

# **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 Loup County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	13	Median	96.80
Total Sales Price	\$1,602,008	Mean	101.60
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,572,008	Wgt. Mean	88.86
Total Assessed Value	\$1,396,840	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$45,872
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$120,924	Avg. Assessed Value	\$107,449

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.62 to 101.90
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	83.10 to 94.62
95% Mean C.I	82.96 to 120.24
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	11.30
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.69
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.30

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	12		69.81
2012	10		68.96
2011	27	95	95
2010	31	92	92

## 2014 Commission Summary for Loup County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	2	Median	85.70
Total Sales Price	\$262,500	Mean	85.70
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$262,500	Wgt. Mean	89.27
Total Assessed Value	\$234,330	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$45,615
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$131,250	Avg. Assessed Value	\$117,165

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	-4.14 to 175.54
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	0.77
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.06
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	15.57

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	2		65.47
2012	2		65.61
2011	2		56
2010	4	100	67



## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Loup 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	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

*\*\*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, appearing to read "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

For 2014, all residential properties were reviewed online in 2013 to meet the six year physical inspection criteria. All were repriced using the September 2012 Marshall & Swift Residential Express pricing program and new effective ages and appropriate locational and physical depreciations applied. Preliminary notices were sent in October allowing all property owners a chance to meet with Referee Bill Kaiser. All new improvements will be added to the 2014 tax rolls and any properties not on at full value for 2013 will be added at 100% or the percentage complete as of January 1, 2014. A very small number of sales and low sale prices continues to be a problem.

Residential properties within the market area designated as Calamus Lake Area MH (Mobile Home) and Calamus Lake Area SB (Stick Built) were reviewed online in 2013 to meet the six year physical inspection criteria. All these properties were also repriced using the September 2012 Marshall & Swift Residential Express pricing program or in the case of mobile homes, a pricing sheet in Microsoft Work using Marshall Swift data. Preliminary notices were sent allowing all property owners to meet with Referee Bill Kaiser. Lot values were reviewed and changed in some subdivisions. Any new construction will be added to the 2014 tax rolls at the percentage complete and those properties not on a full value for 2013 will be put on at 100% or the level of value complete as of January 1, 2014.

If necessary, the Loup County Assessor does send questionnaires and/or visits with the buyer and/or seller. Personally questioning continues to be a better source of information than mailing a form to be completed by the buyer/seller. Due to the size of the county, the assessor many times has information concerning the sale before it occurs. Should any unusual circumstances affect the sale price, the assessor notes same on the Form 521 and determines whether said sale can be used in the sales file, needs to be adjusted or should be coded out.



## 2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Loup County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>														
	County assessor, part-time local lister														
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>														
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%; 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>Calamus Lake Area MH - This includes the three mobile home subdivisions (Mike's Meadows #1, #2 and #3) within in view of the Calamus Lake. It also includes any rural residential sites with mobile homes located within the Calamus Lake area.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Calamus Lake Area SB - This valuation group includes all "stick built" homes located within the following Calamus Lake subdivisions (Aggie's Acres #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7, Glenridge, Quail Ridge, Moses Shoals, and Goodenow). Any rural residential sites with stick built homes located in this area are included in this valuation grouping.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Calamus Lake Area Vacant - This includes all vacant lots within the foregoing Calamus Lake Subdivisions and any unimproved rural residential sites in this area.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Loup River - All improved and unimproved properties bordering the North Loup River are included in this grouping. At this time a very, very small number of sales occur as these lands are owned by farm and ranches and they are not willing to sell these properties.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Rural - This grouping includes all improved and unimproved properties located in rural areas of the county which are not associated with agricultural land/farm/farm home/farm sites. Sales within the unincorporated Village of Almeria are included in this group.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td> <td>Taylor - All improved and unimproved properties within the Village of Taylor are included in this grouping. Said village is located along Highway 183 and Highway 91 and while small, boasts the following businesses and/or government properties: Loup County Public Schools (K-12), post office, bank, bar/grill, city park, county courthouse, Region #26 dispatch center, and a recently opened gift shop.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Calamus Lake Area MH - This includes the three mobile home subdivisions (Mike's Meadows #1, #2 and #3) within in view of the Calamus Lake. It also includes any rural residential sites with mobile homes located within the Calamus Lake area.	02	Calamus Lake Area SB - This valuation group includes all "stick built" homes located within the following Calamus Lake subdivisions (Aggie's Acres #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7, Glenridge, Quail Ridge, Moses Shoals, and Goodenow). Any rural residential sites with stick built homes located in this area are included in this valuation grouping.	03	Calamus Lake Area Vacant - This includes all vacant lots within the foregoing Calamus Lake Subdivisions and any unimproved rural residential sites in this area.	04	Loup River - All improved and unimproved properties bordering the North Loup River are included in this grouping. At this time a very, very small number of sales occur as these lands are owned by farm and ranches and they are not willing to sell these properties.	05	Rural - This grouping includes all improved and unimproved properties located in rural areas of the county which are not associated with agricultural land/farm/farm home/farm sites. Sales within the unincorporated Village of Almeria are included in this group.	06	Taylor - All improved and unimproved properties within the Village of Taylor are included in this grouping. Said village is located along Highway 183 and Highway 91 and while small, boasts the following businesses and/or government properties: Loup County Public Schools (K-12), post office, bank, bar/grill, city park, county courthouse, Region #26 dispatch center, and a recently opened gift shop.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>														
01	Calamus Lake Area MH - This includes the three mobile home subdivisions (Mike's Meadows #1, #2 and #3) within in view of the Calamus Lake. It also includes any rural residential sites with mobile homes located within the Calamus Lake area.														
02	Calamus Lake Area SB - This valuation group includes all "stick built" homes located within the following Calamus Lake subdivisions (Aggie's Acres #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7, Glenridge, Quail Ridge, Moses Shoals, and Goodenow). Any rural residential sites with stick built homes located in this area are included in this valuation grouping.														
03	Calamus Lake Area Vacant - This includes all vacant lots within the foregoing Calamus Lake Subdivisions and any unimproved rural residential sites in this area.														
04	Loup River - All improved and unimproved properties bordering the North Loup River are included in this grouping. At this time a very, very small number of sales occur as these lands are owned by farm and ranches and they are not willing to sell these properties.														
05	Rural - This grouping includes all improved and unimproved properties located in rural areas of the county which are not associated with agricultural land/farm/farm home/farm sites. Sales within the unincorporated Village of Almeria are included in this group.														
06	Taylor - All improved and unimproved properties within the Village of Taylor are included in this grouping. Said village is located along Highway 183 and Highway 91 and while small, boasts the following businesses and/or government properties: Loup County Public Schools (K-12), post office, bank, bar/grill, city park, county courthouse, Region #26 dispatch center, and a recently opened gift shop.														
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>														
	The market of sales approach is used by separating each sale of residential properties into comparable groups to further analyze sales of similar recently sold properties. While said information is not located within the property record cards, due to lack of space in the fire proof file cabinet, it can be accessed by interested individuals desiring to obtain the data. The sales comparison approach, as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties, is used to arrive at a value for the subject property.														
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>														
	Loup County does not have a CAMA vendor so depreciation studies were developed based on local market information.														
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>														
	Yes														

