

# 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 Lancaster County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8719	Median	100.13
Total Sales Price	\$1,552,983,437	Mean	100.61
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,552,983,437	Wgt. Mean	99.91
Total Assessed Value	\$1,551,549,600	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$154,577
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$178,115	Avg. Assessed Value	\$177,950

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	100.05 to 100.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	99.73 to 100.09
95% Mean C.I	100.45 to 100.77
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	66.20
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	9.39
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	10.81

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	8,007	97	96.57
2013	6,589	99	99.13
2012	6,523	99	98.67
2011	7,389	95	95

## 2015 Commission Summary for Lancaster County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	404	Median	98.20
Total Sales Price	\$345,908,986	Mean	96.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$345,908,986	Wgt. Mean	69.63
Total Assessed Value	\$240,865,900	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$696,084
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$856,210	Avg. Assessed Value	\$596,203

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.07 to 99.25
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	50.66 to 88.61
95% Mean C.I	94.04 to 98.42
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	25.30
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.13
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.39

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	367	96	96.00
2013	318	98	97.94
2012	297	98	98.26
2011	317	94	94



## 2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Lancaster 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Special Valuation of Agricultural Land</b>	<b>66</b>	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	MrktArea:1; All AG; +8%

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2015.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Lancaster County**

For the current assessment year, Lancaster County (Lancaster) conducted a market analysis of the residential parcels in the county. The staff conducted over 33000 inspections on residential parcels this year. This consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures.

A lot value study is completed every year and the county continued pickup work and sales verifications. Lancaster also continuously verified sales, within the month that they were filed.

Lancaster continued the tasks it completes on a per annum basis, including creating new depreciation models, concentrating on clean-up work, continuously verifying sales within the month that they were filed, and reviewing the TERC protests from the year prior.

Finally, Lancaster also held informal hearings from January 15th until March 1st for all property types to allow the property owners to come in and have a meeting with the county appraisers.



## 2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																		
	Assessor's appraisal staff																		
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Average-City of Lincoln intermediate valued dwellings</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Hi-rise-Condominiums</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>High-High end dwellings approximately values of 350,000 and up</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Rural-Acreages and Ag dwellings</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Townhouses</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Villages-Small towns surrounding Lincoln</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Low-low end properties in City of Lincoln (mostly older, pre-WWII)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Multi-Multi-family dwellings</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Average-City of Lincoln intermediate valued dwellings	2	Hi-rise-Condominiums	3	High-High end dwellings approximately values of 350,000 and up	4	Rural-Acreages and Ag dwellings	5	Townhouses	6	Villages-Small towns surrounding Lincoln	7	Low-low end properties in City of Lincoln (mostly older, pre-WWII)	8	Multi-Multi-family dwellings
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																		
1	Average-City of Lincoln intermediate valued dwellings																		
2	Hi-rise-Condominiums																		
3	High-High end dwellings approximately values of 350,000 and up																		
4	Rural-Acreages and Ag dwellings																		
5	Townhouses																		
6	Villages-Small towns surrounding Lincoln																		
7	Low-low end properties in City of Lincoln (mostly older, pre-WWII)																		
8	Multi-Multi-family dwellings																		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																		
	Market comparison approach to value is used by the county to establish the assessed value for the residential properties, utilizing automated market modeling and multiple regression analysis.																		
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																		
	The Cost approach is available in the counties CAMA program but is not a secondary approach given little weight for assessment purposes.																		
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																		
	No, the County gives minimal weight to the cost approach in determining market value.																		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																		
	Market sales analysis and field rating of each parcels land characteristics tied to market value based tables.																		
<b>7.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?</b>																		
	Market sales analysis. If a Form 191 is filed discount cash flow is used to set a standard County wide adjustment to individual market sales.																		

8.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	2	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	3	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	4	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	5	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	6	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	7	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014
	8	2014	2014	2014	2008-2014

Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities. The groupings are then reviewed annually to ensure that those similarities remain.

