

Table of Contents

2015 Commission Summary

2015 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

2015 Commission Summary for Douglas County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16800	Median	94.20
Total Sales Price	\$3,189,512,067	Mean	96.83
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,189,512,067	Wgt. Mean	93.33
Total Assessed Value	\$2,976,615,888	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$136,068
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$189,852	Avg. Assessed Value	\$177,180

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.05 to 94.36
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.08 to 93.57
95% Mean C.I	96.48 to 97.18
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	66.74
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	9.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	12.06

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	14,696	96	95.81
2013	12,175	96	96.28
2012	13,462	96	95.75
2011	15,074	96	96

2015 Commission Summary for Douglas County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	792	Median	96.75
Total Sales Price	\$942,507,119	Mean	98.48
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$943,970,719	Wgt. Mean	86.63
Total Assessed Value	\$817,719,400	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$992,323
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$1,191,882	Avg. Assessed Value	\$1,032,474

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.76 to 97.77
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	81.81 to 91.44
95% Mean C.I	95.94 to 101.02
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	31.91
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.66
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.93

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	682	96	96.24
2013	616	96	96.45
2012	581	97	96.87
2011	829	96	96

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Douglas County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	94	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	73	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 9th day of April, 2015.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Douglas County

For the current assessment year, Douglas County (Douglas) conducted a market analysis of the residential parcels in the county. The staff conducted over 30,000 inspections of residential parcels this year. This consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures.

Additionally, over 2,000 Board of Equalization packets were prepared, in conjunction with commercial properties, and 640 properties were protested to the Tax Equalization Review Commission (TERC). The staff spent approximately two months on TERC appeals. This year, a separate hearing department was created with a supervisor and two real estate appraisers to work on the residential TERC cases.

The total number of parcels that received a value change in the residential class of property amounted to approximately 29,000.

GIS is constantly being updated into both the CAMA system and the digital GIS mapping layers. Every year, the assessor department goes over all annexations filed by various governmental subdivisions and GIS technology is used to make sure properties are correctly assessed in the correct tax district as stated in the annexation documents.

In addition, all pickup work was completed by Douglas, as were onsite inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction. The largest number of residential sales since 2009 occurred in the county for the current year. The county used Pictometry to aid in the identification of new improvements in preparation to conduct visual inspections and to confirm measurements of selected properties.

Finally, all sales were reviewed by Douglas and a spreadsheet analysis of all sales within the study period was completed.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Douglas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:																						
	Appraisal Staff																						
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:																						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>South Omaha area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>North Omaha area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Benson area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Midtown area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Upper-end of the Midtown area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Ralston and Millard Areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Southwest Omaha - a developing area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Northwest Omaha - a well-established area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Unincorporated areas west of Omaha</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Rural - all parcels in the rural areas of the county</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	South Omaha area	2	North Omaha area	3	Benson area	4	Midtown area	5	Upper-end of the Midtown area	6	Ralston and Millard Areas	7	Southwest Omaha - a developing area	8	Northwest Omaha - a well-established area	9	Unincorporated areas west of Omaha	10	Rural - all parcels in the rural areas of the county
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																						
1	South Omaha area																						
2	North Omaha area																						
3	Benson area																						
4	Midtown area																						
5	Upper-end of the Midtown area																						
6	Ralston and Millard Areas																						
7	Southwest Omaha - a developing area																						
8	Northwest Omaha - a well-established area																						
9	Unincorporated areas west of Omaha																						
10	Rural - all parcels in the rural areas of the county																						
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.																						
	Cost approach for new construction and properties, but the market approach for existing properties																						
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 uses CAMA tables and calibrates using local market information but, again, the cost approach is used only on new or newer construction																						
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																						
	No																						
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?																						
	Primarily vacant lot sales are used, but the County does use allocation/residual method to establish lot values in older neighborhoods with limited vacant lot sales																						
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?																						

For those qualifying under LB 191, the lots are valued using a discounted cash flow analysis in keeping with the county's previous practice. Lots are assessed fully once a house is complete and closed. The last 10% of lots not sold are discounted, as appropriate, from the list price considering adverse external influences, shape, and topography.

8.

<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
1	N/A	2012	2013	
2	N/A	2012	2013	
3	N/A	2012	2013	
4	N/A	2012	2013	
5	N/A	2012	2013	
6	N/A	2012	2013	
7	N/A	2012	2013	
8	N/A	2012	2013	
9	N/A	2012	2013	
10	N/A	2012	2013	

Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Douglas County

County Overview

Douglas County (Douglas) was founded in 1854 and named for US Senator Stephen Arnold Douglas, one-time Presidential candidate most famous for the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858. Douglas is located in the extreme eastern portion of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). The counties of Sarpy, Saunders, Dodge, Washington, as well as the State of Iowa, abut Douglas. Per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2014, there are 543,244 residents in Douglas, a 1% increase over their 2013 population estimates. Between 2009-2013, 63% of the county residents were homeowners and 82% of the county residents lived consecutively in one of the 224,261 housing units for over a year. Towns include Bennington, Omaha, Ralston, Valley, Boys Town and Waterloo. Omaha, continuing to show steady population growth, is the most populous at 408,958. Well-known people with links to Douglas include author Nichols Sparks and wrestler Ted DiBiase.

Description of Analysis

The Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division (State) verifies the instruments used to analyze the residential data of every county every year. The two main areas where this occurs are a review of the county's valuation groups and an AVU review.

Market information is monitored by Douglas in the context of approximately 2,200 individual neighborhoods grouped together as fieldbooks, but the 10 valuation groupings serve as an equalization monitor for the general residential areas of the county. A review of Douglas's statistical analysis revealed 16,800 residential sales in those 10 valuation groupings, a 14% increase in qualified sales from the prior year. This sample is large enough to be evaluated for measurement purposes. The stratification by valuation groupings reveals all groups have sufficient numbers of sales to perform measurement on and all are within range.

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a biennial review in which generally half of the counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is created and adopted. The last cyclical review of Douglas's actions occurred in 2012 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Sales Qualification

The second review process is one of the sales verification and qualification procedure in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Douglas County

qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors. The last review by the State occurred in 2014. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) recognizes that certain types of sales are oftentimes invalid and should be excluded, unless a larger sample size is needed. When a larger sample is needed, some of these sales may be used for measurement purposes, if they are carefully verified and if they are a significant portion of the market area sales. It should be stressed that some sales considered invalid should never be considered for measurement purposes under any circumstances, no matter the sample size. Three types of sales that have the possibility of being considered valid sales for measurement purposes, if needed, are Sales Involving Government Agencies, Sales Involving Financial Institutions as Sellers, and Short Sales.

When a governmental agency is the seller, values typically fall on the low end of the value range and should not be considered in ratio studies unless an analysis indicates governmental sales have affected the market. Sales involving financial institutions as sellers are typically on the low side of the value range because the financial intuition is highly motivated to sell and may be required by banking regulations to remove the property from its books. These sales may be considered as potentially valid for ratio studies if they comprise more than twenty percent of sales in a specific market area. In a short sale, the lien holder agrees to accept a payoff for less than the outstanding balance of the mortgage or loan.

A comparative analysis was conducted of the qualified sales roster against the qualified sales roster with the inclusion of the three aforementioned sales. The results were very analogous between the two rosters, with the medians of both rosters in range. The results indicated that these non-qualified sales were not disqualified based on an apparent bias. Rather, these sales were disqualified because they simply were not needed. The sample size was more than adequate with their exclusion and they did not meet the needed threshold to be considered a significant portion of sales. The review of Douglas revealed that Douglas ensures that all arm's length sales are made available for the measurement of real property and does not base disqualification on any improper criteria.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Douglas has a cycle of inspection and review in place, utilizing a two-part structure. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Douglas County

properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. First, the organized list of neighborhoods in the county and when they were last inspected is examined. The list is then cross-referenced with the prior year's statistics looking for areas that warrant an inspection in the coming year. This structure allows for a timely, yet flexible, visit to all residential parcels in Douglas. For the current assessment year, over 30,000 residential properties were inspected and reviewed. Based on both Douglas's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the residential class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for residential property within Douglas is 94% of market value.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Douglas County

For the current assessment year, Douglas County (Douglas) conducted a market analysis of the commercial parcels in the county. The staff concentrated on strip malls and office buildings for inspection this year. This consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures. Also, a consultant was brought in to do a capitalization rate study of those neighborhood centers and office buildings.