6.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																												
	<p>The Market and Sales Comparison Approach was used to determine residential lot values for the Village of Taylor. A square foot value was established, based on sales, and applied with \$1000 being added for a well on improved lots as the Village of does not have city water but does have city sewer. The same method is applied to the lake subdivision lots. Unsold vacant lots within the Calamus Lake Area receive a “developer discount”. The “developer discount” is arrived at with the appraiser ascertaining the selling price the developer would realize for the entire remaining unsold development as a whole. The number of unsold lots is then divided into this price to determine the “developer discount” per said lot. Once sold, the lots go to full value and once improved, \$5000 is added to the lot value for water/sewer. Lot values were established in the same method as above for the 2014 assessment year and the amount to be added for a well in the Village of Taylor and for water/sewer in the Calamus Lake area was reviewed to see if said amount needed to be increased or decreased. It was determined that said added value should remain the same.</p>																												
7.	<table><tr><th><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th><th><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th><th><u>Date of Costing</u></th><th><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th></tr><tr><td>01</td><td>2012</td><td>9/2012</td><td>2013</td></tr><tr><td>02</td><td>2012</td><td>9/2012</td><td>2013</td></tr><tr><td>03</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>2013</td></tr><tr><td>04</td><td>2012</td><td>9/2012</td><td>2013</td></tr><tr><td>05</td><td>2012</td><td>9/2012</td><td>2013</td></tr><tr><td>06</td><td>2012</td><td>9/2012</td><td>2013</td></tr></table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	01	2012	9/2012	2013	02	2012	9/2012	2013	03	N/A	N/A	2013	04	2012	9/2012	2013	05	2012	9/2012	2013	06	2012	9/2012	2013
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>																										
01	2012	9/2012	2013																										
02	2012	9/2012	2013																										
03	N/A	N/A	2013																										
04	2012	9/2012	2013																										
05	2012	9/2012	2013																										
06	2012	9/2012	2013																										

# **2014 Residential Correlation Section For Loup County**

---

## **County Overview**

Loup County is located in north central Nebraska on the junction of HWY's 183 and 91 with a total county population of approximately 589 (estimated 2012 census). The county seat Taylor is the only incorporated town in the county with a population of 179 (estimated 2012 census). Taylor has a K-12 public school system, bank, some services and retail trade. Taylor is experiencing an erratic market with unstable economic conditions. The Calamus Lake is located on the eastern side of the county running from northwest to southeast. There are several subdivisions located at the lake with the majority of the residential sales being for vacant lots around the lake.

## **Description of Analysis**

There are only 13 qualified sales in the residential sample. Six valuation groupings have been identified with differing market influences. All residential properties were reviewed with updated 2012 Marshall Swift costing and new depreciation tables for 2014.

The overall measure of central tendency based on thirteen residential sales will not be used as the point estimate in determining the level of value for the residential class of property in Loup County. The total residential parcel counts were gathered and analyzed for each valuation group. Through this analysis it was determined the sales file sample is not representative of the population as a whole. The thirteen sales are divided between three different valuation groups. With a limited number of sales such a small sample would not be considered adequate for statistical reliability.

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

## **Sales Qualification**

A review of the non-qualified sales roster demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes for the reasons for exclusion from the qualified sales roster. 81% of the improved residential sales were considered arms-length sales. Measurement was done utilizing all available information; there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

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

## **2014 Residential Correlation Section For Loup County**

---

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

### **Level of Value**

The sale information for the residential class of property is unreliable to indicate a level of value. However, because the county's assessment practices have been investigated and determined to be acceptable, it has also been determined to be at the statutory level of 100% for the residential class of property.



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

Commercial sites were reviewed online meeting the six year physical inspection criteria in 2013. The properties have been repriced using the latest Marshall and Swift pricing and depreciations applied with little change in value due to lack of reliable sales data and the extremely low number of sales. Many of the commercial properties have been purchased by private individuals and are being used for storage. While there has been no new construction of commercial properties, a commercial property at the Calamus Lake has been changed and the increased value will be placed on the 2014 tax rolls.

## 2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Loup County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>								
	County Assessor, part-time local lister.								
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>								
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <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;">03</td><td>Calamus Lake Area - This includes all commercial properties located at or near the proximity of the Calamus Lake, whether located in a subdivision or within the immediate lake area.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td><td>Rural - All improved and unimproved commercial properties in the rural areas of Loup County.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td><td>Taylor - This includes all commercial properties within the Village of Taylor and within a one mile radius. The 2010 census assesses the population of the village at 190 (up from the 186 noted in the 2000 census). Highways 183 and 91 divide the town. Businesses include a bar/grill and the bank. The K-12 school is located on the southwest edge of town. A post office (whose hours will be cut in 2014) and the Region #26 dispatch center which serves eight counties is located around the town square (city park).</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	03	Calamus Lake Area - This includes all commercial properties located at or near the proximity of the Calamus Lake, whether located in a subdivision or within the immediate lake area.	05	Rural - All improved and unimproved commercial properties in the rural areas of Loup County.	06	Taylor - This includes all commercial properties within the Village of Taylor and within a one mile radius. The 2010 census assesses the population of the village at 190 (up from the 186 noted in the 2000 census). Highways 183 and 91 divide the town. Businesses include a bar/grill and the bank. The K-12 school is located on the southwest edge of town. A post office (whose hours will be cut in 2014) and the Region #26 dispatch center which serves eight counties is located around the town square (city park).
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>								
03	Calamus Lake Area - This includes all commercial properties located at or near the proximity of the Calamus Lake, whether located in a subdivision or within the immediate lake area.								
05	Rural - All improved and unimproved commercial properties in the rural areas of Loup County.								
06	Taylor - This includes all commercial properties within the Village of Taylor and within a one mile radius. The 2010 census assesses the population of the village at 190 (up from the 186 noted in the 2000 census). Highways 183 and 91 divide the town. Businesses include a bar/grill and the bank. The K-12 school is located on the southwest edge of town. A post office (whose hours will be cut in 2014) and the Region #26 dispatch center which serves eight counties is located around the town square (city park).								
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>								
	The market or sales approach is used by separating each sale of commercial properties into comparable groups to further analyze sales of similar recently sold properties. While said information is not contained in the property record cards, due to lack of space in the fire proof file cabinet, it is easily to anyone who would like to peruse the information. The sales comparison approach as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties is used to arrive at a value for the subject property. Lack of sales continues to be a problem.								
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>								
	Loup County has no properties which I would describe as unique.								
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>								
	Loup County does not use a CAMA vendor, therefore depreciation studies are based on local market information.								
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>								
	Yes, individual depreciation tables are developed for each valuation grouping.								
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>								
	The market and sales comparison approach to value is used by separating each sale of unimproved commercial lots (extremely limited number) into comparable groups to further analyze sales of similar sold properties within the current study period. The sales comparison approach, as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties, is used to arrive at the value for a subject property.								

7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	03	2013	1/2014	2013
	05	2013	1/2014	2013
	06	2013	1/2014	2013



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

---

### **County Overview**

Loup County is located in north central Nebraska on the junction of HWY's 183 and 91. The county seat Taylor is the only incorporated town in the county with a population of 179 (estimated 2012 census). The commercial properties are mainly empty buildings no longer operating as a business and the buildings are generally purchased for storage. The Calamus Lake is located on the eastern side of the county running from northwest to southeast. There are several residential subdivisions located at the lake, however there is little to no commercial market.

### **Description of Analysis**

The commercial parcels in Loup County are represented by 16 different occupancy codes with the majority consisting of one parcel. There were only two commercial sales during this study period, the sample is considered unrepresentative of the population as a whole.

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

### **Sales Qualification**

The Loup County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. Because of these job responsibilities the assessor is in a unique position to verify sales. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

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

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

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

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

---

### **Level of Value**

The sale information for the commercial class of property is unreliable to indicate a level of value. However, because the county's assessment practices have been investigated and determined to be acceptable, it has also been determined to be at the statutory level of 100% for the commercial class of property.



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

For assessment year 2014, the Loup County Assessor reviewed the agricultural land sales falling within the appropriate time frame. Adjustments were removed from sales and some sales which had been previously coded out were added back into the sales file. Sales which required additional information due to possible mitigating circumstances or signs of outside influences were reviewed with by phone or in person with the buyer and/or seller or if this method was not possible, by written questionnaire.

The assessor used sales, unimproved and minimally improved combined, to determine that all classes of grass, dry, irrigated, waste and shelterbelts required a raise to achieve the statutory statistical median. Not all classes within the valuation groupings of irrigated, dry and grass received the same percentage of raise. The following raises are an average per class: irrigated - +18%, dryland - +25%, grass - +7%, waste - +37% and shelterbelts from 55 to 200 per acre. New land values will be applied and notices sent for 2014.

All house and newer buildings were repriced in 2013 for 2014 using the September 2012 Marshall & Swift pricing and appropriate depreciations applied. All sites were inspected online (using Google Earth and/or ArcGIS). If any changes were noted, a physical inspection was scheduled. Preliminary notices were sent in October allowing all those affected to meet with Referee Bill Kaiser. New house/buildings values will be placed on the 2014 tax rolls.

