

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 Thayer County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	144	Median	97.16
Total Sales Price	\$7,652,700	Mean	97.55
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,626,900	Wgt. Mean	91.98
Total Assessed Value	\$7,014,903	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$44,432
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,965	Avg. Assessed Value	\$48,715

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.88 to 101.11
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.81 to 95.14
95% Mean C.I	93.99 to 101.11
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	8.26
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.28
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.79

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	132	98	98.12
2012	108	97	96.78
2011	124	97	97
2010	135	98	98

2014 Commission Summary for Thayer County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	95.51
Total Sales Price	\$906,100	Mean	89.70
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$986,100	Wgt. Mean	87.47
Total Assessed Value	\$862,556	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$84,263
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$109,567	Avg. Assessed Value	\$95,840

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	79.49 to 104.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	82.27 to 92.68
95% Mean C.I	72.70 to 106.70
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.80
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.10

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	10		95.80
2012	13		97.19
2011	16		97
2010	18	98	98

2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Thayer 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	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2014 Residential Assessment Actions for Thayer County

The county completed all residential pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. This analysis resulted in a minor increase to the economic depreciation in the town of Alexandria; and a decrease to the economic depreciation in the town of Deshler. No other whole towns or valuation groups were adjusted, but the additional economic depreciation that had been on rural houses with values above \$200,000 was removed.

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

The county inspected, reviewed, and updated all residential property in the towns of Alexandria and Gilead, as well as, all rural residences, acreages, and buildings on parcels in the four geocodes located in Township 4. This includes Geocodes 4145, 4147, 4149, and 4151. They also revalued the residential land in the towns of Hebron, Alexandria and Gilead.

Prior to the inspection process it is the county's procedure to send questionnaires to all property owners in the area to be inspected. The questionnaire requests information regarding the interior features of the residence, and changes during the last 5 years. The inspection process includes going door to door with the existing record and questionnaire, verifying or updating the following: measurements, description of property characteristics, observations of quality and condition and take new photos.

That will complete the 6 year inspection and review process of all improvements on agricultural, rural residential and urban parcels.

2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Thayer County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:																												
	Assessor and Staff																												
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:																												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 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;">1</td> <td>Hebron: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, medical facilities, school, good community infrastructure and social structure.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Alexandria: Characteristics - No commercial businesses or services, school connection with Jefferson County, and location (distance to work and services).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Belvidere: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses, location on 81 Hwy, consolidated school system at Hebron.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Bruning: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, location on 81 Hwy, preschool and high school in community, adequate community infrastructure and social structure, strong sense of community.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Byron: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, consolidated school in Hebron, strong sense of community and location.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Carleton: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, some agricultural based employment, and unified school system in Bruning and Davenport.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Chester: Characteristics –few commercial businesses, some agricultural based employment, location on 81 Hwy., consolidated school at Hebron.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Davenport: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses and services, minimal employment available, unified school (elementary school only)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Deshler: Characteristics-Good commercial businesses and services, employment opportunity, K-12 school system, good community infrastructure and social structures.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Gilead: Characteristics – One commercial business, consolidated school in Hebron, located on Hwy 136.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td>Hubbell: Characteristics- Few commercial businesses, consolidated school in Hebron, location (some distance to employment and services).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td>Acreage: (Including: Rural): Characteristics- Acreages- parcels w/improvements that are less than 20 acres. Rural – parcels with improvements attached to larger agricultural acres.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td>Recreational: Characteristics – Parcels that are primarily used for personal enjoyment (non-agricultural purposes).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Hebron: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, medical facilities, school, good community infrastructure and social structure.	2	Alexandria: Characteristics - No commercial businesses or services, school connection with Jefferson County, and location (distance to work and services).	3	Belvidere: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses, location on 81 Hwy, consolidated school system at Hebron.	4	Bruning: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, location on 81 Hwy, preschool and high school in community, adequate community infrastructure and social structure, strong sense of community.	5	Byron: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, consolidated school in Hebron, strong sense of community and location.	6	Carleton: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, some agricultural based employment, and unified school system in Bruning and Davenport.	7	Chester: Characteristics –few commercial businesses, some agricultural based employment, location on 81 Hwy., consolidated school at Hebron.	8	Davenport: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses and services, minimal employment available, unified school (elementary school only)	9	Deshler: Characteristics-Good commercial businesses and services, employment opportunity, K-12 school system, good community infrastructure and social structures.	10	Gilead: Characteristics – One commercial business, consolidated school in Hebron, located on Hwy 136.	11	Hubbell: Characteristics- Few commercial businesses, consolidated school in Hebron, location (some distance to employment and services).	12	Acreage: (Including: Rural): Characteristics- Acreages- parcels w/improvements that are less than 20 acres. Rural – parcels with improvements attached to larger agricultural acres.	13	Recreational: Characteristics – Parcels that are primarily used for personal enjoyment (non-agricultural purposes).
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																												
1	Hebron: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, medical facilities, school, good community infrastructure and social structure.																												
2	Alexandria: Characteristics - No commercial businesses or services, school connection with Jefferson County, and location (distance to work and services).																												
3	Belvidere: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses, location on 81 Hwy, consolidated school system at Hebron.																												
4	Bruning: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, location on 81 Hwy, preschool and high school in community, adequate community infrastructure and social structure, strong sense of community.																												
5	Byron: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, consolidated school in Hebron, strong sense of community and location.																												
6	Carleton: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, some agricultural based employment, and unified school system in Bruning and Davenport.																												
7	Chester: Characteristics –few commercial businesses, some agricultural based employment, location on 81 Hwy., consolidated school at Hebron.																												
8	Davenport: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses and services, minimal employment available, unified school (elementary school only)																												
9	Deshler: Characteristics-Good commercial businesses and services, employment opportunity, K-12 school system, good community infrastructure and social structures.																												
10	Gilead: Characteristics – One commercial business, consolidated school in Hebron, located on Hwy 136.																												
11	Hubbell: Characteristics- Few commercial businesses, consolidated school in Hebron, location (some distance to employment and services).																												
12	Acreage: (Including: Rural): Characteristics- Acreages- parcels w/improvements that are less than 20 acres. Rural – parcels with improvements attached to larger agricultural acres.																												
13	Recreational: Characteristics – Parcels that are primarily used for personal enjoyment (non-agricultural purposes).																												

	14	Subdivision: Characteristics- Parcels near Hebron which are located in a platted subdivision on hard surface with some city utilities.																																																														
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.																																																															
	Cost Approach																																																															
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?																																																															
	The county develops depreciation tables based on the analysis of the sales in their county.																																																															
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																																																															
	Yes: The county develops depreciation tables for each valuation group. They structure their primary depreciation tables around the market analysis done in Hebron. Then the basic tables are extended to the other valuation groups using economic factors developed by analyzing the sales in each valuation grouping.																																																															
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?																																																															
	Sales comparison approach developed from market analysis is used. The county believes that equity of values is the most important part of land valuation. Similar lots in similar locations must be valued similarly.																																																															
7.	<table border="1"> <thead> <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> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>2010</td><td>2008</td><td>2010</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>2014</td><td>2008</td><td>2014</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>2011</td><td>2008</td><td>2011</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>2012</td><td>2008</td><td>2012</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>2009</td><td>2008</td><td>2009</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>2012</td><td>2008</td><td>2012</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>2011</td><td>2008</td><td>2011</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>2013</td><td>2008</td><td>2013</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>2009</td><td>2008</td><td>2009</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>2014</td><td>2008</td><td>2014</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>2009</td><td>2008</td><td>2009</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>2011/2014</td><td>2008</td><td>2011/2014</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>2011/2014</td><td>2008</td><td>2011/2014</td></tr> <tr><td>14</td><td>2010</td><td>2008</td><td>2010</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	1	2010	2008	2010	2	2014	2008	2014	3	2011	2008	2011	4	2012	2008	2012	5	2009	2008	2009	6	2012	2008	2012	7	2011	2008	2011	8	2013	2008	2013	9	2009	2008	2009	10	2014	2008	2014	11	2009	2008	2009	12	2011/2014	2008	2011/2014	13	2011/2014	2008	2011/2014	14	2010	2008	2010
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>																																																													
1	2010	2008	2010																																																													
2	2014	2008	2014																																																													
3	2011	2008	2011																																																													
4	2012	2008	2012																																																													
5	2009	2008	2009																																																													
6	2012	2008	2012																																																													
7	2011	2008	2011																																																													
8	2013	2008	2013																																																													
9	2009	2008	2009																																																													
10	2014	2008	2014																																																													
11	2009	2008	2009																																																													
12	2011/2014	2008	2011/2014																																																													
13	2011/2014	2008	2011/2014																																																													
14	2010	2008	2010																																																													

----The county has developed the valuation groups partly based on the original assessor locations and partly on the way they organize their work. They typically inspect, review and analyze each town separately. The county has identified characteristics that make each town unique. Those characteristics vary, but are usually related to the population, schools, location, businesses and services in each town.