# **2015 Residential Correlation Section for Lancaster County**

---

## **County Overview**

Lancaster County (Lancaster) was founded in 1855 and named for both Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Lancaster, England. Lancaster is located in the Southeast portion of the State of Nebraska (State). The counties of Cass, Otoe, Gage, Saline, Seward, and Saunders abut Lancaster, which has a total area of 838 miles. Per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2014, there are 301,795 residents in Lancaster, a 2% increase over the 2013 population estimate. Between 2009 and 2013, 60% of the county residents were homeowners and 78% of the county residents lived consecutively in one of the 121,088 housing units for over a year. Towns include Lincoln, Waverly, and Hickman. Lincoln, continuing to show steady population growth, is the most populous at 268,738. Well-known people with links to Lancaster include Ted Sorensen, special counsel to JFK, and actress Lindsey Shaw.

## **Description of Analysis**

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

A review of Lancaster's statistical analysis revealed 8,719 residential sales, representing the eight valuation groupings. This is a 9% increase in qualified sales from the prior year and is large enough to be evaluated for measurement purposes. The stratification by valuation groupings reveals all groups have sufficient numbers of sales to perform measurement on and all are within range.

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

## **Sales Qualification**

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

## **2015 Residential Correlation Section for Lancaster County**

---

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

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

Lancaster maintains a meticulous and well-documented record of when all properties were last inspected. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. The record is then cross-referenced with the prior year's statistics looking for areas that warrant an inspection in the coming year. For the current assessment year, Lancaster created a plan based on that two-part structure. One area in particular that Lancaster focused on, beginning last year, was the valuation grouping of hi-rise condos based on this two-part structure. Based on a review of both Lancaster's inspection structure and all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the residential class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for residential property within Lancaster is 100% of market value.



## **2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Lancaster County**

For the current assessment year, Lancaster County (Lancaster) conducted a market analysis of the commercial parcels in the county. The staff conducted over 1300 inspections this year, which consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures.

Lancaster continued the tasks it completes on a per annum basis, including creating new depreciation models, concentrating on clean-up work, continuously verifying sales within the month that they were filed, and reviewing the TERC protests from the year prior.

Finally, informal hearings were held from January 15th until March 1st for all property types to allow the property owners the opportunity to come in and have a meeting with Lancaster's appraisers.

## 2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>			
	The assessors appraisal staff			
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>			
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>		
	01	Lancaster County is considered one valuation group.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>			
	Lancaster County uses the cost and income approaches for the valuation of all commercial properties.			
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>			
	The county relies on appraisers in their office that have the experience to value the unique properties in the County.			
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>			
	The county develops a depreciation model during each reappraisal cycle.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>			
	N/A			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>			
	Market sales analysis and field rating of each parcels land characteristics tied to market value based tables.			
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	01	2011	2011	2011
	Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities. In Lancaster, all commercial parcels have similar characteristics in that they converge in and around the commercial hub of Lincon. The County uses Primary use instead of valuation groupings, a characteristic not captured in the sales file, though occupancy codes are.			

## **2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Lancaster County**

---

### **County Overview**

The majority of the commercial properties in Lancaster County (Lancaster) convene in and around the county seat of Lincoln, capital of the State and epicenter of the University of Nebraska education system. The smaller community markets, while containing commercial properties of their own, are also guided by the proximity to the larger towns that serve as the area commercial hubs.

94.2% of the residents living in Lancaster also work in Lancaster. 125,461 people are employed in Lancaster (U.S. Census Bureau, Local Employment Dynamics) and, per the Nebraska Department of Labor, there is an expected .2% job growth increase in years 2010-2020. Among the top employers in Lancaster are the State of Nebraska, the US Government, Lincoln Public Schools, University of Nebraska, BryanLGH Medical Center, and Madonna Rehabilitation Hospital (Nebraska Department of Labor). Lancaster contains 42 grocery stores, 171 full-service restaurants, and 100 gas stations (city-data.com). Points of interest in Lancaster include the National Roller Skating Museum, the International Quilt Study Center, and Burr Block.

### **Description of Analysis**

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

A review of Lancaster's statistical analysis showed 404 commercial sales in the one valuation grouping. This is a 10% increase in qualified sales from the prior year and is a large enough sample to be evaluated for measurement purposes. Due to the sheer number of parcels sold in Lancaster each year, the initial compilation of a data group will routinely uncover a measurement that appears to be outside the acceptable measurement range; nevertheless upon further analysis that number reveals itself to be a perfectly acceptable measurement level. The stratification by occupancy code revealed seven codes with large enough samples to measure including, but not limited to, office buildings, multiple residence, retail stores, material storage buildings, and warehouse showroom stores. Occupancy code 391 (material storage buildings) had 10 sales and a median of 90.25. With such a large number of commercial parcels in Lancaster, this is not reliably large enough samples to measure. Because Lancaster applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file appears to represent the level of value for the commercial class of property.

