

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 Keith County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	289	Median	92.72
Total Sales Price	\$29,999,406	Mean	96.20
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$30,220,406	Wgt. Mean	88.25
Total Assessed Value	\$26,668,835	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$60,364
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$104,569	Avg. Assessed Value	\$92,280

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	88.92 to 94.87
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.90 to 91.60
95% Mean C.I	92.59 to 99.81
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	29.54
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.31

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	290	94	94.13
2013	336	95	95.01
2012	270	97	97.01
2011	294	98	98

2015 Commission Summary for Keith County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	48	Median	92.53
Total Sales Price	\$10,609,490	Mean	94.61
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,646,755	Wgt. Mean	75.68
Total Assessed Value	\$8,057,583	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$140,593
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$221,807	Avg. Assessed Value	\$167,866

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.43 to 96.99
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	66.31 to 85.05
95% Mean C.I	85.49 to 103.73
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.06
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.09

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	36	93	95.02
2013	33	97	96.97
2012	28	98	97.68
2011	45	98	98

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Keith County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	94	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	Valuation Grouping # 05, an adjustment of 8.50%
Commercial Real Property	92	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of 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, 2015.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Keith County

This was supposed to be the first year in the six year cycle, but Keith County is behind a year because it took them 2 years to do the lake review.

For the Assessment Year of 2015, Keith County's main review was with the Lake. The previous two years the office was working on reviewing all of the Lake Parcels. This consisted of 2,137 parcels in Lake Residential neighborhoods and 569 parcels for Mobile Home Parks. The lake residential neighborhoods were reviewed and new land tables were created. When we went to start depreciation tables, we realized that during the inspections of each property, condition and quality were not reviewed on any of the homes. Pictures were taken and the properties were re-measured. Any new improvements were sketched on the CAMA system and new values were set. We will be hiring the Tax Valuations, Inc. to come out this summer and review the lake properties again and look at quality and condition. When that is finished they will be creating new depreciation tables based on sales in the county.

All mobile home parks were reviewed for 2015. They were physically re-measured, new photos were taken, and quality and condition were called in the field. New land and depreciation tables were created for these neighborhoods derived from the sales in the county.

Since taking office in January, we have individually had to work on all 2,706 parcels of Lake and Lake mobile Home parks to set up all land values into the CAMA system. We tried initially to do it in mass but the computer system wasn't set up. Parcels in the same designated neighborhood are now pulling the same tables for land values. Any changes in the future will be easier to change and calculate because they won't have to be set up again.

All pick-up work was completed and entered; from all sources of discovery including building permits, self-reporting, neighbor reporting, sale review, drive by identification, etc.

In my opinion, I feel that Residential property in Ogallala has turned into a sellers' market. Homes are more in demand because of new business opportunities in the county. We have opened the new Ace hardware, and Wal-Mart. This has brought people to the community and homes in the 50,000-150,000 range have had a short market time and are starting to sell for more than the assessed value. We will be reviewing Ogallala and Ogallala Suburban for 2015. We will be trying to get in as many smaller towns that we can since we are a year behind already. These include: Brule, Keystone, Paxton, Roscoe and Sarben.

With the increase of the water in the lake since the drought, various neighborhoods at the lake have been selling quickly and for more than assessed value. We saw this with the mobile home parks this year, and will review these this summer.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Keith 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="text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>City of Ogalla</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Village of Paxton approximately 20 miles east of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Village of Brule approximately 7 miles west of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Rural - parcels located outside the City or Village limits, excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Lake McConaughy</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td> <td>K-Lake Area - parcels which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">07</td> <td>Suburban - properties outside the city limits of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">08</td> <td>Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	City of Ogalla	02	Village of Paxton approximately 20 miles east of Ogallala	03	Village of Brule approximately 7 miles west of Ogallala	04	Rural - parcels located outside the City or Village limits, excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban	05	Lake McConaughy	06	K-Lake Area - parcels which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District	07	Suburban - properties outside the city limits of Ogallala	08	Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																		
01	City of Ogalla																		
02	Village of Paxton approximately 20 miles east of Ogallala																		
03	Village of Brule approximately 7 miles west of Ogallala																		
04	Rural - parcels located outside the City or Village limits, excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban																		
05	Lake McConaughy																		
06	K-Lake Area - parcels which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District																		
07	Suburban - properties outside the city limits of Ogallala																		
08	Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben																		
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.																		
	The cost approach is primarily used for determining market value for residential property.																		
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?																		
	Local market data is used to develop depreciation tables.																		
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																		
	Yes, and with the 6-year review and inspection cycle will be updating the tables with each part of the county that is reviewed per that cycle year.																		
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?																		
	By local market data of vacant lot sales.																		
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?																		
	Will be utilizing an income approach taking into consideration such things as the estimated time to sell off the lots, average sale price of the lots, expenses and developing a discount rate.																		

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>
01	2009	2009	2009	2008
02	2008	2008	2008	2007
03	2008	2008	2008	2007
04	2012	2012	2012	2011
05	2015	2015	2015	2013-2014
06	2015	2015	2015	2013-2014
07	2010	2010	2010	2009
08	2008	2008	2008	2007

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Keith County

County Overview

Keith County has three incorporated towns; Ogallala, the county seat, with a population of approximately 4737 residents, and Brule and Paxton with populations of 326 and 523 respectively. Lake McConaughy also has a substantial number of residents that are both year round and seasonal. The lake area will have some influence on the residential market. There are three unincorporated villages (Roscoe, Sarben, and Keystone). Ogallala would be considered the hub of the residential market with the majority of the services and retail trade, grain handling facilities, auto and implement dealerships, hospital, and schools.

Description of Analysis

The statistical sampling of 289 residential sales appears to be an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Keith County. Eight valuation groupings have been identified based on the availability of services and jobs and the varying degrees of economic influence that affect the residential market for each of the valuations groupings. The City of Ogallala is the primary hub of the business district.

The assessor in Keith County was newly elected and assumed office in January. Among the numerous administrative functions to address for 2015, was the goal for the residential class. Along with annual maintenance, the plan was to do a lot study, including leasehold values, and update costing and apply new depreciation to properties around Lake McConaughy. Tax Valuations, Inc. was contracted to assist in completing this work. After land tables were created and put into the CAMA system the depreciation models were started. It was discovered that during the review and physical inspection the quality and condition had not been evaluated. Since depreciation models are dependent on accurate information this portion of the job could not be completed by the March 19th deadline of setting values. The county board and assessor have come to an agreement with the appraisal company, this summer the appraisers will go out and review the quality and condition of the properties around the lake and then create the depreciation models and assist in putting them into the CAMA for setting values for the 2016 assessment year.

Based on the sample of 289 sales, the median measure of central tendency demonstrates that an acceptable level of value has been attained overall and that most of the individual substratum with a sufficient number of sales will demonstrate an acceptable level of value as well.

Sales Qualification

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. The assessor has a very

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Keith County

thorough documentation process. Measurement is done utilizing all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-half of the counties within the state 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 residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Generally the assessment practices will meet mass appraisal standards. However, since one subclass, with sufficient data, has not met an acceptable level of value the assessment practices will be considered not met for 2015.

Level of Value

Based on all available information, the level of value of the residential class of real property in Keith County is 94%.

Non-Binding Recommendation

The recommendation of the Property Tax Administrator is to increase (05) Lake +8.5% to bring the level of value to the midpoint of the acceptable range for the subclass.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Keith County

All pick-up work was completed and entered; from all sources of discovery including permits, self-reporting, neighbor reporting, sale review, drive by identification, etc.

A complete review, inspection and reappraisal of the commercial property were done in 2011 by the State Appraiser.

Along with our pick-up work was two commercial TIF projects Wal-Mart, and WRG Western Resource Group a recycling company.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Keith County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:																		
	Assessor and staff.																		
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:																		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>City of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Village of Paxton approximately 20 miles east of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Village of Brule approximately 7 miles west of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Rural - parcels located outside the City of Village limits, excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Lake McConaughy</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td> <td>K-Lake Area - parcels which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation Distict</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">07</td> <td>Suburban - properties outside the city limits of Ogallala</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">08</td> <td>Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	City of Ogallala	02	Village of Paxton approximately 20 miles east of Ogallala	03	Village of Brule approximately 7 miles west of Ogallala	04	Rural - parcels located outside the City of Village limits, excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban	05	Lake McConaughy	06	K-Lake Area - parcels which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation Distict	07	Suburban - properties outside the city limits of Ogallala	08	Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																		
01	City of Ogallala																		
02	Village of Paxton approximately 20 miles east of Ogallala																		
03	Village of Brule approximately 7 miles west of Ogallala																		
04	Rural - parcels located outside the City of Village limits, excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban																		
05	Lake McConaughy																		
06	K-Lake Area - parcels which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation Distict																		
07	Suburban - properties outside the city limits of Ogallala																		
08	Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben																		
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.																		
	The cost approach is primarily used for determining market value for commercial property.																		
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.																		
	Will seek the assistance of Tax Valuation, Inc. to do the unique commercial 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?																		
	Depreciation tables are built into the MIPS system.																		
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																		
	Yes																		
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.																		
	Market data is used to establish the 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>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	01	2011	2011	2011	2010
	02	2011	2011	2011	2010
	03	2011	2011	2011	2010
	04	2011	2011	2011	2010
	05	2011	2011	2011	2010
	06	2011	2011	2011	2010
	07	2011	2011	2011	2010
	08	2011	2011	2011	2010

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Keith County

County Overview

Keith County has three incorporated towns; Ogallala, the county seat, with a population of approximately 4737 residents, and Brule and Paxton with populations of 326 and 523 respectively. Ogallala and Suburban Ogallala would be considered the hub of the commercial market with the majority of the services and retail trade, grain handling facilities, fertilizer providers, a livestock auction service, auto and implement dealerships, a hospital, and schools. The smaller towns have erratic markets but, they are supportive of the farm producers with their grain handling facilities. Most businesses around Lake McConaughy rely primarily on seasonal tourism but some, such as the bank and golf course, serve many of the area residents as well.

Description of Analysis

Eight valuation groupings have been identified; however, Valuation Grouping 01 (Ogallala) with 34 sales would carry the most weight in developing a reliable sample that would be considered statistically sufficient in the analysis of the commercial real property class.

The commercial parcels in Keith County are represented by 78 different occupancy codes; over 67% of the population consists of motel, office, restaurant and fast food, multiple residence, retail, warehouses, utility buildings and service repair garages. Most all of these primary codes are represented in Valuation Grouping 01 (Ogallala) along with several other occupancy codes.

For 2015, there were no major changes within the commercial class and is confirmed by the abstract of assessment. There were two new TIF projects, Wal-Mart and WRG Western Resource Group which is a recycling company.

Sales Qualification

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. The assessor has a very thorough documentation process. Measurement is done utilizing all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. 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.

For measurement purposes only Valuation Grouping 01 (Ogallala) will be used to determine the level of value for the commercial class of property.

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Keith County

Level of Value

Based on all available information the level of value of the commercial class of real property in Keith County is determined to be 92% of market value.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Keith County

We continue to process any irrigation transfers of certified base acres approved by the Twin Platte NRD.

All agricultural sales and land values were reviewed for all three market areas. New Land values were set by soil type for all three agricultural neighborhoods.

