

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 Jefferson County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	156	Median	94.32
Total Sales Price	\$8,800,834	Mean	105.47
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,800,334	Wgt. Mean	93.82
Total Assessed Value	\$8,256,837	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$48,729
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$56,412	Avg. Assessed Value	\$52,928

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.17 to 101.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.21 to 98.43
95% Mean C.I	98.88 to 112.06
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	13.38
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.63

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	155	97	97.07
2012	148	98	98.42
2011	162	98	98
2010	171	99	99

2014 Commission Summary for Jefferson County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	4	Median	92.99
Total Sales Price	\$122,500	Mean	93.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$122,500	Wgt. Mean	84.36
Total Assessed Value	\$103,335	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$126,921
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$30,625	Avg. Assessed Value	\$25,834

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	44.05 to 142.41
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.06
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.15

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	9		99.35
2012	13		98.40
2011	24		97
2010	24	97	97

2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Jefferson County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	94	Does not meet 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.

***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 Jefferson County

For 2014, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all residential pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. This resulted in the review of a few individual subdivisions in Fairbury and an adjustment to the whole area reviewed by plus+10%.

The county inspected and updated the parcels in neighborhood #3 of Fairbury, and the villages of Harbine, Reynolds, and Steele City.

The inspection process includes a going house to house with the existing record to verify or update the measurements, description of property characteristics, observations of quality and condition and take new photos. The parcels were all viewed from off site to note and record changes in condition. If needed, the inspection was done on site to review changes that needed measurement or closer inspection.

2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

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

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

7.

<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
01	2008 & 2013	2008 & 2013	2008 & 2013
08	2005	2005	2005
11	2008	2008	2008
12	2005 / 2001	2005 / 2001	2005 / 2001
15	2001	2001	2001

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

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

The County is in the process of changing to Dec 2013 costing and adjusting depreciation.

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

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

----Within the Valuation Group #1 (Fairbury), The work is organized into 3 neighborhoods that are intended to break the town into manageable appraisal zones. Neighborhood #3 was revalued for 2013 so there are 2 cost dates for Valuation Group #1, (Fairbury).

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

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Jefferson County

County Overview

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of nine villages and small towns. Eight of them range in population from 49 to 409 and exist primarily to support agriculture. Fairbury, with a population of 3,942, is the largest town and county seat. It hosts additional nonagricultural employers and has a more diversified business climate. According to the 2010 Census data cited in the Departments CTL based municipality charts; the county population is 7,547, with 5,206 or 68.98% living within the villages and towns and 2,341 or 31.02% living outside of the municipal areas. During the past few years there have been few significant economic events in the county that have had a positive impact on the value of residential property. The assessor suggested that the loss of manufacturing jobs in DeWitt and Beatrice has had an impact on some of the smaller towns closest to those locations. Plymouth may have been the hardest hit as it was close to both. Fairbury may have had modest growth but the smaller towns have remained stable or declined.

Description of Analysis:

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

For 2014, the median ratio for the 156 qualified residential sales is 94% and is within the acceptable range; the COD at 29.95 is above the acceptable range and the PRD at 112.42 is above the acceptable range. It is often useful to evaluate the quality of assessment of a trimmed sample of the 100 sales with prices above \$30,000. This statistic represents over 64% of the qualified sales and the mean, which is the statistic most sensitive to outliers, decreases 10.86 percentage points, the COD and the PRD improve but are still outside the acceptable range. The 56 sales below \$30,000 are excluded in this exercise to demonstrate that the county's predominant residential parcels are properly valued and only the volatile low dollar parcels are responsible for the appearance of regressive assessment. In this case, that did not happen. Since the average selling price for the 156 sales is \$56,412, trimming down to \$30,000 and still having quality statistics out of the acceptable range signals that there are other issues in the quality of assessment. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median; but the four valuation groups with largest sample size all have the PRD well above the range and three of them have a COD well above the acceptable range. Valuation group #8 (Plymouth), with 9 sales has a median ratio of 121.02, a COD of 34.47, and a PRD of 113.90 is of concern. It is a small sample but appears a long way

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Jefferson County

out of the acceptable range. The assessor is aware of this situation, has indicated that she is unsure of the last revaluation date but it is before she took office 3 years ago. She indicated that the county plans to start the review of Plymouth during 2014.

Sales Qualification

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

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department is concerned that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class and certainly not for any subclass of residential property. The quality statistics for the county and for the individual valuation groups are troubling. There are questions if the values are equalized throughout the residential class. The statistics for valuation group #8 (Plymouth) as stated earlier are not acceptable. Neither the assessor, the past assessment actions, nor the past 3 year plans portray a recent (since 2010) complete update of Plymouth. In the end, the Department does not support the quality of assessment for the residential property.

Level of Value

The apparent level of value for the residential class based solely on the median calculation is 94%, the quality of the assessment, based on the statistical indicators and the assessment actions is not acceptable and there are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses.

2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Jefferson County

For 2014, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all commercial pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

There was no planned inspection and review of commercial parcels during 2013.

2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:								
	Assessor and Staff								
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:								
	<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;">19</td><td>Includes all Assessor Locations: All commercial sales in Jefferson County are grouped together for analysis and valuation.</td></tr> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	19	Includes all Assessor Locations: All commercial sales in Jefferson County are grouped together for analysis and valuation.				
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>								
19	Includes all Assessor Locations: All commercial sales in Jefferson County are grouped together for analysis and valuation.								
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.								
	The cost approach is the primary method and is used on all parcels. If sufficient data is available, a Market Approach (sales comparison approach) is used and the two values are correlated for a final value.								
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.								
	<p>The assessor relies heavily on the experience of the current staff when unique commercial property is appraised. The assessor and staff members are familiar with the appraisal techniques, sales and procedures used in other counties. There is an exchange of information among other assessors that have similar parcels. This process helps to determine a value and to value unique property similarly to other like property in nearby jurisdictions.</p> <p>----If it is necessary for an unusual property, the county would contract with an outside appraiser.</p>								
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?								
	The local market								
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?								
	Yes; but there is only one valuation group in commercial. There will be individual depreciation developed for various uses or groups of like uses and locations within the valuation group. Among the commercial property, the depreciation tends to be driven by both use and location as well as quality and condition.								
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.								
	The county uses sales of vacant land calculated by square foot for the common unit of comparison.								
7.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 25%; 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: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">19</td><td style="text-align: center;">2008</td><td style="text-align: center;">2008</td><td style="text-align: center;">2008</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>	19	2008	2008	2008
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>						
19	2008	2008	2008						

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

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

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

2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Jefferson County

County Overview

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of nine municipalities; eight villages and small towns, and the town of Fairbury. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. Fairbury, the county seat, is the predominant location for much of the commercial and industrial property. The Department's "2013 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type" reports that 44% of the commercial valuation is reported in Fairbury, 16% is in Plymouth, 9% in Daykin, 6% in the remaining small towns and 25% is in the non-municipal areas. Fairbury has about 19% of the industrial valuation, Plymouth over 8% and the remaining nearly 73% is in the non-municipal areas of the county. In all, the commercial values are stable in Fairbury and generally stable in other parts of the county. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of commercial property.