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a biennial review in which generally half of the counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is created and adopted. The last cyclical review of



## **2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Lancaster County**

---

Lancaster's actions occurred in 2012 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Sales Qualification**

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

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

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

Lancaster maintains a record of when all properties were last inspected. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. The record is then cross-referenced with the prior year's statistics looking for areas that warrant an inspection in the coming year. For the current assessment year, Lancaster created a plan based on that two-part structure. Based on a review of both Lancaster's inspection structure and all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the commercial class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for commercial property within Lancaster is 98% of market value.



## **2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Lancaster County**

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

Additionally, Lancaster updated land use in the agricultural class from GIS imagery, FSA maps, and physical inspections.

Finally, Lancaster completed permit and pickup work for the agricultural class of property.

## 2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>							
	Assessor's appraisal staff							
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; width: 15%;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>The agricultural special value land is one market area.</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	1	The agricultural special value land is one market area.		
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
1	The agricultural special value land is one market area.							
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>							
	Class or subclass includes, but is not limited to, the classifications of agricultural land listed in section 77-1363, parcel use, parcel type, location, geographic characteristics, zoning, city size, parcel size and market characteristics.							
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>							
	Present use of the parcel is the deciding factor in determining the differences.							
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>							
	Market areas are recognized for the sites and improvements based on sales analysis. The differences that are recognized are site and location factors that affect the market value.							
<b>6.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>							
	Market sales.							
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:</b>							
	Yes; the entire county is considered special values; as such, uninfluenced sales from surrounding counties are brought in and used as a basis for developing Lancaster county LCG values.							
<b>7a.</b>	<b>What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist?</b>							
	The County continually reviews and verifies sales to determine if there are influences other than for agricultural use. The County then compares the sales to similar sales from non-influenced counties with the same general land capabilities.							
<b>7b.</b>	<b>Describe the non-agricultural influences present within the county.</b>							
	Housing developments, commercial and industrial development as well as futures investment to place money in a safe commodity i.e.(land to hold wealth) for family portfolio management.							
<b>7c.</b>	<b>How many parcels in the county are receiving special value?</b>							
	6,869							
<b>7d.</b>	<b>Where is the influenced area located within the county?</b>							
	The entire county							
<b>7e.</b>	<b>Describe the valuation models and approaches used to establish the uninfluenced values.</b>							

Market approach utilizing the sales outside influenced areas with 80% or higher majority land use and match those sales as a basis for LCG values in Lancaster County.
--