Additionally, over 2,000 Board of Equalization packets were prepared, in conjunction with residential properties, and 640 properties were protested to the Tax Equalization Review Commission (TERC). Roughly half of those protests were on commercial parcels. The staff spent approximately two months on TERC appeals. Douglas assists the County Attorney's office with TERC cases by maintaining the TERC database.

All pickup work was completed by Douglas, as were onsite inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction. The county saw the most commercial sales in the current year since 2011. The county used Pictometry to aid in the identification of new improvements in preparation to conduct visual inspections and to confirm measurements of selected properties.

Finally, all sales were reviewed by Douglas and a spreadsheet analysis of all sales within the study period was completed.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Douglas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:			
	Staff			
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:			
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>		
	1	Douglas County is considered one valuation group.		
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.			
	County primarily uses the income approach because the cost approach is for new construction only			
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.			
	The County uses the income and or the 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 uses Marshall & Swift as provided by the CAMA provider			
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?			
	County primarily uses the income approach. The cost approach is used for new construction and unique properties. Marshall & Swift takes the midwest weather and market into account in the cost table. The depreciation tables are the same for all valuation groupings.			
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.			
	Sales of similar properties are used to determine commercial lot values			
7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	1	2013	2012	2013
	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>			
	Ongoing			
	Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities. In Douglas, all commercial parcels have similar characteristics in that they converge in and around the commercial hub of Omaha. As a result, occupancy code is considered the most accurate measure for the county.			

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Douglas County

County Overview

The majority of the commercial properties in Douglas County (Douglas) convene in and around the county seat of Omaha, the largest city in the State of Nebraska (State). The smaller community markets, while containing commercial properties of their own, are also guided by the proximity to the larger towns that serve as the area commercial hubs.

Per the U.S. Census Bureau, 304,368 people are employed in Douglas County and 72% of the residents living in Douglas also work in Douglas, a 1% increase from the year prior. Additionally, there is an expected 12% job growth increase in years 2010-2020 (Nebraska Department of Labor). Among the top employers in Douglas are Creighton University, Alegent Health, Omaha Public Schools, Methodist Health System, The Nebraska Medical Center, and First Data Corp. (Nebraska Department of Labor). Douglas contains 78 grocery stores, 392 full-service restaurants, and 154 gas stations (city-data.com). Points of interest in Douglas include the yearly College World Series and Henry Doorly Zoo, largely considered the number one zoo in the world.

Description of Analysis

The Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division (State) verifies the instruments used to analyze the commercial data of every county every year. The two main areas where this occurs are a review of the county's valuation groups and an AVU review.

A review of Douglas's statistical analysis showed 792 qualified commercial sales in the one valuation grouping. This is a 16% increase in qualified sales from the prior year and is a large enough sample to be evaluated for measurement purposes. The stratification by occupancy code valuation groupings revealed sixteen codes with large enough samples to measure, including, but not limited to, office buildings, fast-food restaurants, restaurants, retail stores, storage warehouses, and convenience markets, and all are within range.

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a biennial review in which generally half of the counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is created and adopted. The last cyclical review of Douglas's actions occurred in 2012 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Sales Qualification

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Douglas County

The second review process is one of the sales verification and qualification procedure in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors.

The last review by the State occurred in 2014. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation. The review of Douglas revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determination, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Douglas has a cycle of inspection and review in place, utilizing a two-part structure. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. First, the list of commercial parcels and when they were last inspected is examined. The list is then cross-referenced with the prior year's statistics looking for areas that warrant an inspection in the coming year. This structure allows for a timely, yet flexible, visit to all commercial parcels in Douglas. For the current assessment year, over 30,000 commercial and exempt properties were inspected and reviewed. Based on both Douglas's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the commercial class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for commercial property within Douglas is 97% of market value.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Douglas County

Douglas County (Douglas) performed a market analysis for the agricultural land class of property to determine market value. While special value, influence, and its subsequent impact on Douglas is discussed further in the agricultural correlation section, for purposes of assessment it is key to note that all agricultural land sales within Douglas are influenced by non-agricultural factors. Therefore agricultural sales arising within Douglas are not representative of the market value of the land. As a result, Douglas analyzed uninfluenced agricultural land sales in comparable counties to determine accurate agricultural market value, thus providing a baseline from which to measure the irrigated, dry, and grass land special values in Douglas. For assessment year 2015, the comparable sales in the counties of Burt, Cass, Otoe, and Washington were utilized in a ratio study. Indicators calculated from those ratios were examined in terms of majority land use, then employed to develop the 2015 schedule of special values for agricultural land.

While all agricultural land sales in Douglas are considered influenced by non-agricultural factors, Douglas continues to treat those parcels like all parcels in the county when it comes to inspection and examining for trends. Sales are still monitored and land use is updated, using GIS imagery, FSA maps, and physical inspections. Additionally, as a way to separate out rural residential land and recreational land, the county physically reviewed agricultural parcels to determine primary use before establishing market value.

Finally, all agricultural land in Douglas was updated with the values, as set.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Douglas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:						
	Appraisal 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="text-align: center; border: none;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center; border: none;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="text-align: center; border: none;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; border: none;">N/A</td> <td style="border: none;">All ag land in Douglas County is currently considered fully influenced and is given special value.</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	N/A	All ag land in Douglas County is currently considered fully influenced and is given special value.	
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>					
N/A	All ag land in Douglas County is currently considered fully influenced and is given special value.						
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.						
	Because all ag parcels in Douglas County are influenced by non ag factors, the county has one schedule of agricultural land values for the entire county						
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.						
	The county physically reviews the parcel to determine primary use, and then comparable properties are used to establish market value						
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?						
	In cases where the characteristics are similar, the farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued similarly. Platted Subdivisions may have different values because they have different amenities than farm home sites						
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.						
	N/A						
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:						
	Applications have been received and the county recognizes a difference in assessed value						

Douglas County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Douglas	1	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700
Burt	1	6,630	6,305	5,950	5,560	4,458	4,745	4,200	3,445	5,227
Cass	1	6,465	6,255	5,011	5,505	3,630	5,000	3,800	4,214	5,202
Otoe	8000	5,600	5,600	5,500	5,500	5,000	5,000	4,200	4,200	5,203
Sarpy	1	6,509	6,316	5,862	5,535	5,203	4,920	4,150	3,444	5,620
Washington	1	6,270	6,110	5,650	5,595	5,425	4,920	3,970	3,300	5,371

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Douglas	1	5,625	5,625	5,625	5,625	5,625	5,624	5,625	5,625	5,625
Burt	1	6,500	6,145	5,655	5,460	4,599	4,600	4,175	3,175	5,005
Cass	1	5,293	5,149	5,025	4,648	4,235	4,549	4,409	3,841	4,763
Otoe	8000	4,600	4,600	4,350	4,200	4,150	3,900	3,500	3,000	4,108
Sarpy	1	6,438	6,245	5,748	5,428	5,194	4,751	4,100	3,128	5,438
Washington	1	6,015	5,904	5,555	5,230	4,905	4,815	3,855	2,912	5,080

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Douglas	1	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
Burt	1	2,723	2,648	2,610	2,190	2,243	2,271	2,193	1,822	2,201
Cass	1	2,250	2,198	2,089	2,020	1,956	1,964	1,685	1,434	1,763
Otoe	8000	1,728	1,955	1,718	1,994	1,853	1,747	1,648	1,212	1,703
Sarpy	1	2,335	2,259	2,106	1,923	1,811	1,705	1,604	1,491	1,831
Washington	1	2,120	1,900	1,735	1,545	1,520	1,366	1,301	1,202	1,511

Source: 2015 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

2015 DOUGLAS COUNTY SPECIAL VALUATION METHODOLOGY

Douglas County focused on using generally accepted appraisal practices in establishing its special valuations on agricultural land. The county relied on information supplied by DPAT from the state sales file. 404 sales were analyzed from Burt, Cass, Otoe, Nemaha, Pawnee, Richardson and Washington Counties.

These counties were selected for this analysis due to similarity of location, topography and geological features to Douglas County. There were 104 sales that had at least 95% predominant use, 259 with at least 80% predominant use and 308 with at least 70% predominate use that were utilized.

