$3,332,207	Mean	95.52
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,119,700	Wgt. Mean	93.43
Total Assessed Value	\$3,848,930	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$60,548
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$82,394	Avg. Assessed Value	\$76,979

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.73 to 96.62
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.16 to 98.70
95% Mean C.I	92.59 to 98.45
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	18.46
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.71
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.26

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	49	93	93.35
2012	43	97	96.62
2011	46	93	93
2010	45	96	96

## 2014 Commission Summary for Garfield County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	7	Median	94.27
Total Sales Price	\$759,539	Mean	89.22
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$776,538	Wgt. Mean	94.90
Total Assessed Value	\$736,945	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$68,876
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$110,934	Avg. Assessed Value	\$105,278

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	34.72 to 118.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.72 to 105.08
95% Mean C.I	65.50 to 112.94
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.58
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.70
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.18

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	4		93.98
2012	3		82.03
2011	3		88
2010	7	100	83



## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Garfield 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	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	71	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2014 Residential Assessment Actions for Garfield County**

The valuation groupings and current sales rosters were reviewed for accuracy as well as compliance. Sales are reviewed through research of the deed, questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and any changes noted.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. The county completed the final review segment to complete the systematic review of the residential properties this year.

The City of Burwell was represented with 42 sales and did receive adjustments as this assessor location was not in statistical compliance. Vacant lot sales analysis was completed with new lot land values being applied. The most recent Marshall & Swift costing of 06/2012 was implemented with a new depreciation study done. New assessed values were applied using local depreciation as well as a unit of comparison analysis.

The Calamus location was reviewed. The entire assessor location received adjustments in lot values using vacant lot sales analysis. The Marshall & Swift costing of 06/2012 was also applied using local depreciation analysis from sales as well as a unit of comparison analysis.

The Rural location also received adjustments reflecting the sales activity in this area.

Camper/RV parks were reviewed with the emphasis being on unlicensed/expired plates on campers. Those not having a current license plate were added to the assessment rolls.

The county completed all permit and pick-up work in a timely manner.



## 2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Garfield County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																		
	Assessment Staff																		
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,210 located on State Highway 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The second class city offers a variety of jobs, services and goods that make living in it desirable. Burwell has a large trade area.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located near the Calamus Reservoir. The southeast corner of the lake is located in Garfield County.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Rural is all improved and unimproved residential properties located outside the corporate limits of Burwell.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,210 located on State Highway 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The second class city offers a variety of jobs, services and goods that make living in it desirable. Burwell has a large trade area.	02	Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located near the Calamus Reservoir. The southeast corner of the lake is located in Garfield County.	03	Rural is all improved and unimproved residential properties located outside the corporate limits of Burwell.								
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																		
01	Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,210 located on State Highway 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The second class city offers a variety of jobs, services and goods that make living in it desirable. Burwell has a large trade area.																		
02	Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located near the Calamus Reservoir. The southeast corner of the lake is located in Garfield County.																		
03	Rural is all improved and unimproved residential properties located outside the corporate limits of Burwell.																		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																		
	The cost approach to value is applied using local depreciation derived from a market analysis. The sales comparison approach is also utilized through unit of comparison studies.																		
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																		
	A depreciation study and tables are developed based on local market information.																		
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																		
	Burwell has an individual table; Calamus and Rural share the same table.																		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																		
	Vacant lot sales – based on the size of the parcel the \$/sq ft or \$/acre was determined with consideration given to excess land.																		
<b>7.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 30%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	01	2014	2012	2014	02	2014	2012	2014	03	2014	2012	2014
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>																
01	2014	2012	2014																
02	2014	2012	2014																
03	2014	2012	2014																

## **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

### **County Overview**

Garfield County is located in north central Nebraska with Hwy 11 running north and south and Hwy 91 east and west. The total county population is approximately 2,007 (estimated 2012 census). Burwell, the only town in the county has a population of 1,193. The K-12 public school system is located in town as well as a variety of jobs, services and goods. The very southeastern corner of the Calamus Lake is located in Garfield County. There are some residential subdivisions located by the lake that are in the county.

### **Description of Analysis**

There are 50 qualified sales in the residential sample. Three valuation groupings have been identified with differing market influences. A comparison of the number of sold parcels in each valuation grouping compared to the number of parcels in the county overall shows that only valuation grouping 01, Burwell has an adequate representation in the sales file. Analysis of the sales file revealed that assessment changes were made in accordance with the reported assessment actions, and the abstract also reflects the changes that were made to the sold properties. The overall level of value will be used as a point estimate in determining the level of value and is supported by the qualitative measures. All three measures of central tendency correlate very closely. The low coefficient of dispersion may appear to be a concern, however the movement in the sales file from the preliminary to final values is somewhat similar to the movement in the 2013 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) to the 2014 Abstract of Assessment.

The assessment actions included revaluing the residential properties in valuation grouping 01 which is Burwell. This included a vacant lot sales analysis with new lot values being applied. The Marshall & Swift costing of 06/2012 was implemented with a new depreciation study done. New assessed values were applied using local depreciation as well as a unit of comparison analysis.

Garfield County continues to meet the goals as established in the three year plan and six year physical inspection and review cycle. The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six year cyclical process of parcels in the county and has completed this requirement. The next six year review cycle is scheduled to begin.

### **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties in 2013. The review involved an analysis of the sale utilization rate and a screening of the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. The review revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

## **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

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

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Garfield County was selected for review in 2012. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Based on the analysis, the statistics appear to be reasonable indicators of the level of value of the class, and support a level within the acceptable range. Based on the known assessment practices the quality of assessment in the residential class has been determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on all available information, the level of value of the residential property in Garfield County is 96%.



## **2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Garfield County**

Sales are reviewed through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and onsite reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning the sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and any changes noted.

Garfield County reviewed and revalued the commercial class of property for 2013. At that time the commercial properties were physically inspected, new photos taken, listing information reviewed for accuracy and revalued using Marshall & Swift June 2012 cost tables. Local rental data was acquired as well as local market depreciation was established. An analysis of vacant commercial lot sales was completed with new lot/land values being assigned.

The annual permits and pick-up work on this class of real property was completed timely for 2014.