Description of Analysis

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

The key statistics that are prepared and considered for measurement are as follows: there are 4 qualified sales; the median ratio is 93%; the COD is 22.4; and the PRD is 110.51. Of the 4 qualified sales, 3 are in Fairbury and 1 in Diller. When the 3 different occupancy codes are reviewed, there are 2 sales in code 344 (office building); 1 sale in code 353 (retail store); and 1 sale in code 386 (mini warehouse). Since there are only 3 occupancy codes, there are still many property types with no representation and those that are represented are insufficient for preparing a viable statistical analysis. In short, there are not sufficient sales to represent or measure either the overall class or any subclass of the commercial property.

Sales Qualification

The Division has reviewed the county's sale verification process and finds that the county has retained an unusually low number of the sales as qualified compared to surrounding counties. Since a small number of sales typically exists in the commercial class in this area, it's determined that the possible under-utilization of sales is not affecting the conclusion drawn from the measurement process. That is that there are not sufficient sales to measure the commercial class or any subclass regardless of the verification process. However, the Division will continue to monitor the effort of sales qualification in the commercial class of property.

2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Jefferson County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

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

Level of Value

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

2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Jefferson County

For 2014, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

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

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

The county has completed the inspection and update process for all agricultural improvements so no additional inspections and reviews were conducted during 2013.

2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:								
	Assessor and Staff								
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.								
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th><th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td><td> <p>Market Area 1:</p> <p>This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td><td> <p>Market Area 2:</p> <p>This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with limited ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td><td> <p>Market Area 3:</p> <p>This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes. Area 3 is predominantly grass, some dryland crop and very limited irrigation.</p> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	<p>Market Area 1:</p> <p>This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.</p>	2	<p>Market Area 2:</p> <p>This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with limited ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.</p>	3	<p>Market Area 3:</p> <p>This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes. Area 3 is predominantly grass, some dryland crop and very limited irrigation.</p>
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>								
1	<p>Market Area 1:</p> <p>This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.</p>								
2	<p>Market Area 2:</p> <p>This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with limited ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.</p>								
3	<p>Market Area 3:</p> <p>This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes. Area 3 is predominantly grass, some dryland crop and very limited irrigation.</p>								
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.								
	The county has a strong sale verification and analysis process. This keeps them constantly aware of market trends and changes in agricultural land values.								
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.								
	Agricultural land is identified by its present and predominant use; it is defined in the state statutes as the commercial production of agricultural products. Residential is not used for the commercial production for agricultural products and Recreational is predominantly used for rest and relaxation on an occasional basis. There is currently no land valued as Recreational.								
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?								
	Yes; the first (home site) acre, for both farm home and rural residential home sites is valued the same at \$10,000. This home site acre value is the same throughout the county. The outbuilding site acres are valued at \$2,000 per acre and the excess or yard acres are valued at \$1,500 per acre. The area of the site is determined on a parcel by parcel basis using GIS, Google Earth and FSA data.								
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.								
	Sale verification; information obtained from buyers and sellers is the key technique.								
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.								
	No								

8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.
	<p>The assessor estimates that there are only 2 or 3 parcels that have WRP acres on them. There are no large tracts of land that are all WRP land, rather minor inclusions of acres within larger agricultural parcels. There have been no known sales within the county of WRP parcels. The county has adopted the procedure of valuing the acres at the same use and LCG that they were when they went into the program. The only change is that they are valued at 100% of the ag use value.</p>

Jefferson County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Jefferson	1	5,625	7,041	4,424	5,464	5,044	N/A	4,345	3,170	6,007
Fillmore	1	5,900	5,800	5,700	5,600	5,300	N/A	4,900	4,750	5,675
Gage	1	4,996	5,034	4,552	4,564	3,923	3,936	3,625	3,600	4,556
Saline	2	5,022	5,021	4,929	4,545	4,268	3,650	3,645	3,535	4,709
Thayer	1	5,950	5,950	5,700	5,275	4,900	4,702	4,650	4,650	5,571
Jefferson	2	4,335	6,365	3,385	3,350	3,316	N/A	2,752	2,360	4,582
Gage	1	4,996	5,034	4,552	4,564	3,923	3,936	3,625	3,600	4,556
Thayer	2	5,150	5,150	4,900	4,500	4,125	N/A	3,850	3,850	4,568
Jefferson	3	4,300	4,951	3,665	2,875	3,470	N/A	2,960	2,530	3,808
Gage	1	4,996	5,034	4,552	4,564	3,923	3,936	3,625	3,600	4,556
Thayer	2	5,150	5,150	4,900	4,500	4,125	N/A	3,850	3,850	4,568

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Jefferson	1	3,800	4,959	2,990	3,692	3,155	N/A	2,935	1,650	3,954
Fillmore	1	3,555	3,515	3,415	3,365	3,214	N/A	2,922	2,855	3,405
Gage	1	3,500	3,500	3,100	2,900	2,650	2,650	2,175	2,175	2,832
Saline	2	4,058	4,056	3,773	3,704	3,591	3,150	3,146	3,020	3,768
Thayer	1	3,900	3,900	3,550	3,450	3,190	3,000	3,000	2,950	3,581
Jefferson	2	2,710	4,246	2,105	2,095	1,844	N/A	1,620	935	2,861
Gage	1	3,500	3,500	3,100	2,900	2,650	2,650	2,175	2,175	2,832
Thayer	2	2,900	2,900	2,750	2,650	2,550	2,382	2,350	2,325	2,674
Jefferson	3	2,530	2,905	2,155	1,690	1,735	N/A	1,215	1,000	2,009
Gage	1	3,500	3,500	3,100	2,900	2,650	2,650	2,175	2,175	2,832
Thayer	2	2,900	2,900	2,750	2,650	2,550	2,382	2,350	2,325	2,674

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Jefferson	1	1,968	2,634	1,686	2,199	1,205	N/A	1,948	715	1,508
Fillmore	1	1,260	1,240	1,180	1,120	1,107	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,087
Gage	1	1,077	1,554	1,341	1,575	1,270	1,072	1,128	785	1,165
Saline	2	1,616	1,826	1,464	1,863	1,770	515	1,535	1,048	1,397
Thayer	1	1,409	1,625	1,371	1,342	1,416	1,283	1,379	1,268	1,364
Jefferson	2	1,383	1,542	1,363	1,216	1,232	N/A	1,160	873	1,134
Gage	1	1,077	1,554	1,341	1,575	1,270	1,072	1,128	785	1,165
Thayer	2	1,290	1,390	1,248	1,242	1,358	N/A	1,234	1,190	1,242
Jefferson	3	1,330	1,547	1,220	1,216	1,232	N/A	1,169	955	1,086
Gage	1	1,077	1,554	1,341	1,575	1,270	1,072	1,128	785	1,165
Thayer	2	1,290	1,390	1,248	1,242	1,358	N/A	1,234	1,190	1,242

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

2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Jefferson County

County Overview

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The prevalent crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. The county land use is approximately 25% irrigated land, 43% dry land, 31% grass land and 1% other uses. Jefferson County is bordered on the north by Saline County, on the south by The State of Kansas, on the east by Gage County, and on the west by Thayer County. The agricultural land is valued using three market areas that are more fully described in the survey. Area 1, (the north fourth of the county) is about 57% irrigated crop land; Area 2, (the middle half of the county) has a mix of uses but is about 54% dry crop land; and Area 3, (the south fourth of the county) is about 59% grass land.