----Base depreciation schedules are developed but ongoing sale analysis is used to identify the need to adjust the schedules by an economic factor. The ongoing analysis of sales drives any needed adjustments.

----All of the parcels in each individual valuation grouping have costs from the same cost year. All residential costs are now from the 12/2008 cost tables.

----The base lot study was done in 2003; but lot values are continuously reviewed as part of the ongoing inspection process. Each time the depreciation is updated, the land values are reviewed and affirmed or updated if it is necessary.

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Thayer County

County Overview

Thayer County is an agriculturally based county with an array of 11 villages and towns. Ten of them range in population from 39 to 747 and exist primarily to support agriculture. Hebron, with a population of 1,579, is the largest town and county seat. It hosts additional nonagricultural employers and has a more diversified business climate. According to the 2010 Census data cited in the Departments CTL based municipality charts; the county population is 5,228, with 3,637 or 69.57% living within the villages and towns and 1,591 or 30.43% living outside of the municipal areas. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of residential property. Some locations have shown some positive residential growth but most have remained stable.

Description of Analysis:

Thayer County has divided their residential analysis and valuation work into 14 valuation groups. These groups are centered on individual towns, recreational and rural residential parcels. The characteristics of each Valuation Group are described in in the Residential Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector.

For 2014, the median ratio for the 144 qualified residential sales is 97% and is within the acceptable range; the COD at 16.59 is above the acceptable range and the PRD at 106.06 is above the acceptable range. It is often useful to evaluate the quality of assessment of a slightly trimmed sample of the 95 sales with prices above \$30,000. This statistic represents over 66% of the qualified sales and the mean, which is the statistic most sensitive to outliers, decreases 4.43 percentage points, the COD and the PRD both move into the acceptable range. The 49 sales below \$30,000 are excluded in this exercise to demonstrate that the county's predominant residential parcels are properly valued and only the volatile low dollar parcels are responsible for the appearance of regressive assessment. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median. There are seven minor valuation groups with 6 or less sales outside the range, but they are not considered adequate for individual measurement or adjustment.

Sales Qualification

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

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Thayer County

measurement process. The county qualified 49% of all of the residential sales, so the Department believes that all available sales were used in the measurement process.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department is confident that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class partly because the assessment practices are good, partly because the sample is adequate and partly because the prepared statistics reasonably represent the class. The values are equalized throughout the residential class and there are no subclasses of the residential class identified for individual adjustments.

Level of Value

The apparent level of value for the residential class is 97%, the quality of the assessment, based on the statistical indicators and the assessment actions is acceptable and there are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses.

2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Thayer County

The county completed all commercial pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

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

The county inspected, reviewed, and updated all commercial property in the towns of Alexandria and Gilead. They also revalued the commercial lots in the towns of Alexandria and Gilead.

Prior to the inspection process it is the county's procedure to send notices to all commercial property owners in the area to be inspected stating that the county will be at their property as part of the 6 year review process. The inspection process includes going door to door with the existing record, verifying or updating the following: measurements, description of property characteristics, observations of quality and condition and taking new photos.

2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Thayer County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:																										
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor, and Staff																										
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:																										
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <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;">1</td> <td>Hebron: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, medical facilities, school, good community infrastructure and social structure.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Alexandria: Characteristics - No commercial businesses or services, school connection with Jefferson County, and location (distance to work and services).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Belvidere: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses, location on 81 Hwy, consolidated school system at Hebron.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Bruning: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, location on 81 Hwy, preschool and high school in community, adequate community infrastructure and social structure, strong sense of community.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Byron: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, consolidated school in Hebron, strong sense of community and location.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Carleton: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, some agricultural based employment, and unified school system in Bruning and Davenport.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Chester: Characteristics –few commercial businesses, some agricultural based employment, location on 81 Hwy., consolidated school at Hebron.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Davenport: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses and services, minimal employment available, unified school (elementary school only).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Deshler: Characteristics-Good commercial businesses and services, employment opportunity, K-12 school system, good community infrastructure and social structures.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Gilead: Characteristics – One commercial business, consolidated school in Hebron, located on Hwy 136.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td>Hubbell: Characteristics- Few commercial businesses, consolidated school in Hebron, location (some distance to employment and services).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td>Rural: Characteristics- Any commercial parcel located throughout the county, that is not in or associated with any town or other valuation group.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Hebron: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, medical facilities, school, good community infrastructure and social structure.	2	Alexandria: Characteristics - No commercial businesses or services, school connection with Jefferson County, and location (distance to work and services).	3	Belvidere: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses, location on 81 Hwy, consolidated school system at Hebron.	4	Bruning: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, location on 81 Hwy, preschool and high school in community, adequate community infrastructure and social structure, strong sense of community.	5	Byron: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, consolidated school in Hebron, strong sense of community and location.	6	Carleton: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, some agricultural based employment, and unified school system in Bruning and Davenport.	7	Chester: Characteristics –few commercial businesses, some agricultural based employment, location on 81 Hwy., consolidated school at Hebron.	8	Davenport: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses and services, minimal employment available, unified school (elementary school only).	9	Deshler: Characteristics-Good commercial businesses and services, employment opportunity, K-12 school system, good community infrastructure and social structures.	10	Gilead: Characteristics – One commercial business, consolidated school in Hebron, located on Hwy 136.	11	Hubbell: Characteristics- Few commercial businesses, consolidated school in Hebron, location (some distance to employment and services).	12	Rural: Characteristics- Any commercial parcel located throughout the county, that is not in or associated with any town or other valuation group.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																										
1	Hebron: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, medical facilities, school, good community infrastructure and social structure.																										
2	Alexandria: Characteristics - No commercial businesses or services, school connection with Jefferson County, and location (distance to work and services).																										
3	Belvidere: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses, location on 81 Hwy, consolidated school system at Hebron.																										
4	Bruning: Characteristics – Good commercial businesses and services, location on 81 Hwy, preschool and high school in community, adequate community infrastructure and social structure, strong sense of community.																										
5	Byron: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, consolidated school in Hebron, strong sense of community and location.																										
6	Carleton: Characteristics – Some commercial businesses and services, some agricultural based employment, and unified school system in Bruning and Davenport.																										
7	Chester: Characteristics –few commercial businesses, some agricultural based employment, location on 81 Hwy., consolidated school at Hebron.																										
8	Davenport: Characteristics – Few commercial businesses and services, minimal employment available, unified school (elementary school only).																										
9	Deshler: Characteristics-Good commercial businesses and services, employment opportunity, K-12 school system, good community infrastructure and social structures.																										
10	Gilead: Characteristics – One commercial business, consolidated school in Hebron, located on Hwy 136.																										
11	Hubbell: Characteristics- Few commercial businesses, consolidated school in Hebron, location (some distance to employment and services).																										
12	Rural: Characteristics- Any commercial parcel located throughout the county, that is not in or associated with any town or other valuation group.																										

3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.																																																				
	Cost approach, sales comparison approach, and income approach when applicable.																																																				
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.																																																				
	Unique commercial property appraisal is usually done by the contract appraiser. The county uses the cost approach on unique parcels but also do additional sales research, seeking sales of similar properties from other counties. They also study the methodologies, approaches to values and the values of similar parcels in other counties. All of the information gathered is then used to correlate an estimate of value for the parcel. These steps are taken to address uniformity between counties as well as develop the best estimate of market value that they can.																																																				
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?																																																				
	The county develops its own depreciation tables.																																																				
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																																																				
	No and yes; Depreciation is applied on a parcel by parcel basis by the appraiser based on current market analysis, and the observations of quality and condition. Economic factors are developed by each valuation grouping.																																																				
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.																																																				
	All commercial lot values are developed from analyzing the market. Except for Hebron, the most common practice in the minor towns is that the commercial lots tend to be valued similarly to the residential lots, since the available sales have shown little if any difference based on commercial use. The primary consideration is that lot values are uniform. That means that similar lots in similar locations should be valued similarly.																																																				
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>1</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2010</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2014</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2010</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2011</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2010</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2011</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2011</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2010</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2014</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2010</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</td><td>2012</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>	1	2012	2012	2010	2	2012	2012	2014	3	2012	2012	2010	4	2012	2012	2011	5	2012	2012	2010	6	2012	2012	2012	7	2012	2012	2011	8	2012	2012	2011	9	2012	2012	2010	10	2012	2012	2014	11	2012	2012	2010	12	2012	2012	2012
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>																																																		
1	2012	2012	2010																																																		
2	2012	2012	2014																																																		
3	2012	2012	2010																																																		
4	2012	2012	2011																																																		
5	2012	2012	2010																																																		
6	2012	2012	2012																																																		
7	2012	2012	2011																																																		
8	2012	2012	2011																																																		
9	2012	2012	2010																																																		
10	2012	2012	2014																																																		
11	2012	2012	2010																																																		
12	2012	2012	2012																																																		

----The county has developed the valuation groups partly based on the original assessor locations and partly on the way they organize their work. They typically inspect, review and analyze each town separately. The county has identified characteristics that make each town unique. Those characteristics vary, but are usually related to the population, schools, location, businesses and services in each town.