## 2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Garfield County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																
	Assessment Staff																
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th><th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td><td>Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the corporate limits of the city of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,210 located on State Highways 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The second class city offers a variety of jobs, services and goods that make living in it desirable. Burwell has a large trade area.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td><td>Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located near the Calamus Reservoir. The southeast corner of the lake is located within Garfield County.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td><td>Rural is all improved and unimproved commercial properties located outside the corporate limits of Burwell and not being in Valuation Grouping #02.</td></tr> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the corporate limits of the city of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,210 located on State Highways 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The second class city offers a variety of jobs, services and goods that make living in it desirable. Burwell has a large trade area.	02	Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located near the Calamus Reservoir. The southeast corner of the lake is located within Garfield County.	03	Rural is all improved and unimproved commercial properties located outside the corporate limits of Burwell and not being in Valuation Grouping #02.								
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																
01	Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the corporate limits of the city of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,210 located on State Highways 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The second class city offers a variety of jobs, services and goods that make living in it desirable. Burwell has a large trade area.																
02	Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located near the Calamus Reservoir. The southeast corner of the lake is located within Garfield County.																
03	Rural is all improved and unimproved commercial properties located outside the corporate limits of Burwell and not being in Valuation Grouping #02.																
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>																
	The cost approach to value is applied using Marshall & Swift pricing and depreciation tables supplied by the CAMA vendor and adjusted as needed. The sales approach is also utilized through unit of comparison studies. The income approach is utilized after rental information is gathered.																
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>																
	The contracted appraiser has a very good working knowledge of unique properties as he works in several counties in the state. The state sales file query function is also used when needed.																
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																
	The depreciation study is based on local market information.																
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																
	At present the Marshall & Swift depreciation tables by occupancy code is used and then adjusted to local depreciation.																
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>																
	Vacant lot sales are used based on the size of the parcel, the \$/sq ft or acre.																
<b>7.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th><th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th><th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th><th style="width: 35%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td><td style="text-align: center;">2013</td><td style="text-align: center;">2012</td><td style="text-align: center;">2013</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td><td style="text-align: center;">2013</td><td style="text-align: center;">2012</td><td style="text-align: center;">2013</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td><td style="text-align: center;">2013</td><td style="text-align: center;">2012</td><td style="text-align: center;">2013</td></tr> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	01	2013	2012	2013	02	2013	2012	2013	03	2013	2012	2013
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>														
01	2013	2012	2013														
02	2013	2012	2013														
03	2013	2012	2013														

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

### **County Overview**

Garfield County is located in north central Nebraska with Hwy 11 running north and south and Hwy 91 east and west. Burwell, the only town in the county has a population of 1,193 based on the 2012 census. The K-12 public school system is located in town as well as a variety of jobs, services and goods; however the market is not organized. The very southeastern corner of the Calamus Lake is located in Garfield County; however there are very few commercial properties.

### **Description of Analysis**

The commercial parcels in Garfield County are represented by 48 different occupancy codes and the majority of these will consist of only one parcel. Retail and storage warehouse would be the primary codes. There have been only seven commercial sales during this study period, the sample is considered unrepresentative of the population as a whole.

Garfield County continues to meet the goals as established in the three year plan and six year physical inspection and review cycle. The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six year cyclical process of parcels in the county and has completed this requirement with the reappraisal performed last year. The next six year review cycle is on schedule to begin.

### **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties in 2013. The review involved an analysis of the sale utilization rate and a screening of the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. The review revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

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

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Garfield County was selected for review in 2012. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that commercial property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

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

### **Level of Value**

The sale information for the commercial class of property is unreliable to indicate a level of value. However, because the county's assessment practices have been investigated and

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

determined to be acceptable, it has also been determined to be at the statutory level of 100% for the commercial class of property.





## **2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Garfield County**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural land sales that occurred in the current study period. Sales are plotted on a large soil map to assist in the market analysis. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land class of real property. This analysis includes a joint review with the field liaison of the sales file to determine proportionality, representativeness and adequacy of the sales. After completing the analysis, sales are borrowed from surrounding counties in conformance with the agricultural land analysis.

Garfield County recognizes the non-agricultural influences along the Calamus and North Loup Rivers, as well as along Nebraska State Highway 96 from Burwell to the Garfield/Loup county line. This special valuation area is being monitored for possible expansion and continued agricultural use of the parcels.

All acres in the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetland Reserve Program are tracked and valued giving consideration to the individual sub-class. We continue to work with the Natural Resource District in a cooperative effort focused on coordinating the irrigated acres on the records with the corresponding Farm Service Agency records as available.

Agricultural values were adjusted to reflect current market activity. Irrigated and dry cropland were adjusted up approximately 28% to reflect changes in the market. Grassland received a value adjustment upward of approximately 18% this year to try to stay current with market activity.

Annually the county conducts the pick-up work of new construction of the agricultural improvements and updates of any known land use changes in a timely manner. We have completed the six-year requirement of reviewing rural properties.

The county received a grant in 2013 for GIS and is using the system to correct any soil discrepancies found. This continues to be a work in progress.

## 2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Garfield County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>						
	Assessment Staff.						
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th><th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td><td>The specific characteristics for the non-influenced area are soils, land use and land enrolled in federal programs in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural production.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td><td>The special valuation area is located along the North Loup and Calamus Rivers; as well as, land associated with State Highway 96 which leads from State Highway 91 (on the south end) past the Calamus Lake heading northwest.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	The specific characteristics for the non-influenced area are soils, land use and land enrolled in federal programs in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural production.	5	The special valuation area is located along the North Loup and Calamus Rivers; as well as, land associated with State Highway 96 which leads from State Highway 91 (on the south end) past the Calamus Lake heading northwest.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>						
1	The specific characteristics for the non-influenced area are soils, land use and land enrolled in federal programs in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural production.						
5	The special valuation area is located along the North Loup and Calamus Rivers; as well as, land associated with State Highway 96 which leads from State Highway 91 (on the south end) past the Calamus Lake heading northwest.						
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>						
	The valuation grouping for the non-influenced area is developed by similar topography, soil characteristics and geographic characteristics. The recreational/commercial influenced area is monitored for the determination of the primary use of the parcel.						
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>						
	Rural residential/recreational land is identified by the size of parcel, residence and non-agricultural influences in the market. Also used are questionnaires from buyer/owners as to their purpose for the land.						
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>						
	Yes						
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>						
	We have been able to see a trend of development of both residential and commercial properties in the designated special value area.						
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>						
	Yes, applications have been filed and there is a value difference for the special valuation parcels if they do not have agricultural use.						
<b>8.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>						
	The state sales file query is used with WRP sales being borrowed from neighboring counties to determine an appropriate market value. Fee appraisers are also willing to share sales with me. Sales are reviewed as to what actually sold.						