## Lancaster County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Lancaster	1	6,000	5,999	5,981	5,993	4,874	4,854	2,997	2,998	<b>5,463</b>
Butler	1	6,299	5,500	5,296	5,156	5,147	5,094	4,284	4,158	<b>5,588</b>
Cass	1	6,465	6,255	5,011	5,505	3,630	5,000	3,800	4,214	<b>5,202</b>
Gage	1	6,743	6,796	6,150	6,164	5,301	5,315	4,899	4,876	<b>6,125</b>
Johnson	1	6,390	5,835	5,931	5,301	4,791	n/a	3,271	2,777	<b>5,058</b>
Otoe	8000	5,600	5,600	5,500	5,500	5,000	5,000	4,200	4,200	<b>5,203</b>
Saline	3	7,140	7,143	7,037	6,893	6,096	5,150	5,042	4,850	<b>6,792</b>
Saunders	1	6,160	5,942	5,727	5,229	5,060	4,730	3,768	3,520	4,849
Saunders	3	6,380	6,162	5,946	5,445	5,280	4,950	3,998	3,739	5,469
Seward	2	6,000	5,900	5,700	n/a	5,300	4,400	4,200	3,500	<b>5,677</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Lancaster	1	4,385	4,387	3,943	3,946	3,510	3,509	3,071	3,069	<b>3,819</b>
Butler	1	6,000	5,000	4,899	4,788	4,299	3,999	3,100	3,000	<b>4,503</b>
Cass	1	5,293	5,149	5,025	4,648	4,235	4,549	4,409	3,841	<b>4,763</b>
Gage	1	4,200	4,200	3,720	3,600	3,235	3,235	2,565	2,565	<b>3,434</b>
Johnson	1	4,214	3,894	3,809	3,307	3,310	3,312	2,500	1,873	<b>3,175</b>
Otoe	8000	4,600	4,600	4,350	4,200	4,150	3,900	3,500	3,000	<b>4,108</b>
Saline	3	4,693	4,687	4,224	4,141	4,045	3,525	3,514	3,350	<b>4,262</b>
Saunders	1	5,408	5,176	4,947	4,441	4,257	3,797	3,109	2,764	3,870
Saunders	3	6,004	5,776	5,551	5,144	4,987	4,523	3,684	3,464	4,727
Seward	2	5,800	5,700	5,198	5,198	5,199	3,799	3,750	2,950	<b>4,791</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Lancaster	1	2,358	2,540	2,094	2,162	1,817	1,826	1,430	1,369	<b>1,809</b>
Butler	1	2,765	2,888	2,823	2,482	2,624	2,471	2,288	1,655	<b>2,094</b>
Cass	1	2,250	2,198	2,089	2,020	1,956	1,964	1,685	1,434	<b>1,763</b>
Gage	1	1,401	2,037	1,680	1,992	1,617	1,342	1,437	1,003	<b>1,484</b>
Johnson	1	1,833	2,292	1,755	1,848	1,862	1,650	1,516	1,125	<b>1,589</b>
Otoe	8000	1,728	1,955	1,718	1,994	1,853	1,747	1,648	1,212	<b>1,703</b>
Saline	3	1,467	1,864	1,408	1,858	1,805	1,516	1,576	1,019	<b>1,444</b>
Saunders	1	2,053	2,050	2,417	1,668	2,299	1,992	1,683	925	1,686
Saunders	3	1,601	2,155	1,994	2,073	2,023	1,751	1,744	1,048	1,785
Seward	2	2,177	2,285	2,119	2,116	1,938	2,061	1,511	1,596	<b>1,769</b>

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

## **2015 Special Value Methodology for Lancaster County:**

Lancaster County focused on using generally accepted appraisal practices in establishing its special valuations on agricultural land. Utilizing sales supplied by the Property Assessment Division of the Nebraska Department of Revenue from similar surrounding uninfluenced counties, namely Gage, Johnson, Jefferson, Otoe, and Saline. The county analyzed the sales using statistical studies and market analysis of the sales with predominately the same general classification to determine a value for the productivity levels of each of the three major majority land uses.

We continue to communicate with the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division our concern of being compared to and being supplied with sales from what we consider influenced counties of Cass, Saunders and Seward Counties. These counties reside in the Omaha or Lincoln Metropolitan statistical areas as identified by the Federal Government Census. These areas are strongly influenced by other than agricultural influences based on the growth of non-agricultural uses in these Counties. They reflect the same non-agricultural influences as we have found in Lancaster County. This has limited our ability to truly study our uninfluenced agricultural values.

# 2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Lancaster County

---

## County Overview

Lancaster County (Lancaster), a county with a 69% dry land majority composition, lies in the eastern half of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). Falling within Lower Platte South and Nemaha Natural Resource Districts (NRD), Lancaster saw 258 new wells in 2014, per the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources Well Registration Summary. This brings the total well count in Lancaster to 5,229. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is currently preparing the 2017 Census of Agriculture. According to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture, there are 1,836 farms in Lancaster, totaling 489,023 acres. This is a 8% increase in the number of farms, a 16% increase in production acres, and a 7% increase in acres per farm since the previous census (Ag Census County Profile). When compared against agricultural product value of the other counties in Nebraska, Lancaster ranks first in horse and ponies; second in turkey production; second in Christmas trees; and ninth in milk from cows, respectively. At 82%, row crop production remains the predominant agricultural use in Lancaster.

## Description of Analysis

Given the agricultural trends of the last several years across the state, agricultural land values have surpassed the value for alternative uses in many areas. In effect, agricultural use has become the highest and best use of land historically influenced by development and other non-agricultural activities in most areas. In the state of Nebraska, as the agricultural market began significantly rising around 2008, there have continued to be fewer and fewer counties considered “fully influenced.”