The assessor maps sales on a county map which includes acres sold the location of the property on the map, the percentage of land use, and the price per acre. She posts this in her office and includes it with the valuation notice mailing. Irrigators continue to add acres by buying from water rights from other counties and the assessor updates such information as it is received.

## 2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Loup County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>				
	County Assessor and part time local lister				
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th><th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">1</td><td>Loup County has only one market area at the current time for agricultural properties. With the limited number of sales I have, I cannot detect a definite pattern that would indicate any additional market areas are needed. Sales around the lake, if purchased for agricultural purposes, are not selling substantially higher than the other areas in the county. I don't feel establishing market areas would be defensible to my agricultural producers or in a court of law. While the use of sales from adjoining counties may aid in determining market value, it would not be helpful in establishing market areas.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Loup County has only one market area at the current time for agricultural properties. With the limited number of sales I have, I cannot detect a definite pattern that would indicate any additional market areas are needed. Sales around the lake, if purchased for agricultural purposes, are not selling substantially higher than the other areas in the county. I don't feel establishing market areas would be defensible to my agricultural producers or in a court of law. While the use of sales from adjoining counties may aid in determining market value, it would not be helpful in establishing market areas.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>				
1	Loup County has only one market area at the current time for agricultural properties. With the limited number of sales I have, I cannot detect a definite pattern that would indicate any additional market areas are needed. Sales around the lake, if purchased for agricultural purposes, are not selling substantially higher than the other areas in the county. I don't feel establishing market areas would be defensible to my agricultural producers or in a court of law. While the use of sales from adjoining counties may aid in determining market value, it would not be helpful in establishing market areas.				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>				
	Class or subclass includes, but not limited to, the classifications of agricultural land listed in Neb. Rev. Statutes 77-1363, parcel use, parcel type, location, geographic characteristics, zoning, city size, parcel size and market characteristics.				
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>				
	The Loup County Board of Equalization adopted a resolution on July 15, 2010, defining non-agricultural/non-horticultural land in Loup County. Rural residential land and recreational land (of which Loup County has none) shall mean any land classified as rural and not used for the commercial production of agricultural or horticultural products in an economically viable amount to sustain the amount of income to support the area of parcel. A parcel must be smaller than forty (40) acres, not zoned for uses other than agricultural, agricultural residential or rural conservation. Parcels of land that are contiguous to agricultural properties, under the same ownership, less than 40 acres, and not directly accessible from a county or state road will be classified as agricultural or horticultural.				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>				
	Farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites. One acre is valued at \$5500 on both the farm home sites and rural residential home sites.				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>				
	Loup County has no agricultural land in the county that has a non-agricultural influence.				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>				
	No special valuation applications have been filed in Loup County.				
<b>8.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>				
	N/A				

## Loup County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Loup	1	N/A	2,600	N/A	2,600	2,160	1,970	1,970	1,150	2,236
Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	1,475	#DIV/0!	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
Brown	1	N/A	2,366	2,466	2,539	2,032	2,034	1,786	1,934	2,185
Rock	2	N/A	1,650	N/A	1,550	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,482
Garfield	1	N/A	3,520	3,060	2,660	2,610	2,500	1,580	1,530	2,355
Custer	3	N/A	2,868	2,595	2,432	2,255	2,198	1,556	1,407	2,103
Holt	4003	N/A	2,383	2,197	2,108	1,960	1,948	1,751	1,644	1,848
Custer	2	N/A	1,437	1,304	1,350	N/A	1,426	1,457	1,458	1,444

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Loup	1	N/A	705	N/A	570	545	475	350	350	487
Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	400	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	400	400	400	400	400
Brown	1	N/A	760	760	760	695	565	500	500	655
Rock	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	600	600	570	570	583
Garfield	1	N/A	1,370	1,215	1,165	1,050	945	845	740	1,020
Custer	3	N/A	915	910	910	905	905	900	900	906
Holt	4003	N/A	1,479	1,400	1,396	1,299	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,276
Custer	2	N/A	450	440	440	430	430	420	420	430

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Loup	1	N/A	640	N/A	495	375	375	375	375	376
Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	400	#DIV/0!	400	400	400	330	330	332
Brown	1	N/A	545	545	544	512	415	310	310	335
Rock	2	N/A	499	500	499	468	460	439	326	395
Garfield	1	N/A	630	630	630	585	555	491	404	436
Custer	3	N/A	622	622	620	621	620	607	532	552
Holt	4003	1,100	1,100	950	932	839	858	696	696	735
Custer	2	N/A	330	330	330	330	333	331	330	330

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

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

---

## **County Overview**

Loup County is located in north central Nebraska with Taylor being the county seat. The county is comprised of approximately 4% irrigated land, 3% dry crop and 92% grass/pasture land. The Lower Loup Natural Resource District is the only (NRD) in the county. The county currently has no defined market areas, and its comparable neighboring counties are Blaine, southeast Brown, Rock, Garfield and a portion of northern Custer that adjoins Loup. All these areas share similar characteristics that are comparable in soils and topography.

## **Description of Analysis**

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Loup County the land use of the sales generally matched the County as a whole. However, the sales were not proportionately distributed among the study years. To make the sample reliable and proportionate the agricultural land analysis was expanded using sales from the comparable areas as described above. The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. Both majority land uses show that the grass subclass falls within the acceptable range. The 80% irrigated land subclass also falls into the acceptable parameters.

Assessment actions taken by the Loup County assessor include adjustments to all property classes. Irrigated values amounted to an increase of 12%, dry land increased 24% and grass amounted to an increase of 20%. The majority of the sales are grass, while there are few irrigated sales in the majority land use subclasses and no dry land sales the statistics are generally within the acceptable range. Irrigated values were increased to amounts that are generally comparable to the adjoining counties.

While the assessor raised the lower land capability groups of dry land 46%, they remain lower than the value of grassland and somewhat lower than the adjoining counties. These subclasses of dry land represent a very small portion of the county and are not impacting the overall level of value of agricultural land; however, equalization would improve in future assessment years by raising these subclasses to an amount above the corresponding value of grassland. Most of the dry land values are reasonably close to the more comparable adjoining counties and overall the dry land assessments are determined to be acceptable.

## **Sales Qualification**

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

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

---

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

The sales analysis supports that all subclasses of agricultural land have been assessed at acceptable portions of market value. In comparison with adjoining counties the values appear to be equalized with the neighboring counties in the area.

### **Level of Value**

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





**58 Loup**  
**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 : 13  
 Total Sales Price : 1,602,008  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,572,008  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,396,840  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 120,924  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 107,449

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 89  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 15.11  
 PRD : 114.34

COV : 30.35  
 STD : 30.84  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.63  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.30  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 79.11

95% Median C.I. : 85.62 to 101.90  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.10 to 94.62  
 95% Mean C.I. : 82.96 to 120.24

Printed:3/12/2014 2:34:55PM

**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-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	92.42	92.42	93.51	04.75	98.83	88.03	96.80	N/A	20,000	18,703
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	2	89.50	89.50	86.03	11.61	104.03	79.11	99.88	N/A	187,500	161,308
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	89.47	89.47	85.95	04.30	104.10	85.62	93.31	N/A	200,504	172,338
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	101.90	101.90	101.90	00.00	100.00	101.90	101.90	N/A	110,000	112,090
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	145.72	145.72	92.63	37.46	157.31	91.13	200.30	N/A	182,500	169,050
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	98.77	98.77	98.77	00.00	100.00	98.77	98.77	N/A	65,000	64,200
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2	89.34	89.34	81.58	10.73	109.51	79.75	98.93	N/A	105,000	85,658
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	107.33	107.33	107.33	00.00	100.00	107.33	107.33	N/A	6,000	6,440
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	7	93.31	92.09	88.20	07.02	104.41	79.11	101.90	79.11 to 101.90	132,287	116,684
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	6	98.85	112.70	89.79	23.09	125.52	79.75	200.30	79.75 to 200.30	107,667	96,676
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	7	93.31	107.32	89.33	22.39	120.14	79.11	200.30	79.11 to 200.30	178,715	159,640
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.80	101.60	88.86	15.11	114.34	79.11	200.30	85.62 to 101.90	120,924	107,449