Description of Analysis

There was a total sample of 57 qualified sales; 48 Jefferson County sales supplemented with 9 additional qualified sales used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in the county. After supplementation, the sample was deemed adequate, proportional among study years and representative based on major land uses. Any comparable sales used were selected from a similar agricultural area within six miles of the subject county.

In this study, the 80% Majority Land Use Tables suggest that the irrigated land values for the county with 8 sales are high and for Area 1 with 7 sales are within the range; all that is really demonstrated is that the small size of the sample is unreliable and should not be used. The 80% Majority Land Use Tables suggest that the dry land values for the county with 17 sales are within the range and for Area 1 with 14 sales are slightly low. In these samples the distribution among the study years is mildly biased toward a lower median; the county dry land median of 70.09% with 17 sales has only 4 sales in the earliest study year, and the Area 2 dry land median of 66.17% with 14 sales has only 2 sales in the earliest study year; this indicates that both statistics, but particularly the Area 2 statistic are unreliable and should not be used. The 80% Majority Land Use Tables suggest that the grass land values for the county with a median ratio of 69.76% with 12 sales are within the range and for Area 3 with a median ratio of 73.25% with 8 sales are within the range; in this inference for grass, the county is reasonably balanced and may be reliable, but the Area 3 sample is small and biased toward a higher ratio with 4 of the 8 sales in the earliest study year. The county has made substantial changes to all of the values based on their analysis. The Department is not recommending any change to the values based on any major land use.

The calculated median ratio is 71%; the COD is 18.80 and the PRD is 100.37. The 2014 abstract reports; overall agricultural land increased by 16.96%; irrigated land increased by over 14%, dry land increased by over 18%, and grass land increased by over 23%. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values.

2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Jefferson County

Sales Qualification

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

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and unique practices for the analysis of agricultural values. Each year, the county verifies all of the new sales that take place. They update any changes to land use that are discovered or reported. They completely analyze and revalue all agricultural land within their own classification and valuation system. Jefferson County has an analysis process that breaks each sale down to the individual soil type. Values are prepared for each soil type but the majority of the values are the same across most LCGs. The major exception is the soils that classify as 1A, 1D, and 1G. There are 3 different values found in this group of soil types. The soil that drives this group is Crete (CE and CEA) which are two of the dominant soils in the county. The county's analysis continues to establish it as the most desired soil and thus the highest valued soil in the county. The quality of assessment for agricultural land while unique is still deemed acceptable.

Level of Value

For 2014, the apparent level of value of agricultural land is 71% and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. There are no strong indications of any major subclass outside the range. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

48 Jefferson**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 : 156
 Total Sales Price : 8,800,834
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,800,334
 Total Assessed Value : 8,256,837
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,412
 Avg. Assessed Value : 52,928

MEDIAN : 94
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 105
 COD : 29.95
 PRD : 112.42

COV : 39.81
 STD : 41.99
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 28.25
 MAX Sales Ratio : 297.56
 MIN Sales Ratio : 44.20

95% Median C.I. : 91.17 to 101.13
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.21 to 98.43
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.88 to 112.06

*Printed: 4/3/2014 2:37:54PM***DATE OF SALE ***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	111.57	111.49	116.41	22.74	95.77	47.73	163.37	86.73 to 141.10	40,470	47,113
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	12	92.96	112.23	91.27	38.79	122.96	62.66	237.37	74.66 to 154.55	50,042	45,672
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	24	101.29	117.59	95.54	38.34	123.08	58.45	297.56	82.52 to 123.17	39,638	37,872
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	31	93.02	94.86	93.56	23.99	101.39	44.20	162.55	79.33 to 116.00	60,929	57,008
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	16	111.33	128.34	108.33	30.01	118.47	66.50	258.92	93.95 to 154.69	39,144	42,404
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	16	84.15	89.85	84.45	20.62	106.39	59.55	142.93	74.22 to 102.86	85,188	71,942
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	22	83.08	87.68	86.14	17.60	101.79	56.15	133.63	76.25 to 97.58	72,207	62,200
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	21	95.65	112.49	96.69	32.21	116.34	45.36	207.01	89.31 to 148.21	57,871	55,958
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	81	96.43	107.04	96.92	31.52	110.44	44.20	297.56	90.50 to 114.11	49,471	47,948
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	75	93.25	103.76	91.24	27.68	113.72	45.36	258.92	87.99 to 102.05	63,909	58,307
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	83	99.02	110.40	95.96	32.44	115.05	44.20	297.56	92.83 to 113.69	48,999	47,020
<u>ALL</u>	156	94.32	105.47	93.82	29.95	112.42	44.20	297.56	91.17 to 101.13	56,412	52,928

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	110	94.81	105.85	93.37	31.22	113.37	44.20	262.81	89.31 to 103.36	52,186	48,727
08	9	121.02	141.42	124.16	34.47	113.90	82.24	297.56	89.44 to 207.01	48,722	60,493
11	14	91.79	94.58	90.52	12.03	104.49	75.17	123.67	81.43 to 116.78	122,214	110,633
12	18	92.05	98.37	88.09	28.98	111.67	45.36	162.55	75.31 to 123.17	44,800	39,466
15	5	93.95	88.29	89.64	09.85	98.49	71.78	99.50	N/A	20,797	18,643
<u>ALL</u>	156	94.32	105.47	93.82	29.95	112.42	44.20	297.56	91.17 to 101.13	56,412	52,928

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	156	94.32	105.47	93.82	29.95	112.42	44.20	297.56	91.17 to 101.13	56,412	52,928
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	156	94.32	105.47	93.82	29.95	112.42	44.20	297.56	91.17 to 101.13	56,412	52,928

48 Jefferson**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 : 156	MEDIAN : 94	COV : 39.81	95% Median C.I. : 91.17 to 101.13
Total Sales Price : 8,800,834	WGT. MEAN : 94	STD : 41.99	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.21 to 98.43
Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,800,334	MEAN : 105	Avg. Abs. Dev : 28.25	95% Mean C.I. : 98.88 to 112.06
Total Assessed Value : 8,256,837			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,412	COD : 29.95	MAX Sales Ratio : 297.56	
Avg. Assessed Value : 52,928	PRD : 112.42	MIN Sales Ratio : 44.20	