All pick-up work from all sources of discovery including permits, self-reporting, neighbor reporting, sale review, drive by identification, etc. has been done for 2015.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Keith 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%;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 65%;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>Market Area 01 is in the northern part of Keith County; north of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy. It is part of the Nebraska Sand Hill region that consists primarily of native grasses suitable for grazing. There is a limited amount of cropland in this area. Travel is by county roads, Highway 92 that runs along the north side of Lake McConaughy and Highway 61 that runs north to south across the county. The Union Pacific Railroad maintains two lines that run east to west along the north side of the lake.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012-2013</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Market Area 02 is south of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy but, north of the South Platte River. This land begins as a plateau that descends southerly down into the Platte River Valley. The area comprises approximately two-thirds hard grass, one-third dry land and a small percent of irrigation. Highway 26 goes northwest out of Ogallala and a small portion of Highway 61 goes across it.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012-2013</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Market Area 03 includes the South Platte River and goes to the southern boundary of the county. Highway 30 and Interstate 80 run east to west through this area, along with the Union Pacific Railroad. The area is approximately 43% irrigated, dry and grass making up about 29% and 24% respectively.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012-2013</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	01	Market Area 01 is in the northern part of Keith County; north of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy. It is part of the Nebraska Sand Hill region that consists primarily of native grasses suitable for grazing. There is a limited amount of cropland in this area. Travel is by county roads, Highway 92 that runs along the north side of Lake McConaughy and Highway 61 that runs north to south across the county. The Union Pacific Railroad maintains two lines that run east to west along the north side of the lake.	2012-2013	02	Market Area 02 is south of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy but, north of the South Platte River. This land begins as a plateau that descends southerly down into the Platte River Valley. The area comprises approximately two-thirds hard grass, one-third dry land and a small percent of irrigation. Highway 26 goes northwest out of Ogallala and a small portion of Highway 61 goes across it.	2012-2013	03	Market Area 03 includes the South Platte River and goes to the southern boundary of the county. Highway 30 and Interstate 80 run east to west through this area, along with the Union Pacific Railroad. The area is approximately 43% irrigated, dry and grass making up about 29% and 24% respectively.	2012-2013
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>												
01	Market Area 01 is in the northern part of Keith County; north of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy. It is part of the Nebraska Sand Hill region that consists primarily of native grasses suitable for grazing. There is a limited amount of cropland in this area. Travel is by county roads, Highway 92 that runs along the north side of Lake McConaughy and Highway 61 that runs north to south across the county. The Union Pacific Railroad maintains two lines that run east to west along the north side of the lake.	2012-2013												
02	Market Area 02 is south of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy but, north of the South Platte River. This land begins as a plateau that descends southerly down into the Platte River Valley. The area comprises approximately two-thirds hard grass, one-third dry land and a small percent of irrigation. Highway 26 goes northwest out of Ogallala and a small portion of Highway 61 goes across it.	2012-2013												
03	Market Area 03 includes the South Platte River and goes to the southern boundary of the county. Highway 30 and Interstate 80 run east to west through this area, along with the Union Pacific Railroad. The area is approximately 43% irrigated, dry and grass making up about 29% and 24% respectively.	2012-2013												
	Implemented GIS during 2012 and 2013; took a considerable amount of time to edit parcels for accuracy of the data.													
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.													
	GIS maps, topography and comparable maps of surrounding counties help to identify the unique characteristics that drive the market in each of these areas.													
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.													
	The actual use of the parcel is determined by physical reviews which identify the classification of either rural residential or agricultural land.													
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?													
	Yes													
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.													
	An analysis is done of the sales and if available, the contracts will be examined as well, to try and establish a value for the WRP acres.													
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:													

	Yes
7a.	What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist?
	Market data and sales of similar influences are analyzed and, if possible, on-site reviews are done.
7b.	Describe the non-agricultural influences present within the county.
	Recreational land primarily for hunting.
7c.	How many parcels in the county are receiving special value?
	383
7d.	Where is the influenced area located within the county?
	Primarily along the North and South Platte Rivers,
7e.	Describe the valuation models and approaches used to establish the uninfluenced values.
	Primarily it is the sales comparison approach, the sales are analyzed and a spreadsheet is developed to determine what action is needed to address the agricultural market.

Keith County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Keith	1	n/a	2,101	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Garden	1	n/a	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,963
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Lincoln	2	2,500	2,500	2,469	2,500	2,500	2,459	2,489	2,489	2,489
Keith	2	n/a	3,000	2,750	2,750	2,650	2,650	2,650	2,650	2,781
Deuel	1	n/a	3,030	2,991	2,978	2,975	2,795	2,695	2,645	2,958
Lincoln	1	4,215	4,216	4,217	4,211	4,046	3,982	3,993	3,893	4,119
Keith	3	4,055	4,055	3,745	3,745	3,575	3,575	3,575	3,575	3,880
Lincoln	1	4,215	4,216	4,217	4,211	4,046	3,982	3,993	3,893	4,119
Perkins	1	n/a	3,722	3,703	3,584	3,629	3,478	3,511	3,501	3,630

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Keith	1	n/a	625	n/a	600	600	600	600	600	601
Garden	1	n/a	795	795	775	775	770	750	750	785
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	725	n/a	725	725	725	725
Lincoln	2	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Keith	2	n/a	1,190	1,155	1,140	1,115	1,115	1,115	1,115	1,170
Deuel	1	n/a	970	965	835	835	530	530	525	867
Lincoln	1	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,873	1,875
Keith	3	1,620	1,620	1,505	1,505	1,270	1,270	1,240	1,240	1,526
Lincoln	1	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,873	1,875
Perkins	1	n/a	1,469	1,463	1,365	1,359	1,343	1,260	1,189	1,409

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Keith	1	n/a	436	n/a	369	338	343	329	327	328
Garden	1	n/a	397	300	342	318	335	298	291	295
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	315	n/a	315	315	315	315	315
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	330	330	n/a	330	330	330	330
Lincoln	2	425	425	425	425	425	375	375	374	375
Keith	2	n/a	521	606	464	496	451	413	402	414
Deuel	1	n/a	361	329	326	328	300	312	292	308
Lincoln	1	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,025	1,025	993	1,039
Keith	3	455	512	440	478	520	442	462	403	446
Lincoln	1	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,025	1,025	993	1,039
Perkins	1	n/a	550	550	550	550	550	550	550	550

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

2015 Special Valuation Methodology For Keith County

Identification of the Influenced Area

The Special Valuation Area is the accretion land along the North & South Platte Rivers and Lake Mc Conaughy. This area was first recognized in assessment year 2007. This area is not in any specific Market Area as it is located within each of the three Agricultural Market Areas.

The highest and best use of Properties in the Influenced Area

The highest and best use of the accretion market area is for recreational use. The Special Valuation Area was determined by market trends as the majority of all the agricultural properties that have sold along either river have been purchased for residential living and/or recreational use. The highest and best use is legally permitted, physically possible, economically feasible, and the most profitable. Every parcel with accretion was reviewed. If the parcel contained more accretion acres than deeded acres we then looked at adjoining parcels to identify adjoining parcels with the same ownership as the parcel with accretion. If the total acres of adjoining parcels contained more deeded acres *used for agricultural purpose*, than accretion areas; these parcels were determined to be primarily agricultural purpose and therefore, are allowed Special Valuation. If the total deeded acres *used for agricultural purpose*, is a small difference than the accretion acres, these parcels were determined to be primarily agricultural purpose and therefore, are allowed Special Valuation. If the Accretion Acres contain some acres used for agricultural purpose than these acres are valued as all other land of similar use and considered agricultural purpose and added to the deeded acres to determine whether a parcel is primarily agricultural purpose. Parcels with slivers or small tracts of deeded land lying adjacent to larger accretion acres are not typical agricultural land in Keith County and are considered *food plots or wildlife forage*. Also, putting a few head of horses or cattle for a few months a year on these parcels with more accretion acres, does not qualify the parcel as being used primarily for agricultural purpose. After inspection, it was determined that the primary use of parcels with slivers or small tracts lying adjacent to larger accretion acres on the same parcel; or a few head of livestock for a few months annually, is not considered agricultural production in Keith County. Parcels determined as not being primarily used for agricultural purposes were sent Disqualification Letters.

Valuation Models Used for Value Estimates

The valuation models used in these areas are unit comparison or value per acre. The models were created by using sold properties with accretion acres that were influenced by other than agricultural use. This Special Valuation Area was selected because the sold properties were not reflecting the true agricultural market. This Special Valuation Area was developed to define a market trend for agricultural parcels being used for residential or recreational use within Keith County

Market areas Analyzed-In County and out of County

All three market areas within Keith County area analyzed on an annual basis. Market trends are analyzed and sales within the Special Valuation area are used to determine the areas and market value. We have also reviewed adjoining counties, Garden and Lincoln, Special Valuation Areas and their Valuation Methodology.

Adjustments Made to Sales Reflect Current Cash Equivalency of Typical Market Conditions

We have not adjusted the sales. Typically the most recent sales reflect current cash equivalency. We rely on the most recent sales in determining value.

Estimates of Economic Rent or Net Operating Income

We have not studied rents for these properties. Typically actual income information is not readily available to our office.

Typical Expenses Allowed in Income Capitalization Approach

We have not studied the income approach for these properties. Typically actual income information is not readily available to our office.

Overall Capitalization Rate Used in Income Capitalization Approach

We have not studied the income approach for these properties. Typically actual income information is not readily available to our office.

Other Supporting Information for the Estimate of Special Value

Market trends for agricultural land in Keith County have been highly influenced by residential and recreational uses due to Lake McConaughy, the North Platte River and the South Platte River. This area is primarily agricultural parcels. The Special Valuation Market Area is determined by current sales within Keith County. The Special Value Methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The Keith County assessment office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the Keith County Assessor Office by any interested person.

Rena Zink
Keith County Assessor

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Keith County

County Overview

Keith County is located in the western part of Nebraska. Major highways serving the county are interstate 80 and highway 30 from east to west, highway 61 running north to south, highway 26 on the south side of Lake McConaughy and highway 92 on the north side of the lake. These highways together with the local sale barn, numerous grain elevators, farm and ranch supply businesses, and implement dealerships are all attributes that have an economic impact on the agricultural market in Keith County.

Market Area 1 is in the northern part of the county and is part of the Nebraska Sand Hills and the Valentine series soils are well suited to the native grasses that make the area desirable to the production of livestock. There is some grass, alfalfa, and corn under sprinkler irrigation.

Market Area 2 is south of Lake McConaughy and the North Platte River, the southern boundary line of this area is identified by the north side of the South Platte River. The loess and sandy soils here are suitable for pasture and some crop production. The makeup of this area is mostly hard grass with some dry and irrigated land.

Market Area 3 includes the South Platte River and borders Perkins County on the south. This area is best suited for cropland; primarily irrigation with some dry and grass.

Description of Analysis

The overall sample of agricultural sales over the three year study period appeared to be proportionally distributed over the three year study period. However, when further stratified by Market Area the distribution of sales over the study period was not proportionately distributed. Market Area's 1 and 3 were under represented in the current year and Market Area 2 was over represented in the oldest year.

Comparable sales were identified for inclusion in Market Area one (Sand Hills) in order to have a more reliable sample; the land use of the sample remained representative of the Market Area and the sample remained proportionate over the study period.

As many comparable sales as possible were identified for inclusion in Market Area 2; the sample was slightly skewed with grass sales but the sample would be considered representative and proportionate for measurement.

As many comparable sales as possible were identified for inclusion in Market Area 3; the sample with slightly skewed with dry land sales but the sample would be considered representative and proportionate for measurement.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Keith County

Sales Qualification

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation has been entered in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. Questionnaires are sent out and the returned responses are kept on file in the assessor's office. On-site reviews are also done and information is documented within the electronic file. Measurement is done utilizing all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Many factors were considered in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Keith County. The sales data, as provided by the assessor, in the States sales file was examined and tested. The resulting statistics were indicators of assessment actions and uniform and proportionate treatment within the class and subclasses. To strengthen the confidence in the data further observations were made of the actions of adjoining counties and the economics across the region.

Level of Value

The overall median of 72% will be used in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Keith County. Each Market Area has attained an acceptable level of value as well.

Special Valuation

A review of the agricultural land values in Keith County in areas that have other non-agricultural influence indicates the assessed values used are similar to other areas in the County where no non-agricultural influences exist. Therefore, it is the opinion of Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land in Keith County is 72%.

**51 Keith
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 289
 Total Sales Price : 29,999,406
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,220,406
 Total Assessed Value : 26,668,835
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 104,569
 Avg. Assessed Value : 92,280

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 88
 MEAN : 96
 COD : 21.83
 PRD : 109.01

COV : 32.59
 STD : 31.35
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.24
 MAX Sales Ratio : 317.20
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.52

95% Median C.I. : 88.92 to 94.87
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.90 to 91.60
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.59 to 99.81

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:23PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	16	95.70	105.41	97.79	21.17	107.79	62.50	170.71	85.43 to 135.97	105,123	102,798	
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	20	93.36	97.87	92.97	15.40	105.27	67.22	157.23	89.17 to 99.60	79,374	73,794	
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	34	93.25	92.94	88.04	21.43	105.57	51.29	161.45	74.94 to 100.12	105,444	92,836	
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	51	92.82	95.15	90.95	14.07	104.62	62.92	152.46	88.08 to 98.73	113,457	103,187	
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	28	99.26	106.50	95.79	27.63	111.18	47.24	207.74	87.86 to 110.24	91,479	87,624	
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	28	93.25	90.46	91.98	12.54	98.35	48.66	120.78	84.58 to 97.42	96,448	88,711	
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	52	90.05	96.85	84.36	25.36	114.81	48.38	260.60	83.89 to 100.57	99,730	84,130	
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	60	83.96	93.26	81.57	28.75	114.33	39.52	317.20	80.05 to 90.39	118,861	96,951	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	121	93.47	96.34	91.29	17.35	105.53	51.29	170.71	89.28 to 96.50	104,470	95,369	
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	168	89.52	96.11	86.06	25.68	111.68	39.52	317.20	85.43 to 96.68	104,640	90,055	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	133	94.12	97.39	91.33	19.45	106.64	47.24	207.74	90.64 to 98.48	101,656	92,844	
<u>ALL</u>	289	92.72	96.20	88.25	21.83	109.01	39.52	317.20	88.92 to 94.87	104,569	92,280	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	149	94.13	99.63	91.15	21.59	109.30	39.52	317.20	89.04 to 97.97	80,444	73,324	
02	20	99.55	103.85	90.35	24.93	114.94	57.76	165.75	81.28 to 113.51	56,925	51,434	
03	10	92.96	111.33	96.11	29.28	115.84	71.07	207.74	84.23 to 184.48	43,700	42,000	
04	13	99.64	94.17	82.39	12.24	114.30	50.78	120.33	83.89 to 109.16	213,513	175,924	
05	76	88.42	89.36	87.32	21.99	102.34	44.00	260.60	82.77 to 94.90	135,902	118,670	
06	8	73.22	77.82	81.31	17.60	95.71	52.54	119.37	52.54 to 119.37	176,375	143,405	
07	9	88.27	90.81	88.54	10.16	102.56	76.23	117.52	80.33 to 104.79	202,556	179,334	
08	4	79.89	78.16	71.03	24.03	110.04	50.89	101.96	N/A	80,125	56,910	
<u>ALL</u>	289	92.72	96.20	88.25	21.83	109.01	39.52	317.20	88.92 to 94.87	104,569	92,280	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	286	92.74	96.42	88.42	21.80	109.05	39.52	317.20	88.92 to 94.90	105,159	92,976	
06	3	84.55	76.05	53.51	21.92	142.12	44.00	99.60	N/A	48,333	25,863	
07												
<u>ALL</u>	289	92.72	96.20	88.25	21.83	109.01	39.52	317.20	88.92 to 94.87	104,569	92,280	