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

A 2015 ratio study was conducted using the assessed values established by Lancaster and measured against sale prices from surrogate sales. For the 2015 assessment year, Lancaster did not increase their agricultural land values. The results of this analysis clearly conveyed that Lancaster failed to meet the acceptable overall level of value range of 69-75, as evidenced by the following chart:

Median	66.29%	AAD	15.31%
Mean	68.88%	PRD	107.64%
Weighted Mean	63.99%	COD	23.10%



## **2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Lancaster County**

---

### **Sales Qualification**

As special valuation encompasses Lancaster, Lancaster's agricultural sales are not examined for qualification as all sales are coded as non-qualified.

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

The overall median for the subclass is outside of the acceptable range, as indicated by both the statistics and an equalization comparison to adjoining counties. While Lancaster is situated within a geographic area in which agricultural values transition, by utilizing one market area, the expectation is that all land assessments would be reasonably comparable across all county lines. Analysis suggests that equalization has not been achieved with the eight surrounding counties.

Since agricultural land values are neither uniform nor proportionate in Lancaster, assessment practices are not considered to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal practices.

### **Special Valuation**

Based on a correlation of all available information, the level of value for agricultural land receiving special valuation in Lancaster is determined to be 66%.

### **Recommendation**

The recommendation of the Property Tax Administrator is to increase all agricultural land 8% in Lancaster to achieve an overall measurement at the midpoint of the acceptable range. The resulting values would ensure that all agricultural land values would be reasonably similar to comparative counties.



**55 Lancaster  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 8,719  
 Total Sales Price : 1,552,983,437  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,552,983,437  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,551,549,600  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 178,115  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 177,950

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 100  
 MEAN : 101  
 COD : 04.75  
 PRD : 100.70

COV : 07.48  
 STD : 07.53  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.76  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 220.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 08.68

95% Median C.I. : 100.05 to 100.23  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 99.73 to 100.09  
 95% Mean C.I. : 100.45 to 100.77

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:12PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	833	102.12	103.24	102.53	06.14	100.69	65.75	150.20	101.65 to 102.53	173,143	177,525	
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	743	101.63	102.30	101.80	04.83	100.49	55.03	162.34	101.24 to 101.93	171,573	174,662	
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1,295	100.49	101.12	100.78	04.50	100.34	68.82	162.67	100.20 to 100.81	174,829	176,191	
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1,363	100.19	100.65	99.77	04.40	100.88	57.40	220.00	99.97 to 100.52	179,238	178,818	
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	980	100.54	101.06	100.36	04.57	100.70	73.58	175.88	100.17 to 100.96	177,409	178,041	
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	732	100.37	100.89	100.12	04.31	100.77	75.82	188.93	100.06 to 100.74	174,662	174,866	
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	1,444	99.49	99.46	98.97	04.36	100.50	31.08	170.58	99.28 to 99.68	182,975	181,097	
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1,329	98.61	98.21	97.29	04.60	100.95	08.68	181.84	98.33 to 98.92	184,080	179,093	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	4,234	100.90	101.59	100.96	04.90	100.62	55.03	220.00	100.74 to 101.05	175,345	177,031	
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	4,485	99.62	99.67	98.94	04.53	100.74	08.68	188.93	99.49 to 99.75	180,729	178,819	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	4,381	100.63	101.16	100.53	04.56	100.63	55.03	220.00	100.44 to 100.79	176,226	177,163	
<u>ALL</u>	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	4,296	100.25	100.83	100.45	04.29	100.38	79.77	170.58	100.12 to 100.41	156,386	157,094	
02	247	99.64	100.83	98.64	07.27	102.22	76.08	162.67	98.91 to 100.69	138,671	136,785	
03	1,054	100.00	100.14	99.65	04.13	100.49	08.68	158.22	99.69 to 100.19	334,756	333,585	
04	283	100.00	100.27	99.06	06.01	101.22	66.30	150.20	99.40 to 100.69	293,929	291,176	
05	1,440	100.11	100.39	99.60	03.71	100.79	49.04	148.24	100.00 to 100.32	164,631	163,974	
06	409	99.76	100.07	99.36	05.75	100.71	68.27	158.90	99.30 to 100.35	161,326	160,293	
07	781	100.27	100.82	99.49	08.03	101.34	31.08	220.00	99.45 to 100.75	106,876	106,335	
08	209	100.00	100.17	99.15	05.75	101.03	54.64	175.88	99.41 to 100.64	116,561	115,575	
<u>ALL</u>	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	
06												
07												
<u>ALL</u>	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	