*Printed:4/3/2014 2:37:54PM***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	5	99.50	97.41	102.07	13.68	95.43	71.78	114.11	N/A	3,060	3,123
Less Than 15,000	24	120.53	134.84	139.74	33.74	96.49	47.73	262.81	99.50 to 154.69	9,479	13,246
Less Than 30,000	56	114.61	124.85	122.42	34.30	101.98	44.20	297.56	101.02 to 126.75	17,071	20,899
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	151	93.95	105.73	93.81	30.55	112.71	44.20	297.56	90.64 to 101.45	58,179	54,578
Greater Than 14,999	132	92.93	100.13	92.61	26.16	108.12	44.20	297.56	87.61 to 97.03	64,946	60,143
Greater Than 29,999	100	90.91	94.61	90.34	21.01	104.73	45.36	207.01	84.92 to 93.95	78,444	70,865
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	5	99.50	97.41	102.07	13.68	95.43	71.78	114.11	N/A	3,060	3,123
5,000 TO 14,999	19	126.68	144.69	142.46	34.76	101.57	47.73	262.81	108.96 to 177.04	11,168	15,910
15,000 TO 29,999	32	109.08	117.36	117.02	34.77	100.29	44.20	297.56	89.31 to 133.63	22,765	26,639
30,000 TO 59,999	42	94.38	101.45	100.18	25.19	101.27	45.36	207.01	83.96 to 103.94	41,840	41,917
60,000 TO 99,999	39	92.32	93.36	93.56	18.44	99.79	51.41	142.93	84.62 to 98.57	77,181	72,209
100,000 TO 149,999	9	81.43	80.93	79.80	14.59	101.42	59.90	116.00	60.71 to 94.68	120,722	96,334
150,000 TO 249,999	8	88.76	83.96	83.78	08.52	100.21	64.99	93.02	64.99 to 93.02	182,438	152,852
250,000 TO 499,999	2	79.59	79.59	79.09	17.40	100.63	65.74	93.44	N/A	265,500	209,995
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	156	94.32	105.47	93.82	29.95	112.42	44.20	297.56	91.17 to 101.13	56,412	52,928

48 Jefferson**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 : 4
 Total Sales Price : 122,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 122,500
 Total Assessed Value : 103,335
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,625
 Avg. Assessed Value : 25,834

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 84
 MEAN : 93
 COD : 22.44
 PRD : 110.51

COV : 33.15
 STD : 30.91
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.87
 MAX Sales Ratio : 131.11
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.84

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : 44.05 to 142.41

*Printed:4/3/2014 2:37:54PM***DATE OF SALE ***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	97.08	97.08	97.08	00.00	100.00	97.08	97.08	N/A	24,000	23,300
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											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	131.11	131.11	131.11	00.00	100.00	131.11	131.11	N/A	13,500	17,700
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	55.84	55.84	55.84	00.00	100.00	55.84	55.84	N/A	40,000	22,335
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	88.89	88.89	88.89	00.00	100.00	88.89	88.89	N/A	45,000	40,000
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	1	97.08	97.08	97.08	00.00	100.00	97.08	97.08	N/A	24,000	23,300
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	3	88.89	91.95	81.25	28.23	113.17	55.84	131.11	N/A	32,833	26,678
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	97.08	97.08	97.08	00.00	100.00	97.08	97.08	N/A	24,000	23,300
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12											
<u>ALL</u>	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	97.08	94.68	81.72	25.84	115.86	55.84	131.11	N/A	25,833	21,112
12	1	88.89	88.89	88.89	00.00	100.00	88.89	88.89	N/A	45,000	40,000
<u>ALL</u>	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834

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	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834
04											
<u>ALL</u>	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834

48 Jefferson
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 : 4	MEDIAN : 93	COV : 33.15	95% Median C.I. : N/A
Total Sales Price : 122,500	WGT. MEAN : 84	STD : 30.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
Total Adj. Sales Price : 122,500	MEAN : 93	Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.87	95% Mean C.I. : 44.05 to 142.41
Total Assessed Value : 103,335			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,625	COD : 22.44	MAX Sales Ratio : 131.11	
Avg. Assessed Value : 25,834	PRD : 110.51	MIN Sales Ratio : 55.84	

Printed: 4/3/2014 2:37:54PM

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											
Less Than 15,000	1	131.11	131.11	131.11	00.00	100.00	131.11	131.11	N/A	13,500	17,700
Less Than 30,000	2	114.10	114.10	109.33	14.92	104.36	97.08	131.11	N/A	18,750	20,500
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834
Greater Than 14,999	3	88.89	80.60	78.56	15.47	102.60	55.84	97.08	N/A	36,333	28,545
Greater Than 29,999	2	72.37	72.37	73.34	22.84	98.68	55.84	88.89	N/A	42,500	31,168
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	131.11	131.11	131.11	00.00	100.00	131.11	131.11	N/A	13,500	17,700
15,000 TO 29,999	1	97.08	97.08	97.08	00.00	100.00	97.08	97.08	N/A	24,000	23,300
30,000 TO 59,999	2	72.37	72.37	73.34	22.84	98.68	55.84	88.89	N/A	42,500	31,168
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
344	2	93.48	93.48	74.83	40.27	124.92	55.84	131.11	N/A	26,750	20,018
353	1	97.08	97.08	97.08	00.00	100.00	97.08	97.08	N/A	24,000	23,300
386	1	88.89	88.89	88.89	00.00	100.00	88.89	88.89	N/A	45,000	40,000
<u>ALL</u>	4	92.99	93.23	84.36	22.44	110.51	55.84	131.11	N/A	30,625	25,834

48 Jefferson**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 : 57
 Total Sales Price : 29,625,854
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,625,854
 Total Assessed Value : 20,882,065
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 519,752
 Avg. Assessed Value : 366,352

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 18.80
 PRD : 100.37

COV : 24.48
 STD : 17.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.37
 MAX Sales Ratio : 112.48
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.03

95% Median C.I. : 66.52 to 76.57
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.20 to 76.77
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.25 to 75.25

*Printed:4/3/2014 2:37:55PM***DATE OF SALE ***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	83.75	86.80	89.55	08.38	96.93	77.88	102.30	77.88 to 102.30	288,031	257,932
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	85.07	82.73	83.90	03.46	98.61	74.86	85.93	N/A	512,962	430,365
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	81.13	86.90	83.39	11.66	104.21	76.57	108.79	N/A	320,223	267,025
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	5	74.45	81.63	90.93	17.99	89.77	61.71	112.48	N/A	510,600	464,264
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	68.62	68.49	69.78	09.18	98.15	48.75	84.93	48.75 to 84.93	567,757	396,183
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	72.35	74.25	70.71	13.20	105.01	60.50	100.49	60.50 to 100.49	477,228	337,440
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	39.64	51.51	60.97	36.02	84.48	36.03	78.87	N/A	388,528	236,891
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	52.19	52.19	45.74	23.28	114.10	40.04	64.34	N/A	764,219	349,574
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	9	55.49	59.68	64.39	17.32	92.69	41.26	82.01	49.24 to 73.94	855,052	550,529
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	41.06	41.06	41.06	00.00	100.00	41.06	41.06	N/A	302,400	124,171
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	64.46	64.46	64.46	00.00	100.00	64.46	64.46	N/A	360,000	232,053
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	7	60.57	60.77	61.73	11.16	98.44	43.49	70.90	43.49 to 70.90	506,614	312,715
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	21	83.93	84.81	87.60	10.43	96.82	61.71	112.48	77.88 to 87.85	390,000	341,635
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	18	68.36	65.77	65.13	16.88	100.98	36.03	100.49	60.50 to 75.29	529,539	344,875
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	18	58.69	59.34	63.00	15.62	94.19	41.06	82.01	52.06 to 67.87	661,343	416,666
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	20	75.72	78.31	79.96	13.99	97.94	48.75	112.48	71.13 to 84.93	493,002	394,208
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	20	62.34	62.08	63.30	21.41	98.07	36.03	100.49	52.06 to 73.94	662,643	419,461
<u>ALL</u>	57	71.13	70.75	70.49	18.80	100.37	36.03	112.48	66.52 to 76.57	519,752	366,352