## Garfield County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Garfield	1	N/A	3,520	3,060	2,660	2,610	2,500	1,580	1,530	2,355
Loup	1	N/A	2,600	N/A	2,600	2,160	1,970	1,970	1,150	2,236
Rock	2	N/A	1,650	N/A	1,550	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,482
Custer	3	N/A	2,868	2,595	2,432	2,255	2,198	1,556	1,407	2,103
Wheeler	1	3,650	3,645	3,400	3,220	3,110	3,095	3,025	2,830	3,024
Holt	4003	N/A	2,383	2,197	2,108	1,960	1,948	1,751	1,644	1,848
Valley	1	N/A	4,600	4,600	3,480	3,045	3,045	2,400	2,400	3,700

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Garfield	1	N/A	1,370	1,215	1,165	1,050	945	845	740	1,020
Loup	1	N/A	705	N/A	570	545	475	350	350	487
Rock	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	600	600	570	570	583
Custer	3	N/A	915	910	910	905	905	900	900	906
Wheeler	1	1,555	1,540	1,365	1,300	1,280	1,175	1,105	1,050	1,190
Holt	4003	N/A	1,479	1,400	1,396	1,299	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,276
Valley	1	N/A	1,955	1,955	1,955	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,465	1,709

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Garfield	1	N/A	630	630	630	585	555	491	404	436
Loup	1	N/A	640	N/A	495	375	375	375	375	376
Rock	2	N/A	499	500	499	468	460	439	326	395
Custer	3	N/A	622	622	620	621	620	607	532	552
Wheeler	1	960	945	820	745	770	705	612	521	582
Holt	4003	1,100	1,100	950	932	839	858	696	696	735
Valley	1	N/A	1,091	1,091	1,072	1,090	1,050	805	793	829

Source: 2014 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

2014

## **Methodology for Special Valuation**

### **Garfield County**

Garfield County Assessor submits this report to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.04. 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, Commercial, 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 office for Garfield County by any interested person.

Garfield County currently has two market areas throughout the county. Market area 1 includes the majority of the county and consists of some farming but mostly grassland acres. It consists mostly of sandy soils conducive to our ranching industry.

#### **A. Identification of the influenced area:**

The land in market area 5 has been identified as an area that is located along the Calamus and North Loup Rivers and also includes the land associated with Nebraska State Highway 96 which runs from Highway 91 on the south end (near Burwell) to the Garfield/Loup County line and directly to and along the Calamus Reservoir.

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

Market area 5 is located along the river corridors and Nebraska State Highway 96. For over a decade the areas along the Calamus and North Loup River have sold for uses other than agricultural usage. The influence on these sales has been for residential and recreational use such as hunting, fishing, personal pleasure, family campgrounds and quiet enjoyment. There have also been sales for commercial development along Highway 96. These sales have been to private individuals. Based on the sales in this area it has been determined the highest and best use of the properties located in market area 5 be residential, commercial or recreational.

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

Analysis of sales contained in the special valuation areas creates a market value for properties that are influenced by non-agricultural purposes. In the case of recreational sales, these sales will be located along the two rivers. Residential and commercial sales are located along Highway 96 which is relatively close to the two rivers. After analysis of sales along both rivers and the highway within the county, the market value was set at a price reflective of the use as other than agricultural usage.

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

Analysis of sales in the special valuation area has created a market value for properties that are influenced by other than agricultural purposes.

The special valuation market area 5 was created in conjunction with the surrounding agricultural market area. The special valuation has values determined by the agricultural table developed for the non-influenced market area within the county.

**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/expense information is not readily available to this office.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

Zoning has not been a consideration in the recreational river corridor of market area 5. The corridor along State Highway 96 is zoned transitional agricultural with primary use of commercial agriculture production. The present zoning allows recreational, residential or commercial usage. Therefore, special valuation for properties in these areas has been recommended and approved.

Sharon L. Boucher  
Garfield County Assessor

# **2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

## **County Overview**

Garfield County is located in north central Nebraska, Burwell is the county seat. The land use make up is comprised of 5% irrigated, 2% dry crop and 92% grass/pasture land. The Lower Loup is the only Natural Resource District that governs the county. The County currently has one market area for non-influenced agricultural land in the county. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination. The majority of the county is grassland with sandy soils. The comparable neighboring counties are Loup, southeast Rock southwest Holt, Wheeler and for Valley only the irrigated sales. The irrigated sales from Valley County are generally comparable to the southern area of Garfield County where the majority of irrigated land is. No grass or dry sales are borrowed from Valley County. Once you cross the county line the soils are generally siltier and not as comparable to the majority of the grassland which is sandy.

## **Description of Analysis**

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Garfield County the sales were proportionately distributed and representative of the land uses that exist within the county. However, sales were brought into the analysis using sales from the comparable areas to maximize the sample size. In total 35 sales were used in the analysis.

The assessment actions for Garfield County reflect the general economic conditions; the values were increased in all land capability groupings for all three classes of agricultural land. Irrigated values amounted to an increase of 28%, dry land increased 26% and grass amounted to an increase of 18%.

## **Sales Qualification**

A review of the non-qualified sales roster demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor comments on the reasons for exclusion from the qualified sales roster. Measurement was done utilizing all available information; there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The sales analysis supports that all three subclasses of agricultural property have been assessed at acceptable portions of market value. A comparison of agricultural values in Garfield County to the values used in all of the adjoining counties also supports that values are acceptable and equalized with other counties in the area. The quality of assessment of agricultural land has been determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

## **2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Garfield County is 71%.

### **Special Valuation**

A review of the agricultural land values in Garfield County in areas that have other non-agricultural influences 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 the Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land in Garfield County is 71%.





**36 Garfield**  
**RESIDENTIAL**
**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 50	MEDIAN : 96	COV : 11.08	95% Median C.I. : 95.73 to 96.62
Total Sales Price : 3,332,207	WGT. MEAN : 93	STD : 10.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.16 to 98.70
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,119,700	MEAN : 96	Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.33	95% Mean C.I. : 92.59 to 98.45
Total Assessed Value : 3,848,930			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 82,394	COD : 04.50	MAX Sales Ratio : 117.68	
Avg. Assessed Value : 76,979	PRD : 102.24	MIN Sales Ratio : 40.21	

Printed:3/14/2014 1:17:56PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	6	96.39	95.61	96.36	02.60	99.22	89.12	100.61	89.12 to 100.61	52,083	50,185
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	109.30	109.30	109.30	00.00	100.00	109.30	109.30	N/A	80,000	87,440
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	95.88	96.00	95.14	01.48	100.90	93.47	99.25	N/A	88,400	84,101
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	8	96.32	97.68	94.47	10.63	103.40	62.89	117.68	62.89 to 117.68	73,438	69,379
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	4	98.15	98.55	97.07	02.06	101.52	95.90	102.00	N/A	33,725	32,738
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	8	96.20	96.18	96.23	01.35	99.95	93.01	100.34	93.01 to 100.34	91,663	88,204
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	11	95.73	90.35	86.07	06.25	104.97	40.21	96.86	92.64 to 96.62	107,136	92,214
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	7	96.49	96.32	97.37	01.60	98.92	92.98	100.02	92.98 to 100.02	93,000	90,559
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	20	96.34	97.22	95.93	06.10	101.34	62.89	117.68	95.24 to 99.25	71,100	68,205
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	30	96.14	94.39	92.11	03.42	102.48	40.21	102.00	95.46 to 96.62	89,923	82,828
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	18	96.49	98.05	95.94	06.46	102.20	62.89	117.68	95.61 to 101.94	69,133	66,329
<u>ALL</u>	50	96.20	95.52	93.43	04.50	102.24	40.21	117.68	95.73 to 96.62	82,394	76,979