**51 Keith
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 289
 Total Sales Price : 29,999,406
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,220,406
 Total Assessed Value : 26,668,835
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 104,569
 Avg. Assessed Value : 92,280

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 88
 MEAN : 96
 COD : 21.83
 PRD : 109.01

COV : 32.59
 STD : 31.35
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.24
 MAX Sales Ratio : 317.20
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.52

95% Median C.I. : 88.92 to 94.87
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.90 to 91.60
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.59 to 99.81

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:23PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___Low \$ Ranges___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	9	145.23	156.67	140.30	37.15	111.67	84.55	317.20	94.18 to 207.74	11,704	16,421	
Less Than 30,000	41	111.90	123.73	113.86	35.08	108.67	39.52	317.20	98.73 to 138.91	20,365	23,188	
___Ranges Excl. Low \$___												
Greater Than 4,999	289	92.72	96.20	88.25	21.83	109.01	39.52	317.20	88.92 to 94.87	104,569	92,280	
Greater Than 14,999	280	91.97	94.26	88.07	20.40	107.03	39.52	260.60	88.56 to 94.52	107,554	94,718	
Greater Than 29,999	248	89.82	91.65	87.52	18.00	104.72	44.00	188.30	87.91 to 93.96	118,490	103,702	
___Incremental Ranges___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	9	145.23	156.67	140.30	37.15	111.67	84.55	317.20	94.18 to 207.74	11,704	16,421	
15,000 TO 29,999	32	110.99	114.46	110.05	30.67	104.01	39.52	260.60	85.57 to 135.76	22,801	25,091	
30,000 TO 59,999	68	96.96	100.71	98.19	22.17	102.57	44.28	188.30	90.87 to 103.46	48,820	47,937	
60,000 TO 99,999	65	95.05	93.30	93.01	14.46	100.31	47.24	161.01	88.99 to 98.96	80,055	74,456	
100,000 TO 149,999	53	85.02	85.77	86.48	14.36	99.18	44.00	140.63	78.30 to 89.82	123,797	107,056	
150,000 TO 249,999	42	83.55	84.51	84.74	16.19	99.73	52.54	132.77	74.63 to 88.56	179,312	151,958	
250,000 TO 499,999	19	89.22	87.96	87.29	11.90	100.77	60.36	109.16	80.33 to 95.28	306,305	267,381	
500,000 TO 999,999	1	50.78	50.78	50.78	00.00	100.00	50.78	50.78	N/A	950,000	482,420	
1,000,000 +												
___ALL___	289	92.72	96.20	88.25	21.83	109.01	39.52	317.20	88.92 to 94.87	104,569	92,280	

**51 Keith
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 48
 Total Sales Price : 10,609,490
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,646,755
 Total Assessed Value : 8,057,583
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 221,807
 Avg. Assessed Value : 167,866

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 76
 MEAN : 95
 COD : 23.75
 PRD : 125.01

COV : 34.06
 STD : 32.22
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.98
 MAX Sales Ratio : 198.94
 MIN Sales Ratio : 24.23

95% Median C.I. : 87.43 to 96.99
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.31 to 85.05
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.49 to 103.73

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:24PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	94.30	94.30	94.30	00.00	100.00	94.30	94.30	N/A	88,000	82,985
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	69.74	69.74	69.74	00.00	100.00	69.74	69.74	N/A	565,000	394,005
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	75.86	75.86	73.34	22.28	103.44	58.96	92.75	N/A	11,750	8,618
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	6	97.83	93.31	96.58	21.44	96.61	45.54	133.96	45.54 to 133.96	60,544	58,472
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	5	95.74	108.52	75.52	27.51	143.70	71.09	154.44	N/A	711,440	537,290
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	123.83	123.83	116.81	07.41	106.01	114.66	133.00	N/A	85,000	99,293
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	5	91.49	80.45	82.00	19.89	98.11	54.71	103.70	N/A	321,602	263,715
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	5	81.57	81.87	77.43	08.09	105.73	72.72	91.72	N/A	170,600	132,097
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	129.06	126.77	108.52	17.95	116.82	87.70	161.25	N/A	85,945	93,271
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	4	103.15	109.10	102.33	13.67	106.62	90.08	140.02	N/A	117,500	120,233
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	7	87.43	74.91	51.83	19.09	144.53	24.23	92.53	24.23 to 92.53	220,000	114,037
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	6	93.64	99.35	65.37	32.69	151.98	44.04	198.94	44.04 to 198.94	177,500	116,027
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	10	93.05	87.56	81.27	19.92	107.74	45.54	133.96	58.96 to 106.56	103,977	84,506
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	17	91.49	94.23	78.60	21.87	119.89	54.71	154.44	72.72 to 114.66	364,012	286,123
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	21	92.53	98.28	68.69	27.09	143.08	24.23	198.94	87.43 to 106.38	162,799	111,830
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	14	93.05	94.56	76.48	24.45	123.64	45.54	154.44	69.74 to 133.96	322,069	246,323
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	16	91.61	97.90	85.74	24.08	114.18	54.71	161.25	74.65 to 119.50	185,924	159,421
<u>ALL</u>	48	92.53	94.61	75.68	23.75	125.01	24.23	198.94	87.43 to 96.99	221,807	167,866

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	34	91.61	95.41	73.20	29.22	130.34	24.23	198.94	78.13 to 106.38	275,126	201,386
02	1	134.83	134.83	134.83	00.00	100.00	134.83	134.83	N/A	17,200	23,190
03	5	93.35	88.42	90.20	09.72	98.03	58.96	103.70	N/A	16,700	15,063
05	7	93.93	90.46	94.02	07.07	96.21	68.84	99.92	68.84 to 99.92	151,680	142,616
07	1	87.43	87.43	87.43	00.00	100.00	87.43	87.43	N/A	130,000	113,653
<u>ALL</u>	48	92.53	94.61	75.68	23.75	125.01	24.23	198.94	87.43 to 96.99	221,807	167,866

**51 Keith
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 48
 Total Sales Price : 10,609,490
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,646,755
 Total Assessed Value : 8,057,583
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 221,807
 Avg. Assessed Value : 167,866

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 76
 MEAN : 95
 COD : 23.75
 PRD : 125.01

COV : 34.06
 STD : 32.22
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.98
 MAX Sales Ratio : 198.94
 MIN Sales Ratio : 24.23

95% Median C.I. : 87.43 to 96.99
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.31 to 85.05
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.49 to 103.73

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:24PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	12	92.17	104.83	100.08	22.61	104.75	55.17	198.94	88.67 to 133.00	77,813	77,874
03	35	93.35	91.68	73.27	24.05	125.13	24.23	161.25	81.57 to 99.92	263,800	193,279
04	1	74.65	74.65	74.65	00.00	100.00	74.65	74.65	N/A	480,000	358,325
<u>ALL</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>92.53</u>	<u>94.61</u>	<u>75.68</u>	<u>23.75</u>	<u>125.01</u>	<u>24.23</u>	<u>198.94</u>	<u>87.43 to 96.99</u>	<u>221,807</u>	<u>167,866</u>

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											
Less Than 15,000	2	75.86	75.86	73.34	22.28	103.44	58.96	92.75	N/A	11,750	8,618
Less Than 30,000	10	98.53	107.36	111.75	23.01	96.07	58.96	140.02	85.03 to 138.62	18,570	20,752
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	48	92.53	94.61	75.68	23.75	125.01	24.23	198.94	87.43 to 96.99	221,807	167,866
Greater Than 14,999	46	92.53	95.43	75.69	23.99	126.08	24.23	198.94	87.43 to 97.20	230,940	174,790
Greater Than 29,999	38	91.61	91.26	75.04	23.60	121.62	24.23	198.94	81.57 to 95.74	275,291	206,581
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	75.86	75.86	73.34	22.28	103.44	58.96	92.75	N/A	11,750	8,618
15,000 TO 29,999	8	118.35	115.24	117.32	18.07	98.23	85.03	140.02	85.03 to 140.02	20,275	23,786
30,000 TO 59,999	8	97.42	108.99	110.39	29.77	98.73	45.54	161.25	45.54 to 161.25	51,063	56,367
60,000 TO 99,999	11	91.72	97.07	97.95	22.93	99.10	55.17	198.94	68.84 to 119.50	72,910	71,419
100,000 TO 149,999	4	101.79	99.39	99.15	06.96	100.24	87.43	106.56	N/A	123,065	122,022
150,000 TO 249,999	5	87.70	90.82	90.29	10.94	100.59	72.72	114.66	N/A	174,656	157,696
250,000 TO 499,999	4	85.20	81.26	78.86	19.46	103.04	54.71	99.92	N/A	363,750	286,846
500,000 TO 999,999	4	47.41	47.20	46.54	27.55	101.42	24.23	69.74	N/A	601,250	279,793
1,000,000 +	2	81.29	81.29	76.28	12.55	106.57	71.09	91.49	N/A	2,012,500	1,535,200
<u>ALL</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>92.53</u>	<u>94.61</u>	<u>75.68</u>	<u>23.75</u>	<u>125.01</u>	<u>24.23</u>	<u>198.94</u>	<u>87.43 to 96.99</u>	<u>221,807</u>	<u>167,866</u>

51 Keith
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 48
Total Sales Price : 10,609,490
Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,646,755
Total Assessed Value : 8,057,583
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 221,807
Avg. Assessed Value : 167,866

MEDIAN : 93
WGT. MEAN : 76
MEAN : 95
COD : 23.75
PRD : 125.01

COV : 34.06
STD : 32.22
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.98
MAX Sales Ratio : 198.94
MIN Sales Ratio : 24.23

95% Median C.I. : 87.43 to 96.99
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.31 to 85.05
95% Mean C.I. : 85.49 to 103.73

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:24PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	12	91.77	95.44	90.83	13.49	105.08	55.17	140.02	87.70 to 96.99	75,169	68,277
343	2	92.71	92.71	91.63	01.32	101.18	91.49	93.93	N/A	542,500	497,073
344	4	113.03	97.23	48.10	28.16	202.14	24.23	138.62	N/A	204,375	98,313
349	1	44.04	44.04	44.04	00.00	100.00	44.04	44.04	N/A	740,000	325,875
351	1	71.09	71.09	71.09	00.00	100.00	71.09	71.09	N/A	3,000,000	2,132,615
352	2	142.72	142.72	122.48	39.39	116.53	86.50	198.94	N/A	125,000	153,100
353	4	83.51	79.74	83.86	24.68	95.09	45.54	106.38	N/A	101,125	84,801
384	1	134.83	134.83	134.83	00.00	100.00	134.83	134.83	N/A	17,200	23,190
386	2	83.02	83.02	85.54	17.08	97.05	68.84	97.20	N/A	103,380	88,433
406	4	83.70	92.78	75.25	24.59	123.30	69.74	133.96	N/A	277,500	208,821
410	1	50.78	50.78	50.78	00.00	100.00	50.78	50.78	N/A	500,000	253,905
432	1	58.96	58.96	58.96	00.00	100.00	58.96	58.96	N/A	13,500	7,960
434	1	78.13	78.13	78.13	00.00	100.00	78.13	78.13	N/A	77,265	60,365
442	1	161.25	161.25	161.25	00.00	100.00	161.25	161.25	N/A	53,000	85,465
471	1	87.43	87.43	87.43	00.00	100.00	87.43	87.43	N/A	130,000	113,653
491	1	103.70	103.70	103.70	00.00	100.00	103.70	103.70	N/A	20,000	20,740
494	1	81.57	81.57	81.57	00.00	100.00	81.57	81.57	N/A	65,000	53,020
528	4	96.64	110.27	106.67	17.51	103.37	93.35	154.44	N/A	91,250	97,334
529	1	102.30	102.30	102.30	00.00	100.00	102.30	102.30	N/A	40,000	40,920
534	1	95.74	95.74	95.74	00.00	100.00	95.74	95.74	N/A	320,000	306,380
851	2	84.69	84.69	71.68	35.40	118.15	54.71	114.66	N/A	265,000	189,945
<u>ALL</u>	48	92.53	94.61	75.68	23.75	125.01	24.23	198.94	87.43 to 96.99	221,807	167,866