----The last depreciation schedules for commercial property were done in 2006. Typically, the depreciation is updated when costs are updated. There may be additional schedules prepared for use with properties with unique or single purpose occupancy codes.

----The costs for all commercial valuation groupings are from 2012.

----A study was done in 2009 for commercial lots near Highway 81. Commercial lots are analyzed at the time of commercial review. Whenever values and depreciation are updated, land values are either affirmed or updated as well.

2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Thayer County

County Overview

Thayer County is an agriculturally based county with an array of eleven villages and small towns. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. Hebron, the county seat, is the predominant location for much of the commercial and industrial property. The Department's "2013 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type" reports that 27% of the commercial valuation is reported in Hebron, 56% is in the 10 smaller towns and nearly 17% is in the non-municipal areas. Thayer County has limited industrial improvements; Hebron has about 6%, Bruning has about 7% of the industrial valuation and the remaining 87% is in the non-municipal areas of the county. In all, the commercial values are stable to increasing in most parts of the county. Reinke Manufacturing has recently expanded their plant and that has had significant economic impact on much of the demand for residential property as well as some of the other commercial property.

Description of Analysis

Thayer County has divided their commercial analysis and valuation work into twelve valuation groups. These groups are defined by individual towns and rural commercial parcels. The characteristics of each valuation group are described in the Commercial Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector.

The key statistics that are prepared and considered for measurement are as follows: there are 9 qualified sales; the median ratio is 96%; the COD is 15.35; and the PRD is 102.55. Of the 9 qualified sales, 4 are in Hebron, 2 sales each in Carleton and Deshler, and 1 in Chester. There were 8 valuation groups that had no sales. When the 9 different occupancy codes are reviewed, there is only 1 sale in each occupancy code. Since there are only 9 sales and 9 occupancy codes, there are still many property types with no representation and those that are represented are insufficient for preparing a viable statistical analysis. In short, there are not sufficient sales to represent or measure either the overall class or any subclass of the commercial property.

Sales Qualification

The Department's has reviewed the county's sale verification process and finds that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process and that all available qualified sales were used in the measurement process.

2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Thayer County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department analyzes each county every third year to systematically review assessment practices. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Level of Value

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

2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Thayer County

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

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. This analysis resulted in the removal of economic depreciation that had been on rural houses with values above \$200,000.

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

The county inspected, reviewed, and updated all rural residences, acreages, and buildings on parcels in the four geocodes located in Township 4. This includes Geocodes 4145, 4147, 4149, and 4151.

Prior to the inspection process it is the county's procedure to send questionnaires to all property owners in the area to be inspected. The questionnaire requests information regarding the interior features of the residence, and changes during the last 5 years. The inspection process utilized the existing records, and aerial photos. The inspection and review of each parcel included an onsite review, verification of measurements, verification of building components and condition, for all rural and agricultural residences and agricultural buildings. New photos were taken for all residences and key agricultural buildings.

2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Thayer County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:						
	Assessor and Staff						
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th><th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td><td>Northern part of the county, primarily irrigated cropland with some dryland and grassland mixed in. Most land has the availability of water and the topography is much more desirable.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td><td>Southern part of the county is mostly dry land and grassland with limited irrigated cropland. A large portion of this area does not have the availability of water, the topography is typically rougher and land values tend to be lower than the rest of the county.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Northern part of the county, primarily irrigated cropland with some dryland and grassland mixed in. Most land has the availability of water and the topography is much more desirable.	2	Southern part of the county is mostly dry land and grassland with limited irrigated cropland. A large portion of this area does not have the availability of water, the topography is typically rougher and land values tend to be lower than the rest of the county.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>						
1	Northern part of the county, primarily irrigated cropland with some dryland and grassland mixed in. Most land has the availability of water and the topography is much more desirable.						
2	Southern part of the county is mostly dry land and grassland with limited irrigated cropland. A large portion of this area does not have the availability of water, the topography is typically rougher and land values tend to be lower than the rest of the county.						
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.						
	Each year, the available sales are verified and analyzed. Any changes in value patterns must be noted and possibly integrated into the valuation process if warranted. Any pattern of change in farming practices are followed to see if they impact value or have identifiable reasons.						
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.						
	Rural Residential and recreational land is identified following the guidelines of the County Agricultural or Horticultural Definition Policy. Recreational land is identified based on its present/primary use, or its lack of ag use.						
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?						
	Yes, except for the excess acres on the rural residential. The first acre of the rural farm home site is valued at \$8,000 and any residual acres (Building site) are valued at \$1,500. The first acre for the rural residential home site is \$8,000, and any residual acres (building site) are valued at \$1,500 and all excess acres beyond the building site are valued at \$750.						
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.						
	As the county verifies sales, they monitor for any emerging trend of the conversion of parcels of agricultural land to non-agricultural use.						
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.						
	No						
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.						
	Thayer County has only one parcel enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program. There have not been sales of WRP land in this area and therefore, the potential effect the restrictions have on the market is unclear. Because WRP land carries restrictions the land is not valued at 100% of average grass value, but will continue to be comparable to recreational land.						

Thayer County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Thayer	1	5,950	5,950	5,700	5,275	4,900	4,702	4,650	4,650	5,571
Clay	1	6,300	6,300	5,500	5,300	4,490	N/A	4,200	4,200	5,856
Fillmore	1	5,900	5,800	5,700	5,600	5,300	N/A	4,900	4,750	5,675
Fillmore	2	5,900	5,800	5,700	5,600	5,300	5,100	4,900	4,750	5,687
Jefferson	1	5,625	7,041	4,424	5,464	5,044	N/A	4,345	3,170	6,007
Nuckolls	1	5,600	5,600	4,560	3,950	3,860	3,860	3,860	3,860	5,098
Saline	2	5,022	5,021	4,929	4,545	4,268	3,650	3,645	3,535	4,709
Thayer	2	5,150	5,150	4,900	4,500	4,125	N/A	3,850	3,850	4,568
Jefferson	2	4,335	6,365	3,385	3,350	3,316	N/A	2,752	2,360	4,582
Jefferson	3	4,300	4,951	3,665	2,875	3,470	N/A	2,960	2,530	3,808
Nuckolls	1	5,600	5,600	4,560	3,950	3,860	3,860	3,860	3,860	5,098

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Thayer	1	3,900	3,900	3,550	3,450	3,190	3,000	3,000	2,950	3,581
Clay	1	3,575	3,405	3,000	2,690	2,530	N/A	2,575	2,550	3,146
Fillmore	1	3,555	3,515	3,415	3,365	3,214	N/A	2,922	2,855	3,405
Fillmore	2	3,455	3,405	3,305	3,225	3,090	2,950	2,815	2,755	3,306
Jefferson	1	3,800	4,959	2,990	3,692	3,155	N/A	2,935	1,650	3,954
Nuckolls	1	2,660	2,660	2,171	2,173	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,442
Saline	2	4,058	4,056	3,773	3,704	3,591	3,150	3,146	3,020	3,768
Thayer	2	2,900	2,900	2,750	2,650	2,550	2,382	2,350	2,325	2,674
Jefferson	2	2,710	4,246	2,105	2,095	1,844	N/A	1,620	935	2,861
Jefferson	3	2,530	2,905	2,155	1,690	1,735	N/A	1,215	1,000	2,009
Nuckolls	1	2,660	2,660	2,171	2,173	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,442