This analysis revealed an increase to the value that was selected last year in both Irrigated and Dry. The sales indicated that there was between a 28% to 30% increase in the market from last year's sales base. The analysis also revealed that Grass and Timber sales were stable with no significant change from last year's level and thus were not changed. The primary value determinant for the agricultural sales was use and location. Thus an overall rate was selected and used for each of the agricultural uses.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Douglas County

County Overview

Douglas County (Douglas), a county with a 63% dry land majority composition, lies in the eastern half of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). Falling within the Papio-Missouri River Natural Resource Districts (NRD), Douglas saw 192 new wells in 2014, per the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources Well Registration Summary. This brings the total well count in Douglas to 3,268. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is currently preparing the 2017 Census of Agriculture. According to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture, there are 396 farms in Douglas, totaling 86,123 acres. This is a 9% increase in the number of farms, a 2% increase in production acres, and a 7% decrease in acres per farm since the previous census (Ag Census County Profile). When compared against agricultural product value of the other counties in Nebraska, Douglas ranks first in Christmas trees, nursery stock crops, and nursery, greenhouse, horticulture, and sod. At 89%, row crop production remains the predominant agricultural use in Douglas.

Description of Analysis

Given the agricultural trends of the last several years, agricultural land values have surpassed the value for alternative uses in many areas. In effect, agricultural use has become the highest and best use of land historically influenced by development and other non-agricultural activities. In Nebraska, counties once considered “fully influenced” have been eliminated from that category, and their annual methodology confirms the correctness of that movement.

Sale price analysis continues to demonstrate that not only do sale prices diminish as the land moves away from the urban centers, but sale prices become comparable to uninfluenced neighboring counties with similar land features. For 2015, all agricultural land within the counties of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy were determined to be completely influenced by non-agricultural factors, the only counties fully influenced by nonagricultural factors, whereas land in the remaining counties had a highest and best use as agricultural land. Therefore, measurement is not conducted on the influenced valuation for agricultural land since deficient sales information exists.

The special valuation in Douglas was analyzed by the Property Assessment Division (the State) using assessment-to-sales ratios developed with sales data from uninfluenced areas considered comparable to Douglas. Income rental rates, production factors, topography, typical farming practices, proximity, and other factors were considered to determine general areas of comparability. Ninety sales from uninfluenced areas comprised of similar soil types were used from the counties of Burt, Cass, Otoe, and Washington, to serve as Douglas’s “surrogate” sales.

A 2015 assessment level was estimated by the ratio of special valuation assessment divided by the estimated agricultural land market value determination. Those assessed values established by

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Douglas County

Douglas were then used to estimate value for the uninfluenced sales and measured against their surrogate sale prices. The results of this analysis suggested that Douglas fell into the acceptable overall median range, as evidenced by the following chart.

Median	73.22%	AAD	25.22%
Mean	85.53%	PRD	110.87%
Weighted Mean	77.14%	COD	34.45%

Sales Qualification

Because special valuation encompasses Douglas, Douglas's agricultural sales are not examined for qualification as all sales are coded as non-qualified. However, Douglas does keep a meticulous record of agricultural sales and has had several discussions with the State regarding those sales, leading the State to feel secure in Douglas's knowledge of their own agricultural sales.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

After first ensuring that Douglas measured at an appropriate level, the county's established values were then compared with the average assessed values of the comparative counties to confirm equalization. In comparing the weighted average of irrigated, dry, and grass land in Douglas to adjacent counties, the evidence confirmed that the values were generally equalized, with no extreme outliers noted. In comparing the average assessed values by LCG of Douglas to adjacent counties, the results supported the idea that Douglas might be better served in creating a spread of values for their LCGs. In conversations, the county appeared amenable to exploring those valuation changes in the future. However, this has been a period of transition for Douglas with a small window between assuming office and posting preliminary values. Due to the willingness conveyed by the assessor's office, the State is satisfied that this will be addressed for the next assessment year.

Assessment practices are considered to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Special Valuation

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land special value in Douglas is 73%.

28 Douglas
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 3/19/2015

Number of Sales : 16,800
Total Sales Price : 3,189,512,067
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,189,512,067
Total Assessed Value : 2,976,615,888
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 189,852
Avg. Assessed Value : 177,180

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 97
COD : 11.93
PRD : 103.75

COV : 24.19
STD : 23.42
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.24
MAX Sales Ratio : 589.35
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.60

95% Median C.I. : 94.05 to 94.36
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.08 to 93.57
95% Mean C.I. : 96.48 to 97.18

Printed:4/7/2015 3:54:42PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	1,680	96.71	99.16	96.68	09.55	102.57	39.12	474.20	96.29 to 97.23	185,760	179,598
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1,375	96.61	97.94	95.90	09.41	102.13	30.49	260.97	96.22 to 97.12	179,894	172,514
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2,409	94.91	96.36	94.39	10.05	102.09	26.80	424.82	94.54 to 95.28	190,977	180,266
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2,537	94.08	96.02	93.64	10.75	102.54	22.60	332.18	93.65 to 94.47	198,497	185,873
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	1,899	95.17	98.00	94.19	12.41	104.05	40.00	499.73	94.43 to 95.67	183,177	172,533
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	1,478	94.14	98.02	93.62	13.47	104.70	48.01	483.12	93.66 to 94.65	185,216	173,404
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	2,685	91.82	95.13	90.87	12.91	104.69	29.60	589.35	91.38 to 92.36	193,447	175,789
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2,737	91.80	96.23	90.58	14.53	106.24	32.50	553.14	91.40 to 92.26	191,972	173,892
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	8,001	95.44	97.11	94.86	10.11	102.37	22.60	474.20	95.24 to 95.63	190,361	180,571
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	8,799	92.93	96.58	91.92	13.48	105.07	29.60	589.35	92.72 to 93.14	189,389	174,095
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	8,220	95.04	96.90	94.34	10.74	102.71	22.60	499.73	94.81 to 95.27	189,642	178,913
<u>ALL</u>	16,800	94.20	96.83	93.33	11.93	103.75	22.60	589.35	94.05 to 94.36	189,852	177,180

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	1,382	96.01	103.22	95.27	20.55	108.34	29.60	553.14	95.15 to 96.82	117,673	112,112
02	857	98.20	113.83	97.02	30.89	117.33	22.60	589.35	96.89 to 99.49	81,698	79,267
03	760	95.38	100.97	94.58	18.33	106.76	43.13	483.12	94.47 to 96.36	108,368	102,493
04	1,170	93.51	98.62	92.72	17.93	106.36	48.28	424.92	92.58 to 94.90	119,933	111,208
05	1,035	93.36	93.18	89.85	12.72	103.71	41.04	292.59	92.54 to 94.06	261,925	235,330
06	2,036	93.32	95.55	93.48	10.34	102.21	44.60	277.86	92.88 to 93.81	173,122	161,833
07	1,829	93.51	94.55	92.98	09.42	101.69	57.53	346.47	93.05 to 94.07	221,551	206,005
08	2,298	93.15	94.29	93.47	08.88	100.88	53.36	213.54	92.78 to 93.64	184,812	172,748
09	3,440	94.25	94.36	93.48	06.44	100.94	39.26	474.20	94.04 to 94.50	246,304	230,240
10	1,993	94.66	94.95	93.88	07.36	101.14	30.26	424.82	94.38 to 94.97	217,473	204,163
<u>ALL</u>	16,800	94.20	96.83	93.33	11.93	103.75	22.60	589.35	94.05 to 94.36	189,852	177,180

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	16,800	94.20	96.83	93.33	11.93	103.75	22.60	589.35	94.05 to 94.36	189,852	177,180
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	16,800	94.20	96.83	93.33	11.93	103.75	22.60	589.35	94.05 to 94.36	189,852	177,180

28 Douglas
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 3/19/2015

Number of Sales : 16,800
 Total Sales Price : 3,189,512,067
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,189,512,067
 Total Assessed Value : 2,976,615,888
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 189,852
 Avg. Assessed Value : 177,180

MEDIAN : 94
 WGT. MEAN : 93
 MEAN : 97
 COD : 11.93
 PRD : 103.75

COV : 24.19
 STD : 23.42
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.24
 MAX Sales Ratio : 589.35
 MIN Sales Ratio : 22.60

95% Median C.I. : 94.05 to 94.36
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.08 to 93.57
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.48 to 97.18