51 Keith
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 133
 Total Sales Price : 65,266,427
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 69,225,943
 Total Assessed Value : 47,753,791
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 520,496
 Avg. Assessed Value : 359,051

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 26.76
 PRD : 110.39

COV : 35.30
 STD : 26.88
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.18
 MAX Sales Ratio : 197.30
 MIN Sales Ratio : 28.45

95% Median C.I. : 66.21 to 74.44
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.72 to 73.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.58 to 80.72

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:25PM

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	15	83.27	92.17	83.66	21.10	110.17	47.18	153.60	80.55 to 99.33	504,728	422,236
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	17	74.45	83.20	79.14	21.64	105.13	55.31	153.60	67.25 to 97.18	323,663	256,159
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	8	88.73	90.81	82.86	20.07	109.59	54.30	133.58	54.30 to 133.58	463,415	383,971
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	7	61.97	68.09	67.06	24.67	101.54	46.74	93.75	46.74 to 93.75	498,614	334,365
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	23	64.76	71.82	61.33	32.69	117.10	31.75	156.67	54.02 to 81.25	590,284	362,034
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	13	62.77	74.52	59.09	39.13	126.11	31.23	197.30	46.11 to 89.50	477,693	282,284
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	5	67.73	61.63	64.88	13.18	94.99	45.10	72.47	N/A	1,220,549	791,849
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	3	74.44	66.55	68.14	13.72	97.67	47.29	77.92	N/A	477,667	325,459
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	11	71.13	81.18	73.65	37.07	110.22	28.45	141.30	47.34 to 120.71	558,912	411,628
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	14	63.29	65.32	64.73	16.54	100.91	41.79	88.87	53.98 to 83.29	559,456	362,144
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	9	66.90	72.46	66.95	18.55	108.23	53.04	95.25	57.14 to 89.55	456,235	305,427
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	8	66.77	67.41	66.95	12.40	100.69	49.25	90.15	49.25 to 90.15	443,289	296,797
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	47	83.21	85.11	79.43	21.55	107.15	46.74	153.60	73.57 to 91.13	431,294	342,565
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	44	64.72	71.10	61.97	31.47	114.73	31.23	197.30	58.57 to 72.47	620,961	384,820
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	42	66.56	71.40	68.05	22.51	104.92	28.45	141.30	62.52 to 72.08	515,068	350,503
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	55	71.78	77.62	68.86	27.75	112.72	31.75	156.67	64.76 to 83.84	477,753	328,978
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	32	68.41	74.05	66.02	32.38	112.16	28.45	197.30	58.05 to 75.35	621,681	410,413
<u>ALL</u>	133	71.67	76.15	68.98	26.76	110.39	28.45	197.30	66.21 to 74.44	520,496	359,051

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	33	71.67	73.97	70.39	24.96	105.09	33.04	127.74	59.63 to 83.21	375,132	264,057
2	31	70.90	72.33	60.61	24.82	119.34	38.88	133.58	58.57 to 88.87	564,078	341,872
3	69	72.08	78.90	72.26	28.40	109.19	28.45	197.30	65.08 to 80.66	570,437	412,201
<u>ALL</u>	133	71.67	76.15	68.98	26.76	110.39	28.45	197.30	66.21 to 74.44	520,496	359,051

51 Keith
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 133
Total Sales Price : 65,266,427
Total Adj. Sales Price : 69,225,943
Total Assessed Value : 47,753,791
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 520,496
Avg. Assessed Value : 359,051

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 76
COD : 26.76
PRD : 110.39

COV : 35.30
STD : 26.88
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.18
MAX Sales Ratio : 197.30
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.45

95% Median C.I. : 66.21 to 74.44
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.72 to 73.25
95% Mean C.I. : 71.58 to 80.72

Printed:4/2/2015 12:43:25PM

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	8	53.53	60.73	56.81	27.05	106.90	41.79	94.29	41.79 to 94.29	581,068	330,109
1	2	69.70	69.70	57.19	35.29	121.87	45.10	94.29	N/A	386,523	221,053
2	2	43.43	43.43	43.24	03.78	100.44	41.79	45.07	N/A	429,000	185,495
3	4	60.12	64.90	60.57	18.91	107.15	53.04	86.33	N/A	754,375	456,945
_____Dry_____											
County	30	72.40	83.10	72.24	29.75	115.03	46.74	197.30	65.08 to 88.87	430,846	311,253
2	10	69.43	73.45	65.55	22.08	112.05	46.74	103.25	49.49 to 91.13	528,506	346,421
3	20	73.13	87.93	76.87	33.49	114.39	50.92	197.30	64.68 to 89.22	382,016	293,669
_____Grass_____											
County	44	68.77	72.34	63.58	24.71	113.78	31.23	125.86	61.29 to 81.25	426,539	271,173
1	27	71.67	74.19	71.65	22.58	103.55	47.18	125.86	59.59 to 83.83	394,648	282,750
2	10	66.71	71.33	51.72	24.72	137.92	38.88	104.01	52.78 to 97.15	638,903	330,413
3	7	68.45	66.62	57.64	29.80	115.58	31.23	104.95	31.23 to 104.95	246,168	141,887
_____ALL_____	133	71.67	76.15	68.98	26.76	110.39	28.45	197.30	66.21 to 74.44	520,496	359,051

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	43	69.78	74.40	70.65	27.17	105.31	28.45	156.67	62.77 to 80.66	647,832	457,675
1	4	68.84	69.27	63.09	21.30	109.80	45.10	94.29	N/A	404,718	255,317
2	8	56.94	69.39	57.20	38.67	121.31	41.79	133.58	41.79 to 133.58	341,543	195,364
3	31	72.08	76.35	72.73	24.86	104.98	28.45	156.67	62.97 to 83.27	758,245	551,479
_____Dry_____											
County	33	73.53	84.95	73.69	30.40	115.28	46.74	197.30	66.90 to 89.22	417,921	307,953
2	10	69.43	73.45	65.55	22.08	112.05	46.74	103.25	49.49 to 91.13	528,506	346,421
3	23	74.45	89.95	78.74	33.78	114.24	50.92	197.30	65.08 to 93.53	369,840	291,228
_____Grass_____											
County	48	68.77	71.73	64.68	24.62	110.90	31.23	125.86	61.99 to 74.44	456,102	295,017
1	28	69.87	72.72	71.36	24.30	101.91	33.04	125.86	59.59 to 83.21	383,411	273,596
2	11	70.90	71.43	57.84	21.34	123.50	38.88	104.01	52.78 to 97.15	824,003	476,617
3	9	68.45	69.03	60.06	27.30	114.94	31.23	104.95	31.75 to 96.33	232,596	139,702
_____ALL_____	133	71.67	76.15	68.98	26.76	110.39	28.45	197.30	66.21 to 74.44	520,496	359,051

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	289	Median :	94	COV :	32.33	95% Median C.I. :	91.21 to 97.26
Total Sales Price :	29,999,406	Wgt. Mean :	91	STD :	31.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	87.24 to 94.33
Total Adj. Sales Price :	30,220,406	Mean :	98	Avg. Abs.Dev :	20.56	95% Mean C.I. :	94.54 to 101.86
Total Assessed Value :	27,435,446						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	104,569	COD :	21.88	MAX Sales Ratio :	317.20		
Avg. Assessed Value :	94,932	PRD :	108.17	MIN Sales Ratio :	39.52		

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>											
10/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	16	96.88	106.69	99.31	20.43	107.43	67.82	170.71	87.31 to 135.97	105,123	104,394
01/01/2013 To 03/31/2013	20	94.42	99.05	93.69	15.53	105.72	67.22	157.23	90.64 to 101.69	79,374	74,362
04/01/2013 To 06/30/2013	34	93.25	96.35	91.46	22.29	105.35	55.65	161.45	78.44 to 107.53	105,444	96,435
07/01/2013 To 09/30/2013	51	95.38	97.00	93.72	13.91	103.50	68.27	152.58	91.21 to 102.60	113,457	106,327
10/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	28	99.63	107.86	98.14	27.13	109.90	51.25	207.74	87.86 to 110.24	91,479	89,777
01/01/2014 To 03/31/2014	28	93.80	92.25	94.96	12.56	97.15	52.80	120.78	84.58 to 101.96	96,448	91,585
04/01/2014 To 06/30/2014	52	97.25	99.29	86.61	24.48	114.64	48.38	282.75	86.10 to 101.26	99,730	86,377
07/01/2014 To 09/30/2014	60	84.63	95.05	84.23	29.27	112.85	39.52	317.20	80.11 to 94.09	118,861	100,113
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 09/30/2013	121	94.47	98.44	93.81	17.50	104.94	55.65	170.71	92.28 to 99.12	104,470	98,008
10/01/2013 To 09/30/2014	168	92.71	98.03	88.61	25.27	110.63	39.52	317.20	86.78 to 98.07	104,640	92,717
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	133	96.47	99.43	93.95	19.21	105.83	51.25	207.74	92.71 to 99.99	101,656	95,507

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	289	Median :	94	COV :	32.33	95% Median C.I. :	91.21 to 97.26
Total Sales Price :	29,999,406	Wgt. Mean :	91	STD :	31.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	87.24 to 94.33
Total Adj. Sales Price :	30,220,406	Mean :	98	Avg. Abs. Dev :	20.56	95% Mean C.I. :	94.54 to 101.86
Total Assessed Value :	27,435,446						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	104,569	COD :	21.88	MAX Sales Ratio :	317.20		
Avg. Assessed Value :	94,932	PRD :	108.17	MIN Sales Ratio :	39.52		

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
01	149	94.13	99.63	91.15	21.59	109.30	39.52	317.20	89.04 to 97.97	80,444	73,324
02	20	99.55	103.85	90.35	24.93	114.94	57.76	165.75	81.28 to 113.51	56,925	51,434
03	10	92.96	111.33	96.11	29.28	115.84	71.07	207.74	84.23 to 184.48	43,700	42,000
04	13	99.64	94.17	82.39	12.24	114.30	50.78	120.33	83.89 to 109.16	213,513	175,924
05	76	95.93	96.95	94.74	21.98	102.33	47.74	282.75	89.81 to 102.97	135,902	128,757
06	8	73.22	77.82	81.31	17.60	95.71	52.54	119.37	52.54 to 119.37	176,375	143,405
07	9	88.27	90.81	88.54	10.16	102.56	76.23	117.52	80.33 to 104.79	202,556	179,334
08	4	79.89	78.16	71.03	24.03	110.04	50.89	101.96	N/A	80,125	56,910

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
01	286	94.03	98.37	90.94	21.87	108.17	39.52	317.20	90.64 to 97.46	105,159	95,634
06	3	91.74	82.52	58.06	21.92	142.13	47.74	108.07	N/A	48,333	28,062
07											

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	289	Median :	94	COV :	32.33	95% Median C.I. :	91.21 to 97.26
Total Sales Price :	29,999,406	Wgt. Mean :	91	STD :	31.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	87.24 to 94.33
Total Adj. Sales Price :	30,220,406	Mean :	98	Avg. Abs. Dev :	20.56	95% Mean C.I. :	94.54 to 101.86
Total Assessed Value :	27,435,446						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	104,569	COD :	21.88	MAX Sales Ratio :	317.20		
Avg. Assessed Value :	94,932	PRD :	108.17	MIN Sales Ratio :	39.52		

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	9	145.23	158.36	142.66	35.98	111.01	91.74	317.20	98.73 to 207.74	11,704	16,697
Less Than 30,000	41	112.05	126.01	116.26	34.62	108.39	39.52	317.20	101.26 to 138.91	20,365	23,677
__ Ranges Excl. Low \$__											
Greater Than 4,999	289	93.96	98.20	90.78	21.88	108.17	39.52	317.20	91.21 to 97.26	104,569	94,932
Greater Than 15,000	280	93.25	96.27	90.60	20.51	106.26	39.52	282.75	89.82 to 96.60	107,554	97,447
Greater Than 30,000	248	92.71	93.61	90.06	17.91	103.94	44.28	188.30	89.04 to 94.87	118,490	106,712
__ Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	9	145.23	158.36	142.66	35.98	111.01	91.74	317.20	98.73 to 207.74	11,704	16,697
15,000 TO 29,999	32	111.77	116.91	112.45	30.37	103.97	39.52	282.75	86.78 to 135.76	22,801	25,640
30,000 TO 59,999	68	98.57	101.93	99.46	21.79	102.48	44.28	188.30	92.71 to 104.16	48,820	48,554
60,000 TO 99,999	65	96.86	94.49	94.23	14.31	100.28	50.89	161.01	89.84 to 99.12	80,055	75,437
100,000 TO 149,999	53	87.06	87.82	88.67	15.29	99.04	47.74	152.58	80.42 to 92.72	123,797	109,766
150,000 TO 249,999	42	84.56	87.35	87.59	17.18	99.73	52.54	144.06	76.23 to 91.22	179,312	157,062
250,000 TO 499,999	19	93.83	92.99	92.15	12.16	100.91	65.49	114.31	80.33 to 103.38	306,305	282,264
500,000 TO 999,999	1	50.78	50.78	50.78		100.00	50.78	50.78	N/A	950,000	482,420
1,000,000 +											