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Thayer	1	1,409	1,625	1,371	1,342	1,416	1,283	1,379	1,268	1,364
Clay	1	1,350	1,350	1,285	1,285	1,215	N/A	1,150	1,115	1,189
Fillmore	1	1,260	1,240	1,180	1,120	1,107	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,087
Fillmore	2	1,260	1,240	1,180	1,120	1,100	1,020	1,000	1,000	1,095
Jefferson	1	1,968	2,634	1,686	2,199	1,205	N/A	1,948	715	1,508
Nuckolls	1	1,090	1,109	945	1,114	1,125	368	1,123	1,054	1,074
Saline	2	1,616	1,826	1,464	1,863	1,770	515	1,535	1,048	1,397
Thayer	2	1,290	1,390	1,248	1,242	1,358	N/A	1,234	1,190	1,242
Jefferson	2	1,383	1,542	1,363	1,216	1,232	N/A	1,160	873	1,134
Jefferson	3	1,330	1,547	1,220	1,216	1,232	N/A	1,169	955	1,086
Nuckolls	1	1,090	1,109	945	1,114	1,125	368	1,123	1,054	1,074

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

2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Thayer County

County Overview

Thayer County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The prevalent crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. The county land use is approximately 44% irrigated land, 33% dry land, 20% grass land and 3% other uses. Thayer County is bordered on the north by Fillmore County, on the south by the State of Kansas, on the east by Jefferson County, and on the west by Nuckolls County. The agricultural land is valued using two market areas. The characteristics of the Market Areas are more fully described in the Agricultural Assessment Survey.

Description of Analysis

There was a total sample of 54 qualified sales; 38 Thayer County sales supplemented with 16 additional qualified sales used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in the county. The sample after supplementation was deemed adequate, proportional among study years and representative based on major land uses. Any comparable sales used were selected from a similar agricultural area within six miles of the subject county.

In this study, the 80% Majority Land Use Tables demonstrate that the irrigated values for the county and for Area 1 are within the range. Sales with predominantly dry and grass acres and other majority land uses are too scarce to produce an independent measurement. The county tends to have mixed use sales and the area from which to find supplemental sales is limited since Thayer County is adjacent to Kansas on the south. The county has made substantial changes to all of the values based on their analysis. The Department is not recommending any change to the values based on any major land use.

The calculated median ratio is 72%; the COD 31.91 and the PRD is 120.30. Given the high appreciation in land value during the three years of this analysis, little weight is given to the COD and PRD. The 2014 abstract reports; overall agricultural land increased by 45.97%; irrigated land increased by over 49%, dry land increased by nearly 48%, and grass land increased by nearly 20%. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values.

Sales Qualification

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

2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Thayer County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values. Each year, the county verifies all of the new sales that take place. They update any changes to land use that are discovered or reported. They completely analyze and revalue all agricultural land within a classification system and monitor sales to affirm their use of one market area. The quality of assessment for agricultural land is acceptable.

Level of Value

For 2014, the apparent level of value of agricultural land is 72% and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. There are no strong indications of any major subclass outside the range. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

85 Thayer
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 : 144
 Total Sales Price : 7,652,700
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,626,900
 Total Assessed Value : 7,014,903
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,965
 Avg. Assessed Value : 48,715

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 16.59
 PRD : 106.06

COV : 22.32
 STD : 21.77
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.12
 MAX Sales Ratio : 177.15
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.79

95% Median C.I. : 91.88 to 101.11
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.81 to 95.14
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.99 to 101.11

Printed:3/28/2014 11:38:49AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	17	104.77	107.82	110.85	15.80	97.27	58.57	177.15	92.73 to 113.96	36,194	40,121
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	19	98.00	96.92	86.03	17.84	112.66	54.65	146.55	77.79 to 106.18	62,166	53,479
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	20	93.09	97.00	93.06	14.35	104.23	62.28	137.87	87.69 to 101.81	44,923	41,805
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	17	87.60	91.16	86.56	17.23	105.31	55.85	120.79	75.07 to 108.33	67,000	57,992
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	10	92.88	94.06	89.90	14.44	104.63	70.62	120.94	73.85 to 115.46	52,050	46,793
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	15	99.77	99.71	94.97	18.61	104.99	56.95	149.50	78.35 to 117.53	48,793	46,340
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	25	99.89	100.14	93.97	14.69	106.57	53.79	170.97	87.66 to 104.54	56,272	52,880
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	21	89.93	92.56	89.06	18.64	103.93	54.85	153.66	80.27 to 102.84	53,990	48,083
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	73	98.10	98.14	91.82	16.31	106.88	54.65	177.15	91.23 to 102.12	52,519	48,221
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	71	96.60	96.95	92.14	16.75	105.22	53.79	170.97	89.25 to 101.84	53,423	49,222
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	66	94.60	95.03	88.42	16.05	107.48	54.65	146.55	87.60 to 101.21	56,653	50,091
<u>ALL</u>	144	97.16	97.55	91.98	16.59	106.06	53.79	177.15	91.88 to 101.11	52,965	48,715

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	54	95.96	94.66	93.04	15.78	101.74	53.79	142.16	87.62 to 102.80	57,181	53,199
02	5	102.91	111.79	115.91	29.85	96.45	58.57	177.15	N/A	17,000	19,705
03	1	135.40	135.40	135.40	00.00	100.00	135.40	135.40	N/A	5,000	6,770
04	13	95.22	99.67	89.63	15.36	111.20	54.65	153.66	89.19 to 112.63	38,577	34,578
05	3	79.38	92.07	84.95	18.32	108.38	76.60	120.23	N/A	30,633	26,022
07	11	98.10	99.46	99.96	18.34	99.50	62.28	149.50	74.24 to 128.13	26,545	26,535
08	12	98.68	101.35	91.43	17.47	110.85	59.56	170.97	82.42 to 111.61	48,542	44,380
09	31	97.10	96.77	91.03	13.99	106.31	70.23	146.55	87.69 to 104.04	66,124	60,191
10	4	89.72	96.89	90.11	12.80	107.52	82.63	125.51	N/A	23,350	21,040
11	3	120.94	116.97	118.62	07.25	98.61	101.84	128.14	N/A	17,000	20,166
12	6	86.65	88.92	84.65	16.39	105.04	66.71	112.94	66.71 to 112.94	85,333	72,232
14	1	87.60	87.60	87.60	00.00	100.00	87.60	87.60	N/A	275,000	240,899
<u>ALL</u>	144	97.16	97.55	91.98	16.59	106.06	53.79	177.15	91.88 to 101.11	52,965	48,715

85 Thayer
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 : 144
 Total Sales Price : 7,652,700
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,626,900
 Total Assessed Value : 7,014,903
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,965
 Avg. Assessed Value : 48,715

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 16.59
 PRD : 106.06

COV : 22.32
 STD : 21.77
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.12
 MAX Sales Ratio : 177.15
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.79

95% Median C.I. : 91.88 to 101.11
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.81 to 95.14
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.99 to 101.11

Printed:3/28/2014 11:38:49AM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	144	97.16	97.55	91.98	16.59	106.06	53.79	177.15	91.88 to 101.11	52,965	48,715
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	144	97.16	97.55	91.98	16.59	106.06	53.79	177.15	91.88 to 101.11	52,965	48,715

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	128.14	128.14	128.14	00.00	100.00	128.14	128.14	N/A	3,500	4,485
Less Than 15,000	13	107.73	105.30	105.60	20.42	99.72	58.57	135.40	81.39 to 131.46	9,515	10,048
Less Than 30,000	49	101.84	106.15	104.34	19.44	101.73	54.85	177.15	97.10 to 109.66	18,237	19,028
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	143	97.10	97.34	91.96	16.50	105.85	53.79	177.15	91.88 to 101.06	53,310	49,024
Greater Than 14,999	131	96.83	96.78	91.75	15.88	105.48	53.79	177.15	91.48 to 100.45	57,276	52,552
Greater Than 29,999	95	92.14	93.12	90.34	14.76	103.08	53.79	149.50	87.69 to 99.73	70,877	64,027
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	128.14	128.14	128.14	00.00	100.00	128.14	128.14	N/A	3,500	4,485
5,000 TO 14,999	12	104.79	103.39	104.95	21.12	98.51	58.57	135.40	81.39 to 131.46	10,017	10,512
15,000 TO 29,999	36	101.28	106.46	104.14	18.58	102.23	54.85	177.15	94.90 to 109.66	21,386	22,271
30,000 TO 59,999	47	98.25	97.16	96.78	14.53	100.39	53.79	149.50	89.53 to 103.91	42,467	41,099
60,000 TO 99,999	30	93.09	91.60	91.05	13.38	100.60	55.85	113.96	82.42 to 101.21	73,462	66,888
100,000 TO 149,999	14	88.47	85.34	84.62	14.10	100.85	54.65	109.05	66.71 to 99.77	119,750	101,329
150,000 TO 249,999	3	84.07	83.16	83.28	03.90	99.86	77.79	87.62	N/A	194,000	161,566
250,000 TO 499,999	1	87.60	87.60	87.60	00.00	100.00	87.60	87.60	N/A	275,000	240,899
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	144	97.16	97.55	91.98	16.59	106.06	53.79	177.15	91.88 to 101.11	52,965	48,715