**55 Lancaster  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 8,719	MEDIAN : 100	COV : 07.48	95% Median C.I. : 100.05 to 100.23
Total Sales Price : 1,552,983,437	WGT. MEAN : 100	STD : 07.53	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 99.73 to 100.09
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,552,983,437	MEAN : 101	Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.76	95% Mean C.I. : 100.45 to 100.77
Total Assessed Value : 1,551,549,600			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 178,115	COD : 04.75	MAX Sales Ratio : 220.00	
Avg. Assessed Value : 177,950	PRD : 100.70	MIN Sales Ratio : 08.68	

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:12PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000												
Less Than 30,000	23	124.00	123.91	123.48	14.27	100.35	76.92	220.00	110.50 to 129.53	23,126	28,557	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	
Greater Than 14,999	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	
Greater Than 29,999	8,696	100.13	100.54	99.90	04.70	100.64	08.68	188.93	100.04 to 100.22	178,525	178,346	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	23	124.00	123.91	123.48	14.27	100.35	76.92	220.00	110.50 to 129.53	23,126	28,557	
30,000 TO 59,999	185	103.51	106.75	106.72	11.51	100.03	68.36	181.84	100.96 to 105.60	48,629	51,897	
60,000 TO 99,999	1,020	101.69	102.57	102.45	06.93	100.12	41.25	188.93	101.21 to 102.13	83,056	85,091	
100,000 TO 149,999	3,012	100.27	100.50	100.49	04.30	100.01	73.04	143.11	100.08 to 100.46	125,875	126,494	
150,000 TO 249,999	2,984	100.06	100.28	100.19	03.95	100.09	31.08	158.22	99.94 to 100.18	189,355	189,717	
250,000 TO 499,999	1,392	99.45	99.17	99.03	04.23	100.14	08.68	136.92	99.24 to 99.70	319,234	316,145	
500,000 TO 999,999	97	98.18	97.14	96.98	05.43	100.16	66.30	119.17	96.48 to 99.14	643,952	624,491	
1,000,000 +	6	90.61	89.51	87.09	09.45	102.78	69.19	100.26	69.19 to 100.26	1,288,594	1,122,283	
<u>ALL</u>	8,719	100.13	100.61	99.91	04.75	100.70	08.68	220.00	100.05 to 100.23	178,115	177,950	

**55 Lancaster**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 404  
Total Sales Price : 345,908,986  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 345,908,986  
Total Assessed Value : 240,865,900  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 856,210  
Avg. Assessed Value : 596,203

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 70  
MEAN : 96  
COD : 13.88  
PRD : 138.20

COV : 23.36  
STD : 22.48  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.63  
MAX Sales Ratio : 253.60  
MIN Sales Ratio : 13.92

95% Median C.I. : 97.07 to 99.25  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.66 to 88.61  
95% Mean C.I. : 94.04 to 98.42