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	2	98.34	98.34	99.37	01.57	98.96	96.80	99.88	N/A	75,000	74,525
02	5	85.62	87.50	86.42	07.98	101.25	79.11	101.90	N/A	258,702	223,563
06	6	98.85	114.45	101.15	21.33	113.15	88.03	200.30	88.03 to 200.30	21,417	21,663
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.80	101.60	88.86	15.11	114.34	79.11	200.30	85.62 to 101.90	120,924	107,449

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	13	96.80	101.60	88.86	15.11	114.34	79.11	200.30	85.62 to 101.90	120,924	107,449
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.80	101.60	88.86	15.11	114.34	79.11	200.30	85.62 to 101.90	120,924	107,449

**58 Loup**  
**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 : 13  
 Total Sales Price : 1,602,008  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,572,008  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,396,840  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 120,924  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 107,449

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 89  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 15.11  
 PRD : 114.34

COV : 30.35  
 STD : 30.84  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.63  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.30  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 79.11

95% Median C.I. : 85.62 to 101.90  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.10 to 94.62  
 95% Mean C.I. : 82.96 to 120.24

*Printed:3/12/2014 2:34:55PM*

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	2	153.82	153.82	149.59	30.22	102.83	107.33	200.30	N/A	5,500	8,228
Less Than 30,000	6	97.87	114.12	101.67	21.87	112.25	88.03	200.30	88.03 to 200.30	14,750	14,996
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	13	96.80	101.60	88.86	15.11	114.34	79.11	200.30	85.62 to 101.90	120,924	107,449
Greater Than 14,999	11	93.31	92.11	88.43	07.07	104.16	79.11	101.90	79.75 to 99.88	141,910	125,490
Greater Than 29,999	7	91.13	90.88	88.09	08.79	103.17	79.11	101.90	79.11 to 101.90	211,930	186,695
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	153.82	153.82	149.59	30.22	102.83	107.33	200.30	N/A	5,500	8,228
15,000 TO 29,999	4	95.06	94.27	94.86	03.79	99.38	88.03	98.93	N/A	19,375	18,380
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999	1	98.77	98.77	98.77	00.00	100.00	98.77	98.77	N/A	65,000	64,200
100,000 TO 149,999	2	100.89	100.89	100.83	01.00	100.06	99.88	101.90	N/A	117,500	118,470
150,000 TO 249,999	1	79.75	79.75	79.75	00.00	100.00	79.75	79.75	N/A	190,000	151,530
250,000 TO 499,999	3	85.62	85.29	85.98	04.68	99.20	79.11	91.13	N/A	331,169	284,732
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.80	101.60	88.86	15.11	114.34	79.11	200.30	85.62 to 101.90	120,924	107,449

**58 Loup**  
**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 : 2  
 Total Sales Price : 262,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 262,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 234,330  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 131,250  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 117,165

MEDIAN : 86  
 WGT. MEAN : 89  
 MEAN : 86  
 COD : 08.25  
 PRD : 96.00

COV : 11.67  
 STD : 10.00  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.07  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 92.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 78.63

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
 95% Mean C.I. : -4.14 to 175.54

Printed:3/12/2014 2:34:55PM

**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											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	78.63	78.63	78.63	00.00	100.00	78.63	78.63	N/A	65,000	51,110
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	1	92.77	92.77	92.77	00.00	100.00	92.77	92.77	N/A	197,500	183,220
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	1	78.63	78.63	78.63	00.00	100.00	78.63	78.63	N/A	65,000	51,110
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	1	92.77	92.77	92.77	00.00	100.00	92.77	92.77	N/A	197,500	183,220
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	78.63	78.63	78.63	00.00	100.00	78.63	78.63	N/A	65,000	51,110
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	1	92.77	92.77	92.77	00.00	100.00	92.77	92.77	N/A	197,500	183,220
<u>ALL</u>	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	92.77	92.77	92.77	00.00	100.00	92.77	92.77	N/A	197,500	183,220
06	1	78.63	78.63	78.63	00.00	100.00	78.63	78.63	N/A	65,000	51,110
<u>ALL</u>	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165

**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	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165
04											
<u>ALL</u>	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165

**58 Loup**  
**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 : 2	MEDIAN : 86	COV : 11.67	95% Median C.I. : N/A
Total Sales Price : 262,500	WGT. MEAN : 89	STD : 10.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
Total Adj. Sales Price : 262,500	MEAN : 86	Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.07	95% Mean C.I. : -4.14 to 175.54
Total Assessed Value : 234,330			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 131,250	COD : 08.25	MAX Sales Ratio : 92.77	
Avg. Assessed Value : 117,165	PRD : 96.00	MIN Sales Ratio : 78.63	

Printed:3/12/2014 2:34:55PM

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											
Less Than 30,000											
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165
Greater Than 14,999	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165
Greater Than 29,999	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999	1	78.63	78.63	78.63	00.00	100.00	78.63	78.63	N/A	65,000	51,110
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999	1	92.77	92.77	92.77	00.00	100.00	92.77	92.77	N/A	197,500	183,220
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165
<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
442	1	78.63	78.63	78.63	00.00	100.00	78.63	78.63	N/A	65,000	51,110
467	1	92.77	92.77	92.77	00.00	100.00	92.77	92.77	N/A	197,500	183,220
<u>ALL</u>	2	85.70	85.70	89.27	08.25	96.00	78.63	92.77	N/A	131,250	117,165

**58 Loup****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 : 44  
 Total Sales Price : 36,205,504  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 36,107,504  
 Total Assessed Value : 23,952,728  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 820,625  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 544,380

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 29.30  
 PRD : 105.53

COV : 35.71  
 STD : 25.00  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.88  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 127.59  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 22.26

95% Median C.I. : 53.80 to 87.30  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.24 to 75.43  
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.62 to 77.40

*Printed:3/12/2014 2:34:56PM***DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	82.50	79.46	84.50	14.62	94.04	53.38	102.81	53.38 to 102.81	248,372	209,880
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	93.22	95.91	93.80	06.15	102.25	88.24	113.73	N/A	502,020	470,904
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	88.35	86.52	78.66	08.27	109.99	74.64	96.58	N/A	3,900,000	3,067,900
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	90.08	90.08	92.17	04.30	97.73	86.21	93.94	N/A	278,665	256,838
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	75.13	79.59	75.77	13.03	105.04	66.67	99.19	66.67 to 99.19	896,966	679,675
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	74.55	70.27	64.03	17.14	109.75	48.96	87.30	N/A	660,180	422,713
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	65.83	65.83	65.83	00.00	100.00	65.83	65.83	N/A	90,000	59,250
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	7	49.42	57.14	50.06	32.25	114.14	38.72	127.59	38.72 to 127.59	467,629	234,090
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	5	30.20	37.65	36.66	39.24	102.70	22.26	66.13	N/A	1,272,314	466,368
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	4	48.68	45.72	36.45	18.92	125.43	28.16	57.37	N/A	566,448	206,471
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	16	88.42	85.93	81.73	11.76	105.14	53.38	113.73	74.64 to 93.75	1,012,317	827,329
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	12	75.13	77.86	73.90	15.19	105.36	48.96	99.19	66.67 to 93.49	667,472	493,259
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	16	43.68	48.19	40.30	33.15	119.58	22.26	127.59	30.20 to 53.80	743,798	299,772
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	91.91	91.93	81.75	06.88	112.45	74.64	113.73	86.21 to 96.58	1,476,743	1,207,190
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	17	66.67	67.89	65.67	27.63	103.38	38.72	127.59	48.96 to 87.30	630,926	414,357
<u>ALL</u>	44	71.26	70.01	66.34	29.30	105.53	22.26	127.59	53.80 to 87.30	820,625	544,380

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	44	71.26	70.01	66.34	29.30	105.53	22.26	127.59	53.80 to 87.30	820,625	544,380
<u>ALL</u>	44	71.26	70.01	66.34	29.30	105.53	22.26	127.59	53.80 to 87.30	820,625	544,380