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED - ADJUSTED

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
VALUATION GROUPING	05	Total	Increase	8.5%

What IF

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	76	Median :	96	COV :	33.35	95% Median C.I. :	89.81 to 102.97
Total Sales Price :	10,212,580	Wgt. Mean :	95	STD :	32.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	89.20 to 100.29
Total Adj. Sales Price :	10,328,580	Mean :	97	Avg. Abs. Dev :	21.09	95% Mean C.I. :	89.68 to 104.22
Total Assessed Value :	9,785,516						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	135,902	COD :	21.98	MAX Sales Ratio :	282.75		
Avg. Assessed Value :	128,757	PRD :	102.33	MIN Sales Ratio :	47.74		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	3	89.84	86.88	85.12	13.05	102.07	67.82	102.97	N/A	127,667	108,672
01/01/2013 To 03/31/2013	3	99.99	99.93	100.40	05.44	99.53	91.74	108.07	N/A	48,167	48,357
04/01/2013 To 06/30/2013	16	91.64	92.35	90.06	23.97	102.54	55.65	130.57	66.84 to 116.96	108,381	97,607
07/01/2013 To 09/30/2013	12	96.67	100.50	101.05	11.92	99.46	68.27	152.58	91.21 to 103.21	168,542	170,317
10/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	6	77.72	81.29	91.91	24.77	88.45	51.25	120.33	51.25 to 120.33	139,567	128,279
01/01/2014 To 03/31/2014	7	93.83	91.56	102.48	19.01	89.34	52.80	115.98	52.80 to 115.98	143,147	146,696
04/01/2014 To 06/30/2014	14	102.75	115.90	111.79	30.78	103.68	61.70	282.75	84.95 to 144.06	95,261	106,487
07/01/2014 To 09/30/2014	15	91.22	91.55	84.33	22.54	108.56	47.74	164.20	71.81 to 105.19	191,427	161,437
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2012 To 09/30/2013	34	96.67	95.41	95.16	16.78	100.26	55.65	152.58	89.81 to 103.21	126,003	119,900
10/01/2013 To 09/30/2014	42	93.26	98.20	94.45	26.71	103.97	47.74	282.75	84.95 to 105.19	143,916	135,927
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	37	96.47	93.81	95.39	18.55	98.34	51.25	152.58	81.31 to 103.21	128,068	122,169

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
05	76	95.93	96.95	94.74	21.98	102.33	47.74	282.75	89.81 to 102.97	135,902	128,757

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	76	Median :	96	COV :	33.35	95% Median C.I. :	89.81 to 102.97
Total Sales Price :	10,212,580	Wgt. Mean :	95	STD :	32.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	89.20 to 100.29
Total Adj. Sales Price :	10,328,580	Mean :	97	Avg. Abs. Dev :	21.09	95% Mean C.I. :	89.68 to 104.22
Total Assessed Value :	9,785,516						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	135,902	COD :	21.98	MAX Sales Ratio :	282.75		
Avg. Assessed Value :	128,757	PRD :	102.33	MIN Sales Ratio :	47.74		

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
01	73	96.47	97.55	95.26	21.84	102.40	51.25	282.75	89.81 to 102.97	139,501	132,895
06	3	91.74	82.52	58.06	21.92	142.13	47.74	108.07	N/A	48,333	28,062
07											

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	2	96.97	96.97	98.92	05.39	98.03	91.74	102.19	N/A	16,000	15,828
Less Than 30,000	11	91.74	108.49	96.90	37.60	111.96	52.80	282.75	65.63 to 130.57	24,000	23,256
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$___											
Greater Than 4,999	76	95.93	96.95	94.74	21.98	102.33	47.74	282.75	89.81 to 102.97	135,902	128,757
Greater Than 15,000	74	95.93	96.95	94.73	22.43	102.34	47.74	282.75	89.81 to 102.97	139,143	131,809
Greater Than 30,000	65	96.47	95.00	94.69	19.44	100.33	47.74	164.20	89.84 to 102.97	154,840	146,611
___ Incremental Ranges___											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	96.97	96.97	98.92	05.39	98.03	91.74	102.19	N/A	16,000	15,828
15,000 TO 29,999	9	86.78	111.06	96.62	46.60	114.95	52.80	282.75	65.63 to 130.57	25,778	24,906
30,000 TO 59,999	11	92.69	96.04	96.04	26.59	100.00	57.35	164.20	61.70 to 126.90	50,712	48,706
60,000 TO 99,999	11	96.86	90.21	89.90	20.08	100.34	51.25	118.43	55.65 to 114.31	82,341	74,028
100,000 TO 149,999	14	98.23	99.05	100.62	22.19	98.44	47.74	152.58	68.27 to 119.14	130,150	130,957
150,000 TO 249,999	16	93.30	94.92	95.05	18.62	99.86	64.81	144.06	77.90 to 107.26	179,944	171,042
250,000 TO 499,999	13	96.80	93.91	92.56	11.46	101.46	65.49	114.31	74.71 to 103.38	299,985	277,659
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											

RESIDENTIAL IMPROVED - ADJUSTED

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
VALUATION GROUPING	05	Total	Increase	8.5%

What IF

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 9,215

Value : 1,234,935,140

Growth 7,238,320

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	208	1,794,600	48	719,980	331	6,092,065	587	8,606,645	
02. Res Improve Land	2,246	19,307,250	166	2,545,360	1,892	32,238,345	4,304	54,090,955	
03. Res Improvements	2,383	140,088,375	175	23,332,930	1,993	122,807,650	4,551	286,228,955	
04. Res Total	2,591	161,190,225	223	26,598,270	2,324	161,138,060	5,138	348,926,555	4,291,965
% of Res Total	50.43	46.20	4.34	7.62	45.23	46.18	55.76	28.25	59.30
05. Com UnImp Land	116	3,256,750	18	806,260	34	921,760	168	4,984,770	
06. Com Improve Land	385	14,994,130	32	1,296,480	70	2,120,900	487	18,411,510	
07. Com Improvements	409	54,185,240	40	7,262,595	76	10,555,615	525	72,003,450	
08. Com Total	525	72,436,120	58	9,365,335	110	13,598,275	693	95,399,730	1,273,855
% of Com Total	75.76	75.93	8.37	9.82	15.87	14.25	7.52	7.73	17.60
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	28,750	1	24,010	0	0	2	52,760	
10. Ind Improve Land	12	314,835	1	36,170	0	0	13	351,005	
11. Ind Improvements	12	3,627,055	1	109,410	0	0	13	3,736,465	
12. Ind Total	13	3,970,640	2	169,590	0	0	15	4,140,230	55,040
% of Ind Total	86.67	95.90	13.33	4.10	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.34	0.76
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	855	14,269,285	855	14,269,285	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	1	165,045	42	528,960	43	694,005	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	1	66,385	50	882,080	51	948,465	
16. Rec Total	0	0	1	231,430	905	15,680,325	906	15,911,755	241,395
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.11	1.45	99.89	98.55	9.83	1.29	3.33
Res & Rec Total	2,591	161,190,225	224	26,829,700	3,229	176,818,385	6,044	364,838,310	4,533,360
% of Res & Rec Total	42.87	44.18	3.71	7.35	53.42	48.46	65.59	29.54	62.63
Com & Ind Total	538	76,406,760	60	9,534,925	110	13,598,275	708	99,539,960	1,328,895
% of Com & Ind Total	75.99	76.76	8.47	9.58	15.54	13.66	7.68	8.06	18.36
17. Taxable Total	3,129	237,596,985	284	36,364,625	3,339	190,416,660	6,752	464,378,270	5,862,255
% of Taxable Total	46.34	51.16	4.21	7.83	49.45	41.00	73.27	37.60	80.99

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	2	8,760	123,355	0	0	0
19. Commercial	19	2,940,075	17,027,315	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	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	2	8,760	123,355
19. Commercial	0	0	0	19	2,940,075	17,027,315
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				21	2,948,835	17,150,670

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	64	139,150	64	139,150	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	64	139,150	64	139,150	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	233	78	364	675

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	7	1,495,165	130	30,362,935	1,761	501,960,070	1,898	533,818,170
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	40	8,713,765	433	169,653,960	473	178,367,725
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	40	4,798,530	461	53,433,295	501	58,231,825
30. Ag Total							2,399	770,417,720

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	12,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	23	26.00	314,600	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	23	0.00	3,164,705	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	3.50	5,075	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	25	29.66	43,015	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	36	0.00	1,633,825	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	2	6.72	0	73	194.44	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	21	21.00	254,100	22	22.00	266,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	304	344.00	4,162,400	327	370.00	4,477,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	320	0.00	31,810,595	343	0.00	34,975,300	0
34. HomeSite Total				365	392.00	39,718,500	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	13	9.41	13,660	16	12.91	18,735	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	283	313.86	455,350	308	343.52	498,365	
37. FarmSite Improvements	429	0.00	21,622,700	465	0.00	23,256,525	1,376,065
38. FarmSite Total				481	356.43	23,773,625	
39. Road & Ditches	1,328	4,887.86	0	1,403	5,089.02	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				846	5,837.45	63,492,125	1,376,065

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	2	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	3	0.00	0	5	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	74	8,039.14	14,847,230
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	74	8,039.14	16,776,230
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	199	43,542.54	51,572,450	273	51,581.68	66,419,680
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3.43	0.03%	7,205	0.03%	2,100.58
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	702.37	6.61%	1,474,975	6.61%	2,100.00
49. 3A1	126.09	1.19%	264,790	1.19%	2,100.01
50. 3A	2,601.33	24.47%	5,462,795	24.47%	2,100.00
51. 4A1	5,316.83	50.02%	11,165,345	50.02%	2,100.00
52. 4A	1,878.69	17.68%	3,945,255	17.68%	2,100.00
53. Total	10,628.74	100.00%	22,320,365	100.00%	2,100.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	33.90	4.56%	21,190	4.74%	625.07
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	197.93	26.62%	118,760	26.57%	600.01
58. 3D1	112.86	15.18%	67,715	15.15%	599.99
59. 3D	130.52	17.55%	78,310	17.52%	599.98
60. 4D1	209.65	28.20%	125,790	28.14%	600.00
61. 4D	58.68	7.89%	35,210	7.88%	600.03
62. Total	743.54	100.00%	446,975	100.00%	601.14
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	128.46	0.05%	56,010	0.06%	436.01
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	656.95	0.25%	242,375	0.28%	368.94
67. 3G1	1,094.35	0.41%	369,910	0.42%	338.02
68. 3G	5,622.99	2.10%	1,926,060	2.20%	342.53
69. 4G1	48,951.98	18.31%	16,113,485	18.40%	329.17
70. 4G	210,853.00	78.88%	68,861,835	78.64%	326.59
71. Total	267,307.73	100.00%	87,569,675	100.00%	327.60
Irrigated Total					
	10,628.74	3.77%	22,320,365	19.89%	2,100.00
Dry Total					
	743.54	0.26%	446,975	0.40%	601.14
Grass Total					
	267,307.73	94.73%	87,569,675	78.05%	327.60
72. Waste	3,459.51	1.23%	1,795,985	1.60%	519.14
73. Other	39.88	0.01%	57,990	0.05%	1,454.11
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	282,179.40	100.00%	112,190,990	100.00%	397.59