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:13PM

**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	28	101.26	99.94	90.16	09.92	110.85	43.99	134.40	94.87 to 105.94	692,652	624,500
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	42	98.67	99.31	105.57	13.31	94.07	52.80	211.56	95.70 to 100.94	573,627	605,605
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	29	100.42	100.22	98.01	11.84	102.25	66.11	155.63	91.30 to 104.35	257,092	251,979
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	28	97.08	97.51	92.42	08.31	105.51	62.80	142.58	95.84 to 100.67	467,139	431,711
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	52	101.66	97.94	84.02	17.01	116.57	13.92	146.09	97.05 to 107.04	708,904	595,648
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	21	96.40	99.89	95.34	12.50	104.77	77.74	173.23	88.97 to 100.85	480,149	457,771
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	33	97.88	97.15	89.87	14.21	108.10	31.70	163.21	95.75 to 101.60	945,220	849,448
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	31	99.94	99.28	85.70	18.98	115.85	17.67	253.60	89.41 to 102.37	503,905	431,842
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	34	97.15	92.46	42.55	14.28	217.30	25.67	125.39	84.56 to 101.15	2,262,988	962,941
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	36	96.27	90.85	87.31	12.46	104.05	38.89	127.88	82.17 to 99.18	676,240	590,431
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	31	93.54	85.77	38.13	16.31	224.94	24.63	125.70	81.57 to 97.92	2,190,942	835,506
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	39	98.54	95.46	87.98	11.39	108.50	24.25	140.40	95.14 to 99.97	485,178	426,851
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	127	99.18	99.26	97.34	11.28	101.97	43.99	211.56	97.24 to 100.75	504,112	490,683
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	137	99.52	98.35	87.46	16.30	112.45	13.92	253.60	97.05 to 101.30	684,376	598,582
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	140	96.99	91.40	51.32	13.51	178.10	24.25	140.40	92.85 to 98.54	1,343,767	689,596
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	151	99.54	98.68	93.02	13.60	106.08	13.92	211.56	97.96 to 100.94	539,675	502,016
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	119	97.63	96.85	62.59	15.30	154.74	17.67	253.60	96.00 to 99.94	1,124,689	703,967
<u>ALL</u>	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203
<u>ALL</u>	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203
04											
<u>ALL</u>	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203

**55 Lancaster**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 404  
 Total Sales Price : 345,908,986  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 345,908,986  
 Total Assessed Value : 240,865,900  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 856,210  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 596,203

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 13.88  
 PRD : 138.20

COV : 23.36  
 STD : 22.48  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.63  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 253.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 13.92

95% Median C.I. : 97.07 to 99.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.66 to 88.61  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.04 to 98.42

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:13PM

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												
Less Than 30,000	2	96.00	96.00	96.00	24.48	100.00	72.50	119.50	N/A	20,000	19,200	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203	
Greater Than 14,999	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203	
Greater Than 29,999	402	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.83	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	860,371	599,073	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	2	96.00	96.00	96.00	24.48	100.00	72.50	119.50	N/A	20,000	19,200	
30,000 TO 59,999	6	100.71	101.14	101.37	09.80	99.77	85.82	118.75	85.82 to 118.75	43,833	44,433	
60,000 TO 99,999	25	109.89	111.93	111.99	10.99	99.95	81.87	155.63	103.13 to 116.50	79,264	88,768	
100,000 TO 149,999	40	99.54	98.01	98.26	09.50	99.75	68.31	142.58	95.75 to 101.44	125,966	123,775	
150,000 TO 249,999	121	99.53	98.53	98.84	09.86	99.69	31.70	146.09	98.11 to 101.15	196,061	193,792	
250,000 TO 499,999	88	97.81	96.01	96.43	10.38	99.56	38.89	173.23	95.84 to 99.59	345,554	333,233	
500,000 TO 999,999	58	95.77	93.29	93.15	21.50	100.15	13.92	253.60	88.72 to 99.30	670,672	624,733	
1,000,000 +	64	89.50	87.13	58.80	20.92	148.18	14.11	211.56	84.04 to 95.57	3,836,789	2,255,983	
___ ALL ___	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203	

**55 Lancaster**

**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 404  
 Total Sales Price : 345,908,986  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 345,908,986  
 Total Assessed Value : 240,865,900  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 856,210  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 596,203

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 13.88  
 PRD : 138.20

COV : 23.36  
 STD : 22.48  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.63  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 253.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 13.92

95% Median C.I. : 97.07 to 99.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 50.66 to 88.61  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.04 to 98.42