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	13	71.39	73.94	73.68	15.91	100.35	52.06	112.48	59.37 to 85.93	1,074,240	791,490
2	26	72.88	69.71	67.01	22.30	104.03	36.03	108.79	55.49 to 83.93	419,153	280,865
3	18	69.88	69.96	69.08	15.23	101.27	43.49	100.49	60.57 to 78.87	264,598	182,790
<u>ALL</u>	57	71.13	70.75	70.49	18.80	100.37	36.03	112.48	66.52 to 76.57	519,752	366,352

48 Jefferson
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 : 57
 Total Sales Price : 29,625,854
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,625,854
 Total Assessed Value : 20,882,065
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 519,752
 Avg. Assessed Value : 366,352

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 18.80
 PRD : 100.37

COV : 24.48
 STD : 17.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.37
 MAX Sales Ratio : 112.48
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.03

95% Median C.I. : 66.52 to 76.57
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.20 to 76.77
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.25 to 75.25

Printed:4/3/2014 2:37:55PM

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	2	61.73	61.73	62.69	15.66	98.47	52.06	71.39	N/A	2,065,000	1,294,452
1	2	61.73	61.73	62.69	15.66	98.47	52.06	71.39	N/A	2,065,000	1,294,452
_____Dry_____											
County	10	73.37	68.42	67.38	14.75	101.54	41.06	85.13	41.26 to 80.19	335,209	225,868
1	1	76.57	76.57	76.57	00.00	100.00	76.57	76.57	N/A	377,692	289,182
2	7	70.09	65.19	64.02	18.89	101.83	41.06	85.13	41.06 to 85.13	339,057	217,066
3	2	75.66	75.66	74.88	05.99	101.04	71.13	80.19	N/A	300,500	225,019
_____Grass_____											
County	10	68.36	69.24	69.25	12.29	99.99	55.91	88.40	58.00 to 82.36	198,965	137,774
1	2	63.05	63.05	62.73	08.01	100.51	58.00	68.09	N/A	221,826	139,154
2	1	70.90	70.90	70.90	00.00	100.00	70.90	70.90	N/A	60,000	42,539
3	7	68.62	70.77	71.12	14.68	99.51	55.91	88.40	55.91 to 88.40	212,286	150,985
_____ALL_____	57	71.13	70.75	70.49	18.80	100.37	36.03	112.48	66.52 to 76.57	519,752	366,352

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	8	77.66	77.80	73.28	18.99	106.17	52.06	112.48	52.06 to 112.48	1,250,388	916,247
1	7	71.39	76.93	72.57	21.10	106.01	52.06	112.48	52.06 to 112.48	1,339,986	972,415
2	1	83.93	83.93	83.93	00.00	100.00	83.93	83.93	N/A	623,200	523,067
_____Dry_____											
County	17	70.09	65.89	65.37	17.22	100.80	39.64	85.13	48.75 to 78.70	399,174	260,950
1	1	76.57	76.57	76.57	00.00	100.00	76.57	76.57	N/A	377,692	289,182
2	14	66.17	63.73	63.66	19.77	100.11	39.64	85.13	41.26 to 78.70	414,805	264,066
3	2	75.66	75.66	74.88	05.99	101.04	71.13	80.19	N/A	300,500	225,019
_____Grass_____											
County	12	69.76	72.80	73.56	15.28	98.97	55.91	102.30	60.50 to 82.36	234,825	172,730
1	2	63.05	63.05	62.73	08.01	100.51	58.00	68.09	N/A	221,826	139,154
2	2	86.60	86.60	94.39	18.13	91.75	70.90	102.30	N/A	119,125	112,445
3	8	73.25	71.78	73.48	13.79	97.69	55.91	88.40	55.91 to 88.40	267,000	196,195
_____ALL_____	57	71.13	70.75	70.49	18.80	100.37	36.03	112.48	66.52 to 76.57	519,752	366,352

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 7,080

Value : 1,332,434,291

Growth 12,522,711

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	367	932,946	21	149,317	141	828,670	529	1,910,933	
02. Res Improve Land	2,524	7,209,729	29	513,236	527	9,283,443	3,080	17,006,408	
03. Res Improvements	2,532	96,578,389	29	5,502,708	552	55,088,925	3,113	157,170,022	
04. Res Total	2,899	104,721,064	50	6,165,261	693	65,201,038	3,642	176,087,363	1,585,202
% of Res Total	79.60	59.47	1.37	3.50	19.03	37.03	51.44	13.22	12.66
05. Com UnImp Land	61	621,656	1	4,007	20	613,607	82	1,239,270	
06. Com Improve Land	339	3,430,618	10	488,414	31	556,639	380	4,475,671	
07. Com Improvements	345	34,740,410	10	2,472,833	69	16,276,729	424	53,489,972	
08. Com Total	406	38,792,684	11	2,965,254	89	17,446,975	506	59,204,913	6,783,870
% of Com Total	80.24	65.52	2.17	5.01	17.59	29.47	7.15	4.44	54.17
09. Ind UnImp Land	6	16,398	0	0	3	47,696	9	64,094	
10. Ind Improve Land	8	141,394	2	129,962	6	162,987	16	434,343	
11. Ind Improvements	8	1,826,351	2	529,192	6	5,336,282	16	7,691,825	
12. Ind Total	14	1,984,143	2	659,154	9	5,546,965	25	8,190,262	1,382,169
% of Ind Total	56.00	24.23	8.00	8.05	36.00	67.73	0.35	0.61	11.04
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	9	629,697	9	629,697	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	7	701,089	7	701,089	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	7	834,250	7	834,250	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	16	2,165,036	16	2,165,036	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.23	0.16	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,899	104,721,064	50	6,165,261	709	67,366,074	3,658	178,252,399	1,585,202
% of Res & Rec Total	79.25	58.75	1.37	3.46	19.38	37.79	51.67	13.38	12.66
Com & Ind Total	420	40,776,827	13	3,624,408	98	22,993,940	531	67,395,175	8,166,039
% of Com & Ind Total	79.10	60.50	2.45	5.38	18.46	34.12	7.50	5.06	65.21
17. Taxable Total	3,319	145,497,891	63	9,789,669	807	90,360,014	4,189	245,647,574	9,751,241
% of Taxable Total	79.23	59.23	1.50	3.99	19.26	36.78	59.17	18.44	77.87