Printed:4/7/2015 3:54:42PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	6	164.97	218.28	191.54	48.81	113.96	95.48	483.12	95.48 to 483.12	3,708	7,103	
Less Than 15,000	98	156.17	188.48	186.28	56.29	101.18	44.79	589.35	107.44 to 191.46	10,307	19,199	
Less Than 30,000	336	148.88	171.69	166.16	43.87	103.33	26.80	589.35	135.25 to 159.45	18,700	31,071	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	16,794	94.19	96.79	93.32	11.89	103.72	22.60	589.35	94.05 to 94.36	189,918	177,240	
Greater Than 14,999	16,702	94.17	96.29	93.30	11.39	103.20	22.60	553.14	93.99 to 94.31	190,905	178,106	
Greater Than 29,999	16,464	94.05	95.30	93.18	10.42	102.28	22.60	424.82	93.88 to 94.20	193,345	180,161	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	6	164.97	218.28	191.54	48.81	113.96	95.48	483.12	95.48 to 483.12	3,708	7,103	
5,000 TO 14,999	92	145.54	186.54	186.16	60.49	100.20	44.79	589.35	104.09 to 191.46	10,737	19,988	
15,000 TO 29,999	238	148.33	164.77	162.30	37.72	101.52	26.80	553.14	133.48 to 159.07	22,156	35,960	
30,000 TO 59,999	686	112.81	123.87	121.81	28.40	101.69	22.60	424.82	108.75 to 115.81	45,188	55,045	
60,000 TO 99,999	1,887	97.55	100.24	99.75	15.45	100.49	30.49	244.22	96.82 to 98.30	81,411	81,208	
100,000 TO 149,999	5,120	94.22	94.33	94.18	08.27	100.16	30.26	215.06	93.96 to 94.48	126,307	118,956	
150,000 TO 249,999	5,071	93.00	92.93	92.93	07.92	100.00	39.26	199.16	92.75 to 93.20	190,862	177,368	
250,000 TO 499,999	3,245	93.33	92.50	92.28	08.20	100.24	45.44	200.76	92.99 to 93.68	326,908	301,677	
500,000 TO 999,999	412	91.19	89.24	89.10	10.60	100.16	49.09	152.21	89.65 to 92.37	646,791	576,310	
1,000,000 +	43	93.63	88.55	88.63	14.54	99.91	45.05	144.03	86.68 to 95.97	1,320,011	1,169,915	
<u>ALL</u>	16,800	94.20	96.83	93.33	11.93	103.75	22.60	589.35	94.05 to 94.36	189,852	177,180	

COMMERCIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2011 to 09/30/2014 Posted Before : 03/19/2015

Number of Sales :	792	Median :	97	COV :	37.06	95% Median C.I. :	95.76 to 97.77
Total Sales Price :	942,507,119	Wgt. Mean :	87	STD :	36.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	81.81 to 91.44
Total Adj. Sales Price :	943,970,719	Mean :	98	Avg.Abs.Dev :	19.09	95% Mean C.I. :	95.94 to 101.02
Total Assessed Value :	817,719,400						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	1,191,882	COD :	19.73	MAX Sales Ratio :	622.31		
Avg. Assessed Value :	1,032,474	PRD :	113.68	MIN Sales Ratio :	17.32		

Printed : 04/07/2015

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
10/01/2011 To 12/31/2011	71	97.00	101.89	91.99	17.03	110.76	40.57	327.60	94.48 to 99.35	1,180,144	1,085,624
01/01/2012 To 03/31/2012	47	97.72	100.03	100.24	10.39	99.79	54.02	137.14	95.79 to 100.00	340,429	341,231
04/01/2012 To 06/30/2012	63	97.90	103.44	90.98	19.37	113.70	35.97	270.73	95.16 to 100.00	886,180	806,273
07/01/2012 To 09/30/2012	46	99.60	101.23	97.13	13.78	104.22	54.93	238.01	94.55 to 101.28	732,584	711,559
10/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	95	96.34	95.83	87.12	16.65	110.00	31.28	274.85	93.64 to 98.10	756,860	659,411
01/01/2013 To 03/31/2013	30	99.39	101.46	95.56	18.37	106.17	34.83	172.27	92.22 to 103.46	771,061	736,807
04/01/2013 To 06/30/2013	69	97.31	99.85	91.88	15.24	108.67	43.00	189.63	93.86 to 99.94	1,976,219	1,815,771
07/01/2013 To 09/30/2013	64	95.42	95.90	83.27	21.11	115.17	41.67	213.44	90.00 to 99.64	1,962,313	1,634,061
10/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	69	99.46	92.24	85.76	18.57	107.56	24.10	171.73	88.85 to 101.38	1,315,149	1,127,891
01/01/2014 To 03/31/2014	65	96.31	99.54	68.25	26.95	145.85	35.06	227.92	84.91 to 100.05	2,111,103	1,440,764
04/01/2014 To 06/30/2014	82	93.86	91.51	88.67	19.80	103.20	17.32	218.15	89.16 to 98.28	1,238,596	1,098,242
07/01/2014 To 09/30/2014	91	95.28	103.02	95.29	31.17	108.11	35.97	622.31	89.91 to 98.76	748,789	713,505
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2012	227	97.90	101.80	93.31	15.68	109.10	35.97	327.60	96.43 to 98.88	834,003	778,168
10/01/2012 To 09/30/2013	258	96.31	97.58	88.13	17.71	110.72	31.28	274.85	94.89 to 97.95	1,383,646	1,219,443
10/01/2013 To 09/30/2014	307	95.43	96.79	82.09	24.61	117.91	17.32	622.31	93.37 to 98.19	1,295,347	1,063,384
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	251	97.54	99.52	91.42	15.69	108.86	31.28	274.85	96.33 to 98.57	706,893	646,250
01/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	232	96.94	96.71	87.75	18.51	110.21	24.10	213.44	94.87 to 99.46	1,619,932	1,421,538
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	792	96.75	98.48	86.63	19.73	113.68	17.32	622.31	95.76 to 97.77	1,191,882	1,032,474

COMMERCIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2011 to 09/30/2014 Posted Before : 03/19/2015

Number of Sales :	792	Median :	97	COV :	37.06	95% Median C.I. :	95.76 to 97.77
Total Sales Price :	942,507,119	Wgt. Mean :	87	STD :	36.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	81.81 to 91.44
Total Adj. Sales Price :	943,970,719	Mean :	98	Avg.Abs.Dev :	19.09	95% Mean C.I. :	95.94 to 101.02
Total Assessed Value :	817,719,400						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	1,191,882	COD :	19.73	MAX Sales Ratio :	622.31		
Avg. Assessed Value :	1,032,474	PRD :	113.68	MIN Sales Ratio :	17.32		

Printed : 04/07/2015

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
01	792	96.75	98.48	86.63	19.73	113.68	17.32	622.31	95.76 to 97.77	1,191,882	1,032,474
_____ALL_____											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	792	96.75	98.48	86.63	19.73	113.68	17.32	622.31	95.76 to 97.77	1,191,882	1,032,474

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
02	181	96.20	98.74	94.00	16.28	105.04	41.67	218.15	94.73 to 98.28	892,481	838,892
03	457	97.61	99.13	84.61	19.09	117.16	24.10	389.14	96.57 to 98.57	1,430,748	1,210,488
04	154	92.52	96.26	87.64	26.01	109.84	17.32	622.31	86.99 to 96.91	834,934	731,734
_____ALL_____											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	792	96.75	98.48	86.63	19.73	113.68	17.32	622.31	95.76 to 97.77	1,191,882	1,032,474

COMMERCIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2011 to 09/30/2014 Posted Before : 03/19/2015

Number of Sales :	792	Median :	97	COV :	37.06	95% Median C.I. :	95.76 to 97.77
Total Sales Price :	942,507,119	Wgt. Mean :	87	STD :	36.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	81.81 to 91.44
Total Adj. Sales Price :	943,970,719	Mean :	98	Avg.Abs.Dev :	19.09	95% Mean C.I. :	95.94 to 101.02
Total Assessed Value :	817,719,400						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	1,191,882	COD :	19.73	MAX Sales Ratio :	622.31		
Avg. Assessed Value :	1,032,474	PRD :	113.68	MIN Sales Ratio :	17.32		