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	6	61.87	63.27	49.45	32.39	127.95	39.58	93.49	39.58 to 93.49	508,368	251,365
Blank	6	61.87	63.27	49.45	32.39	127.95	39.58	93.49	39.58 to 93.49	508,368	251,365
<u>Grass</u>											
County	26	75.06	70.79	67.46	25.59	104.94	27.14	99.19	57.37 to 88.48	1,123,149	757,630
Blank	26	75.06	70.79	67.46	25.59	104.94	27.14	99.19	57.37 to 88.48	1,123,149	757,630
<u>ALL</u>	44	71.26	70.01	66.34	29.30	105.53	22.26	127.59	53.80 to 87.30	820,625	544,380

**58 Loup****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 : 44	MEDIAN : 71	COV : 35.71	95% Median C.I. : 53.80 to 87.30
Total Sales Price : 36,205,504	WGT. MEAN : 66	STD : 25.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.24 to 75.43
Total Adj. Sales Price : 36,107,504	MEAN : 70	Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.88	95% Mean C.I. : 62.62 to 77.40
Total Assessed Value : 23,952,728			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 820,625	COD : 29.30	MAX Sales Ratio : 127.59	
Avg. Assessed Value : 544,380	PRD : 105.53	MIN Sales Ratio : 22.26	

*Printed:3/12/2014 2:34:56PM***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
<u>      Irrigated      </u>											
County	10	71.34	73.17	62.22	32.09	117.60	39.58	127.59	41.17 to 102.81	493,358	306,946
Blank	10	71.34	73.17	62.22	32.09	117.60	39.58	127.59	41.17 to 102.81	493,358	306,946
<u>      Grass      </u>											
County	32	71.26	68.63	67.01	26.96	102.42	22.26	99.19	53.38 to 88.24	954,545	639,641
Blank	32	71.26	68.63	67.01	26.96	102.42	22.26	99.19	53.38 to 88.24	954,545	639,641
<u>      ALL      </u>	44	71.26	70.01	66.34	29.30	105.53	22.26	127.59	53.80 to 87.30	820,625	544,380





Total Real Property  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 2,077

Value : 196,089,525

Growth 1,358,655

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	37	38,595	0	0	195	2,241,745	232	2,280,340	
02. Res Improve Land	116	206,170	0	0	134	2,313,235	250	2,519,405	
03. Res Improvements	117	2,654,055	0	0	134	14,702,240	251	17,356,295	
04. Res Total	154	2,898,820	0	0	329	19,257,220	483	22,156,040	654,180
% of Res Total	31.88	13.08	0.00	0.00	68.12	86.92	23.25	11.30	48.15
05. Com UnImp Land	3	565	0	0	0	0	3	565	
06. Com Improve Land	23	31,420	0	0	7	48,940	30	80,360	
07. Com Improvements	23	416,115	0	0	7	1,008,255	30	1,424,370	
08. Com Total	26	448,100	0	0	7	1,057,195	33	1,505,295	30,105
% of Com Total	78.79	29.77	0.00	0.00	21.21	70.23	1.59	0.77	2.22
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	154	2,898,820	0	0	329	19,257,220	483	22,156,040	654,180
% of Res & Rec Total	31.88	13.08	0.00	0.00	68.12	86.92	23.25	11.30	48.15
Com & Ind Total	26	448,100	0	0	7	1,057,195	33	1,505,295	30,105
% of Com & Ind Total	78.79	29.77	0.00	0.00	21.21	70.23	1.59	0.77	2.22
17. Taxable Total	180	3,346,920	0	0	336	20,314,415	516	23,661,335	684,285
% of Taxable Total	34.88	14.15	0.00	0.00	65.12	85.85	24.84	12.07	50.36

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	33	0	15	48

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,125	159,877,720	1,125	159,877,720
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	413	1,420,325	413	1,420,325
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	436	11,130,145	436	11,130,145
30. Ag Total							1,561	172,428,190

## 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	0	0.00	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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	179	192.51	1,058,750	179	192.51	1,058,750	
33. HomeSite Improvements	190	0.00	8,651,170	190	0.00	8,651,170	529,255
34. HomeSite Total				190	192.51	9,709,920	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	234	723.15	361,575	234	723.15	361,575	
37. FarmSite Improvements	246	0.00	2,478,975	246	0.00	2,478,975	145,115
38. FarmSite Total				246	723.15	2,840,550	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,091.19	0	0	1,091.19	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				436	2,006.85	12,550,470	674,370

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	9	1,320.00	531,460	9	1,320.00	531,460

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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	4,953.88	31.95%	12,880,090	37.15%	2,600.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	3,131.20	20.19%	8,141,125	23.48%	2,600.00
49. 3A1	530.53	3.42%	1,145,945	3.31%	2,160.00
50. 3A	2,527.12	16.30%	4,978,430	14.36%	1,970.00
51. 4A1	3,058.37	19.72%	6,024,990	17.38%	1,970.00
52. 4A	1,304.68	8.41%	1,500,390	4.33%	1,150.01
53. Total	15,505.78	100.00%	34,670,970	100.00%	2,236.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	835.82	9.69%	589,255	14.01%	705.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	3,222.91	37.36%	1,837,060	43.69%	570.00
58. 3D1	600.59	6.96%	327,325	7.78%	545.01
59. 3D	498.93	5.78%	236,995	5.64%	475.01
60. 4D1	2,573.00	29.82%	900,550	21.42%	350.00
61. 4D	896.22	10.39%	313,675	7.46%	350.00
62. Total	8,627.47	100.00%	4,204,860	100.00%	487.38
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	411.28	0.13%	263,220	0.22%	640.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	744.67	0.23%	368,610	0.31%	495.00
67. 3G1	2,197.01	0.68%	823,885	0.68%	375.00
68. 3G	9,445.39	2.94%	3,542,075	2.94%	375.01
69. 4G1	61,864.58	19.29%	23,199,230	19.26%	375.00
70. 4G	246,080.40	76.72%	92,282,425	76.60%	375.01
71. Total	320,743.33	100.00%	120,479,445	100.00%	375.63
Irrigated Total	15,505.78	4.44%	34,670,970	21.69%	2,236.00
Dry Total	8,627.47	2.47%	4,204,860	2.63%	487.38
Grass Total	320,743.33	91.81%	120,479,445	75.36%	375.63
72. Waste	2,962.82	0.85%	222,225	0.14%	75.00
73. Other	1,501.10	0.43%	300,220	0.19%	200.00
74. Exempt	11,449.40	3.28%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	349,340.50	100.00%	159,877,720	100.00%	457.66

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	15,505.78	34,670,970	15,505.78	34,670,970
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	8,627.47	4,204,860	8,627.47	4,204,860
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	320,743.33	120,479,445	320,743.33	120,479,445
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,962.82	222,225	2,962.82	222,225
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,501.10	300,220	1,501.10	300,220
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	11,449.40	0	11,449.40	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>349,340.50</b>	<b>159,877,720</b>	<b>349,340.50</b>	<b>159,877,720</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	15,505.78	4.44%	34,670,970	21.69%	2,236.00
<b>Dry Land</b>	8,627.47	2.47%	4,204,860	2.63%	487.38
<b>Grass</b>	320,743.33	91.81%	120,479,445	75.36%	375.63
<b>Waste</b>	2,962.82	0.85%	222,225	0.14%	75.00
<b>Other</b>	1,501.10	0.43%	300,220	0.19%	200.00
<b>Exempt</b>	11,449.40	3.28%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>349,340.50</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>159,877,720</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>457.66</b>

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

58 Loup

	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	16,505,220	22,156,040	5,650,820	34.24%	654,180	30.27%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	8,103,835	9,709,920	1,606,085	19.82%	529,255	13.29%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>24,609,055</b>	<b>31,865,960</b>	<b>7,256,905</b>	<b>29.49%</b>	<b>1,183,435</b>	<b>24.68%</b>
05. Commercial	1,341,130	1,505,295	164,165	12.24%	30,105	10.00%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	2,601,155	2,840,550	239,395	9.20%	145,115	3.62%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>3,942,285</b>	<b>4,345,845</b>	<b>403,560</b>	<b>10.24%</b>	<b>175,220</b>	<b>5.79%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>28,551,340</b>	<b>36,211,805</b>	<b>7,660,465</b>	<b>26.83%</b>	<b>1,358,655</b>	<b>22.07%</b>
11. Irrigated	30,785,785	34,670,970	3,885,185	12.62%		
12. Dryland	3,378,010	4,204,860	826,850	24.48%		
13. Grassland	99,883,550	120,479,445	20,595,895	20.62%		
14. Wasteland	163,200	222,225	59,025	36.17%		
15. Other Agland	82,195	300,220	218,025	265.25%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>134,292,740</b>	<b>159,877,720</b>	<b>25,584,980</b>	<b>19.05%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>162,844,080</b>	<b>196,089,525</b>	<b>33,245,445</b>	<b>20.42%</b>	<b>1,358,655</b>	<b>19.58%</b>

**2013 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT**  
**for**  
**LOUP COUNTY**  
**Assessment Years 2014, 2015, and 2016**  
**Date: June 15, 2013**

**INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15<sup>th</sup> of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31<sup>st</sup> each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31<sup>st</sup> each year.

**REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land for 2013; 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.

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION of REAL PROPERTY in LOUP COUNTY**

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

	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>% of Total Parcels</b>	<b>% of Taxable Value Base</b>
Residential	483	23.23%	10.14%
Commercial	34	1.64%	.82%
Industrial	0	0	0
Recreational	0	0	0
Agricultural	1562	75.13%	89.04%
Special Value	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2079</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

	<b>Acres</b>	<b>% of Agland Total</b>
Agricultural taxable acres:	349,341.81	100%
Grass	320,798.39	91.83%
Irrigated	15,529.93	4.45%
Dryland	8,552.17	2.44%
Waste	2,967.22	.85%
Shelterbelts	1,494.10	.43%

Loup County is mainly an agricultural county. However, the construction of the Calamus Dam and subsequent Calamus Lake resulted in the loss of close to 8,000 acres of farm and ranch land. This has been replaced with fifteen rural residential developments (a new subdivision was added in 2010) and numerous small rural residential sites, with the possibility of the subdividing and creation of several more developments. These subdivisions have more than replaced the agricultural valuation lost to the lake. The northern half of the county consists of mainly large cattle operations containing many acres of grassland with some acres of cropland. The southern half of the county is a mix of smaller owned operations combining livestock and farming, with a mix of grassland, dry and irrigated cropland. The Village of Taylor, the only incorporated village in the county, lies in the southeast portion of the county and serves as the county seat.

**New Property**

The County had an estimated seventeen (17) zoning permits for new construction/additions for 2013. This number is slightly down from the twenty-three (23) zoning permits for 2012.

## **CURRENT RESOURCES**

### **STAFFING, BUDGET AND TRAINING**

#### **Staffing**

The office is staffed by one full-time clerk and the County Clerk, who also serves as Register of Deeds, Clerk of the District Court, Assessor and Election Commissioner. The office lost the part-time clerk when she retired on February 29, 2008 and the county has no plans to refill this position. Loup County does not have a Deputy Assessor, the County Clerk, ex-officio Assessor, hereafter referred to as assessor, is the only employee in the office holding the necessary certificate. The assessor does all the Assessor duties with regards to real estate records, maintenance and valuations, personal property filings, administrative reports and processing of Homestead Exemption Applications.

#### **Training**

The assessor is required to obtain sixty hours of continuing education within a four year period. Her current certificate will expire on December 31, 2014. She has taken and passed IAAO Course 100 and has been notified by the Property Assessment Division that she has been grandfathered in on **IAAO Course 300**. She took the following IAAO courses in October of 2011: **IAAO 100 UNDERSTANDING REAL PROPERTY APPRAISAL** and **IAAO 150 MATHEMATICS FOR ASSESSING OFFICERS** for a total of thirty (30) continuing education credits. She intends to complete her remaining thirty (30) hours by taking **IAAO WORKSHOP 260-VALUATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND** and attending the Assessors' Workshop .

#### **Budget**

As she serves as ex-officio Assessor, most of the budget is contained within the County Clerk budget. Beginning in the year 2007, the County Clerk started receiving compensation for the ex-officio Assessor position in the amount of \$3000.00 additional salary per year with an annual cost of living

increase on same. The Board set the addition compensation for the Assessor position beginning with the year 2011 at \$3,200.00 with an annual 2% increase per year. This actually resulted in a small deduction in wages for that position. The County Clerk's 2012-2013 budget is \$62,700.00 and her clerk salary plus the ex-officio salary is covered in this budget. Her one full-time clerk's salary comes from the County Clerk budget. However, she does maintain a small Assessor office budget in the amount of \$7,000.00. This budget covers education and travel expense, supplies and postage required by the Assessor's office. No salaries are taken from the Assessor budget. The appraisal budget for 2012-2013 is \$20,000.00, a large increase over the previous year's \$6,000.00. This budget is used to pay for the annual pickup work and for the ongoing review of all improved properties and will be used to pay for the appraisal planned for 2013. The budget authority made the Appraisal budget a part of the General Fund budget beginning with the 2012-13 budget year.

### **CADASTRAL AND AERIAL MAPS**

The cadastral maps are kept current by the assessor with new ownership lines, acres, and property owner's names being done as changes occur. If only an ownership change has occurred the office clerk makes that change. However, the maps are from 1969 and new maps are desperately needed due to the many changes over the years to keep them up to date. As new subdivisions have been added, the assessor has added sheets to the cadastral map book. She has plans to create a separate cadastral book for the lake subdivisions so they can be maintained in a more accessible and neat manner. In 2014, she plans to look into obtaining GIS contingent upon receiving a grant for such services from the Nebraska State Records Board and this will replace the old cadastral records. She will still keep a cadastral record for the unincorporated village of Almeria, the Village of Taylor and the fifteen lake subdivisions.

Land use, as well as ownership lines, are kept on the aerial maps. The assessor does all the record maintenance of the aerial maps including but not limited to mapping, ownership changes, land splits, land use changes, etc.. The assessor obtained 1999 aerial maps at a cost of \$2,720.00. She has drawn in the section lines and her clerk has completed the process of transferring ownership and land use lines. The new aerial maps are now in use. The assessor draws in ownership lines when irregular tracts have sold. She first enters the description into Deed Plotter+ for Windows, and then prints the

resulting map to any scale desired and transfers the resulting information onto the cadastral and aerial maps. Plans are to implement GIS, contingent upon funding, which will aid in all of the above actions.

### **Property Record Cards**

The assessor maintains the record cards with ownership and splits kept up to date. We have converted to new folder type color coded record cards, using green folders for agricultural, white for village and commercial, blue for exempt and yellow for rural subdivisions. Said cards contain current pictures of the house and any other major improvements, ownership and mailing addresses, physical addresses, classification, school and tax district codes, as well as land classifications and values for improvements and land. The county's communication center has established E911 addresses for all residences in Loup County. All property record cards now contain physical addresses. New residences are assigned an E911 address by the communication director and a monthly update is emailed to the assessor.

All properties with more than one improvement contain a ground sketch for the locations of each improvement. Scale drawings of all houses can be found on the cards. Pricing information is contained within the folder for ease in identifying how the value was established. Value information for at least the previous five years can be found on the front of each property record card.

### **SOFTWARE**

At this time, the assessor is using MIPS/County Solutions for the pricing of agricultural land record keeping only. All notices, tax receipts, etc. are still done by hand. The assessor is currently working on getting all data onto the MIPS site so that future administrative reports, tax receipts, valuation notices, etc.. can be done electronically. No web based access exists for records in Loup County.

### **CURRENT ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES for REAL PROPERTY**

#### **Discovery, Listing and Inventory of All Property**

As the County Clerk is also the ex-officio Assessor, the Real Estate Transfer Statement starts and stops in her office. She uses the information obtained from the Form 521 to ascertain the selling price of the property, whether any personal property was included in the sale, and characteristics of the sale based on the information at hand. From this information, it is determined if further investigation of the sale need occur. If deemed so, the assessor will talk with the buyer and/or seller, the real estate agent, or if this is not possible, will resort to the sending of questionnaires. The zoning administrator is also the full-time clerk in the assessor's office and willingly shares all zoning permit applications with the assessor, which is of great benefit in tracking new construction.