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	6	406,453	4,778,277		0	0	0
20. Industrial	2	258,465	581,460		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		6	406,453	4,778,277
20. Industrial	0	0	0		2	258,465	581,460
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					8	664,918	5,359,737

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	263	37	80	380

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	21,890	2,043	678,757,263	2,044	678,779,153
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	880	332,261,137	880	332,261,137
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	847	75,746,427	847	75,746,427
30. Ag Total							2,891	1,086,786,717

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	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	1	0.20	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	17	16.43	164,300	17	16.43	164,300	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	522	530.91	5,308,100	522	530.91	5,308,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	527	0.00	40,673,518	527	0.00	40,673,518	0
34. HomeSite Total				544	547.34	46,145,918	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	177	501.12	611,645	177	501.12	611,645	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	783	2,815.47	5,004,130	783	2,815.47	5,004,130	
37. FarmSite Improvements	834	0.00	35,072,909	834	0.00	35,072,909	2,771,470
38. FarmSite Total				1,011	3,316.59	40,688,684	
39. Road & Ditches	2,470	6,702.75	0	2,471	6,702.95	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	37	390.62	441,695	37	390.62	441,695	
41. Total Section VI				1,555	10,957.50	87,276,297	2,771,470

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	26	2,501.45	3,658,433	26	2,501.45	3,658,433

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,358.79	2.71%	7,643,205	2.54%	5,625.01
46. 1A	25,375.71	50.57%	178,665,389	59.28%	7,040.80
47. 2A1	3,055.70	6.09%	13,519,483	4.49%	4,424.35
48. 2A	9,306.10	18.55%	50,848,422	16.87%	5,463.99
49. 3A1	5,608.23	11.18%	28,285,885	9.39%	5,043.64
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	4,322.36	8.61%	18,780,732	6.23%	4,345.02
52. 4A	1,149.50	2.29%	3,643,915	1.21%	3,170.00
53. Total	50,176.39	100.00%	301,387,031	100.00%	6,006.55
Dry					
54. 1D1	683.08	2.75%	2,595,704	2.64%	3,800.00
55. 1D	9,963.89	40.12%	49,414,545	50.32%	4,959.36
56. 2D1	1,063.14	4.28%	3,178,700	3.24%	2,989.92
57. 2D	5,814.73	23.41%	21,468,664	21.86%	3,692.12
58. 3D1	3,790.86	15.26%	11,961,797	12.18%	3,155.43
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,939.98	11.84%	8,628,963	8.79%	2,935.04
61. 4D	581.92	2.34%	960,168	0.98%	1,650.00
62. Total	24,837.60	100.00%	98,208,541	100.00%	3,954.03
Grass					
63. 1G1	203.23	1.80%	399,963	2.35%	1,968.03
64. 1G	787.54	6.97%	2,074,212	12.18%	2,633.79
65. 2G1	826.12	7.32%	1,392,432	8.18%	1,685.51
66. 2G	1,998.16	17.69%	4,393,284	25.81%	2,198.66
67. 3G1	1,789.03	15.84%	2,155,063	12.66%	1,204.60
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	2,062.12	18.26%	4,016,782	23.59%	1,947.89
70. 4G	3,627.05	32.12%	2,593,188	15.23%	714.96
71. Total	11,293.25	100.00%	17,024,924	100.00%	1,507.53
Irrigated Total	50,176.39	57.61%	301,387,031	72.32%	6,006.55
Dry Total	24,837.60	28.52%	98,208,541	23.56%	3,954.03
Grass Total	11,293.25	12.97%	17,024,924	4.09%	1,507.53
72. Waste	788.71	0.91%	145,940	0.04%	185.04
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	87,095.95	100.00%	416,766,436	100.00%	4,785.14

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,368.99	4.05%	5,934,235	3.83%	4,334.75
46. 1A	14,154.09	41.85%	90,086,950	58.12%	6,364.73
47. 2A1	2,612.51	7.72%	8,843,575	5.71%	3,385.09
48. 2A	7,099.08	20.99%	23,781,926	15.34%	3,350.00
49. 3A1	5,249.88	15.52%	17,406,794	11.23%	3,315.66
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	2,709.02	8.01%	7,455,736	4.81%	2,752.19
52. 4A	631.30	1.87%	1,489,868	0.96%	2,360.00
53. Total	33,824.87	100.00%	154,999,084	100.00%	4,582.40
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,769.70	4.29%	10,215,888	4.07%	2,710.00
55. 1D	34,292.78	39.06%	145,612,365	57.99%	4,246.15
56. 2D1	5,885.33	6.70%	12,390,403	4.93%	2,105.30
57. 2D	19,661.14	22.40%	41,190,285	16.40%	2,095.01
58. 3D1	15,357.39	17.49%	28,321,608	11.28%	1,844.17
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	7,498.92	8.54%	12,146,034	4.84%	1,619.70
61. 4D	1,320.20	1.50%	1,234,504	0.49%	935.09
62. Total	87,785.46	100.00%	251,111,087	100.00%	2,860.51
Grass					
63. 1G1	416.89	1.01%	576,603	1.23%	1,383.11
64. 1G	2,781.32	6.75%	4,288,063	9.17%	1,541.74
65. 2G1	3,073.02	7.46%	4,188,447	8.96%	1,362.97
66. 2G	7,860.14	19.08%	9,560,101	20.45%	1,216.28
67. 3G1	7,079.09	17.18%	8,722,935	18.66%	1,232.21
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	6,780.69	16.46%	7,868,849	16.84%	1,160.48
70. 4G	13,212.06	32.07%	11,533,695	24.68%	872.97
71. Total	41,203.21	100.00%	46,738,693	100.00%	1,134.35
Irrigated Total	33,824.87	20.38%	154,999,084	34.18%	4,582.40
Dry Total	87,785.46	52.90%	251,111,087	55.38%	2,860.51
Grass Total	41,203.21	24.83%	46,738,693	10.31%	1,134.35
72. Waste	3,127.91	1.88%	578,731	0.13%	185.02
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	165,941.45	100.00%	453,427,595	100.00%	2,732.46