Printed : 04/07/2015

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	2	221.43	221.43	237.47	47.95	93.25	115.25	327.60	N/A	3,475	8,252
Less Than 15,000	7	144.98	209.06	187.18	58.24	111.69	105.33	389.14	105.33 to 389.14	8,051	15,070
Less Than 30,000	16	136.59	174.37	154.58	52.21	112.80	42.99	389.14	108.00 to 238.01	16,426	25,390
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	790	96.72	98.17	86.62	19.46	113.33	17.32	622.31	95.68 to 97.76	1,194,891	1,035,067
Greater Than 14,999	785	96.67	97.50	86.62	18.89	112.56	17.32	622.31	95.64 to 97.61	1,202,439	1,041,546
Greater Than 29,999	776	96.57	96.92	86.61	18.37	111.90	17.32	622.31	95.55 to 97.54	1,216,118	1,053,239
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	2	221.43	221.43	237.47	47.95	93.25	115.25	327.60	N/A	3,475	8,252
5,000 TO 14,999	5	144.98	204.11	180.11	52.25	113.33	105.33	389.14	N/A	9,882	17,798
15,000 TO 29,999	9	116.41	147.40	145.67	47.29	101.19	42.99	274.85	94.48 to 227.92	22,939	33,416
30,000 TO 59,999	34	99.40	103.99	102.68	19.61	101.28	43.27	187.93	93.75 to 108.60	44,654	45,850
60,000 TO 99,999	73	99.30	105.11	103.85	23.22	101.21	40.50	270.73	94.56 to 103.61	78,952	81,993
100,000 TO 149,999	92	97.74	109.26	107.90	26.24	101.26	24.10	622.31	96.24 to 100.01	119,327	128,752
150,000 TO 249,999	131	96.22	93.49	93.61	15.56	99.87	35.06	166.22	94.02 to 99.20	193,027	180,694
250,000 TO 499,999	130	94.75	92.58	93.11	16.40	99.43	17.32	144.63	90.45 to 96.91	351,204	327,012
500,000 TO 999,999	124	97.00	95.83	96.03	17.09	99.79	31.28	189.63	94.34 to 98.65	708,707	680,582
1,000,000 +	192	95.82	92.61	84.44	16.01	109.68	35.24	213.44	93.69 to 97.72	3,992,841	3,371,610
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	792	96.75	98.48	86.63	19.73	113.68	17.32	622.31	95.76 to 97.77	1,191,882	1,032,474

COMMERCIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2011 to 09/30/2014 Posted Before : 03/19/2015

Number of Sales :	792	Median :	97	COV :	37.06	95% Median C.I. :	95.76 to 97.77
Total Sales Price :	942,507,119	Wgt. Mean :	87	STD :	36.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	81.81 to 91.44
Total Adj. Sales Price :	943,970,719	Mean :	98	Avg.Abs.Dev :	19.09	95% Mean C.I. :	95.94 to 101.02
Total Assessed Value :	817,719,400						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	1,191,882	COD :	19.73	MAX Sales Ratio :	622.31		
Avg. Assessed Value :	1,032,474	PRD :	113.68	MIN Sales Ratio :	17.32		

Printed : 04/07/2015

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
081	3	114.07	110.23	111.16	12.82	99.16	86.37	130.24	N/A	140,833	156,546
088	4	100.79	108.00	105.33	13.24	102.53	94.17	136.27	N/A	161,300	169,898
101	1	60.91	60.91	60.91		100.00	60.91	60.91	N/A	750,000	456,800
106	6	97.72	119.39	111.14	24.93	107.42	94.42	174.22	94.42 to 174.22	113,417	126,054
116	90	96.32	100.83	95.39	20.48	105.70	41.67	274.85	93.07 to 100.00	176,929	168,780
118	81	95.64	94.77	94.91	11.31	99.85	61.83	144.63	93.42 to 97.57	1,548,024	1,469,228
146	1	54.02	54.02	54.02		100.00	54.02	54.02	N/A	215,000	116,149
149	2	159.79	159.79	114.08	37.64	140.07	99.64	219.94	N/A	62,500	71,299
161	1	24.10	24.10	24.10		100.00	24.10	24.10	N/A	116,667	28,111
173	1	42.36	42.36	42.36		100.00	42.36	42.36	N/A	185,000	78,357
204	1	100.53	100.53	100.53		100.00	100.53	100.53	N/A	30,000,000	30,159,184
210	25	94.67	91.41	86.95	12.94	105.13	58.95	115.52	85.86 to 100.00	1,078,180	937,489
227	1	100.44	100.44	100.44		100.00	100.44	100.44	N/A	225,000	226,000
304	5	95.47	85.82	87.22	12.23	98.39	68.56	99.99	N/A	1,553,857	1,355,221
309	5	97.96	99.90	98.26	06.45	101.67	90.26	117.08	N/A	158,500	155,750
312	2	95.42	95.42	105.14	11.01	90.76	84.91	105.92	N/A	2,445,000	2,570,605
313	2	128.22	128.22	112.18	66.46	114.30	43.00	213.44	N/A	2,094,300	2,349,318
319	4	99.53	98.11	93.49	16.36	104.94	71.59	121.80	N/A	1,914,837	1,790,155
325	45	94.55	96.58	81.59	30.20	118.37	34.83	389.14	79.87 to 99.35	315,471	257,399
326	3	143.08	109.52	64.74	24.34	169.17	40.50	144.98	N/A	34,803	22,533
328	2	76.19	76.19	77.36	17.05	98.49	63.20	89.17	N/A	55,000	42,550
329	1	103.61	103.61	103.61		100.00	103.61	103.61	N/A	94,100	97,500
332	5	105.26	115.62	103.80	25.10	111.39	76.67	161.63	N/A	3,714,600	3,855,611
333	2	98.40	98.40	99.47	01.63	98.92	96.80	100.00	N/A	596,388	593,211
334	13	100.00	141.12	96.15	58.15	146.77	64.02	622.31	76.47 to 132.89	1,308,200	1,257,890

336	6	99.01	103.86	104.00	09.64	99.87	88.50	132.45	88.50 to 132.45	136,167	141,614
340	4	87.06	85.02	75.76	32.77	112.22	35.97	129.97	N/A	1,789,800	1,355,973
341	7	103.98	120.94	105.49	32.17	114.65	72.57	175.00	72.57 to 175.00	1,195,156	1,260,738
343	5	100.01	98.63	92.79	06.70	106.29	79.81	111.16	N/A	1,653,253	1,534,069
344	114	98.30	99.51	82.06	11.82	121.26	47.37	157.23	96.51 to 99.29	2,093,685	1,718,042
345	1	66.36	66.36	66.36		100.00	66.36	66.36	N/A	402,500	267,100
349	14	91.63	95.86	91.81	22.58	104.41	49.16	148.51	76.98 to 116.52	1,040,044	954,826
350	15	94.59	89.74	84.94	13.74	105.65	57.71	113.00	80.30 to 102.64	935,978	794,982
351	1	60.77	60.77	60.77		100.00	60.77	60.77	N/A	10,069,215	6,119,111
353	64	98.32	103.60	92.26	16.83	112.29	40.01	266.15	94.87 to 101.61	538,377	496,685
380	1	83.29	83.29	83.29		100.00	83.29	83.29	N/A	1,885,000	1,570,000
382	3	80.17	77.14	77.05	17.13	100.12	55.04	96.22	N/A	295,000	227,292
384	2	84.07	84.07	74.95	17.45	112.17	69.40	98.73	N/A	92,500	69,328
386	1	84.74	84.74	84.74		100.00	84.74	84.74	N/A	210,000	177,957
387	2	84.54	84.54	82.34	03.93	102.67	81.22	87.86	N/A	901,221	742,039
406	102	91.56	94.18	83.91	27.06	112.24	17.32	327.60	84.66 to 96.70	436,292	366,090
407	10	100.28	94.38	78.49	12.37	120.24	58.46	112.35	63.21 to 110.29	3,212,750	2,521,820
408	2	89.22	89.22	87.46	07.35	102.01	82.66	95.77	N/A	205,000	179,283
410	4	78.09	78.92	85.25	19.63	92.57	63.20	96.31	N/A	737,125	628,374
412	27	98.42	100.76	100.77	06.21	99.99	84.11	131.51	94.99 to 100.83	1,877,440	1,891,889
418	2	45.92	45.92	45.11	13.24	101.80	39.84	51.99	N/A	13,469,414	6,076,071
419	16	95.70	93.83	81.58	24.70	115.02	37.82	159.69	55.35 to 113.24	1,488,228	1,214,126
423	2	106.43	106.43	101.86	08.18	104.49	97.72	115.14	N/A	694,767	707,688
424	1	99.94	99.94	99.94		100.00	99.94	99.94	N/A	1,750,000	1,748,938
426	4	97.55	83.08	59.16	15.90	140.43	38.47	98.74	N/A	1,105,000	653,670
434	5	109.92	124.89	118.38	20.84	105.50	99.98	166.22	N/A	253,064	299,580
436	2	79.26	79.26	64.70	26.15	122.50	58.53	99.99	N/A	2,015,150	1,303,807
442	20	95.68	90.88	85.26	22.60	106.59	40.55	150.59	72.92 to 101.02	152,925	130,382
444	3	151.63	160.29	185.99	16.34	86.18	127.46	201.79	N/A	733,333	1,363,957
446	10	98.86	92.03	80.36	08.19	114.52	35.24	101.77	92.61 to 100.00	3,783,549	3,040,640
447	2	84.05	84.05	95.70	18.99	87.83	68.09	100.00	N/A	5,258,650	5,032,500
473	1	189.63	189.63	189.63		100.00	189.63	189.63	N/A	900,000	1,706,670
502	1	125.65	125.65	125.65		100.00	125.65	125.65	N/A	30,000	37,695
516	4	117.25	119.66	113.60	22.24	105.33	87.44	156.70	N/A	111,250	126,384
529	3	100.02	104.29	102.29	11.82	101.96	88.69	124.16	N/A	91,033	93,122
532	1	114.77	114.77	114.77		100.00	114.77	114.77	N/A	112,000	128,538
577	11	98.55	100.96	87.51	28.89	115.37	62.33	227.92	65.33 to 119.45	78,806	68,967
588	2	76.98	76.98	57.93	41.66	132.88	44.91	109.04	N/A	6,948,500	4,025,348