85 Thayer
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 : 9
 Total Sales Price : 906,100
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 986,100
 Total Assessed Value : 862,556
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 109,567
 Avg. Assessed Value : 95,840

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 87
 MEAN : 90
 COD : 15.35
 PRD : 102.55

COV : 24.66
 STD : 22.12
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.66
 MAX Sales Ratio : 123.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.50

95% Median C.I. : 79.49 to 104.28
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.27 to 92.68
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.70 to 106.70

Printed:3/28/2014 11:38:50AM

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	1	85.35	85.35	85.35	00.00	100.00	85.35	85.35	N/A	720,000	614,496
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	95.92	98.57	96.58	03.04	102.06	95.51	104.28	N/A	42,167	40,726
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	97.88	97.88	97.88	00.00	100.00	97.88	97.88	N/A	46,000	45,025
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	101.63	101.63	102.26	21.78	99.38	79.49	123.76	N/A	24,300	24,850
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	42.50	42.50	42.50	00.00	100.00	42.50	42.50	N/A	15,000	6,375
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	82.60	82.60	82.60	00.00	100.00	82.60	82.60	N/A	30,000	24,781
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	5	95.92	95.79	87.59	04.44	109.36	85.35	104.28	N/A	178,500	156,340
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	101.63	101.63	102.26	21.78	99.38	79.49	123.76	N/A	24,300	24,850
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	2	62.55	62.55	69.24	32.05	90.34	42.50	82.60	N/A	22,500	15,578
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	95.92	97.46	88.34	09.77	110.32	79.49	123.76	79.49 to 123.76	134,443	118,771
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12											
<u>ALL</u>	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	4	83.98	76.59	85.30	16.72	89.79	42.50	95.92	N/A	207,500	177,000
06	2	110.82	110.82	106.99	11.68	103.58	97.88	123.76	N/A	35,500	37,983
07	1	95.51	95.51	95.51	00.00	100.00	95.51	95.51	N/A	49,000	46,798
09	2	91.89	91.89	88.07	13.49	104.34	79.49	104.28	N/A	18,050	15,898
<u>ALL</u>	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840

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	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840
04											
<u>ALL</u>	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840

85 Thayer
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 : 9
 Total Sales Price : 906,100
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 986,100
 Total Assessed Value : 862,556
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 109,567
 Avg. Assessed Value : 95,840

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 87
 MEAN : 90
 COD : 15.35
 PRD : 102.55

COV : 24.66
 STD : 22.12
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.66
 MAX Sales Ratio : 123.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.50

95% Median C.I. : 79.49 to 104.28
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.27 to 92.68
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.70 to 106.70

Printed:3/28/2014 11:38:50AM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	1	104.28	104.28	104.28	00.00	100.00	104.28	104.28	N/A	12,500	13,035
Less Than 30,000	4	91.89	87.51	90.81	28.85	96.37	42.50	123.76	N/A	19,025	17,278
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840
Greater Than 14,999	8	90.43	87.88	87.26	17.02	100.71	42.50	123.76	42.50 to 123.76	121,700	106,190
Greater Than 29,999	5	95.51	91.45	87.19	05.41	104.89	82.60	97.88	N/A	182,000	158,689
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	104.28	104.28	104.28	00.00	100.00	104.28	104.28	N/A	12,500	13,035
15,000 TO 29,999	3	79.49	81.92	88.17	34.08	92.91	42.50	123.76	N/A	21,200	18,692
30,000 TO 59,999	3	95.51	92.00	93.28	05.33	98.63	82.60	97.88	N/A	41,667	38,868
60,000 TO 99,999	1	95.92	95.92	95.92	00.00	100.00	95.92	95.92	N/A	65,000	62,346
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999	1	85.35	85.35	85.35	00.00	100.00	85.35	85.35	N/A	720,000	614,496
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
344	1	79.49	79.49	79.49	00.00	100.00	79.49	79.49	N/A	23,600	18,760
350	1	97.88	97.88	97.88	00.00	100.00	97.88	97.88	N/A	46,000	45,025
353	1	82.60	82.60	82.60	00.00	100.00	82.60	82.60	N/A	30,000	24,781
381	1	95.92	95.92	95.92	00.00	100.00	95.92	95.92	N/A	65,000	62,346
384	1	42.50	42.50	42.50	00.00	100.00	42.50	42.50	N/A	15,000	6,375
406	1	104.28	104.28	104.28	00.00	100.00	104.28	104.28	N/A	12,500	13,035
410	1	123.76	123.76	123.76	00.00	100.00	123.76	123.76	N/A	25,000	30,940
419	1	85.35	85.35	85.35	00.00	100.00	85.35	85.35	N/A	720,000	614,496
442	1	95.51	95.51	95.51	00.00	100.00	95.51	95.51	N/A	49,000	46,798
<u>ALL</u>	9	95.51	89.70	87.47	15.35	102.55	42.50	123.76	79.49 to 104.28	109,567	95,840

85 Thayer**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 : 54
 Total Sales Price : 44,295,844
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 44,493,244
 Total Assessed Value : 28,805,091
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 823,949
 Avg. Assessed Value : 533,428

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 78
 COD : 31.91
 PRD : 120.30

COV : 37.56
 STD : 29.25
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.86
 MAX Sales Ratio : 156.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.71

95% Median C.I. : 60.83 to 79.90
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.06 to 72.42
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.08 to 85.68

*Printed:3/28/2014 11:38:51AM***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	7	109.29	99.94	106.20	12.34	94.11	71.88	122.83	71.88 to 122.83	606,750	644,372
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	92.57	99.93	91.35	19.30	109.39	79.90	146.10	79.90 to 146.10	362,591	331,213
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	131.00	131.00	117.51	19.68	111.48	105.22	156.78	N/A	161,057	189,262
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	78.38	80.29	83.39	13.19	96.28	65.73	96.75	N/A	715,501	596,629
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	58.67	58.67	58.67	00.00	100.00	58.67	58.67	N/A	676,077	396,674
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	90.10	90.46	74.18	30.29	121.95	60.20	121.44	N/A	502,842	373,029
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	75.11	70.72	68.85	07.84	102.72	59.69	77.37	N/A	1,003,767	691,087
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	7	67.82	74.53	63.75	29.34	116.91	47.41	145.53	47.41 to 145.53	641,909	409,243
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	8	49.76	52.12	49.64	13.02	105.00	40.37	63.24	40.37 to 63.24	1,642,864	815,470
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	6	53.25	53.73	42.89	29.41	125.27	27.71	93.67	27.71 to 93.67	956,139	410,065
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	5	64.03	61.99	63.15	13.63	98.16	48.07	76.96	N/A	1,160,960	733,094
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	20	98.74	100.09	97.01	18.62	103.17	65.73	156.78	80.82 to 109.63	480,830	466,436
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	15	67.82	76.96	66.98	27.78	114.90	47.41	145.53	59.69 to 79.69	679,474	455,117
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	19	53.08	55.23	51.25	20.42	107.77	27.71	93.67	46.63 to 63.24	1,299,187	665,769
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	90.58	97.21	86.26	23.57	112.69	58.67	156.78	78.38 to 117.54	431,816	372,485
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	22	60.52	68.76	57.17	27.97	120.27	40.37	145.53	50.10 to 75.11	1,029,952	588,811
<u>ALL</u>	54	71.63	77.88	64.74	31.91	120.30	27.71	156.78	60.83 to 79.90	823,949	533,428

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	28	71.47	73.53	64.23	30.46	114.48	27.71	156.78	59.69 to 80.82	1,052,192	675,856
2	26	71.63	82.56	65.73	33.55	125.60	49.25	146.10	60.83 to 106.83	578,149	380,043
<u>ALL</u>	54	71.63	77.88	64.74	31.91	120.30	27.71	156.78	60.83 to 79.90	823,949	533,428