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	42	96.27	96.91	96.61	02.04	100.31	89.12	115.45	95.83 to 96.62	67,398	65,116
02	4	93.06	91.67	91.29	14.95	100.42	62.89	117.68	N/A	167,500	152,910
03	4	94.91	84.83	81.17	19.20	104.51	40.21	109.30	N/A	154,750	125,606
<u>ALL</u>	50	96.20	95.52	93.43	04.50	102.24	40.21	117.68	95.73 to 96.62	82,394	76,979

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	46	96.27	97.38	96.86	02.70	100.54	89.12	117.68	95.82 to 96.62	80,559	78,026
06											
07	4	77.94	74.17	62.74	29.02	118.22	40.21	100.61	N/A	103,500	64,934
<u>ALL</u>	50	96.20	95.52	93.43	04.50	102.24	40.21	117.68	95.73 to 96.62	82,394	76,979

**36 Garfield****RESIDENTIAL****PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013    Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 50	MEDIAN : 96	COV : 11.08	95% Median C.I. : 95.73 to 96.62
Total Sales Price : 3,332,207	WGT. MEAN : 93	STD : 10.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.16 to 98.70
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,119,700	MEAN : 96	Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.33	95% Mean C.I. : 92.59 to 98.45
Total Assessed Value : 3,848,930			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 82,394	COD : 04.50	MAX Sales Ratio : 117.68	
Avg. Assessed Value : 76,979	PRD : 102.24	MIN Sales Ratio : 40.21	

*Printed:3/14/2014 1:17:56PM***SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	7	96.45	96.44	95.22	02.04	101.28	92.64	102.00	92.64 to 102.00	112,500	107,126
Less Than 15,000	8	96.54	96.77	95.28	02.13	101.56	92.64	102.00	92.64 to 102.00	99,813	95,099
Less Than 30,000	12	96.62	96.75	95.43	01.60	101.38	92.64	102.00	95.24 to 97.59	74,146	70,755
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	43	96.20	95.37	93.00	04.90	102.55	40.21	117.68	95.73 to 96.62	77,493	72,071
Greater Than 14,999	42	96.14	95.28	92.98	04.94	102.47	40.21	117.68	95.73 to 96.56	79,076	73,527
Greater Than 29,999	38	96.05	95.13	92.88	05.37	102.42	40.21	117.68	95.46 to 96.56	84,999	78,944
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	7	96.45	96.44	95.22	02.04	101.28	92.64	102.00	92.64 to 102.00	112,500	107,126
5,000 TO 14,999	1	99.14	99.14	99.14	00.00	100.00	99.14	99.14	N/A	11,000	10,905
15,000 TO 29,999	4	96.89	96.70	96.73	00.54	99.97	95.73	97.29	N/A	22,813	22,066
30,000 TO 59,999	17	96.08	96.80	96.47	02.75	100.34	89.12	115.45	94.44 to 96.56	42,456	40,957
60,000 TO 99,999	12	96.48	99.54	99.94	04.46	99.60	93.01	117.68	95.46 to 101.94	78,200	78,150
100,000 TO 149,999	3	95.82	84.86	86.15	11.48	98.50	62.89	95.88	N/A	130,267	112,225
150,000 TO 249,999	5	94.29	84.72	84.26	13.14	100.55	40.21	100.02	N/A	178,800	150,650
250,000 TO 499,999	1	96.80	96.80	96.80	00.00	100.00	96.80	96.80	N/A	285,000	275,880
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	50	96.20	95.52	93.43	04.50	102.24	40.21	117.68	95.73 to 96.62	82,394	76,979

**36 Garfield**  
**COMMERCIAL**
**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 7  
 Total Sales Price : 759,539  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 776,538  
 Total Assessed Value : 736,945  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 110,934  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 105,278

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 89  
 COD : 13.39  
 PRD : 94.01

COV : 28.75  
 STD : 25.65  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.62  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 118.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.72

95% Median C.I. : 34.72 to 118.19  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.72 to 105.08  
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.50 to 112.94

Printed:3/14/2014 1:17:56PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	92.57	92.57	92.57	00.00	100.00	92.57	92.57	N/A	291,000	269,375
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	93.68	93.68	93.68	00.00	100.00	93.68	93.68	N/A	17,000	15,925
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	94.27	94.27	94.27	00.00	100.00	94.27	94.27	N/A	85,000	80,130
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	95.90	95.90	95.90	00.00	100.00	95.90	95.90	N/A	130,000	124,665
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	64.97	64.97	83.80	46.56	77.53	34.72	95.22	N/A	76,769	64,330
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	118.19	118.19	118.19	00.00	100.00	118.19	118.19	N/A	100,000	118,190
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	93.13	93.13	92.63	00.60	100.54	92.57	93.68	N/A	154,000	142,650
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	95.09	95.09	95.25	00.86	99.83	94.27	95.90	N/A	107,500	102,398
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	3	95.22	82.71	97.36	29.22	84.95	34.72	118.19	N/A	84,513	82,283
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	93.68	93.68	93.68	00.00	100.00	93.68	93.68	N/A	17,000	15,925
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	95.09	95.09	95.25	00.86	99.83	94.27	95.90	N/A	107,500	102,398
<u>ALL</u>	7	94.27	89.22	94.90	13.39	94.01	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	110,934	105,278

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	7	94.27	89.22	94.90	13.39	94.01	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	110,934	105,278
<u>ALL</u>	7	94.27	89.22	94.90	13.39	94.01	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	110,934	105,278

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	6	94.45	88.38	94.98	15.58	93.05	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	115,256	109,469
04	1	94.27	94.27	94.27	00.00	100.00	94.27	94.27	N/A	85,000	80,130
<u>ALL</u>	7	94.27	89.22	94.90	13.39	94.01	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	110,934	105,278

**36 Garfield**  
**COMMERCIAL**
**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013    Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 7  
 Total Sales Price : 759,539  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 776,538  
 Total Assessed Value : 736,945  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 110,934  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 105,278

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 89  
 COD : 13.39  
 PRD : 94.01