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	569.11	17.76%	2,447,173	20.05%	4,300.00
46. 1A	825.54	25.76%	4,087,380	33.49%	4,951.16
47. 2A1	248.67	7.76%	911,377	7.47%	3,665.01
48. 2A	411.06	12.83%	1,181,802	9.68%	2,875.01
49. 3A1	465.20	14.51%	1,614,244	13.23%	3,470.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	531.03	16.57%	1,571,849	12.88%	2,960.00
52. 4A	154.50	4.82%	390,885	3.20%	2,530.00
53. Total	3,205.11	100.00%	12,204,710	100.00%	3,807.89
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,690.74	8.80%	6,807,576	11.09%	2,530.00
55. 1D	7,673.32	25.11%	22,287,214	36.30%	2,904.51
56. 2D1	2,036.10	6.66%	4,387,229	7.15%	2,154.72
57. 2D	7,400.15	24.21%	12,506,254	20.37%	1,690.00
58. 3D1	4,978.62	16.29%	8,637,724	14.07%	1,734.96
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	4,610.84	15.09%	5,601,746	9.12%	1,214.91
61. 4D	1,170.81	3.83%	1,170,510	1.91%	999.74
62. Total	30,560.58	100.00%	61,398,253	100.00%	2,009.07
Grass					
63. 1G1	429.16	0.84%	570,657	1.03%	1,329.71
64. 1G	1,524.25	2.99%	2,358,003	4.25%	1,546.99
65. 2G1	1,149.51	2.25%	1,402,599	2.53%	1,220.17
66. 2G	5,182.94	10.15%	6,301,970	11.36%	1,215.91
67. 3G1	7,073.44	13.85%	8,711,016	15.71%	1,231.51
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	9,468.59	18.55%	11,071,809	19.96%	1,169.32
70. 4G	26,227.67	51.37%	25,047,327	45.16%	955.00
71. Total	51,055.56	100.00%	55,463,381	100.00%	1,086.33
Irrigated Total	3,205.11	3.72%	12,204,710	9.44%	3,807.89
Dry Total	30,560.58	35.51%	61,398,253	47.48%	2,009.07
Grass Total	51,055.56	59.32%	55,463,381	42.89%	1,086.33
72. Waste	1,186.76	1.38%	219,595	0.17%	185.04
73. Other	60.90	0.07%	30,450	0.02%	500.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	86,068.91	100.00%	129,316,389	100.00%	1,502.48

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	87,206.37	468,590,825	87,206.37	468,590,825
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	10.30	20,112	143,173.34	410,697,769	143,183.64	410,717,881
78. Grass	0.00	0	1.50	1,778	103,550.52	119,225,220	103,552.02	119,226,998
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,103.38	944,266	5,103.38	944,266
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	60.90	30,450	60.90	30,450
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	11.80	21,890	339,094.51	999,488,530	339,106.31	999,510,420

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	87,206.37	25.72%	468,590,825	46.88%	5,373.36
Dry Land	143,183.64	42.22%	410,717,881	41.09%	2,868.47
Grass	103,552.02	30.54%	119,226,998	11.93%	1,151.37
Waste	5,103.38	1.50%	944,266	0.09%	185.03
Other	60.90	0.02%	30,450	0.00%	500.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	339,106.31	100.00%	999,510,420	100.00%	2,947.48

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

48 Jefferson

	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	171,518,945	176,087,363	4,568,418	2.66%	1,585,202	1.74%
02. Recreational	1,924,969	2,165,036	240,067	12.47%	0	12.47%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	44,911,355	46,145,918	1,234,563	2.75%	0	2.75%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	218,355,269	224,398,317	6,043,048	2.77%	1,585,202	2.04%
05. Commercial	52,932,718	59,204,913	6,272,195	11.85%	6,783,870	-0.97%
06. Industrial	6,808,093	8,190,262	1,382,169	20.30%	1,382,169	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	38,393,897	40,688,684	2,294,787	5.98%	2,771,470	-1.24%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	98,134,708	108,083,859	9,949,151	10.14%	10,937,509	-1.01%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	316,489,977	332,923,871	16,433,894	5.19%	12,522,711	1.24%
11. Irrigated	409,345,528	468,590,825	59,245,297	14.47%		
12. Dryland	347,000,973	410,717,881	63,716,908	18.36%		
13. Grassland	96,875,092	119,226,998	22,351,906	23.07%		
14. Wasteland	882,704	944,266	61,562	6.97%		
15. Other Agland	455,290	30,450	-424,840	-93.31%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	854,559,587	999,510,420	144,950,833	16.96%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,171,049,564	1,332,434,291	161,384,727	13.78%	12,522,711	12.71%

**2013 Plan of Assessment for Jefferson County
Assessment Years 2014, 2015, and 2016**

Date: June 13, 2013

Yellow highlighted areas were amended on October 21, 2013

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. Section 77-1311.02, on or before June 15 each year, the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201, R. S. Supp., 2006.

General Description of Real Property in Jefferson County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels
Residential	3661	52%
Commercial	482	7%
Industrial	25	<1%
Recreational	17	<1%
Agricultural	2878	41%
T.I.F.	7	
Exempt	381	
Game & Parks	26	

Agricultural land -- 338,851.58 acres

New Property: For assessment year 2013, an estimated 153 building permits and 42 improvement information statements were filed for new property construction/additions, demolitions, land use changes, etc., in the county. The office mailed out 445 Homestead Exemptions to applicants who filed the previous year and 1,171 Personal Property Returns were mailed. The county added one new T.I.F. project in 2013.

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

The Jefferson County Assessor's office staff currently consists of the assessor, 1 full time lister/ GIS specialist, 1 full time clerk and 1 part time clerk who is scheduled to work 16 hours per week. Office budget for 2012 -2013 was \$147,690. This was the second consecutive year that the budget was decreased from the previous year. Employee benefits, such as health insurance, retirement, etc., are funded by county general rather than through the assessor's budget. Official estimation for 2013-2014 fiscal year budget was \$ 154,864. Board proposed and adopted a budget of \$152,694. This will be the third consecutive year for a budget decrease.

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

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

B. Cadastral Maps

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

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

Aerial photos were flown by Pictometry after Thanksgiving 2012 and into early December 2012. A six year contract was signed September 2010 with Pictometry International Corporation. The contract will run through the fall of 2015 and include 2 flights. As the new photos were not completely loaded into the system until after the first of the year, the ability to do a split screen change print and the change finder not being available until this spring, the 2012 aerial photos were not used for the 2013 assessment year. The office has utilized Google, GIS and FSA photos as tools in the assessment process as well as on site inspections.

County wide zoning regulations were adopted August 1, 2001 and amended March 12, 2013. The villages of Plymouth and Diller also have zoning as does Fairbury. Permits are to be faxed, emailed or mailed to the Assessor's office in a timely manner. Letters are mailed on or about August 1 to each Village clerk to remind them to forward permits to the office on before September 1. The Village of Jansen implemented zoning in 2013 but they do not issue permits.

C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards are kept for taxable residential, commercial, industrial, improvements on leased land, TIF, partially exempt, permissive exempt, government exempt and centrally assessed parcels. Each card has legal description, book and page of last deed recorded in the last 5 years, current owner name and address, situs address of parcel, cadastral map book and page, current property classification code, tax district code and the current plus one or more years of assessed land value and improvements. The exception would be for properties that receive an exemption.

Each record card with buildings contains a photo, sketch of the house, and aerial photographs, if available. The front of the card has a parcel identification number, school district codes, history of valuation changes, codes for reason of valuation change, status, property type, zoning, location, city size and parcel size.

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

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

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property

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

Building permits are received from the Jefferson County zoning manager, the Fairbury zoning administrator, and the village clerks of Plymouth and Diller. Permits are not received from Jansen as they do not issue them. Letters are sent every August to remind all village clerks to forward permits to the office and what should be reported if a permit is not required. The County Assessor and staff inspect

other small towns, by driving each street and alley of the town to verify if any changes have been made. The appropriate real estate cards are tabbed for review that we receive a permit, improvement information statement or discover changes for.