### **Data Collection**

Data collection is done by a local person who has done extensive work with a Nebraska appraisal company in the listing of properties for reappraisal. She lists the necessary data to price all new improvements, measures the improvement and shows the improvement location on the current ground sketch. All market and income data is collected and processed by Kaiser Appraisal Service of Omaha, Nebraska. The assessor then prices all new improvements with computer programs using Marshall Swift data. She also enters all information concerning the new improvement on the appropriate record card including but not limited to sketches, reasons for change, etc..

Loup County has implemented a complete appraisal of all properties. The appraisal was done by Kaiser Appraisal Service. The resulting value changes for the lake properties and Village of Taylor were placed on the tax rolls for 2000 and rural properties were put on in 2001. Commercial properties were put on in 2002. This reappraisal included a physical inspection of all properties and included re-measuring when there was an obvious discrepancy with the previous information in hand. An exterior inspection was done unless the taxpayer was willing to allow the appraiser inside. New pictures were taken of all improvements and attached to the real estate property cards. Square footage was figured based on the drawings and appraiser's notes and figures.

In order to keep the new appraisal up to date, the county was divided into fifths with a complete inspection of all improved properties done on a rotating basis with current information in hand. Following is the breakdown of the timeline for the yearly review. However, with the start of a new

appraisal in for 2013, physical inspections will be done by viewing aerial photographs of all rural agricultural properties and will meet the six year requirement. If new construction is found, a visit and physical inspection will be made of that property. The assessor is using two different programs to accomplish this Google Earth and ArcGIS Explorer.

**Lake Subdivisions: 2008**

**Village of Taylor: 2009**

All houses will be re-entered on a new Marshall Swift database with new depreciations applied. The year 2006 completed a four year cycle of a complete physical review of the entire county. A quarterly review of the county began in the summer of 2008 (refer to above schedule). This review has cost the Loup County taxpayers approximately \$5,000.00 per year. All further reviews will be online unless changes are seen and someone will then physically inspect the improvement site.

**Review assessment of sales ratio studies before assessment actions**

I do my own Assessment/Ratio studies beginning in July by removing the sales which will be out of the current study period and adding in the newest available year's sales for each study group, residential, commercial and agricultural. I have spread sheets on my computer listing the sales and the necessary information so I can then process the data for P.R.D., C.O.D., median, etc.. for each class of property. I share this information, which lists sales, buyer/seller, selling price, and value for assessment, as well as statistics, with my County Board prior to deciding on any action necessary to bring the statistics into compliance for the next assessment year. I also review all preliminary data provided by my field liaison and discuss necessary actions with him. I also discuss what, if any, changes need to be made to residential and commercial with Bill Kaiser of Kaiser Appraisal Service.

**Approaches to Value**

All three approaches to value are done by Kaiser Appraisal Service.

- 1) He does a market approach using sales comparisons. If not enough sales are available for Loup County, he has borrowed from other counties.
- 2) The cost approach is from the 1998 Marshall Swift manual, in computer format, and the latest depreciation study was completed by Kaiser Appraisal Service in 2000 and is being used to date, as a yearly analysis, so far, does not indicate a change.
- 3) Kaiser Appraisal Service also completed an income and expense analysis at the time of the reappraisal. He has all information and data used to compile this study in a computer format, available for inspection.
- 4) The ex-officio assessor conducts all land valuation studies by reviewing the current data available and borrowing sales from neighboring counties when too few have occurred in Loup County. At this time no market areas have been established and Loup County has no special value on any agricultural land. Both market areas and special value may be established in the future if a need is shown.

### **Reconciliation of Final Value and Documentation**

Reconciliation of final value is done by the assessor using acceptable assessment practices.

Documentation of pricing is contained in the Real Property card folders, while depreciation factors can be found in the reappraisal file available for public inspection.

### **Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions**

Once the assessment process has been completed the assessor puts the new information into her sales file data and redoes the ratio statistics.

### **Notices and Public Relations**

Once the above assessment processes are complete, the assessor mails evaluation notices to all taxpayers whose value has changed. Such notices contain all information as prescribed by state statute, including but not limited to, level of assessment, prior and current year's values, ownership and legal description, date for filing protests, and dates during which the Board of Equalization will be in session. She also includes a review of assessment actions to each class of property for the current year. If agricultural land values are changed, she includes a numbered map indicating where sales have occurred. These numbers correspond to a sheet detailing each sale as to address of buyer/seller, date of sale, number of acres, percentage of acres to each land class (irrigated, dry and grass), and the sale price per acre.

Once the notices have been mailed, she publishes a Notice in the legal newspaper notifying the public that the annual revision of the assessment rolls is complete and on file. Said notice also contains the dates during which protests may be filed and the meeting dates of the Board of Equalization.

### **LEVEL OF VALUE, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2013**

<b><u>Property Class</u></b>	<b><u>Median</u></b>	<b><u>C.O.D.</u></b>	<b><u>P.R.D.</u></b>
Residential	*	*	*
Commercial	*	*	*
Agricultural	73.00	15.18	112.15

**RESIDENTIAL:** This class had a total of twelve (12) improved sales. Insufficient number of sales in any one of the Assessor Locations to establish statistics and the Tax Equalization and Review Commission did not certify any statistics for this class. Three sales were Calamus Lake Mobile Homes, four were Calamus Lake Stick Built and five were in the Village of Taylor.

**COMMERCIAL:** The commercial statistics, based on two (2) sales, makes the resulting stats very unreliable. The figures above are the actual statistics based on the two sales. However, due to the lack of sales, the Tax Equalization and Review Commission did not certify stats for this class. It is hard to



establish or justify changes to value based on the small number of sales. Also, commercial sales in this county involve use changes as businesses close and the property is subsequently purchased for storage.

***AGRICULTURAL:*** This class saw twenty-six (26) sales for the current study period for Loup County and the Property Assessment Department added four sales from Blaine County and three sales from Rock County. After looking at the preliminary stats, the assessor increased values on irrigated ground by 40%, dryland by 5% and grassland, shelterbelts and waste by 6% for 2013. The resulting stats on the thirty-three sales was a median of 73, a C.O.D. of 15.18 and a P.R.D. of 112.15. The median is within the accepted range as is the C.O.D.. The P.R.D. is outside the acceptable range.

#### **ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2014**

***RESIDENTIAL:*** Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes to depreciations and values. E911 addresses will be added to new property cards as they become available to the assessor. All improved properties within the Village of Taylor were physically inspected in 2009 per the schedule on page 8 and have been reviewed online prior to the repricing in 2013. The assessor has purchased the most current Marshall Swift pricing for this class of property and all properties will be priced and depreciations applied as mentioned above in the third paragraph on page 8. Preliminary notices will be sent prior to official notices and the resulting values will be added in 2014.

***RESIDENTIAL/Lake Properties and Subdivisions:*** Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes in depreciation factors and valuations. The sales data from this area will be watched closely and data analyzed by Kaiser Appraisal as more improved sales occur in the area. Kaiser Appraisal Service will work with the assessor to establish more accurate values of improved and unimproved properties within the lake subdivisions as more sales occur to make this study possible. An online review and repricing of these properties is being done in 2013 with resulting values being added in 2014. The assessor has purchased the most current Marshall Swift pricing for

this class of property and all properties will be priced and depreciations applied. Preliminary notices will be sent prior to official notices.

**COMMERCIAL:** Annual pickup work completed and priced by Kaiser Appraisal Service as needed. If more sales begin to occur in this class, a new study may need to be done by said appraisal company to determine if current depreciations are acceptable. An online review and repricing will be conducted in 2013 with resulting values being added in 2014. The assessor has purchased the most current Marshall Swift pricing for this class of property and all properties will be priced and depreciations applied.

**AGRICULTURAL:** Land use changes made as discovered. On agricultural home sites and farm sites, pickup work will be done and new value added. As many pivots have been placed on previously gravity irrigated land, through use of the local Farm Service Agency (F.S.A.) information and drawings, changes have been made to correct the type of irrigation and the resulting changes in irrigated acres. Sales ratio and statistical studies are done annually to discover necessary changes in land values.