595	9	91.91	88.48	85.28	10.88	103.75	51.19	101.91	78.73 to 100.00	6,295,245	5,368,859
718	2	93.39	93.39	92.71	01.51	100.73	91.98	94.79	N/A	1,450,000	1,344,267
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	792	96.75	98.48	86.63	19.73	113.68	17.32	622.31	95.76 to 97.77	1,191,882	1,032,474

28 Douglas
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 3/19/2015

Number of Sales : 90
Total Sales Price : 65,890,123
Total Adj. Sales Price : 67,420,123
Total Assessed Value : 51,662,882
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 749,112
Avg. Assessed Value : 574,032

MEDIAN : 73
WGT. MEAN : 77
MEAN : 85
COD : 33.31
PRD : 110.53

COV : 41.78
STD : 35.39
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.39
MAX Sales Ratio : 204.75
MIN Sales Ratio : 19.62

95% Median C.I. : 68.39 to 82.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 71.50 to 81.76
95% Mean C.I. : 77.39 to 92.01

Printed:4/7/2015 3:54:44PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	13	102.15	104.99	97.95	24.54	107.19	61.46	183.53	67.86 to 128.67	609,967	597,442
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	8	101.96	113.54	102.17	29.30	111.13	63.72	204.75	63.72 to 204.75	465,339	475,418
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	64.75	73.87	67.62	19.17	109.24	59.82	97.04	N/A	865,138	585,018
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	6	105.38	98.21	97.55	15.04	100.68	62.15	115.59	62.15 to 115.59	531,694	518,656
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	18	69.35	86.21	77.28	39.65	111.56	35.79	195.14	61.56 to 100.44	679,869	525,391
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	5	61.52	76.80	72.06	27.68	106.58	57.79	134.66	N/A	703,678	507,087
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	3	68.89	68.68	68.68	01.73	100.00	66.79	70.36	N/A	624,400	428,825
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	4	62.63	69.77	67.21	26.46	103.81	45.67	108.14	N/A	804,128	540,422
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	9	70.31	72.17	73.86	14.72	97.71	50.98	93.37	55.20 to 83.96	974,351	719,673
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	7	72.93	70.17	66.54	13.16	105.46	42.84	91.37	42.84 to 91.37	1,306,180	869,072
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	11	59.08	69.24	62.81	36.70	110.24	19.62	172.74	44.64 to 85.13	796,336	500,181
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	74.48	71.97	69.90	05.59	102.96	64.48	76.95	N/A	821,463	574,208
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	30	99.43	102.80	94.26	24.80	109.06	59.82	204.75	86.41 to 108.51	581,262	547,903
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	30	67.59	80.69	74.07	32.80	108.94	35.79	195.14	61.56 to 74.05	694,858	514,688
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	30	70.76	70.61	67.91	21.41	103.98	19.62	172.74	59.12 to 76.95	971,217	659,506
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	35	85.22	93.46	83.36	34.67	112.12	35.79	204.75	65.54 to 100.44	621,312	517,925
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	21	68.83	72.32	71.71	18.38	100.85	45.67	134.66	60.87 to 77.20	827,489	593,365
<u>ALL</u>	90	73.22	84.70	76.63	33.31	110.53	19.62	204.75	68.39 to 82.33	749,112	574,032

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	90	73.22	84.70	76.63	33.31	110.53	19.62	204.75	68.39 to 82.33	749,112	574,032
<u>ALL</u>	90	73.22	84.70	76.63	33.31	110.53	19.62	204.75	68.39 to 82.33	749,112	574,032

28 Douglas
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 3/19/2015

Number of Sales : 90
Total Sales Price : 65,890,123
Total Adj. Sales Price : 67,420,123
Total Assessed Value : 51,662,882
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 749,112
Avg. Assessed Value : 574,032

MEDIAN : 73
WGT. MEAN : 77
MEAN : 85
COD : 33.31
PRD : 110.53

COV : 41.78
STD : 35.39
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.39
MAX Sales Ratio : 204.75
MIN Sales Ratio : 19.62

95% Median C.I. : 68.39 to 82.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 71.50 to 81.76
95% Mean C.I. : 77.39 to 92.01

Printed:4/7/2015 3:54:44PM

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	98.92	98.92	87.62	16.77	112.90	82.33	115.50	N/A	321,301	281,532
1	2	98.92	98.92	87.62	16.77	112.90	82.33	115.50	N/A	321,301	281,532
Dry											
County	34	69.73	80.15	73.78	25.13	108.63	50.98	204.75	64.52 to 77.59	718,237	529,925
1	34	69.73	80.15	73.78	25.13	108.63	50.98	204.75	64.52 to 77.59	718,237	529,925
Grass											
County	1	52.21	52.21	52.21	00.00	100.00	52.21	52.21	N/A	320,000	167,081
1	1	52.21	52.21	52.21	00.00	100.00	52.21	52.21	N/A	320,000	167,081
ALL	90	73.22	84.70	76.63	33.31	110.53	19.62	204.75	68.39 to 82.33	749,112	574,032

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	2	98.92	98.92	87.62	16.77	112.90	82.33	115.50	N/A	321,301	281,532
1	2	98.92	98.92	87.62	16.77	112.90	82.33	115.50	N/A	321,301	281,532
Dry											
County	68	69.73	84.61	76.42	34.32	110.72	35.79	204.75	65.14 to 77.59	754,719	576,789
1	68	69.73	84.61	76.42	34.32	110.72	35.79	204.75	65.14 to 77.59	754,719	576,789
Grass											
County	2	102.12	102.12	83.78	48.87	121.89	52.21	152.03	N/A	234,000	196,041
1	2	102.12	102.12	83.78	48.87	121.89	52.21	152.03	N/A	234,000	196,041
ALL	90	73.22	84.70	76.63	33.31	110.53	19.62	204.75	68.39 to 82.33	749,112	574,032