B. Data Collection

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

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

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

D. Approaches to Value

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

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

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

On or before June 1 of each year, notices are mailed to all land owners that have had either an increase or decrease in value from the previous assessment year. Any changes made after March 19th are made by the County Board of Equalization. Approximately 3140 notice of valuation changes were mailed for the 2013 assessment year.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2013:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	97%	30.28	113.72
Commercial	NEI		
Agricultural	73%	20.13	110.05

For assessment years 2011, 2012 and 2013, the PAD recommended to TERC that a level of value for commercial property be rendered “not enough information” to establish statistics.

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2013 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential:

Finish, by March 19, 2014, the review of any area that is needed to comply with the 6-year review cycle. All small towns and Fairbury will have house sheets ran on the 2008 GIS costing prior to conversion to the MIPS Version II program. Cost table will be updated to 2013 with this conversion process. Areas that show a need for adjustment, based on their statistics, will be reviewed and valuations changed according to sales study. All pick up work of reported or discovered changes to parcels will be physically reviewed. Photos, sketches, etc., will be updated as needed.

Commercial:

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

Agricultural Land:

Verification of rural sales is done by phone, in person, letters and questionnaires with buyer, seller, auctioneer or realtor and occasionally an attorney may be contacted. A yearly review of all agricultural sales within the study period as set forth by TERC and PAD is done to determine any changes in land value according to the market in Jefferson County. The study of agricultural

land sales is done by breaking each sale down by total number of acres, soil type and land use in each parcel sold. Using this study the weighted average value per acre is determined. If there were no sales of a certain type of soil, the value is determined by using values within the same land classification. Our three neighborhoods are also reviewed to determine if changes in area lines need to be made to keep equality in the valuations for Jefferson County. All land use changes reported are verified and files are changed to reflect current land use. New FSA maps are requested from property owners and the GIS system and County Solutions are changed accordingly.

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

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

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

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

Staff will continue updating and correcting information on GIS layers and will probably add more layers and information as it is collected. It is also planned to link County GIS systems, so information obtained from other offices will be shared with information on GIS layers.

The Jefferson County Assessor's office will be converting to the MIPS Version II for residential and commercial costing programs plus administrative and CAMA packages for 2014. We will retain the APEX sketch program at an additional cost. Retaining the APEX program will allow staff to make changes to sketches without having to redraw the entire sketch. The conversion took place on September 3, 2013. It has not been a smooth transition with lot of additional staff time need for data entry of information that did transfer from the old system to the new. We are also learning the new system which is quite different from the previous one. No manual is available at this time, even though it has been requested the last two years at workshop.

October 3, 2013 I received a letter from Denny Donner on behalf of the Tax Commissioner indicating documentation was poor and lacking for compliance with the six-year inspection and review requirement. I was asked to develop an alternative procedure and notify my field liaison and Mr. Donner, in writing, of the procedure. I am currently working on that procedure and will implement that in my 3 year plan of assessment next year

Assessment Actions Planned for 2015

Residential:

Begin to review aerial photos taken in fall 2013 by pictometry and make necessary changes on our real estate cards after they have been physically inspected. Run new cost sheets as needed. Physically inspect and list all new or changed construction and update all records accordingly.

Commercial:

Review depreciation.

Run new cost sheets, as needed.

Study sales statistics to determine if any changes need to be made.

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

Agricultural Land:

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

Review neighborhood boundaries.

Make all known changes to land use.

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

Run new irrigation listing for Jefferson County from Internet

Continue updating the GIS system.

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016

Residential:

Complete the review of aerial photos taken in fall 2013 by pictometry and make necessary changes on our real estate cards after they have been physically inspected. Run new cost sheets as needed. Physically inspect and list all new or changed construction and update all records accordingly.

Review statistics to determine what other towns or subclasses may need to be reviewed.

Commercial:

Review sales study statistics

Physically review properties to comply with the 6 year cycle.

Staff appraiser to help with this physical review and to do pickup work

Agricultural Land:

Study sales statistics

Update valuations according to sales analysis

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

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

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

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

Abstract of Assessment for Real Property

Assessor Survey

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

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

School District Taxable Value Report

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

Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate

Amended Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate (as needed)

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

Three Year Plan of Assessment

3. Administer annual personal property filings. For 2012 there were 980 schedules on the tax roll and 1,171 schedules were sent out for 2013. Prepare schedules for mailing to anyone who filed the previous year and anyone that the office feels may need to file. Prepare notices of change, unsigned schedule notices, reminder of schedules due, and penalty notices. Help people review and complete schedule mailed to them. Contact personal property owner as needed to obtain more information regarding the filed personal property. Obtain the federal depreciation worksheet, whenever possible, to verify all equipment reported for personal property.

4. Permissive Exemption Application (Form 451) or Statement of Reaffirmation of Tax Exemption (Form 451A) are prepared and mailed to the previous years' applicant. Reminder

notices are mailed on or about Dec 1 to any applicant that has not returned their form. Review and make recommendations to county board. Attend all hearings for permissive exemption applications.

5. Taxable Government Owned Property – make an annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax on or before March 1st of each year and attend protest hearing if entity files a protest.

6. Homestead Exemption Applications and Income Statements – 445 applications were mailed out for 2013 to people who had filed in 2012. For 2012 we had 419 approved applications and 25 disapproved. Taxpayer assistance is given at the counter and over the phone. Applications are processed as to ownership and verified that forms are filled out properly. The Assessor approves or disapproves the owner/occupancy requirements and signs the application. Original exemption form and income statement are forwarded to PAD. A copy of the exemption application and income statement are returned to applicant after the current valuation is entered on the form. Assessor's office retains a copy of the application only. Reminder notices are sent to applicants that haven't filed by June 1.

7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records for each subdivision taxed to each company and tax billing for tax list given the County Treasurer.

8. Tax Increment Financing (T.I.F.) – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Two parcels for each TIF property, one real estate card with the base value and one for the excess value of the property are maintained. Copies of the applications are forwarded to PAD and county treasurer.

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

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

11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval and file with County Clerk and County Treasurer.

12. County Board of Equalization – attends county board of equalization meetings, hearings for valuation protests & permissive exemptions; assemble and provide information on behalf of the assessor's office.

13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC and defend valuation as determined by the Assessor. If the taxpayer is appealing a valuation set by the County Board of Equalization, the board will defend the value.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature *Vicki L. Haskell* Date June 13, 2013
Vicki L. Haskell

2014 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	2
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$154,864
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$152,694 --all health care, retirement and social security costs are paid from county general.
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$50,000 controlled by commissioners for projects and other appraisal contracts
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	0; computer costs now come entirely from the county general budget
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,500; --This fund is also for all dues (IAAO, S.E. Assessors Association, and NACO), newspaper subscriptions and other publications, Marshal Swift books and updates, and any newspaper ads from the assessor's office.
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$16,866.39

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	County Solutions --Moved to the new V2 system during 2013
2.	CAMA software:
	County Solutions --Also uses the Apex sketch program.
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	No; but there is public access to the records through NACO's Taxes On Line, and Assessors Online.
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and Staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

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

D. Contracted Services

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

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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

2014 Certification for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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