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	2,427.85	25.69%	7,283,550	27.72%	3,000.00
47. 2A1	10.13	0.11%	27,860	0.11%	2,750.25
48. 2A	3,878.14	41.04%	10,664,965	40.58%	2,750.02
49. 3A1	444.36	4.70%	1,177,550	4.48%	2,649.99
50. 3A	2,133.35	22.58%	5,653,410	21.51%	2,650.02
51. 4A1	82.12	0.87%	217,620	0.83%	2,650.02
52. 4A	473.60	5.01%	1,255,055	4.78%	2,650.03
53. Total	9,449.55	100.00%	26,280,010	100.00%	2,781.09
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	33,863.90	69.14%	40,298,090	70.31%	1,190.00
56. 2D1	427.08	0.87%	493,280	0.86%	1,155.01
57. 2D	5,843.28	11.93%	6,661,355	11.62%	1,140.00
58. 3D1	1,426.00	2.91%	1,590,010	2.77%	1,115.01
59. 3D	4,405.57	9.00%	4,912,225	8.57%	1,115.00
60. 4D1	792.43	1.62%	883,575	1.54%	1,115.02
61. 4D	2,219.59	4.53%	2,474,880	4.32%	1,115.02
62. Total	48,977.85	100.00%	57,313,415	100.00%	1,170.19
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,959.02	4.38%	2,062,250	5.51%	520.90
65. 2G1	74.53	0.08%	45,135	0.12%	605.60
66. 2G	3,794.52	4.20%	1,759,230	4.70%	463.62
67. 3G1	1,062.26	1.18%	527,120	1.41%	496.23
68. 3G	4,650.57	5.15%	2,097,065	5.61%	450.93
69. 4G1	3,110.02	3.44%	1,283,925	3.43%	412.83
70. 4G	73,709.47	81.57%	29,623,900	79.21%	401.90
71. Total	90,360.39	100.00%	37,398,625	100.00%	413.88
Irrigated Total					
	9,449.55	6.23%	26,280,010	21.53%	2,781.09
Dry Total					
	48,977.85	32.30%	57,313,415	46.95%	1,170.19
Grass Total					
	90,360.39	59.60%	37,398,625	30.64%	413.88
72. Waste	43.38	0.03%	13,510	0.01%	311.43
73. Other	2,785.25	1.84%	1,072,310	0.88%	385.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	151,616.42	100.00%	122,077,870	100.00%	805.18

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	180.22	0.19%	730,800	0.20%	4,055.04
46. 1A	50,399.64	54.01%	204,370,670	56.44%	4,055.00
47. 2A1	166.60	0.18%	623,915	0.17%	3,744.99
48. 2A	24,584.36	26.34%	92,068,545	25.43%	3,745.00
49. 3A1	3,773.72	4.04%	13,491,155	3.73%	3,575.03
50. 3A	5,425.01	5.81%	19,394,590	5.36%	3,575.03
51. 4A1	7,166.35	7.68%	25,619,985	7.08%	3,575.04
52. 4A	1,624.41	1.74%	5,807,385	1.60%	3,575.07
53. Total	93,320.31	100.00%	362,107,045	100.00%	3,880.26
Dry					
54. 1D1	7.34	0.01%	11,890	0.01%	1,619.89
55. 1D	33,272.83	59.66%	53,902,005	63.35%	1,620.00
56. 2D1	103.51	0.19%	155,780	0.18%	1,504.98
57. 2D	11,791.29	21.14%	17,745,950	20.86%	1,505.00
58. 3D1	2,344.39	4.20%	2,977,390	3.50%	1,270.01
59. 3D	2,127.48	3.81%	2,701,910	3.18%	1,270.00
60. 4D1	5,464.12	9.80%	6,775,525	7.96%	1,240.00
61. 4D	656.35	1.18%	813,895	0.96%	1,240.03
62. Total	55,767.31	100.00%	85,084,345	100.00%	1,525.70
Grass					
63. 1G1	14.76	0.03%	6,720	0.03%	455.28
64. 1G	5,291.51	11.34%	2,709,500	13.01%	512.05
65. 2G1	84.53	0.18%	37,210	0.18%	440.20
66. 2G	8,677.15	18.59%	4,150,310	19.92%	478.30
67. 3G1	1,590.78	3.41%	827,440	3.97%	520.15
68. 3G	3,815.66	8.17%	1,685,410	8.09%	441.71
69. 4G1	7,862.66	16.84%	3,629,500	17.42%	461.61
70. 4G	19,340.17	41.43%	7,785,195	37.37%	402.54
71. Total	46,677.22	100.00%	20,831,285	100.00%	446.28
Irrigated Total					
	93,320.31	45.84%	362,107,045	76.61%	3,880.26
Dry Total					
	55,767.31	27.40%	85,084,345	18.00%	1,525.70
Grass Total					
	46,677.22	22.93%	20,831,285	4.41%	446.28
72. Waste	71.40	0.04%	23,925	0.01%	335.08
73. Other	7,730.69	3.80%	4,610,135	0.98%	596.34
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	203,566.93	100.00%	472,656,735	100.00%	2,321.87

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	368.65	1,396,005	7,765.68	28,615,985	105,264.27	380,695,430	113,398.60	410,707,420
77. Dry Land	81.92	96,395	4,053.14	5,160,615	101,353.64	137,587,725	105,488.70	142,844,735
78. Grass	7.00	2,765	9,516.71	4,004,090	394,821.63	141,792,730	404,345.34	145,799,585
79. Waste	0.00	0	26.13	8,755	3,548.16	1,824,665	3,574.29	1,833,420
80. Other	0.00	0	1,420.62	912,465	9,135.20	4,827,970	10,555.82	5,740,435
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	457.57	1,495,165	22,782.28	38,701,910	614,122.90	666,728,520	637,362.75	706,925,595

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	113,398.60	17.79%	410,707,420	58.10%	3,621.80
Dry Land	105,488.70	16.55%	142,844,735	20.21%	1,354.12
Grass	404,345.34	63.44%	145,799,585	20.62%	360.58
Waste	3,574.29	0.56%	1,833,420	0.26%	512.95
Other	10,555.82	1.66%	5,740,435	0.81%	543.82
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	637,362.75	100.00%	706,925,595	100.00%	1,109.14

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

51 Keith

	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	341,056,390	348,926,555	7,870,165	2.31%	4,291,965	1.05%
02. Recreational	9,635,310	15,911,755	6,276,445	65.14%	241,395	62.63%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	38,889,360	39,718,500	829,140	2.13%	0	2.13%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	389,581,060	404,556,810	14,975,750	3.84%	4,533,360	2.68%
05. Commercial	94,507,635	95,399,730	892,095	0.94%	1,273,855	-0.40%
06. Industrial	4,085,190	4,140,230	55,040	1.35%	55,040	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	23,410,395	23,773,625	363,230	1.55%	1,376,065	-4.33%
08. Minerals	134,280	139,150	4,870	3.63	0	3.63
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	122,137,500	123,452,735	1,315,235	1.08%	2,704,960	-1.14%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	511,718,560	528,009,545	16,290,985	3.18%	7,238,320	1.77%
11. Irrigated	323,944,205	410,707,420	86,763,215	26.78%		
12. Dryland	115,961,525	142,844,735	26,883,210	23.18%		
13. Grassland	120,742,990	145,799,585	25,056,595	20.75%		
14. Wasteland	6,139,905	1,833,420	-4,306,485	-70.14%		
15. Other Agland	822,130	5,740,435	4,918,305	598.24%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	567,610,755	706,925,595	139,314,840	24.54%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,079,329,315	1,234,935,140	155,605,825	14.42%	7,238,320	13.75%

**2014
PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
FOR
KEITH COUNTY**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 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 permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Keith County:

Per the 2014 County Abstract, Keith County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Taxable Value Base	% of Value
Residential	5149	52%	341,922,920	31.6 %
Commercial	695	7%	93,565,715	8.6%
Industrial	15	0%	4,085,190	0.3%
Recreational	907	9%	8,834,290	0.8%
Agricultural	2390	24%	631,299,515	58.4 %
Minerals	64	0%	134,280	0 %
Sub Total	9220			
Exempt	672	7%	0	0%
Game & Parks	5	0%		0%
Total	9897		1,079,841,910	
Special Value	256			
Market Value	24 denied Special Val			
Tax Increment Financing	21		11,574,810	
			Total Valuation of 1,079,841,910*	
			*excludes TIF Excess	

Agricultural land - taxable acres [**638,031.16**]

	<u>USE</u>	<u>ACRES</u>	<u>VALUE</u>
	Irrigated		113,685.29
323,756,345			
	Dry		105,667.94
116,131,510			
	Grass		404,004.66
120,876,430			
	<u>Waste/Other (Primarily Accretion)</u>		<u>14,673.27</u>
<u>8,175,760</u>			
	Sub-Total Land only		638,031.16
568,940,045			
	Ag Home Sites		395.34
4,783,615			
	Ag Farm Sites		353.12
512,300			
	<u>Improvements</u>		
<u>57,063,555</u>			
	<u>Sub -Total Sites & IMPS</u>		<u>62,359,470</u>
	Total	Agricultural	Valuation
631,299,515			

Other pertinent facts: The majority of our parcels in Keith County are Residential. It is important to note that 60% of these Residential properties surround Lake McConaughy. Also, approximately 11% of the total Residential parcels are mobile homes.

While the Agricultural parcel count consists of less than half of the Residential parcel count the Agricultural total valuations are almost twice the valuation of the Residential total valuation.

This is a shift from 2008; when Residential total valuations were 6% more than Agricultural total valuations. As you can see from the acre count and values listed above, the majority of Agricultural land use consists of Grassland. The majority of the Grassland lies in the northern region of Keith County which is north of Lake McConaughy and the North Platte River. Prior to 2008 the total Grassland valuation ran a close second to Irrigated land for the largest valuation per use of Keith County Agricultural land. The Irrigated acres consist of a little over a fourth of the Grassland acres; however, due to major increases in the Irrigated Land Market the total valuation of Irrigated Land is more almost triple the valuation of the total Grassland valuation for 2014. Dry land consists of slightly less acres than Irrigated; however, it comprises the least amount of valuation per use. In 2013 the Dry land valuation went from slightly over 50% of the Grassland valuation to almost 76% of the Grassland valuation due to the major increases in the Dry land Market. For 2014 the Dry land increased to be 96% of the Grassland valuation. In Keith County Dry land Acres were historically more than the Irrigated Acres. This change due to the Well Moratorium and in 2011 there was a shift when Irrigated Acres exceeded the Dry land Acres. Despite the Moratorium producers are still able, with the approval of the Twin Platte NRD, to convert their Dry land or Grassland Acres to Irrigated. There are many requirements that must be met prior to approval by the NRD. With the high grain prices Irrigated Acres were quite desirable, therefore, property owners requested transfer of acres from one location to another location so they are able to utilize their “right to irrigate” in a more productive way. In some cases they transfer acres into a bank with the NRD and wait until they have banked enough acres to drop a new pivot in another location. Some property owners are also buying the Certified Irrigated Acres (cia), without the land attached, from the land owner; which allows them to move the Certified Irrigated Acres to former Dry or Grass land. All transfers and new wells must be approved by the NRD. The NRD works well with the Keith County Assessor Office on all transfers to ensure accuracy of acre counts on correct parcels.

Please note that 2007 was the first year that market value on Accretion was implemented in Keith County. At the July 2011 Board of Equalization (BOE) hearing the Board requested the Assessor review the Accretion Acres in Keith County for Approval or Disapproval of Special Valuation. In 2012 a complete review was processed. After March 19, 2013 the Assessor discovered that one parcel, with 123.99Acres of Accretion and only 45.82Acres of Deeded property, was missed during the 2012 review of parcels with Accretion. With more nonagricultural use acres than agricultural use acres the Assessor did not consider the parcel to be “predominately” used for agricultural purposes. Therefore, the Assessor attempted to run an undervalued property correction through the BOE to correct this error and have the BOE send a new Change of Value Notice along with the Assessor sending a Special Valuation Disapproval Letter. The BOE did not approve the correction on this parcel for 2013 so in 2014 the Assessor denied this parcel for Special Valuation as it has more Accretion Acres than Deeded Acres. The Assessor sent a Letter of Disapproval of Special Valuation to the property owner. The property owner appealed the valuation increase and the Keith County Board decision was to lower the value on the accretion acres on this parcel to the same value as property owners who were approved for special valuation. This does not conform to the Special Valuation Methodology for Keith County or treat property uniformly or equitably. Also for 2014 one of the former parcels that had been denied Special Valuation, had fenced off part of the accretion acres and had cattle present on the parcel on January 1, 2014. Therefore, when the Special Valuation application was submitted, the Assessor verified the predominate use of the parcel that now had more acres of

agricultural use than acres of nonagricultural use, so the parcel was approved for Special Valuation.

New Property: For assessment year 2014, an estimated [200] building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. Additional parcels were reviewed for new property construction/additions in Keith County due to other forms of discovery than building permit reporting. Unfortunately, Keith County does not require building permits for our Agricultural Zoned Parcels and seldom are any Information Statements completed and returned to the office. In the spring of 2012 GIS Workshop flew Keith County for oblique imagery to assist us with identification and a remedy to this issue of new construction in the rural areas.

For more information see 2014 Reports & Opinion, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training: 1 Assessor, no Deputy at this time, 4 Assessment Clerks.

Keith County Board voted to have the State assume the Assessment Office of Keith County in September 1998 and the State assumed the office in July 1999 and was budgeted under Property Assessment and Taxation. The County Assessor became a State Assessor July 1, 1999 and in July 2003 the State Assessor was reclassified as an Assessment Administrative Manager. In late November 1999 the ASI Terra Scan CAMA Program replaced the former MIPS that had been in use prior to state assumption. In July 2007 the office was budgeted through the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. Beginning July 1 2011 the office was reassumed by Keith County and again was budgeted by Keith County. Also, the State of Nebraska, Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division the former Terra Scan CAMA Program was replaced with the Orion CAMA Program by Tyler Technologies in mid June 2011. In November 2012 CAMA was changed to MIPS.