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 195,246	Value : 36,971,034,110	Growth 553,161,620	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	7,911	64,139,000	5,275	156,282,400	2,118	68,548,300	15,304	288,969,700	
02. Res Improve Land	131,375	2,075,266,800	27,478	818,415,000	3,510	179,521,600	162,363	3,073,203,400	
03. Res Improvements	133,209	15,453,724,600	28,142	5,184,846,900	3,747	669,526,900	165,098	21,308,098,400	
04. Res Total	141,120	17,593,130,400	33,417	6,159,544,300	5,865	917,596,800	180,402	24,670,271,500	396,625,600
% of Res Total	78.23	71.31	18.52	24.97	3.25	3.72	92.40	66.73	71.70
05. Com UnImp Land	1,500	211,010,500	362	112,212,800	50	3,649,300	1,912	326,872,600	
06. Com Improve Land	6,964	1,838,189,600	253	161,729,100	98	19,457,900	7,315	2,019,376,600	
07. Com Improvements	7,125	7,104,881,800	259	564,219,700	136	89,129,100	7,520	7,758,230,600	
08. Com Total	8,625	9,154,081,900	621	838,161,600	186	112,236,300	9,432	10,104,479,800	134,416,020
% of Com Total	91.44	90.59	6.58	8.29	1.97	1.11	4.83	27.33	24.30
09. Ind UnImp Land	539	33,565,100	18	3,364,700	32	7,579,700	589	44,509,500	
10. Ind Improve Land	1,787	302,676,500	41	11,646,500	58	9,564,800	1,886	323,887,800	
11. Ind Improvements	1,767	1,238,904,000	41	44,618,900	58	39,345,200	1,866	1,322,868,100	
12. Ind Total	2,306	1,575,145,600	59	59,630,100	90	56,489,700	2,455	1,691,265,400	20,639,900
% of Ind Total	93.93	93.13	2.40	3.53	3.67	3.34	1.26	4.57	3.73
13. Rec UnImp Land	174	526,900	472	1,514,900	93	233,400	739	2,275,200	
14. Rec Improve Land	12	177,600	6	70,100	38	200	56	247,900	
15. Rec Improvements	9	47,900	1	0	191	2,077,100	201	2,125,000	
16. Rec Total	183	752,400	473	1,585,000	284	2,310,700	940	4,648,100	0
% of Rec Total	19.47	16.19	50.32	34.10	30.21	49.71	0.48	0.01	0.00
Res & Rec Total	141,303	17,593,882,800	33,890	6,161,129,300	6,149	919,907,500	181,342	24,674,919,600	396,625,600
% of Res & Rec Total	77.92	71.30	18.69	24.97	3.39	3.73	92.88	66.74	71.70
Com & Ind Total	10,931	10,729,227,500	680	897,791,700	276	168,726,000	11,887	11,795,745,200	155,055,920
% of Com & Ind Total	91.96	90.96	5.72	7.61	2.32	1.43	6.09	31.91	28.03
17. Taxable Total	152,234	28,323,110,300	34,570	7,058,921,000	6,425	1,088,633,500	193,229	36,470,664,800	551,681,520
% of Taxable Total	78.78	77.66	17.89	19.36	3.33	2.98	98.97	98.65	99.73

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	1,958	19,205,100	314,803,600	0	0	0
19. Commercial	445	113,622,600	1,145,265,600	0	0	0
20. Industrial	39	49,592,000	86,393,900	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	1,958	19,205,100	314,803,600
19. Commercial	0	0	0	445	113,622,600	1,145,265,600
20. Industrial	0	0	0	39	49,592,000	86,393,900
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2,442	182,419,700	1,546,463,100

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
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	12,016	512	1,178	13,706

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,344	238,778,030	1,344	238,778,030
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	52,200	1	1,200	1,926	145,728,380	1,928	145,781,780
29. Ag Improvements	27	926,000	4	595,000	642	114,288,500	673	115,809,500
30. Ag Total							2,017	500,369,310

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	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	1	0.24	1,200	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	529,100	2	0.00	591,600	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	8.70	52,200	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	26	0.00	396,900	2	0.00	3,400	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	577	623.90	19,934,500	578	624.14	19,935,700	
33. HomeSite Improvements	496	0.00	110,543,300	499	0.00	111,664,000	1,480,100
34. HomeSite Total				499	624.14	131,599,700	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	622	1,159.81	11,621,380	623	1,168.51	11,673,580	
37. FarmSite Improvements	146	0.00	3,745,200	174	0.00	4,145,500	0
38. FarmSite Total				174	1,168.51	15,819,080	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				673	1,792.65	147,418,780	1,480,100

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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	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	2,071	74,530.64	352,950,530	2,071	74,530.64	352,950,530
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	2,012.09	18.96%	11,468,913	18.96%	5,700.00
46. 1A	365.45	3.44%	2,083,065	3.44%	5,700.00
47. 2A1	493.51	4.65%	2,813,007	4.65%	5,700.00
48. 2A	4,774.17	44.99%	27,212,538	44.99%	5,699.95
49. 3A1	1,306.17	12.31%	7,445,169	12.31%	5,700.00
50. 3A	1,199.33	11.30%	6,836,181	11.30%	5,700.00
51. 4A1	246.00	2.32%	1,402,200	2.32%	5,700.00
52. 4A	215.26	2.03%	1,226,982	2.03%	5,700.00
53. Total	10,611.98	100.00%	60,488,055	100.00%	5,699.98
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,218.31	13.31%	34,977,977	13.31%	5,625.00
55. 1D	9,765.33	20.90%	54,929,970	20.90%	5,625.00
56. 2D1	1,233.17	2.64%	6,936,580	2.64%	5,625.00
57. 2D	8,690.84	18.60%	48,885,975	18.60%	5,625.00
58. 3D1	4,940.25	10.58%	27,788,905	10.58%	5,625.00
59. 3D	4,977.23	10.65%	27,992,325	10.65%	5,624.08
60. 4D1	10,064.55	21.55%	56,613,105	21.55%	5,625.00
61. 4D	824.31	1.76%	4,636,727	1.76%	5,624.98
62. Total	46,713.99	100.00%	262,761,564	100.00%	5,624.90
Grass					
63. 1G1	736.45	8.23%	1,767,480	8.23%	2,400.00
64. 1G	1,593.35	17.80%	3,824,047	17.80%	2,400.00
65. 2G1	75.24	0.84%	180,576	0.84%	2,400.00
66. 2G	851.42	9.51%	2,043,396	9.51%	2,399.99
67. 3G1	494.33	5.52%	1,186,392	5.52%	2,400.00
68. 3G	1,424.52	15.91%	3,418,848	15.91%	2,400.00
69. 4G1	2,184.35	24.40%	5,242,440	24.40%	2,400.00
70. 4G	1,592.29	17.79%	3,821,496	17.79%	2,400.00
71. Total	8,951.95	100.00%	21,484,675	100.00%	2,400.00
Irrigated Total	10,611.98	14.24%	60,488,055	17.14%	5,699.98
Dry Total	46,713.99	62.68%	262,761,564	74.45%	5,624.90
Grass Total	8,951.95	12.01%	21,484,675	6.09%	2,400.00
72. Waste	2,924.51	3.92%	438,676	0.12%	150.00
73. Other	5,328.21	7.15%	7,777,560	2.20%	1,459.69
74. Exempt	1,142.17	1.53%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	74,530.64	100.00%	352,950,530	100.00%	4,735.64

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	10,611.98	60,488,055	10,611.98	60,488,055
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	46,713.99	262,761,564	46,713.99	262,761,564
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	8,951.95	21,484,675	8,951.95	21,484,675
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,924.51	438,676	2,924.51	438,676
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,328.21	7,777,560	5,328.21	7,777,560
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,142.17	0	1,142.17	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	74,530.64	352,950,530	74,530.64	352,950,530

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	10,611.98	14.24%	60,488,055	17.14%	5,699.98
Dry Land	46,713.99	62.68%	262,761,564	74.45%	5,624.90
Grass	8,951.95	12.01%	21,484,675	6.09%	2,400.00
Waste	2,924.51	3.92%	438,676	0.12%	150.00
Other	5,328.21	7.15%	7,777,560	2.20%	1,459.69
Exempt	1,142.17	1.53%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	74,530.64	100.00%	352,950,530	100.00%	4,735.64

2015 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2014 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

28 Douglas

	2014 CTL County Total	2015 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2015 form 45 - 2014 CTL)	Percent Change	2015 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	23,963,126,935	24,670,271,500	707,144,565	2.95%	396,625,600	1.30%
02. Recreational	2,586,600	4,648,100	2,061,500	79.70%	0	79.70%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	154,062,530	131,599,700	-22,462,830	-14.58%	1,480,100	-15.54%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	24,119,776,065	24,806,519,300	686,743,235	2.85%	398,105,700	1.20%
05. Commercial	9,264,100,620	10,104,479,800	840,379,180	9.07%	134,416,020	7.62%
06. Industrial	1,648,950,400	1,691,265,400	42,315,000	2.57%	20,639,900	1.31%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,294,705	15,819,080	-1,475,625	-8.53%	0	-8.53%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	10,930,345,725	11,811,564,280	881,218,555	8.06%	155,055,920	6.64%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	35,050,121,790	36,618,083,580	1,567,961,790	4.47%	553,161,620	2.90%
11. Irrigated	45,064,390	60,488,055	15,423,665	34.23%		
12. Dryland	201,790,805	262,761,564	60,970,759	30.21%		
13. Grassland	27,603,385	21,484,675	-6,118,710	-22.17%		
14. Wasteland	338,770	438,676	99,906	29.49%		
15. Other Agland	3,031,115	7,777,560	4,746,445	156.59%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	277,828,465	352,950,530	75,122,065	27.04%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	35,327,950,255	36,971,034,110	1,643,083,855	4.65%	553,161,620	3.09%

Douglas County Assessor
2015 - 2017 Three Year
Plan of Assessment

Introduction

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), 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 thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue on or before October 31 each year.