COV : 28.75  
 STD : 25.65  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.62  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 118.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.72

95% Median C.I. : 34.72 to 118.19  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.72 to 105.08  
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.50 to 112.94

Printed:3/14/2014 1:17:56PM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	93.68	93.68	93.68	00.00	100.00	93.68	93.68	N/A	17,000	15,925
Less Than 15,000	1	93.68	93.68	93.68	00.00	100.00	93.68	93.68	N/A	17,000	15,925
Less Than 30,000	2	64.20	64.20	56.51	45.92	113.61	34.72	93.68	N/A	23,000	12,998
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	6	94.75	88.48	94.93	15.44	93.21	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	126,590	120,170
Greater Than 14,999	6	94.75	88.48	94.93	15.44	93.21	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	126,590	120,170
Greater Than 29,999	5	95.22	99.23	97.32	05.72	101.96	92.57	118.19	N/A	146,108	142,190
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	93.68	93.68	93.68	00.00	100.00	93.68	93.68	N/A	17,000	15,925
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	1	34.72	34.72	34.72	00.00	100.00	34.72	34.72	N/A	29,000	10,070
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999	1	94.27	94.27	94.27	00.00	100.00	94.27	94.27	N/A	85,000	80,130
100,000 TO 149,999	3	95.90	103.10	101.95	07.99	101.13	95.22	118.19	N/A	118,179	120,482
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	1	92.57	92.57	92.57	00.00	100.00	92.57	92.57	N/A	291,000	269,375
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	7	94.27	89.22	94.90	13.39	94.01	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	110,934	105,278

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	93.68	93.68	93.68	00.00	100.00	93.68	93.68	N/A	17,000	15,925
340	1	118.19	118.19	118.19	00.00	100.00	118.19	118.19	N/A	100,000	118,190
344	1	92.57	92.57	92.57	00.00	100.00	92.57	92.57	N/A	291,000	269,375
353	3	94.27	74.96	88.06	21.63	85.12	34.72	95.90	N/A	81,333	71,622
419	1	95.22	95.22	95.22	00.00	100.00	95.22	95.22	N/A	124,538	118,590
<u>ALL</u>	7	94.27	89.22	94.90	13.39	94.01	34.72	118.19	34.72 to 118.19	110,934	105,278

**36 Garfield****AGRICULTURAL LAND****PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 35  
 Total Sales Price : 26,040,300  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,973,299  
 Total Assessed Value : 16,802,935  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 770,666  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 480,084

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 62  
 MEAN : 71  
 COD : 30.98  
 PRD : 114.16

COV : 36.25  
 STD : 25.78  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.99  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 120.72  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.55

95% Median C.I. : 55.17 to 86.91  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.32 to 74.27  
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.57 to 79.65

*Printed:3/14/2014 1:17:57PM***DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	95.66	91.95	92.33	15.54	99.59	70.27	112.38	70.27 to 112.38	263,561	243,355
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	86.91	87.80	88.59	01.37	99.11	86.45	90.03	N/A	184,167	163,158
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	51.14	51.14	51.14	00.00	100.00	51.14	51.14	N/A	144,000	73,645
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	62.27	62.27	62.27	00.00	100.00	62.27	62.27	N/A	831,750	517,935
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	7	92.01	83.83	79.17	14.25	105.89	46.39	101.63	46.39 to 101.63	1,315,023	1,041,129
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	64.99	76.13	58.33	40.02	130.52	42.68	120.72	N/A	639,101	372,809
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	45.89	45.89	39.37	20.96	116.56	36.27	55.50	N/A	1,375,920	541,693
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	3	63.11	56.55	62.73	22.94	90.15	31.55	75.00	N/A	543,500	340,923
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	7	42.97	42.84	41.66	14.73	102.83	34.95	55.17	34.95 to 55.17	1,118,823	466,079
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	12	88.47	87.51	89.48	15.76	97.80	51.14	112.38	70.99 to 106.54	233,749	209,163
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	11	78.00	79.77	74.65	24.77	106.86	42.68	120.72	46.39 to 101.63	1,086,747	811,297
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	12	45.34	46.78	43.96	23.36	106.41	31.55	75.00	35.12 to 55.50	1,017,842	447,392
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	86.45	75.36	70.74	14.70	106.53	51.14	90.03	N/A	305,650	216,211
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	12	77.57	75.58	68.40	28.04	110.50	36.27	120.72	46.39 to 97.79	1,156,192	790,810
<u>ALL</u>	35	70.99	71.11	62.29	30.98	114.16	31.55	120.72	55.17 to 86.91	770,666	480,084

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	35	70.99	71.11	62.29	30.98	114.16	31.55	120.72	55.17 to 86.91	770,666	480,084
<u>ALL</u>	35	70.99	71.11	62.29	30.98	114.16	31.55	120.72	55.17 to 86.91	770,666	480,084

**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
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	5	97.79	85.29	70.91	17.94	120.28	55.50	106.54	N/A	408,794	289,877
1	5	97.79	85.29	70.91	17.94	120.28	55.50	106.54	N/A	408,794	289,877
<u>Grass</u>											
County	17	70.99	68.93	66.69	30.62	103.36	31.55	112.38	46.39 to 92.01	939,055	626,216
1	17	70.99	68.93	66.69	30.62	103.36	31.55	112.38	46.39 to 92.01	939,055	626,216
<u>ALL</u>	35	70.99	71.11	62.29	30.98	114.16	31.55	120.72	55.17 to 86.91	770,666	480,084

**36 Garfield****AGRICULTURAL LAND****PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013    Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 35	MEDIAN : 71	COV : 36.25	95% Median C.I. : 55.17 to 86.91
Total Sales Price : 26,040,300	WGT. MEAN : 62	STD : 25.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.32 to 74.27
Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,973,299	MEAN : 71	Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.99	95% Mean C.I. : 62.57 to 79.65
Total Assessed Value : 16,802,935			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 770,666	COD : 30.98	MAX Sales Ratio : 120.72	
Avg. Assessed Value : 480,084	PRD : 114.16	MIN Sales Ratio : 31.55	

*Printed:3/14/2014 1:17:57PM***80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	15	70.27	70.23	57.01	27.78	123.19	34.95	106.54	47.70 to 91.37	568,424	324,040
1	15	70.27	70.23	57.01	27.78	123.19	34.95	106.54	47.70 to 91.37	568,424	324,040
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	19	70.99	69.20	64.57	31.62	107.17	31.55	112.38	46.39 to 92.01	967,997	625,050
1	19	70.99	69.20	64.57	31.62	107.17	31.55	112.38	46.39 to 92.01	967,997	625,050
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>70.99</b>	<b>71.11</b>	<b>62.29</b>	<b>30.98</b>	<b>114.16</b>	<b>31.55</b>	<b>120.72</b>	<b>55.17 to 86.91</b>	<b>770,666</b>	<b>480,084</b>