85 Thayer**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 : 54
 Total Sales Price : 44,295,844
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 44,493,244
 Total Assessed Value : 28,805,091
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 823,949
 Avg. Assessed Value : 533,428

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 78
 COD : 31.91
 PRD : 120.30

COV : 37.56
 STD : 29.25
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.86
 MAX Sales Ratio : 156.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.71

95% Median C.I. : 60.83 to 79.90
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.06 to 72.42
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.08 to 85.68

*Printed:3/28/2014 11:38:51AM***95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	2	72.41	72.41	70.36	33.61	102.91	48.07	96.75	N/A	885,252	622,848
1	2	72.41	72.41	70.36	33.61	102.91	48.07	96.75	N/A	885,252	622,848
_____Dry_____											
County	6	59.44	65.75	61.25	19.01	107.35	47.41	105.22	47.41 to 105.22	481,709	295,045
1	4	58.75	67.53	61.39	25.84	110.00	47.41	105.22	N/A	471,544	289,499
2	2	62.20	62.20	60.98	05.68	102.00	58.67	65.73	N/A	502,039	306,138
_____Grass_____											
County	1	156.78	156.78	156.78	00.00	100.00	156.78	156.78	N/A	76,800	120,407
1	1	156.78	156.78	156.78	00.00	100.00	156.78	156.78	N/A	76,800	120,407
_____ALL_____	54	71.63	77.88	64.74	31.91	120.30	27.71	156.78	60.83 to 79.90	823,949	533,428

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	21	75.11	72.15	63.76	27.29	113.16	37.22	122.83	49.25 to 80.82	1,246,236	794,595
1	15	75.11	71.01	63.55	26.73	111.74	37.22	122.83	46.63 to 80.82	1,393,872	885,850
2	6	70.26	75.01	64.58	30.69	116.15	49.25	109.29	49.25 to 109.29	877,146	566,457
_____Dry_____											
County	7	60.20	77.15	63.84	36.33	120.85	47.41	145.53	47.41 to 145.53	426,007	271,981
1	4	58.75	67.53	61.39	25.84	110.00	47.41	105.22	N/A	471,544	289,499
2	3	65.73	89.98	68.06	44.04	132.21	58.67	145.53	N/A	365,292	248,625
_____Grass_____											
County	3	109.63	107.88	98.75	30.27	109.25	57.22	156.78	N/A	136,350	134,646
1	1	156.78	156.78	156.78	00.00	100.00	156.78	156.78	N/A	76,800	120,407
2	2	83.43	83.43	85.34	31.42	97.76	57.22	109.63	N/A	166,125	141,766
_____ALL_____	54	71.63	77.88	64.74	31.91	120.30	27.71	156.78	60.83 to 79.90	823,949	533,428

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 6,106

Value : 1,467,949,969

Growth 6,370,252

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	322	627,185	10	145,787	49	87,267	381	860,239	
02. Res Improve Land	1,933	6,037,002	20	416,465	339	3,845,077	2,292	10,298,544	
03. Res Improvements	1,945	73,571,557	20	4,461,054	348	30,699,524	2,313	108,732,135	
04. Res Total	2,267	80,235,744	30	5,023,306	397	34,631,868	2,694	119,890,918	2,999,744
% of Res Total	84.15	66.92	1.11	4.19	14.74	28.89	44.12	8.17	47.09
05. Com UnImp Land	65	274,685	0	0	10	21,728	75	296,413	
06. Com Improve Land	372	1,677,754	0	0	25	822,137	397	2,499,891	
07. Com Improvements	378	23,880,580	0	0	29	4,937,166	407	28,817,746	
08. Com Total	443	25,833,019	0	0	39	5,781,031	482	31,614,050	354,762
% of Com Total	91.91	81.71	0.00	0.00	8.09	18.29	7.89	2.15	5.57
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	51,660	0	0	2	152,334	5	203,994	
11. Ind Improvements	3	1,145,171	0	0	2	8,073,107	5	9,218,278	
12. Ind Total	3	1,196,831	0	0	2	8,225,441	5	9,422,272	482,152
% of Ind Total	60.00	12.70	0.00	0.00	40.00	87.30	0.08	0.64	7.57
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	32	1,004,628	32	1,004,628	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	3	274,204	3	274,204	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	3	84,770	3	84,770	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	35	1,363,602	35	1,363,602	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.57	0.09	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,267	80,235,744	30	5,023,306	432	35,995,470	2,729	121,254,520	2,999,744
% of Res & Rec Total	83.07	66.17	1.10	4.14	15.83	29.69	44.69	8.26	47.09
Com & Ind Total	446	27,029,850	0	0	41	14,006,472	487	41,036,322	836,914
% of Com & Ind Total	91.58	65.87	0.00	0.00	8.42	34.13	7.98	2.80	13.14
17. Taxable Total	2,713	107,265,594	30	5,023,306	473	50,001,942	3,216	162,290,842	3,836,658
% of Taxable Total	84.36	66.09	0.93	3.10	14.71	30.81	52.67	11.06	60.23

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	15	822,887	110,749		0	0	0
19. Commercial	43	4,435,814	9,991,110		0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	488,252	2,011,303		0	0	0
21. Other	4	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		15	822,887	110,749
19. Commercial	0	0	0		43	4,435,814	9,991,110
20. Industrial	0	0	0		1	488,252	2,011,303
21. Other	1	0	0		5	0	0
22. Total Sch II					64	5,746,953	12,113,162

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	347	1	134	482

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	85	1,231,498	6	0	1,938	833,428,436	2,029	834,659,934
28. Ag-Improved Land	37	591,220	2	0	1,049	420,738,056	1,088	421,329,276
29. Ag Improvements	1	15,971	0	0	860	49,653,946	861	49,669,917
30. Ag Total							2,890	1,305,659,127

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	1	2.58	3,863	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	15,971	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	4	0.86	0	8	14.73	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	9	8.94	71,528	9	8.94	71,528	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	369	376.23	3,009,800	369	376.23	3,009,800	
33. HomeSite Improvements	373	0.00	26,130,323	373	0.00	26,130,323	826,278
34. HomeSite Total				382	385.17	29,211,651	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	30	361.85	542,786	31	364.43	546,649	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	758	2,373.35	3,560,208	758	2,373.35	3,560,208	
37. FarmSite Improvements	850	0.00	23,523,623	851	0.00	23,539,594	1,707,316
38. FarmSite Total				882	2,737.78	27,646,451	
39. Road & Ditches	2,705	7,214.21	0	2,717	7,229.80	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	8	25.55	34,388	8	25.55	34,388	
41. Total Section VI				1,264	10,378.30	56,892,490	2,533,594

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	16	1,289.17	2,833,697	16	1,289.17	2,833,697

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	10,278.92	8.47%	61,159,569	9.05%	5,950.00
46. 1A	66,015.51	54.41%	392,793,219	58.11%	5,950.01
47. 2A1	7,719.13	6.36%	43,999,098	6.51%	5,700.01
48. 2A	2,194.07	1.81%	11,573,692	1.71%	5,274.99
49. 3A1	12,293.93	10.13%	60,240,259	8.91%	4,900.00
50. 3A	7.43	0.01%	34,936	0.01%	4,702.02
51. 4A1	15,662.94	12.91%	72,832,621	10.77%	4,650.00
52. 4A	7,167.67	5.91%	33,329,691	4.93%	4,650.00
53. Total	121,339.60	100.00%	675,963,085	100.00%	5,570.84
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,884.03	13.50%	19,047,741	14.70%	3,900.00
55. 1D	15,897.17	43.94%	61,999,661	47.85%	3,900.04
56. 2D1	2,109.87	5.83%	7,490,027	5.78%	3,549.99
57. 2D	773.13	2.14%	2,667,298	2.06%	3,450.00
58. 3D1	4,860.55	13.43%	15,505,183	11.97%	3,190.01
59. 3D	41.48	0.11%	124,446	0.10%	3,000.14
60. 4D1	5,613.81	15.52%	16,841,445	13.00%	3,000.00
61. 4D	2,000.33	5.53%	5,900,992	4.55%	2,950.01
62. Total	36,180.37	100.00%	129,576,793	100.00%	3,581.41
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,531.35	6.94%	2,158,402	7.18%	1,409.48
64. 1G	2,085.42	9.46%	3,389,187	11.27%	1,625.18
65. 2G1	1,453.86	6.59%	1,993,807	6.63%	1,371.39
66. 2G	732.61	3.32%	982,872	3.27%	1,341.60
67. 3G1	1,984.79	9.00%	2,811,368	9.35%	1,416.46
68. 3G	88.23	0.40%	113,232	0.38%	1,283.37
69. 4G1	5,814.93	26.37%	8,017,842	26.67%	1,378.84
70. 4G	8,358.56	37.91%	10,598,206	35.25%	1,267.95
71. Total	22,049.75	100.00%	30,064,916	100.00%	1,363.50
Irrigated Total	121,339.60	65.71%	675,963,085	80.70%	5,570.84
Dry Total	36,180.37	19.59%	129,576,793	15.47%	3,581.41
Grass Total	22,049.75	11.94%	30,064,916	3.59%	1,363.50
72. Waste	928.67	0.50%	139,306	0.02%	150.01
73. Other	4,166.49	2.26%	1,931,871	0.23%	463.67
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	184,664.88	100.00%	837,675,971	100.00%	4,536.20