The assessor has added any new irrigated acres that were found through the N.R.D. required review with irrigators. She has copied the FSA maps provided by the irrigators for her records as she has been unable to obtain these herself from the local F.S.A. office. Irrigated acres continue to change as the N.R.D. processes applications for increased irrigated acres which are subsequently reported to the assessor.

#### **ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2015**

**RESIDENTIAL:** Annual pickup work will be done and new value added where necessary. Statistical studies will be done to determine any changes that may need to be made to depreciation and valuation.

**RESIDENTIAL/Lake Properties and Subdivisions:** Any new subdivisions will be added with a study done by Kaiser Appraisal Service to determine value of the lots. Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes in depreciation factors and valuations. The sales data from

this area will be watched closely and data analyzed by Kaiser Appraisal as more improved sales occur in the area.

**COMMERCIAL:** Annual pickup work completed and priced by Kaiser Appraisal Service as needed. If more sales begin to occur in this class, a new study may need to be done by said appraisal company to determine if current depreciations and values are acceptable.

**AGRICULTURAL:** Land use changes made as discovered. On agricultural home sites and farm sites, pickup work will be done and new value added. Sales ratio and statistical studies are done annually to discover necessary changes in land values.

#### **ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2016**

**RESIDENTIAL:** Annual pickup work will be done and new value added where necessary. Statistical studies will be done to determine any changes that may need to be made to depreciation and valuation.

**RESIDENTIAL/Lake Properties and Subdivisions:** Any new subdivisions will be added with a study done by Kaiser Appraisal Service to determine value of the lots. Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes in depreciation factors and valuations. The sales data from this area will be watched closely and data analyzed by Kaiser Appraisal as more improved sales occur in the area.

**COMMERCIAL:** Annual pickup work completed and priced by Kaiser Appraisal Service as needed. If more sales begin to occur in this class, a new study may need to be done by said appraisal company to determine if current depreciations and values are acceptable.

**AGRICULTURAL:** Land use changes made as discovered. On agricultural home sites and farm sites, pickup work will be done and new value added. Sales ratio and statistical studies are done annually to discover necessary changes in land values.

### **OTHER FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE ASSESSOR'S OFFICE**

**RECORD MAINTENANCE, MAPPING UPDATES, OWNERSHIP CHANGES:** The assessor does the records maintenance with regards to ownership changes, mapping updates required and record maintenance as needed. All changes are updated regularly and generally within two weeks of the change.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:** The assessor completes all reports including but not limited to the following and files same on a timely basis with the appropriate officials: the *Abstract of Real Property*, *Assessor Survey*, and *Assessed Value Update* on or before March 19<sup>th</sup>, the *Certification of Values* on or before August 20<sup>th</sup>, the *School District Taxable Value Report* on or before August 25<sup>th</sup>, the *Average Assessed Value of Single-Family Residential Property* on or before September 1<sup>st</sup>, the *Annual Plan of Assessment* with the Board of Equalization on or before July 31<sup>st</sup> and PA & T on or before October 31<sup>st</sup>, the *Annual Tax Roll* on or before November 22<sup>nd</sup>, the *Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate Form 458S* on or before November 30<sup>th</sup>, the *Certificate of Taxes Levied* on or before December 1<sup>st</sup>, the *Legal Description and Owner of all property owned by the State or governmental subdivisions of the State* on or before December 1, 2004 and every fourth December thereafter, and the *Report of current values of properties owned by the Board of Educational Lands and Funds*.

**PERSONAL PROPERTY:** The assessor administers the timely filing of approximately one hundred thirty (130) personal property schedules each year. As a courtesy reminder, in the middle of February,

she mails postcards to everyone who filed the previous year and those who will be new filers for the current year. Another reminder is sent the middle of April to those who haven't yet filed. Those who fail to file on or before May 1<sup>st</sup> are penalized according to state statute. She provides her Board of Equalization with a listing of personal property filers with the amount of personal property value attributed to each and separated into tax districts.

***PERMISSIVE EXEMPTIONS:*** The assessor completes the basic information on the appropriate permissive exemption forms and mails those forms to the filers in November. Once the filings are returned she makes determinations as to their new and/or continued exempt use and advises the Board of Equalization of her recommendations. In 451 application years, notices are sent to all filers ten days prior to the exemption hearing. Notices are also sent in the case of a continuation of exemption being denied.

***TAXABLE GOVERNMENT OWNED PROPERTY:*** An annual review is made of government owned property not used for public purposes. At this time, Loup County has no such government property but reviews government owned property each year to find any that may qualify and be taxed.

***HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS:*** The Nebraska Department of Revenue (DOR) sends pre-printed Homestead Exemption (HSE) Application Forms to the assessor. The assessor then prepares mailings to all those still qualifying, consisting of a brief letter from the office explaining the contents of the mailing and instructions, DOR instructions, pre-printed HSE Forms 458, Nebraska Schedule I (Income Statement) and instructions and the United States Citizenship Attestation. The assessor also fills out the necessary information on HSE Form 458 for those persons requesting applications for the current year who were not eligible for exemption in prior years and sends them all necessary information. Approximately thirty applications are processed each year. The assessor assists all applicants who need help with completing the forms.

***TAX DISTRICTS, TAX RATES, TAX LISTS, TAX LIST CORRECTIONS:*** The assessor checks that all tax districts and valuations are correct and balanced. As she also serves as the County Clerk she sets the tax rates and verifies that they are correct. The assessor prepares and certifies the annual tax roll to the treasurer for all real, centrally assessed, personal property and in-lieu of taxes. She also

prepares all necessary tax list corrections and presents them to the County Board for action and to the Treasurer for collection or refund as the case may be.

**COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, TERC APPEALS:** The county assessor provides copies to the Board of Equalization members of all protests with her recommendation noted thereon and copies of all information she has concerning valuation of the protested property prior to the protest hearings. She defends values before the TERC board with written testimony.

**EDUCATION:** Please see *Training*, page 4 of this document.

## **CONCLUSION**

The budget requests aforementioned (see *Budget*, page 4 and 5 in this document) are sufficient to maintain the current assessment practices and cover the annual pickup work and annual physical inspection of one fifth of the county each year.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Debbie Postany, Loup County Assessor

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2014 Assessment Survey for Loup County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	No deputies on staff. One full-time clerk who does not hold an assessor's certificate.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	None
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	None
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	None
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$7500.00
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same as above.
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	The assessor's budget does not cover appraisal work. Appraisal is a function under the General Fund and \$20,000 is set aside for appraisal/pickup/review work.
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	See question #8 above.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$1,450.00
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$900.00
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$2995.61

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS is used for the pricing of agricultural land record keeping only. All notices, tax receipts and administrative reports are done by hand and submitted electronically per the department's requirement.
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	None, the assessor prices all improvements via the Marshall Swift program which is installed on her computer.
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes. Said maps are from 1969 but are kept up to date with ownership changes including landowner names, ownership lines, legal descriptions and acreage amounts.
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The assessor maintains the cadastral maps. She has added sheets where and when necessary to accommodate the addition of the lake subdivisions.
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	The county is currently not using any personal property software but may consider using MIPS in the future as there is no additional cost to the county for using this function.

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	The Village of Taylor is zoned, it being the only incorporated municipality within Loup County.



<b>4.</b>	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	October 10, 2001.

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	N/A
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	N/A
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	An agreement for Consulting and Training Services with William E. Kaiser was signed on October 10, 2012. The scope of this agreement can be found in said document on file with the State of Nebraska Property Tax Department.

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	I use a local person to list all new improvements for my office.
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	This service is not performed under a contract and I have used the same person for over 10 years. She is very familiar with the county, the people and the improvements.
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	The county would require any appraisal certifications and/or qualifications as established by statute and the Nebraska Appraisal Board.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	N/A
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	No, the local lister obtains data including but not limited to: measurements, construction date, heating/cooling, percent complete at the time of listing, construction materials (siding, roof, etc.), number of bathrooms/fixtures/rough-ins, and any and all other information required to get an accurate pricing using the Marshall & Swift program.



## 2014 Certification for Loup 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 Loup 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