**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 2,360

Value : 286,993,495

Growth 1,699,420

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	33	197,410	2	73,720	13	154,760	48	425,890	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	520	4,460,740	27	626,365	192	3,659,460	739	8,746,565	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	520	27,244,365	27	2,311,555	192	13,497,335	739	43,053,255	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	553	31,902,515	29	3,011,640	205	17,311,555	787	52,225,710	877,225
<b>% of Res Total</b>	70.27	61.09	3.68	5.77	26.05	33.15	33.35	18.20	51.62
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	7	55,615	2	44,175	1	14,500	10	114,290	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	103	1,113,070	5	87,735	17	583,555	125	1,784,360	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	103	5,262,945	5	349,600	17	1,075,610	125	6,688,155	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	110	6,431,630	7	481,510	18	1,673,665	135	8,586,805	175,735
<b>% of Com Total</b>	81.48	74.90	5.19	5.61	13.33	19.49	5.72	2.99	10.34
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	4	114,760	0	0	4	114,760	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	6	73,630	3	185,575	1	41,500	10	300,705	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	6	398,195	3	406,210	1	455,865	10	1,260,270	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	6	471,825	7	706,545	1	497,365	14	1,675,735	18,835
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	42.86	28.16	50.00	42.16	7.14	29.68	0.59	0.58	1.11
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	83	689,040	83	689,040	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	5	8,355	5	8,355	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	5	56,110	5	56,110	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	88	753,505	88	753,505	1,660
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	3.73	0.26	0.10
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	553	31,902,515	29	3,011,640	293	18,065,060	875	52,979,215	878,885
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	63.20	60.22	3.31	5.68	33.49	34.10	37.08	18.46	51.72
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	116	6,903,455	14	1,188,055	19	2,171,030	149	10,262,540	194,570
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	77.85	67.27	9.40	11.58	12.75	21.15	6.31	3.58	11.45
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	669	38,805,970	43	4,199,695	312	20,236,090	1,024	63,241,755	1,073,455
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	65.33	61.36	4.20	6.64	30.47	32.00	43.39	22.04	63.17

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					0	0	0

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	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	78	18	134	230

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	3	226,060	32	4,065,515	982	136,360,950	1,017	140,652,525
28. Ag-Improved Land	2	166,595	14	3,865,695	286	60,982,055	302	65,014,345
29. Ag Improvements	2	26,705	14	1,227,530	303	16,830,635	319	18,084,870
30. Ag Total							1,336	223,751,740

## 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	0	0.00	0	9	9.00	120,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	9	0.00	644,130	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	12.00	33,600	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	1.89	5,670	14	44.00	132,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	2	0.00	26,705	14	0.00	583,400	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	47.97	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	9.90	1,240	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	2.00	24,000	2	2.00	24,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	201	223.00	2,450,500	210	232.00	2,570,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	201	0.00	11,579,330	210	0.00	12,223,460	553,845
34. HomeSite Total				212	234.00	14,817,960	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	11	15.00	21,000	12	27.00	54,600	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	271	683.90	1,580,755	287	729.79	1,718,425	
37. FarmSite Improvements	288	0.00	5,251,305	304	0.00	5,861,410	72,120
38. FarmSite Total				316	756.79	7,634,435	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,778.12	0	0	1,826.09	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	2,325.92	448,070	0	2,335.82	449,310	
41. Total Section VI				528	5,152.70	22,901,705	625,965

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

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

## Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	28	2,267.38	5,225,890
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	68	9,414.91	12,407,365	96	11,682.29	17,633,255
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

## Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3,644.71	20.67%	12,829,395	30.89%	3,520.00
47. 2A1	106.43	0.60%	325,690	0.78%	3,060.13
48. 2A	3,432.89	19.47%	9,131,515	21.99%	2,660.01
49. 3A1	829.70	4.71%	2,165,535	5.21%	2,610.02
50. 3A	2,152.90	12.21%	5,382,250	12.96%	2,500.00
51. 4A1	5,341.77	30.29%	8,439,985	20.32%	1,580.00
52. 4A	2,125.35	12.05%	3,251,805	7.83%	1,530.01
53. Total	17,633.75	100.00%	41,526,175	100.00%	2,354.93
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	383.40	5.06%	525,270	6.80%	1,370.03
56. 2D1	54.70	0.72%	66,470	0.86%	1,215.17
57. 2D	3,179.21	41.97%	3,703,855	47.96%	1,165.02
58. 3D1	922.75	12.18%	968,885	12.55%	1,050.00
59. 3D	114.26	1.51%	107,980	1.40%	945.04
60. 4D1	1,802.72	23.80%	1,523,355	19.73%	845.03
61. 4D	1,117.62	14.75%	827,030	10.71%	739.99
62. Total	7,574.66	100.00%	7,722,845	100.00%	1,019.56
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	612.72	0.20%	385,935	0.28%	629.87
65. 2G1	273.58	0.09%	172,355	0.13%	630.00
66. 2G	6,397.78	2.04%	4,030,625	2.95%	630.00
67. 3G1	1,987.09	0.63%	1,162,595	0.85%	585.07
68. 3G	8,846.92	2.82%	4,912,120	3.59%	555.24
69. 4G1	77,064.91	24.58%	37,827,230	27.65%	490.85
70. 4G	218,300.64	69.64%	88,295,365	64.55%	404.47
71. Total	313,483.64	100.00%	136,786,225	100.00%	436.34
Irrigated Total	17,633.75	5.13%	41,526,175	22.21%	2,354.93
Dry Total	7,574.66	2.20%	7,722,845	4.13%	1,019.56
Grass Total	313,483.64	91.12%	136,786,225	73.15%	436.34
72. Waste	4,986.77	1.45%	581,800	0.31%	116.67
73. Other	342.63	0.10%	369,280	0.20%	1,077.78
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	344,021.45	100.00%	186,986,325	100.00%	543.53