The assessor and deputy are required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years to remain certified. The assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field. The assessment staff at this time does not have continuing education requirements; however, the staff has taken classes to assist with their knowledge of the assessment field, such as, Residential Data Collection, Assessor CAMA user education, as well as IAAO classes for one of the staff.

B. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1329 the Assessor shall maintain tax maps. Keith County was flown in 1988 for aerial maps. All mapping for splits, as well as new subdivision plats, are kept up to date by the Assessment Manager. Ownership maintenance is updated continually utilizing the information from the 521 transfer statement by an Assessment Clerk. In 2011 the Keith County Board signed a contract with GIS Workshop for a web based GIS system and Keith County was flown by GIS Workshop for new oblique imagery in the spring of 2012. This system will be a definite asset to the Assessor Office due to saving time with computer generated information as well as providing improved accuracy; most especially with regards to the listing of soils

and acres for the Agland inventory. All GIS data continues to be edited by staff within the Assessor Office for accuracy.

- C. **Property Record Cards:** Ownership transfers are no longer being kept up to date on paper property record cards. Changes in the property structures are no longer being kept current on the property record cards. A concentrated effort towards a “paperless” property record card is in effect. This was achieved in 2010 with the completion of Paxton and Ogallala Suburban Reappraisal which completed the 6 year cycle of a complete reappraisal of every parcel within Keith County. Keith County Assessment Office went on-line in June of 2011 with the property record information thru the GISWorkshop website.
- D. **Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, and GIS:** Keith County was converted from the Terra Scan system for CAMA & Assessment Administration to a new system with Tyler Technologies called Orion in June 2011 and then converted to MIPS in November 2012.

GIS Workshop provides the software for the web based GIS system.

- E. **Web based – property record information access:**
www.keith.gisworkshop.com and Nebraskaassessorsonline.us

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A. **Discover, List & Inventory all property.** All property located within the County must be listed. This includes field data collection, new digital photos, annual pick-up work utilizing all the forms of discovery in the County such as building permits, self-reporting, neighbor reporting, newspaper realtor advertising, etc. The data is gathered using all forms of discovery in a systematic process so that all properties are treated uniformly with the attempt for all the values to be equalized with comparable properties.
- B. **Data Collection.** Data collection and physical review of property located within Keith County is completed on an annual basis to achieve the six year legislative requirement of every property being reviewed. The condition is called from the field and all the data collected is entered into the CAMA system. This includes field data collection and verification of measurements, digital photos, and annual pick-up work. Keith County utilizes all the forms of discovery.
- C. **Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.** Both Ratio studies produced by the county, as well as by the State are reviewed. These studies are reviewed with the field liaison.
- D. **Approaches to Value;** All approaches to value are looked at. Currently, the Cost Approach bears the most weight. We are working on a notation within the record file referencing the correlation of the three approaches to value and the reconciliation of the approach carrying the most weight in determining the final estimate of value. Also used as a guideline for revaluation is “Mass Appraisal of Real Property” page 27 by Robert J. Gloudemans and Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice by Appraisal Standards Board. After determining the market value; residential and commercial real estate are both targeted to be assessed at 100% of market value. This includes all agricultural dwellings and outbuildings. All agricultural land is targeted to be assessed at 75% of market value.

- 1) Market Approach; sales comparisons,
 - 2) Cost Approach; Marshall and Swift cost manual is used. As of 2009 we had all of our Residential or Recreational improvements valued on the CAMA system with updated cost and depreciation tables. With the two CAMA conversions some sketches need to be redrawn due to conversion issues. Also, until time allows the properties are valued based on the former CAMA. Statistic studies are reviewed on an annual basis to ensure equalization.
 - 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market: Income and expense data analysis is completed when information is available.
- E. **Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land:** Land Valuation Studies, Market Areas, along with the Special Valuation for Agricultural land have been established and are reviewed on an annual basis and refined as indicated.
- F. **Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation:** For 2012, & thereafter, since the Assessment Office is again the Keith County Assessor Office, the County Assessor is ultimately responsible for estimating all the values of Real Property within the county and documenting procedures.
- G. **Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.** The County Assessor reviews the Ratio studies produced by Property Assessment Division.
- H. **Notices and Public Relations** are completed by the County Assessor

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2014:

<u>PROPERTY CLASS</u>	<u>MEDIAN RATIO</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	94%	22.56%	108.38%
Commercial	95%	19.39%	117.55%
Agricultural	72%	30.93%	115.24%
Special Value Agricultural	72%	30.93%	115.24%

*COD means Coefficient of Dispersion and PRD means Price Related Differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2014 Reports & Opinions.

Keith County was a State County from July 1, 1999 thru June 30, 2011. On July 1, 2011 there was a major change in staffing. Due to a change in staff from six people, working 40 hours a week, down to the Assessor and one staff member, working 35 hours per week, as of July 2011. (Please note the Assessor never worked only 35 hours per week, however, could not require her staff to work over the 35 hours per week due to other county offices only working 35 hours per week.) The county allowed the Assessor to hire three new staff working the County 35 hour week. Of the three hired one has been here since August 2011; sometimes this person does work over the 35 hours per week. Another staff member has been here since Oct 2011. The former Deputy started in September 2012 and quit in March 2014. The County Assessor requested money in her 2011 and 2012 budget for additional staff due to the number of hours worked as a state office with six staff equaling 240 hours a week in comparison to five staff working in the county office for 35 hours being only 175 hours a week. One of the Keith County Board stated that the Assessor Office should not have more staff than the County Clerk or County Treasurer. Finally, in late September 2013 the County Board agreed to allow a temporary staff to assist with

review and pick up work on new construction for one year. This enabled the Assessor and her other staff to have time to review and clean up issues with data corrections due to the two CAMA conversions since June 2011; as well as, continued training of staff. Not only were there staffing and CAMA changes the Keith County Board signed a contract with GISWorkshop for a new website in February 2011. This GIS website that went live in 2011 required editing and reviewing of all parcel boundaries for accuracy which required more time than typical office duties. With the training of new staff, two CAMA conversions and implementation of GIS, it had been difficult to keep up with the daily demands of the Assessor Office. Now that the GIS has been reviewed and most of the conversion issues resolved the office will have more time to keep up with the annual duties of the Assessor Office. The current Assessor is moving out of the county and a new Assessor will be placed in January 2015. It is difficult for the current Assessor to make plans for another Assessor. The current Assessor reviewed the number of parcels within each Assessor Location and visited with her liaison and revised the former years Assessment Plan accordingly. This Plan may be revised by the new Assessor in 2015 for years thereafter.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

For 2015 Keith County will continue to verify information in the new CAMA and GIS system to insure accuracy, as well as, continued education of newer staff members. Keith County had a loss of four staff in 2011 and another staff in 2012 and another in 2014. The new staff continues education on all aspects of the office.

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Commence 2nd 6 year review cycle.

Continue to Relist, Remeasure and complete a Reappraisal of Residential Property surrounding Lake McConaughy, Verify Condition and Quality of improvements to insure uniformity.

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

County Board specifically requested the outgoing assessor notify the incoming assessor that neighborhood 2910 be reviewed as the County Board did not agree with the increments of values or the additive value along Highway corridors. The assessor told the board that these increments of value are used county wide in many neighborhoods for equalization and uniformity.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Continue to process all Irrigation Transfers of Certified Base Areas approved by the NRD.

Special Value – Agland:

Continue Analysis of Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Analyze Agland influences for other than agriculture-horticulture use.

Review all sales and value accordingly.

Process and send disqualification letters to all owners not meeting qualifications.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Assessor's CAMA Sales File.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Review all sold properties Oct 01, 2013 thru Sept 30, 2014.

Mail Sales Review on all sold properties.

Request FSA Maps for use verification to all new Agland owners per Sales File.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Map all new splits and subdivisions Process all NRD transfer of irrigated acres.

Utilize NRD maps to identify irrigated land use.

Continue resketching of parcels with sketch issues. Continue cleanup of parcels with multiple dwellings so all sketches & data are on separate appraisal records.

Identify contiguous lots that are valued with a price break on excessive square footage or acres and combine them for valuation or value as if combined to provide equalization of all land.

Continued Education for all staff.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Relist, Remeasure and complete a Reappraisal of Residential Property within Village of Paxton, Paxton Suburban, Brule, Keystone, Roscoe, Sarben and Sudman's Addition, & all Mobile Home Parks in the County. Verify Condition and Quality of improvements to insure uniformity. Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Continue to process all Irrigation Transfers of Certified Base areas approved by the NRD.

Send Request letter to all Agricultural owners for current FSA Map & Acres per Use Update.

Verify all information in the GISWorkshop website for accuracy of boundary lines and acres.

Implement GISWorkshop calculated Acres per use by utilizing FSA Map & Acres for Dry land, Grassland and CRP Use. Utilize NRD acres for Irrigated Use.

Special Value – Agland: Continue analysis for Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Analyze Agland influences for other than agriculture-horticulture use.

Review all sales and value accordingly.

Process and send disqualification letters to all owners not meeting qualifications.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Assessor's CAMA Sales File.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Review all sold properties Oct 01, 2014 thru Sept 30, 2015.

Mail Sales Review on all sold properties.

Request FSA Maps for use verification on all new Agland owners per Sales File.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.
Map all new splits and subdivisions
Process all NRD transfer of irrigated acres.
Utilize NRD maps to identify irrigated land use.
Continued Education for all staff

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2017:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Commence to Relist and Remeasure Residential Property within City of Ogallala and Ogallala Suburban locations with plan to finalize Relisting and Remeasurement of Property within the City of Ogallala and Ogallala Suburban locations along with a complete Reappraisal of both locations in 2018. Verify Condition and Quality of improvements to insure uniformity.
Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods and refine as indicated.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.
Continue to process all Irrigation Transfers of Certified Base areas approved by the NRD.

Special Value – Agland: Continue analysis for Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Analyze Agland influences for other than agriculture-horticulture use.

Review all sales and value accordingly.

Process and send disqualification letters to all owners not meeting qualifications.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Assessor's CAMA Sales File.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Review all sold properties Oct 01, 2015 thru Sept 30, 2016.

Mail Sales Review on all sold properties

Request FSA Maps for use verification on all new Agland owners per Sales File.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Process all NRD transfer of irrigated acres

Utilize NRD maps to identify irrigated land use.

Input last Deed Book & Page on parcels not in Sales File for historical research capability

Continued Education for all staff

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

Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes: Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1303 and §77-1331. Since we were a State County Record Maintenance has been kept

current on computerized forms with reliance solely on computer generated cards since 2007. In 2010 all of our property record cards had appraisal information that supported the values of the property and were completely generated by the computer system. The Appraisal and Administrative File balanced and were generated on all parcels in the CAMA. Now that we have a new CAMA the depreciation and cost tables need to be reviewed so that the Appraisal information again supports the values on the Administrative File of the Property Record Card. With the reliance on computerized Record Maintenance we need to be assured that the CAMA stores all the annual property record cards. Property Record Cards contain the information as set forth in Regulation 10-004.04 and 10-001.10 including ownership, legal description, cadastral map reference data, parcel I.D., property classification codes, taxing district, land information, building characteristics and annual value postings.

The sketches and the appraisal information were updated in the Terra Scan CAMA; however, some of the sketches need to be redrawn as some of the sketches currently in the new CAMA did not convert accurately. The 2005 cost is on all Residential and Commercial Improvements including Mobile Homes; within the City of Ogallala as well as Ogallala Suburban, Lake, Agricultural, Rural Residential, Villages of Paxton, Brule, Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben. The appraisal file is a work in progress file and does not always balance with the summary and assessment tab. All information within the Appraisal File will continue to be verified for accuracy.

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1329 the Assessor shall maintain tax maps. Keith County was flown in 1988 for aerial maps. All mapping is kept up to date by the Assessor & staff. Ownership maintenance is updated continually utilizing the information from the 521 transfer statement by an Assessment Clerk and is able to be viewed on the GISWorkshop website for Keith County. In February 2011 the Keith County Board signed a contract with GIS Workshop for a web based GIS system to assist the Assessor office with daily assessment work. This website is also accessible to the public via the Internet (*on a limited basis, to ensure privacy for the property owner*) that provides valuable property information to the users. All of the mapping completed by the Assessor's office that currently is mapped in paper Cadastral Books is now on the GIS website continues to be edited for accuracy. Other offices may use the Assessor base maps to overlay maps for surveying, zoning, etc.