Source: Laws 2005, LB 263, § 9; Laws 2007, LB334, § 64. Operative date July 1, 2007.

Real Property

Douglas County consists of the following breakdown of real property parcels in 2013:

Type	# of Parcels	Value
Residential	180,321	\$24,017,975,300
Commercial/Industrial	11,862	\$10,901,750,300
Agricultural	2,055	\$423,170,300
Exempt	17,634	
State Assessed	1,270	
TIF	2,473	\$1,700,274,900
Total	215,615	\$37,043,170,800

Assessment Calendar

Date	Activity
January 1	Assessment Date
January 15	Preliminary Values Set
February	Informal Hearings
March 7	Transfer Values to IMS & Error Reports
March 25	Reports and Opinions to State – Abstract & Sales File
Mar – May	Data Collection & TERC cases reviewed
Jun – Jul	BOE & AG Applications
Aug – Oct	Data Collection & New Construction
Nov – Dec	Building Permits & Set Values

Staffing and Budget

The office's appraisal staff currently consists of 28 individuals including the Chief Field Deputy. There is also 4 clerical support staff assigned to the department. In preparing the three year plan, there are two major hurdles that hamper the completion of the statutory mandate of inspecting all properties every six years. The first constraint is the lack of adequate funding of appraisal functions which results in an overly high work load of the appraisers. The residential appraisers have an average of over 16,000 parcels assigned to each appraiser, while the commercial appraisers have an average of around 3700 parcels each. (This appraiser workload is about double that recommended by the International Association of Assessing Officers – IAAO)

The second major drain on the appraisal staff has been the high number of protests to both the Board of Equalization and the Tax Equalization Review Commission. The protest process has taken a high amount of staff time. Our staff prepares a BOE packet for the Board for each protest, which will also serve as evidence for TERC if the property is appealed. When an individual files a TERC protest, our office performs an interior inspection, prepares the required TERC documentation as well as having the appraiser or supervisor attend the hearing along with the County Attorney's designee. This is different than some of the other counties who have the BOE staff defend their values. The breakdown for value changes and protests for the last four years are as follows:

Year	Value Changes	BOE Protests	% of changes	TERC Protests	% of BOE
2010	61,000	5,455	8.94	1,032	18.92
2011	27,000	5,196	19.24	1,044	20.09
2012	48,410	4,419	9.13	1,028	21.34
2013	53,219	3,659	6.88	781	21.34

Three years ago the office requested an additional \$500,000 to meet last year's new State mandates. The County Board committed \$250,000 to our offices for these purposes in the 2012-13 and the 2013-14 budget. The Assessor's Office has submitted a 2014-15 budget of \$3,378,084.

2013 & 2014 Valuation Statistics

Despite these constraints, the office values all properties every year. This is accomplished through the use of the Office's Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal system and extensive use of statistical analysis. The Cost Approach to value is utilized primarily for new construction and unique properties; the Sales Comparison Approach is used in valuing residential properties, while the Income Approach is utilized in valuing commercial, industrial and Multiple Commercial properties.

The results of the 2013 & 2014 reappraisal of the County's properties are illustrated below.

The 2013 Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator Statistics were as follows:

	# of Sales	Ratio	COD	PRD
Residential	12,175	96	8.99	102.83
Commercial	616	96	19.40	112.98
Agricultural		75		

For 2013, the Assessor’s Office reviewed all 213,000 parcels and made 52,973 value changes. There were 48,720 residential changes and 33,385 (69%) of these were decreases. The remaining neighborhoods were within the acceptable value range set by the State.

The 2014 Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator Statistics were as follows:

	# of Sales	Ratio	COD	PRD
Residential	14,696	96	9.72	102.72
Commercial	682	96	17.87	109.60
Agricultural		70		

For 2014, the Assessor’s Office reviewed all 215,000 parcels and made 28,548 value changes. The breakdown by account type was residential 25,790, agricultural 1,703 and commercial 1,055. The remaining neighborhoods were within the acceptable value range set by the State.

Real Property Inspection Cycle 2015 – 2017

Commercial

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.03 (2007), On or before March 19 of each year, each county assessor shall conduct a systematic inspection and review by class or subclass of a portion of the taxable real property parcels in the county for the purpose of achieving uniform and proportionate valuations and assuring that the real property record data accurately reflects the property. The county assessor shall adjust the value of all other taxable real property parcels by class or subclass in the county so that the value of all real property is uniform and proportionate. The county assessor shall determine the portion to be inspected and reviewed each year to assure that all parcels of real property in the county have been inspected and reviewed no less frequently than every six years.

The inspection cycle consist of having an appraiser physically inspect each improved parcel in the County every 6 years. Due to a shortage of vehicles available to the appraisal staff, this may entail the staff working in a team of two at times. The extent of the physical inspection is based upon the completeness of our data. Some areas may need to have the current information reviewed with the staff taking a front and rear photo of each property, while other areas may need to have the data completely re-listed to include re-measuring the improvements. Some commercial properties need to have interior inspections completed to determine usage and finished versus unfinished areas. While Pictometry was purchased two years ago and is helpful in verifying some measurements and identifying missing characteristics such as decks and swimming pools, it can’t be substituted for an on-site inspection. An on-site inspection is important to verify quality of construction and to determine the condition of the property. This is

especially important for areas of the County with older properties since property conditions can change over a short period of time.

There are approximately 10,000 improved commercial/Industrial/Multiple Commercial parcels. There are 1200 parcels left to complete and the commercial department will be able to maintain the six year inspection cycle.

The past three years the commercial department has listed the industrial, office and apartments in the County. The priority for the next three years will be to list and analysis all strip retail properties, finish up analysis, listing and model development for offices and apartments not addressed the last two years. In the 2016 valuation cycle industrial property will need to have the models recalculated and revalued. This will include flex, storage and distribution warehouses.

A major drain on the commercial department has been the amount of commercial properties that have filed TERC protests. Out of an average of a thousand cases filed every year half of them are commercial properties. Unlike the residential department these cases are prepared and attended by either the supervisor and or staff. This also includes cases where the BOE's appraisers have changed the Assessor's value. The office has attempted to work the BOE in having the BOE hiring their appraisers to represent the large and complex cases. The Assessor's office assists the County Attorney's office with the TERC cases by having the Supervisor of Records maintain the TERC database.

Another priority this last two years has been to list the permissive exempt properties. Two staff members have completed over 1300 inspections of these properties. Most of these properties had never been inspected. The goal is get all properties both taxable and exempt listed.

Residential

There are currently 165,600 improved residential properties in the County. The residential inspection cycle has been based upon neighborhoods and the last inspection dates. The staff have been accomplishing around 30,000 inspections per year which has allowed the office to catch up on the six year inspection cycle.

The residential staff consists of 10 appraisers and 9 listers. The requirement to inspect all parcels within the 6 year time frame has been especially difficult to accomplish due to the amount of appraisal time spent on tax appeals. The current staff of appraisers spends an average of two months a year working on Board appeals. This last year a separate hearing department has been created with a supervisor and two real estate appraisers to work the residential TERC cases.

2015 Assessment Survey for Douglas County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	2
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	28 appraisers and listers
3.	Other full-time employees:
	5 administrative, 4 GIS, 6 Personal Property, 5 Real Estate Records, 1 TERC Department
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1, beginning in February 2015
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$3,406,767
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$3,356,769
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$1,307,761.66 (salaries) plus \$100,000 for modeling contract and \$75,000 for benchmark/capitalization rate study
9.	
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$250,316
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	0
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$102,000 unspent for Fiscal 2013-2014

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	County Clerk's Office—IMS Mainframe System
2.	CAMA software:
	Harris Systems
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	GIS Department within the Assessor's Office
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	dcassessor.org
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor's Office
8.	Personal Property software:
	Harris Systems

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?
	All municipalities in the county are zoned
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Over 45 years ago

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	N/A
2.	GIS Services:
	In-house
3.	Other services:
	Modeling contract with South Consulting Services and Benchmark/Capitalization Rate Study with Valuation Services, Inc.

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	N/A
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	N/A
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	N/A
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	N/A
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	N/A

2015 Certification for Douglas County

This is to certify that the 2015 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 Douglas County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2015.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