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

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,457.59	44.74%	5,130,720	54.01%	3,520.00
47. 2A1	9.80	0.30%	29,990	0.32%	3,060.20
48. 2A	904.64	27.77%	2,406,345	25.33%	2,660.00
49. 3A1	3.50	0.11%	9,135	0.10%	2,610.00
50. 3A	578.08	17.75%	1,445,200	15.21%	2,500.00
51. 4A1	249.50	7.66%	394,220	4.15%	1,580.04
52. 4A	54.48	1.67%	83,360	0.88%	1,530.10
53. Total	3,257.59	100.00%	9,498,970	100.00%	2,915.95
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	76.95	10.54%	107,595	13.34%	1,398.25
56. 2D1	0.80	0.11%	970	0.12%	1,212.50
57. 2D	265.24	36.32%	329,220	40.81%	1,241.22
58. 3D1	2.00	0.27%	2,100	0.26%	1,050.00
59. 3D	283.33	38.80%	269,855	33.45%	952.44
60. 4D1	86.00	11.78%	81,340	10.08%	945.81
61. 4D	16.00	2.19%	15,670	1.94%	979.38
62. Total	730.32	100.00%	806,750	100.00%	1,104.65
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	133.64	1.88%	84,205	2.46%	630.09
65. 2G1	45.71	0.64%	28,800	0.84%	630.06
66. 2G	477.32	6.72%	302,085	8.83%	632.88
67. 3G1	9.60	0.14%	5,615	0.16%	584.90
68. 3G	1,081.56	15.24%	606,660	17.73%	560.91
69. 4G1	1,759.41	24.78%	878,915	25.69%	499.55
70. 4G	3,591.81	50.60%	1,514,630	44.28%	421.69
71. Total	7,099.05	100.00%	3,420,910	100.00%	481.88
Irrigated Total	3,257.59	28.47%	9,498,970	68.52%	2,915.95
Dry Total	730.32	6.38%	806,750	5.82%	1,104.65
Grass Total	7,099.05	62.04%	3,420,910	24.68%	481.88
72. Waste	274.76	2.40%	31,615	0.23%	115.06
73. Other	81.23	0.71%	105,465	0.76%	1,298.35
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	11,442.95	100.00%	13,863,710	100.00%	1,211.55

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	108.40	374,670	2,193.34	6,819,895	18,589.60	43,830,580	20,891.34	51,025,145
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	5.11	6,920	220.40	267,795	8,079.47	8,254,880	8,304.98	8,529,595
<b>78. Grass</b>	8.57	5,395	899.13	507,120	319,674.99	139,694,620	320,582.69	140,207,135
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	31.60	3,640	5,229.93	609,775	5,261.53	613,415
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	30.98	45,920	392.88	428,825	423.86	474,745
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>122.08</b>	<b>386,985</b>	<b>3,375.45</b>	<b>7,644,370</b>	<b>351,966.87</b>	<b>192,818,680</b>	<b>355,464.40</b>	<b>200,850,035</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	20,891.34	5.88%	51,025,145	25.40%	2,442.41
<b>Dry Land</b>	8,304.98	2.34%	8,529,595	4.25%	1,027.05
<b>Grass</b>	320,582.69	90.19%	140,207,135	69.81%	437.35
<b>Waste</b>	5,261.53	1.48%	613,415	0.31%	116.58
<b>Other</b>	423.86	0.12%	474,745	0.24%	1,120.05
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>355,464.40</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>200,850,035</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>565.04</b>

## 2014 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2013 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

36 Garfield

	2013 CTL County Total	2014 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2014 form 45 - 2013 CTL)	Percent Change	2014 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	44,100,810	52,225,710	8,124,900	18.42%	877,225	16.43%
02. Recreational	759,360	753,505	-5,855	-0.77%	1,660	-0.99%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,466,460	14,817,960	2,351,500	18.86%	553,845	14.42%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>57,326,630</b>	<b>67,797,175</b>	<b>10,470,545</b>	<b>18.26%</b>	<b>1,432,730</b>	<b>15.77%</b>
05. Commercial	8,464,055	8,586,805	122,750	1.45%	175,735	-0.63%
06. Industrial	1,659,940	1,675,735	15,795	0.95%	18,835	-0.18%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,531,960	7,634,435	102,475	1.36%	72,120	0.40%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>17,655,955</b>	<b>17,896,975</b>	<b>241,020</b>	<b>1.37%</b>	<b>266,690</b>	<b>-0.15%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>74,982,585</b>	<b>86,143,460</b>	<b>11,160,875</b>	<b>14.88%</b>	<b>1,699,420</b>	<b>12.62%</b>
11. Irrigated	39,925,470	51,025,145	11,099,675	27.80%		
12. Dryland	6,747,535	8,529,595	1,782,060	26.41%		
13. Grassland	119,241,125	140,207,135	20,966,010	17.58%		
14. Wasteland	615,685	613,415	-2,270	-0.37%		
15. Other Agland	277,840	474,745	196,905	70.87%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>166,807,655</b>	<b>200,850,035</b>	<b>34,042,380</b>	<b>20.41%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>241,790,240</b>	<b>286,993,495</b>	<b>45,203,255</b>	<b>18.70%</b>	<b>1,699,420</b>	<b>17.99%</b>



## **2013 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR GARFIELD COUNTY**

### **Assessment Years 2014, 2015 and 2016**

#### 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 any changes are made by either the assessor or 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 is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (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.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 ( 2009).

### General Description of Real Property in Garfield County:

Per the 2013 County Abstract, Garfield County consists of 2,369 taxable parcels with the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	788	33.26%	18.30%
Commercial	135	5.70%	3.53%
Industrial	14	.59%	.69%
Recreational	96	4.05%	.33%
Agricultural	1,336	56.40%	77.15%
Special Value	99	4.18%	5.99%

Agricultural land - taxable acres: 355,740.82

Other pertinent facts: Approximately 69% of the county value is agricultural land and of that value 71.5% is primarily grassland.

### Current Resources:

#### A. Staff: County Assessor, Deputy Assessor and Assessor Assistant.

The Assessor and Deputy Assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every four years to maintain certification. The Assessor Certificate holders which include the Assessor Assistant attends workshops and meetings to further their knowledge of the assessment field. The staff has taken classes provided by Property Assessment Division, CAMA user education, as well as IAAO classes.

The Assessor is credentialed with the Nebraska Real Property Appraiser Board and is required to obtain 28 hours of continuing education every two years. This includes USPAP every two years and Nebraska Report Writing every four years.

#### B. Cadastral Maps

The Garfield County cadastral maps were originally completed in 1969. Additional pages have been added to show changes such as annexation and new subdivisions. The assessment staff maintains the cadastral maps. All new subdivision and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

#### C. Property Record Cards - Property information, photo, sketches, etc.

A concentrated effort towards a "paperless" property record card is in effect. Garfield County Assessment Office went on-line July, 2006 with the property record information.