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,245.82	3.78%	6,415,981	4.26%	5,150.01
46. 1A	14,218.42	43.10%	73,224,971	48.59%	5,150.01
47. 2A1	1,170.82	3.55%	5,737,007	3.81%	4,899.99
48. 2A	1,224.84	3.71%	5,511,822	3.66%	4,500.03
49. 3A1	5,703.08	17.29%	23,525,206	15.61%	4,125.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	6,286.69	19.06%	24,203,780	16.06%	3,850.00
52. 4A	3,137.98	9.51%	12,081,213	8.02%	3,850.00
53. Total	32,987.65	100.00%	150,699,980	100.00%	4,568.38
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,930.32	6.54%	14,297,926	7.09%	2,900.00
55. 1D	29,637.11	39.31%	85,947,914	42.63%	2,900.01
56. 2D1	3,011.87	3.99%	8,282,684	4.11%	2,750.01
57. 2D	3,763.76	4.99%	9,973,952	4.95%	2,650.00
58. 3D1	15,888.88	21.07%	40,516,684	20.10%	2,550.00
59. 3D	2.29	0.00%	5,455	0.00%	2,382.10
60. 4D1	14,498.77	19.23%	34,072,604	16.90%	2,350.03
61. 4D	3,666.70	4.86%	8,525,085	4.23%	2,325.00
62. Total	75,399.70	100.00%	201,622,304	100.00%	2,674.05
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,229.32	2.76%	1,586,267	2.87%	1,290.36
64. 1G	2,537.44	5.70%	3,527,194	6.38%	1,390.06
65. 2G1	1,757.89	3.95%	2,193,666	3.96%	1,247.90
66. 2G	4,273.40	9.59%	5,306,702	9.59%	1,241.80
67. 3G1	4,508.15	10.12%	6,121,168	11.06%	1,357.80
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	13,494.37	30.29%	16,654,770	30.10%	1,234.20
70. 4G	16,750.23	37.60%	19,938,464	36.04%	1,190.34
71. Total	44,550.80	100.00%	55,328,231	100.00%	1,241.91
Irrigated Total	32,987.65	20.45%	150,699,980	36.66%	4,568.38
Dry Total	75,399.70	46.75%	201,622,304	49.05%	2,674.05
Grass Total	44,550.80	27.62%	55,328,231	13.46%	1,241.91
72. Waste	1,309.03	0.81%	196,351	0.05%	150.00
73. Other	7,038.97	4.36%	3,243,800	0.79%	460.83
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	161,286.15	100.00%	411,090,666	100.00%	2,548.83

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	32.52	190,833	0.00	0	154,294.73	826,472,232	154,327.25	826,663,065
77. Dry Land	434.52	1,314,694	0.00	0	111,145.55	329,884,403	111,580.07	331,199,097
78. Grass	222.02	275,020	0.00	0	66,378.53	85,118,127	66,600.55	85,393,147
79. Waste	12.57	1,886	0.00	0	2,225.13	333,771	2,237.70	335,657
80. Other	80.94	36,422	0.00	0	11,124.52	5,139,249	11,205.46	5,175,671
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	782.57	1,818,855	0.00	0	345,168.46	1,246,947,782	345,951.03	1,248,766,637

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	154,327.25	44.61%	826,663,065	66.20%	5,356.56
Dry Land	111,580.07	32.25%	331,199,097	26.52%	2,968.26
Grass	66,600.55	19.25%	85,393,147	6.84%	1,282.17
Waste	2,237.70	0.65%	335,657	0.03%	150.00
Other	11,205.46	3.24%	5,175,671	0.41%	461.89
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	345,951.03	100.00%	1,248,766,637	100.00%	3,609.66

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

85 Thayer

	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	115,170,621	119,890,918	4,720,297	4.10%	2,999,744	1.49%
02. Recreational	1,234,889	1,363,602	128,713	10.42%	0	10.42%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	28,251,023	29,211,651	960,628	3.40%	826,278	0.48%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	144,656,533	150,466,171	5,809,638	4.02%	3,826,022	1.37%
05. Commercial	31,153,666	31,614,050	460,384	1.48%	354,762	0.34%
06. Industrial	8,922,936	9,422,272	499,336	5.60%	482,152	0.19%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	26,034,708	27,646,451	1,611,743	6.19%	1,707,316	-0.37%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	66,111,310	68,682,773	2,571,463	3.89%	2,544,230	0.04%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	210,767,843	219,183,332	8,415,489	3.99%	6,370,252	0.97%
11. Irrigated	554,722,201	826,663,065	271,940,864	49.02%		
12. Dryland	224,535,371	331,199,097	106,663,726	47.50%		
13. Grassland	71,424,009	85,393,147	13,969,138	19.56%		
14. Wasteland	224,783	335,657	110,874	49.32%		
15. Other Agland	4,604,237	5,175,671	571,434	12.41%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	855,510,601	1,248,766,637	393,256,036	45.97%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,066,278,444	1,467,949,969	401,671,525	37.67%	6,370,252	37.07%

For 2013 THAYER COUNTY

Plan of Assessment

Pursuant to Neb. Revised Statute, 77-1311.02,

The county assessor shall, on or before June 15 each year, prepare a plan of assessment which shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make 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. The plan shall be presented to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 each year. The county assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments shall be forwarded to the Department of Revenue on or before October 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 : and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special value under 77-1344.

Parcel Count

In reviewing the 2013 abstract, the real property within Thayer County is comprised of the following: 2,712 residential parcels of which 407 are unimproved; 497 commercial parcels of which 84 are unimproved; 5 improved industrial parcels; 36 recreational parcels of which 33 are unimproved; and 2,909 agricultural parcels of which 2,042 are unimproved. Among the improved agricultural parcels are 381 parcels with residential improvements.

	<u>Records</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>Valuation</u>	<u>% of Total Value Valuation</u>
Residential	2712	44.0%	\$115,231,897	10.80%
Commercial	497	8.1%	\$ 31,145,685	2.92%
Industrial	5	---	\$ 8,922,936	.84%
Recreational	36	0.6%	\$ 1,234,432	.12%
Agricultural	2,909	47.3%	\$909,970,508	85.32%
Total	6159	100.0%	\$1,066,505,458	100.00%

Valuation Base per Class

The total real estate valuation base for Thayer County, taken from lines 17, 25 & 30 of the 2013 abstract is \$1,066,505,458. The residential class is approximately 11% of that total; the commercial/industrial classes are approximately 4% of the total; and the agricultural class is 85% of the total.

Staff/Budget

The Thayer County assessor's office personnel consists of the assessor, the deputy assessor, and 2 full time clerks to see to the administrative duties of the office. The Assessor, Deputy and 1 Clerk presently hold a State of Nebraska assessor's certificate, and have attended the necessary courses for their continuing education hours required by the State of Nebraska to remain a certificate holder. The assessor and staff actively participate in the appraisal process and are assisted by a contracted licensed appraiser. The appraisal company handles most commercial parcels, the complex pick-up work, and statistical analysis. The outside appraisal firm, namely Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. handles any other ongoing projects as needed. The total budget for 2012-2013 was \$211,035. In the Assessor's budget, there is a total of \$20,000 budgeted for all appraisal work, \$9,200 for education (incl. Registration, Lodging, Mileage and Meals), and \$200 in miscellaneous budget.