Keith County has a contract with GIS Workshop to provide our website for our Cadastral Maps; however, we still verify information with Aerials that are bound in large books with 4 sections per page to ensure accuracy of the GIS website. The Cadastral Maps have two sets of paper overlays. One with ownership boundary lines; and the other with soil and use lines bound in separate books. In 1988 Sall Engineering was hired by the Keith County Assessor to fly Keith County to provide the County with new aerials. When the new maps were completed, acres were computer digitized to provide accuracy with soil types and land valuation groups captured in the computer system. It is important to note that prior to 1994 all sections were recorded as exactly 640 Acres and the Accretion almost always ran straight with the Section Lines. With the 1988 aerials utilized, the accretion lines were drawn in perpendicular to the thread of the river, as the river laid at the time the land was flown and the new aerials were produced. Therefore, the way accretion was allocated between land owners was changed. The acres from the new aerials were utilized in 1994. Changes were implemented on all parcels with Accretion. Some Accretion acres changed substantially. Letters were sent out to all landowners explaining the change in methodology of Accretion acres as well as Sections no longer being exactly 640 Acres. The letter requested property owners to come in to the Assessment Office if the property owner had any

questions. Very few property owners contacted the Assessment Office with questions about new acre counts. If they had a survey, the acres were corrected to match the survey. With the anticipation of utilization of the GIS Workshop acres in the near future, the property owners may again see a slight change in the number of Total Acres owned due to increased accuracy of computerization. Our GIS website has several overlays besides our ownership boundary layer that shows parcel #, section, township and range. The additional overlays are Oblique Aerial's flown in March 2012, River Meander Lines, Tax Districts, NRD, Fire Boundary Lines where fires have been in Keith County, Roads, Lots, Subdivision, Land use, and Soils. New layers to be added soon will be an IOLL layer showing the K-Areas, along with both Fire and Cemetery Districts. All of these overlays may be laid over the satellite aerials, which go back ten years. The various years allow you to view how land is and how it has changed in the past 10 years as far as Ag use change from dry to irrigated, etc. It is also helpful to view if, or when, new improvements were added. It is important to note that the Lot & Subdivision layers are not complete. With County Board approval, money needs to be budgeted, to complete those layers, as well as, adding to the Improvements on Leased Land Layer for the rest of the Improvements on Leased Land. It is my understanding that the Zoning Department is working on the Lot & Subdivision Layer for the GIS Website.

The 2009 Soil Conversion is currently utilized. This Soil Conversion was completed in mass. To update the acres per soil type the composite maps were utilized for a record of soils, as well as, a program called Agri-Data. Use change updates were completed on an annual basis on the composite overlay by the Assessment Staff utilizing information obtained from Twin Platte NRD, Farm Service Agency, well registration and physical review. After the County was assumed by the State, acre counts were no longer computer digitized by Olson Associates like they were prior to the county being assumed by the State. Assessment Staff had to again complete acre counts by soils and use, by utilizing a grid and hand count dots before updating the parcels with the hand counted acres per soil and use. In April 2008 a new Agri-Data, Inc Website was utilized to more accurately inventory soil types per use. Currently we use the GIS Website for our acre counts per soil and use, however, we do not change the total number of acres within the parcel. We have a blue line cadastral map that includes both the aerial picture and the ownership boundary lines. There are also separate pages for each subdivision filed directly behind the section map that the subdivision is located in. For each blue line cadastral map there is a corresponding page that lists Cadastral Map #, Parcel #, Ownership Name and Legal Description. Maps for split updates and new subdivisions were updated on the Cadastral Maps thru 2012, however, since that time all the updates are kept current on the GIS website. Our former Cadastral Maps, including the Agri-Data Program will be phased out when we implement the GISWorkshop acres for the Total Acre count of the parcel. We anxiously anticipate this GIS system to provide better accuracy. Annual Verification with the Twin Platte NRD, Farm Service Agency, well registration and physical review will still be utilized to keep the Assessor Office up to date with the current use of all agricultural properties.

We have several boundary disputes over Accretion land since it has become so valuable. There has been a District Court case between Westerbuhr and TBT (Lyons), about an Accretion boundary dispute of land located within Keith County, which was appealed to a higher court. The Nebraska Court of Appeals reversed the District Court decision and ruled in favor of Westerbuhr. The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Court of Appeals in Westerbuhr's favor. Therefore, Accretion Acres have been left as they had been inventoried since 1994. Ownership changes are entered into the CAMA system by an Assessor Clerk on an ongoing

basis. Our County Clerk's office provides us with the 521 Real Estate Transfer Statements on a daily basis.

1. Annually prepare and file Assessor Reports required by law/regulation:

- a. Assessor Survey
 - b. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - c. Notice of Taxable Status to Governmental Entities that lease Property for other than Public Purpose
 - d. Special Valuation Methodology
 - e. Real Property Abstract
 - f. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
 - g. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - h. School District Taxable Value Report
 - i. Average Assessed Value Report for Homestead Exemption
 - j. Generate Tax Roll
 - k. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - l. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
2. **Updating 521/Ownership Transfers:** administer updating of all 521's. One of our Assessment Clerks is the primary person who handles updating of all ownership transfers, process splits, mail Sales Review Questionnaire to Buyer & Seller, scanning copies to the Department of Revenue and making copies for the Sales Books. Another Assessment Clerk is responsible for entering all the responses to the Sales Review Questionnaire into the State Sales File and updating the CAMA with any new information received on the Sales Review Questionnaire.
3. **Permissive Exemptions:** administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board. We currently have 58 Real Properties that have a partial or complete Permissive Use Exemption on them; as well as 2 Organizations that have exemptions on their Personal Property. The Assessor and clerks assist the applicants with their annual filing.
4. **Mobile Home Report:** administer annual filings of Mobile Home Report for listing of Year, Make & Model located in each Mobile Home Park; along with the current owner and address. This requires constant monitoring as it is difficult to achieve receiving this report from all owners of Mobile Home Parks; as well as, obtaining up to date and accurate information. Annually we send a list of Mobile Home Owners, Addresses, and Legal Description that includes the Year, Make & Model of each Mobile Home for the Park Owner to verify. We have some Mobile Home Park Owners who don't file for up to five years. We work with our Treasurer and try to get the Mobile Home Park Report at the time they license their Mobile Home Park, however, some owners don't even file or pay for their annual license and are not penalize if they don't. We would appreciate stiffer penalties for Mobile Home Park Owners that are continually non-compliant.
5. **Personal Property:** administer annual filing of approximately 900 schedules. One of our Assessment Clerks is the primary person who handles all the mailing of postcard reminders with PIN numbers on them, as well as, entering the updated information from depreciation worksheets and/ or new schedules filed into the CAMA system and all the subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required. We diligently try to assess all personal property in Keith County. We have

frustration with this “honest man’s tax” and share the opinion of many assessors that we would like to see Depreciation Worksheets required to be filed with the Personal Property. Within the corporate limits we often see a decline in valuation; as Property Owners either never file or continue to file without their Depreciation Worksheet. Our Assessment Clerk spends countless hours correcting past year tax rolls due to prior year’s inaccurate filings. Property Owners are then extremely upset about the penalties and interest on past years tax. If we could have the Depreciation Worksheet at the time of filing, these issues would be eliminated. The Assessor and clerks assist the applicants with their annual filing. Keith County sends out postcards to notify prior personal property filers of the filing requirements rather than the expensive and wasteful sending of preprinted copies of the former years filing. In 2013 we implemented on-line filing for Personal Property Owners to be able to file their Personal Property Schedules on-line with their PIN # noted on the mailed postcard.

6. **Notice of Taxable Status:** administer and mail Notices to Governmental Entities that lease out property for other than Public Purpose. We received a Supreme Court Decision on the appeal of Central Nebraska Public Power & Irrigation District’s Taxable Status. Numerous hours and paper have been spent since 2008 with these appeals. We look forward to a resolution of this matter to free up time to spend on other office functions and duties. There is some confusion by Central who says they will continue to file annual appeals as long as we send them the Notice to Tax. They have been informed that by Statute the Notice of Tax must be sent to them as the owner and all they have to do is continue forwarding this Notice of Intent to Tax on to their lessees like they have since 2008. Then the lessee may pay the tax just like the lessees of Nebraska Public Power lessees have since 2008.
7. **Change of Value Notices:** administer annual notices on all property that have any change in Valuation, whether the change is a plus or a minus from the former year. Keith County has sent out Postcard notices with one total valuation for several years prior to being reassumed back from the State to County assumption. Clarification of who to send the Change of Value Notice and Tax Statement to on Governmental Entities, who lease out property for other than Public Purpose, may need to be clarified in Statute and Regulations.
8. **Homestead Exemptions:** Administer approximately 500 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance: One of our Assessment Clerks is the primary person who handles verification of owner/occupancy, mailing address and all information on the forms preprinted by Department of Revenue, prior to mailing the 458 Nebraska Homestead Exemption Application and Schedule I, Income Statement and Instructions to all former year applicants. This Assessment Clerk also mails any required Physician Certifications to the applicant’s doctor after receiving permission from the applicant. She also enters approval amounts into the CAMA system after receiving the approval roster from Department of Revenue (hereafter referred to as DOR). The Assessor and clerks assist the applicants with their annual filing and completing their Income Statements with information the applicant provides. The Assessor and all staff work with the Veteran to assist with required VA letter for 100% Disability. When applicable the Assessor, as well as the primary Assessment Clerk, mails the 458R Notice of Rejection of Homestead Exemption, for reasons other than exceeding income allowed. The Assessor annually completes the 458V-Certification of the Average

Assessed Valuation of Single-family Residential Property and the 458S-Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate. If corrections arise during the DOR verification of Income reported by the homestead applicant and the Applicant's Income Tax, etc. the DOR notifies the applicant and the assessor. Then the Assessor or the Assessment Clerk completes the necessary correction of the prior year tax roll. If corrections have been made to a prior year tax roll on any homestead the Assessor files a 458X-Amended Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate with the Department of Revenue.

9. **Centrally Assessed:** review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list. The Assessor reviews the valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities to insure accuracy.
10. **Tax Increment Financing:** management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Keith County currently has 19 TIF projects that are maintained by the Assessor for 2014. However, other projects are soon to be retired and new TIFS are projected for 2015. Paperwork must be provided from the CRA prior to any additions or deletions of dividing tax.
11. **Special Valuation:** annually review any special valuation and influences of other than agricultural or horticultural use. Send Disqualification Letter on any parcel that is not predominantly agricultural or horticultural use.
12. **Tax Districts and Tax Rates:** management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; compiling/input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process are maintained by the Assessor.
13. **Tax Lists:** prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed are prepared and certified by the Assessor.
14. **Tax List Corrections:** prepare tax list correction documents for county board approvals are prepared by the Assessment Clerks as well as the Assessor.
15. **County Board of Equalization:** All protested properties are reviewed and personal inspections are made when deemed necessary, protest information is entered into the County Board of Equalization File of the CAMA system. All staff assists property owners at the counter and on the phone with questions in regards to their values. Information and evidence is assembled and provided to the information to the County Board of Equalization at the hearing. The Assessor attends all County Board of Equalization hearings and makes the valuation recommendations to the Board of Equalization. The Assessor documents information for record keeping and balancing values back to values set at abstract time to insure accurate valuations. The Assessor processes all of the Informal protests for over and undervalued properties to present to the County Board of Equalization for their decision.
16. **TERC Appeals:** prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation. Numerous hours have been spent on annual appeals since 2008 with Central Nebraska Public Power District on property they lease out surrounding Lake Mac Conaughy for Residential Dwelling and Commercial Use. A Supreme Court Decision was issued May 2014 on the 2011 appeal. Also, numerous hours are spent on annual TERC appeals in regards to leasehold values in the K Areas at Lake McConaughy despite the TERC upholding the Assessor values. These leasehold appeals have gone on to the

Supreme Court and the Supreme Court upheld our values in three different appeals, most recently in an appeal heard in Oct 2014.

17. **TERC Statewide Equalization:** attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC
18. **Education:** Assessor & Deputy attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc.

Conclusion:

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

With the continual review of all properties and implementation of GIS, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equitable and uniformly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: _____

2015 Assessment Survey for Keith County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	2 appraisal clerks
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2 assessment clerks
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 281,190
7.	
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$ 5,000
9.	
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	The data processing expenses are within a county data processing budget in County General.
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 3,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$ 273,190
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	Unknown

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes, as historic research work.
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	These were maintained through December 31, 2012.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes www.keith.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

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?
	Ogallala, Brule and Paxton
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1975

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Tax Valuations, Inc. Joe Wilson and Ron Elliott out of Lincoln, NE
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	Tax Valuations, Inc. Joe Wilson and Ron Elliott out of Lincoln, NE

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Tax Valuations, Inc. Joe Wilson and Ron Elliott out of Lincoln, NE
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Credentialed real property appraiser.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Contract was sent to the Property Tax Administrator, Ruth Sorenson, for approval 03/09/15.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	They provide estimated values for the assessors review and approval. This year they are helping with land and depreciation tables so the costing in CAMA works correctly.

2015 Certification for Keith 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 Keith County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