- D. Software for CAMA and Assessment Administration.  
Garfield County uses the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Tyler Technologies Inc software for CAMA and Assessment Administration. Garfield County has received a GIS grant and has implemented the system. We continue to correct inaccuracies as found.
- E. Web based – property record information access  
Property record information is available at: [www.garfieldrealproperty.nebraska.gov](http://www.garfieldrealproperty.nebraska.gov)  
The county GIS website is: [www.garfield.gisworkshop.com](http://www.garfield.gisworkshop.com)
- F. Agridata, Inc software was used to measure rural parcels to aid the conversion from old alpha soil symbols to the new numeric symbols. This was completed for 2009. The software is still being used to measure new field certifications and splits of agricultural property.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property – Assessment staff processes sales transactions in the computer system and prints a copy of the 521 forms and property review sheet which is then used for physical review of the property. This process changes the ownership in the CAMA System and ownership changes are made on the cadastral maps as each transfer statement is processed. Sales questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and seller for further sales analysis. Telephone calls are sometimes made to realtors, attorneys and brokers when further information is needed. The assessment staff reviews the sales, takes new pictures, checks the accuracy of the data, and visits with property owners whenever possible. Current photos are taken and later entered in the CAMA system. Building permits and information statements are received from city and county zoning personnel, individual taxpayers, and from personal knowledge of changes to a property. These are entered in the computer for later review.
- B. Data Collection – In accordance with Neb. Statute 77-1311.03 the county is working to ensure that all parcels of real property are reviewed no less frequently than every six years. Further, properties are reviewed as deemed necessary from analysis of the market conditions within each assessor location. These are onsite inspections. The market areas are reviewed annually and compared for equity between like classes of property as well as other classes. If necessary a market boundary will be adjusted to more accurately reflect the market activity. The statistics of the assessor locations are also reviewed annually to determine if new adjustments are necessary to stay current with the sales and building activity that is taking place.

The permit and sales review system offer opportunity for individual property reviews annually. Working with agricultural property owners or tenants with land certification requirements between the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resource District provides updates for changes.

- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions – Sales ratio studies are done on an ongoing basis to stay informed with trends in the market. For each assessor location and market area consideration is given to the number of sales in the study and the time frame of the parcel data. This information is reviewed several times throughout the year. Analysis of this data is reviewed with the assigned Field Liaison and the plan of action for the year is developed.
- D. Approaches to Value
- 1) Market Approach; sales comparisons, - Similar properties are studied to determine if and what actions will be necessary for adjustments for the upcoming year. Comparable sales are used when valuing property or during valuation protest hearings.
  - 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study-  
  
Garfield County currently uses Tyler Technologies Inc with Marshall & Swift cost manuals. The Department of Revenue controls when the manuals are updated. Currently we are using June-2012 costing which at this juncture will be used for a three year period unless there are economic conditions that indicate the costing should be changed more frequently. Local/market depreciation is developed and utilized. The latest depreciation study varies by assessor location and property class.
  - 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market, -  
  
Gather income/rental information as available for commercial properties. The income approach is used when available on the commercial properties. Garfield County does not use the income approach to value on residential properties.
  - 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land-  
  
Sales are plotted on a map indicative to the land use of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry cropland with the selling price per acre listed. Analysis is completed for agricultural sales based on but not limited to the following components: Number of sales, Time frame of sales, and Number of acres sold. The special value areas are reviewed annually in an attempt to determine if there is additional areas that reflect non-agricultural influences affecting the market.
- E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation – The market is analyzed based on the standard approaches to valuation with the final valuation based on the most appropriate method.
- F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions. – Sales assessment ratios are reviewed prior to any assessment actions and after final values are applied to the sales within all classes and subclasses of properties. Then any changes needed are applied to the entire population of properties within the subclasses and classes of

property within the county. Finally a unit of comparison analysis is completed to insure uniformity within the class or sub-class.

- G. Notices and Public Relations – Notice of Valuation Changes are mailed to property owners on or before June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. These are mailed to the last known address of property owners as of May 20th. After notices have been mailed the assessment staff is available to answer any questions or concerns from the taxpayers. Personal Property and Homestead Exemption notices are printed with staff assisting in the filing of these documents.

### **Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2013:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	93	17.24	107.06
Commercial	NEI**	NEI**	NEI**
Agricultural Land	73	23.78	104.48
Special Value Agland	73	23.78	104.48

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2013 Reports & Opinions.

\*\*Insufficient information available to determine level of value.

### **Assessment Actions planned for Assessment Year 2014:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete the rural review of properties for any changes. Complete Burwell City review of properties. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done. And last but not least correct data on new CAMA system to correct errors and review all data on file.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done. And last but not least correct data on new CAMA system to reflect correct data on file.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Sales will be plotted on the soil topographical map indicative to the use at 80+% of each subclass of irrigation, grassland, or dry cropland with the price per acre listed.

Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriate will be scrutinized for proportionality of number of sales and timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties. Continue on the rural review of improved properties. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done. And last but not least correct data on new CAMA system to reflect correct data on file.

Special Value – Agricultural: Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural. Complete an annual review of properties for continued agricultural use.

#### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue to review a portion of the class. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done. Begin a new cycle of six year review of properties.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue to monitor market areas and plot sales. Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done. Begin a new cycle of six year review of properties.

Special Value – Agricultural: Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural. Complete an annual review of properties for continued agricultural use.

#### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue the review of the class. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue to monitor market areas and plot sales. Adjustment to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary. Continue the review of properties. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes will be done.

Special Value – Agricultural: Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural. Complete an annual review of properties for continued agricultural use.

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
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. Average Assessed Residential Value Report (for homestead exemptions)
  - g. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - h. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - i. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - j. Report of Permissive Exempt Property (to County Clerk for publication)
  - k. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property: annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

6. Homestead Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed: review of valuations as certified by Department of Revenue for public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. 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.
9. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed property.
10. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization: attend County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
12. Tax Equalization and Review Appeals: staff prepares information and Assessor attends taxpayer appeal hearings before the Commission to defend valuation.
13. Tax Equalization and Review Appeals Statewide Equalization: Assessor attends hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders from the Commission.
14. 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. Retention of the assessor certification requires 60 hours of approved continuing education every four years. Retention of the appraiser license requires 28 hours of continuing education every two years.

Conclusion:

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

The continual review of all properties will cause the assessment records to be 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:

Sharon L. Boucher  
Garfield County Assessor



## 2014 Assessment Survey for Garfield County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	One
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	None
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$144,000
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same as above
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$14,000
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$5,000
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$4,500
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$500
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$8,000

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Tyler Technologies/Orion
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Tyler Technologies/Orion
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessment Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes     garfield.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessment Staff and GIS Workshop Inc
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Tyler Technologies/Orion

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Burwell
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	Burwell-1970; County-2000

#### **D. Contracted Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	N/A
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop Inc
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	N/A

#### **E. Appraisal /Listing Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Not for 2014
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	N/A
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	N/A
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	N/A
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	N/A



## 2014 Certification for Garfield County

---

This is to certify that the 2014 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 Garfield County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