Software/Mapping

The Thayer County Assessor's office utilizes the administrative system MIPS/County Solutions, provided by and supported by NACO. The county costing is done using the Marshall Swift for the residential and commercial improvements and the agricultural buildings. The county administrative system includes the Version II CAMA package. The assessment records are kept in the hard copy format with updates made in the form of inserts. The valuation history kept on the face of the hard copy is typically updated to reflect all valuation changes that are made annually. The county also relies on the electronic file to keep track of valuation changes that are made. The county has implemented a GIS system for mapping. Parcel identification and all agricultural land have been measured/GIS. The old cadastral hard copy maps of the towns are updated as well by the assessor and staff. New rural cadastral books have been completed using GIS mapping. Each section contains the identified parcel, owner name, county ID, legal description, etc. In 2011, GIS mapping of towns was started. We will continue to work with GIS Workshop on this project and at completion of each town; a cadastral book will be completed and updated as necessary. This will be an ongoing project until all towns and new cadastral maps have been completed.

The county was zoned in 2002. The county zoning administrator handles the permitting process in conjunction with the Assessor's office.

Sales Review/ Verification

The Assessor's office makes an initial qualification decision based on the information contained on the 521 document, the residential, commercial and agricultural sales questionnaires, and the personal knowledge of the assessor and the assessor's staff. That decision may be modified based on the findings during the verification and inspection portions of the sale review process. Thayer County relies on its field inspection, sales questionnaires, or on-site interview for nearly all verification of sales. During the sale review process, the assessor and/or the contract appraiser get a perspective of

the sales in the county. During the inspection, the property record card is reviewed; the improvements are measured if necessary, and the assessor or appraiser attempts to interview the buyer to gather information as to determine what was physically present at the time of the sale. The assessor uses this information to guide future appraisal decisions and to develop a sales comparison for various classes of property. The sales review also helps the county determine general appraisal needs and geographical areas of appraisal need. The assessor's office also evaluates the accuracy of their current records.

County Progress for the Three Property Classes 2012 Review for Tax year 2013

The county assessor's office annual practice is to complete all of the pick-up work, review sales of all classes, prepare an analysis of those classes and determine which, if any classes or subclasses need immediate changes. We also examine the data for any trends that would indicate the need for change in the subsequent assessment year.

Residential property: A sales study and depreciation analysis as well as on site reviews were completed on the following town in 2012: Davenport. An economic depreciation was applied based on market. Updated cost tables (12/2008) are implemented for all the residential property. Lot studies were conducted in the following town and any adjustments needed were applied: Davenport. All improved parcels were reviewed on site in Townships 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4. The third tier of townships was completely reviewed and updated information was applied to each parcel. Subdivision lot values were reviewed and adjustments were made based on the market value of lots sold. GIS mapping was completed for the Villages of Hubbell and Chester.

All urban properties have been reviewed within the 6-year time frame as required by statute.

Commercial property: Sales reviews were completed on all commercial property in the county. CAMA 2012 costing tables were applied to all commercial and industrial parcels. Based on a market analysis of each market area an economic depreciation was applied. Rural commercial and industrial parcel land values were reviewed and equalized.

All commercial and industrial properties have been reviewed within the 6-year time frame as required by statute.

Agricultural property: A sales review and analysis is completed each year. When this is complete, market areas are reviewed to determine if adjustments are needed. The new USDA soil codes and land classifications throughout the county are completed. Both market areas had substantial increases in each land value group due to the market. Updated cost tables (12/2008) have been implemented for all agricultural improvements. Agricultural improvements in Townships 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4 were reviewed onsite, updated information was collected and value applied. The office continues to work with the surveyor to update survey quarter points to our GIS mapping in an effort to provide the most accurate parcel information.

Recreational property: The office continues to monitor recreational parcels in the county. Those parcels in which the primary use does **not** meet the definition of agricultural land as per statute, as well as, the definition of agricultural land accepted for Thayer County, were reclassified as recreational parcels.

Level/Quality/Uniformity

The following are the 2013 statistical measures of central tendency as determined by the Property Tax Administrator for Thayer County, Nebraska.

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Assessment-Sales Median Ratio</u>	<u>Coefficient of Dispersion (COD)</u>	<u>Price Related Differential (PRD)</u>
Residential	98%	17.76	107.29
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural	72%	26.69	111.95

Median: The middle placement when the assessment/sales ratios are arrayed from high to low (or low to high)

COD: (Coefficient of Dispersion) the average absolute deviation divided by the median

PRD: (Price Related Differential) the mean ratio divided by the aggregate ratio

Aggregate: The sum of the assessed values divided by the sum of the sales prices

Average Absolute Deviation: Each ratio minus the median, summed and divided by the number of sales

Mean: The sum of the ratios divided by the number of sales.

Assessment Plan for Agricultural Land

The Thayer County Assessor's office annually reviews all agricultural land sales to establish market values for agricultural land. In the review of the sale, the Assessor determines which sales are arms length, generally by firsthand knowledge, information acquired from the agricultural questionnaire, contact with the seller and/or agent, or through the buyer. Statistical analysis is done to determine market trends in the county. Thayer County currently has two market areas. During each assessment cycle, market areas are reviewed and Land Value Groups (LVG's) are studied to make sure that values are uniform and consistent for Thayer County. Adjustments are made to values to maintain a sales assessment ratio that falls into the 69% to 75% range as required by statute. The office continues to work with the County Surveyor locating the quarter points within the county. This information when entered into our GIS system provides more accurate parcel mapping and acres. The Assessor's office continues to monitor all property with CRP, we analyzed the market compared to dry crop and adjustments are made as necessary in both market areas. We will continue to monitor all program dates and contact those individuals coming out of the program, so land use is correctly listed.

Assessment Plan for Residential Property

The Thayer County Assessor's office continually reviews sold properties and makes notes on any trends in the marketing of residential properties. The assessor and/or staff, conduct a sales review process, review questionnaires, inspect sold properties if necessary and determine if valuations are maintaining statutory requirements. As each town is reviewed an economic factor will be applied to all residences based on the sales study in each market area. The following is the Residential Assessment Plan:

Tax Year 2014: On site review will be done in Alexandria, and Gilead, and complete the onsite review of rural improvements by township (4-1, 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4.) Conduct a study of lot values in Alexandria, and Gilead. Work will continue on the GIS mapping of towns in Thayer County. **This will complete a full review of all rural parcels in Thayer County within the 6-year time frame.**

Tax Year 2015: On site review in Byron, Hubbell and Deshler and lot study will be completed. A sales study will be done and adjustments in economic depreciation applied to maintain an acceptable level of value. GIS mapping will continue of towns within Thayer County.

Tax Year 2016: On site review in Hebron and Subdivisions will be completed. A sales study will be done and adjustment in economic depreciation applied to maintain an acceptable level of value. GIS mapping will continue of towns within Thayer County. New oblique imagery will be completed on all rural improved sites. The rural sites will be reviewed based on new imagery and on site reviews will be done as necessary.

Assessment Plan for Commercial Property

Annually the assessor's office conducts a sales review process much the same as residential property. Physical inspections along with verifying measurements are conducted at the time of the sale. Standard Appraisal along with the assessor conducts the sales review.

Tax Year 2014: On-site reviews of improvements and any lot study will be conducted in the towns of Alexandria and Gilead.

Tax Year 2015: On-site reviews of improvements and lot study will be conducted in the towns of Byron, Hubbell and Deshler.

Tax Year 2016: On-site reviews of improvements and lot study will be conducted in the town of Hebron.

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

Karla Joe
Thayer County Assessor

6-11-13
Date

2014 Assessment Survey for Thayer County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$227,830
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$227,830; This budget contains the costs of all benefits; healthcare, social security, life insurance and dental coverage.
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$17,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$3,000; County general pays for a majority of the operating system and the assessor budget pays maintenance costs and specialized programs.
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,500; Is budgeted for class registration and fees. There is \$5,000 additional that is available for mileage, food, motels and other related expenses.
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	N/A
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	Yes, \$10,176.77.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	County Solutions
2.	CAMA software:
	MicroSolve; Version 2
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	GIS generated cadastral is being used for rural area and for 4 of the towns. Original cadastral maps are being used for the remaining towns.
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes; thayer.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and Staff and GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Deshler and Hebron
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2002

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal; used for commercial properties
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	Bottom Line Resources for Personal Property on line

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Yes; Stanard Appraisal; used for commercial properties
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	The assessor prefers that the appraiser has professional certifications and credentials. Among the appraisers at Stanard Appraisal is a full range of experience and credentials. The primary concern for the assessor is that the appraiser has the experience in mass appraisal and can produce and defend good valuations.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	No; The county attorney reviews and signs off on all contracts.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	In Thayer County, the contractor does only commercial appraisals. They develop the appraisals and present their estimates of value to the assessor. The assessor reviews all of the prepared data and values. The assessor then approves or alters them based on her opinion.

2014 Certification for Thayer 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 Thayer 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