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:13PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
157	9	81.87	87.76	84.54	12.69	103.81	72.19	125.13	73.99 to 103.24	206,882	174,889
186	1	99.94	99.94	99.94	00.00	100.00	99.94	99.94	N/A	1,400,000	1,399,200
300	5	104.18	105.10	102.39	07.38	102.65	90.76	116.13	N/A	160,080	163,900
303	1	87.68	87.68	87.68	00.00	100.00	87.68	87.68	N/A	7,000,000	6,137,500
304	1	108.30	108.30	108.30	00.00	100.00	108.30	108.30	N/A	235,000	254,500
309	4	104.08	118.17	133.44	25.65	88.56	91.29	173.23	N/A	234,498	312,925
319	1	109.45	109.45	109.45	00.00	100.00	109.45	109.45	N/A	1,100,000	1,204,000
323	1	101.27	101.27	101.27	00.00	100.00	101.27	101.27	N/A	300,000	303,800
341	3	95.88	89.64	85.61	10.21	104.71	71.84	101.20	N/A	1,015,000	868,967
343	7	99.57	105.49	102.94	18.79	102.48	64.75	163.21	64.75 to 163.21	1,438,984	1,481,243
344	65	96.69	95.02	46.23	16.02	205.54	24.63	211.56	94.79 to 100.57	2,283,323	1,055,649
345	1	14.11	14.11	14.11	00.00	100.00	14.11	14.11	N/A	3,600,000	508,100
349	2	79.01	79.01	73.40	27.67	107.64	57.15	100.86	N/A	1,345,000	987,200
350	6	92.48	102.13	99.36	28.20	102.79	68.67	146.40	68.67 to 146.40	1,232,667	1,224,817
352	142	99.99	99.08	93.53	07.45	105.93	21.03	155.63	99.18 to 100.75	366,799	343,061
353	16	91.71	88.47	91.31	11.47	96.89	38.89	113.50	83.17 to 98.71	582,281	531,681
386	4	73.11	77.66	70.79	14.84	109.70	65.15	99.29	N/A	1,244,661	881,075
391	10	90.25	96.42	95.51	17.77	100.95	67.72	146.09	72.50 to 118.75	434,000	414,520
392	1	253.60	253.60	253.60	00.00	100.00	253.60	253.60	N/A	540,700	1,371,200
406	17	92.70	89.79	68.34	10.30	131.39	59.64	108.87	81.28 to 96.94	1,633,315	1,116,253
412	3	108.27	118.86	136.66	17.28	86.97	96.09	152.21	N/A	1,345,000	1,838,067
423	1	110.50	110.50	110.50	00.00	100.00	110.50	110.50	N/A	300,000	331,500
426	2	98.89	98.89	98.88	00.03	100.01	98.86	98.92	N/A	227,450	224,900
434	3	112.84	107.23	106.17	16.03	101.00	77.28	131.56	N/A	210,417	223,400
435	1	119.50	119.50	119.50	00.00	100.00	119.50	119.50	N/A	20,000	23,900
436	1	108.40	108.40	108.40	00.00	100.00	108.40	108.40	N/A	175,000	189,700
442	3	99.92	95.56	99.53	05.04	96.01	85.82	100.94	N/A	292,333	290,967
444	4	104.61	100.10	105.24	11.82	95.12	73.87	117.32	N/A	511,031	537,800
453	3	65.50	57.63	66.58	22.38	86.56	31.70	75.68	N/A	632,600	421,167
468	1	98.00	98.00	98.00	00.00	100.00	98.00	98.00	N/A	60,000	58,800
528	5	78.10	80.51	89.07	12.64	90.39	66.11	96.00	N/A	1,178,040	1,049,300
529	2	64.83	64.83	60.60	18.56	106.98	52.80	76.85	N/A	200,500	121,500
531	6	107.43	107.90	96.11	15.01	112.27	85.77	142.58	85.77 to 142.58	517,500	497,350
534	41	96.55	92.72	72.02	21.14	128.74	13.92	144.79	87.97 to 101.44	445,165	320,629
554	30	93.42	94.00	89.59	10.07	104.92	68.19	126.91	87.44 to 97.07	566,438	507,460
600	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	2,890,000	2,890,000
<u>    </u> ALL <u>    </u>	404	98.20	96.23	69.63	13.88	138.20	13.92	253.60	97.07 to 99.25	856,210	596,203

**55 Lancaster**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 97  
Total Sales Price : 52,336,664  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 52,336,664  
Total Assessed Value : 33,492,756  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 539,553  
Avg. Assessed Value : 345,286

MEDIAN : 66  
WGT. MEAN : 64  
MEAN : 69  
COD : 23.10  
PRD : 107.64

COV : 28.98  
STD : 19.96  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.31  
MAX Sales Ratio : 122.28  
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.01

95% Median C.I. : 60.87 to 70.48  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.52 to 67.47  
95% Mean C.I. : 64.91 to 72.85

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:14PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	13	79.46	75.42	75.21	14.50	100.28	50.30	107.00	58.14 to 83.87	438,144	329,512	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	10	92.32	90.78	82.95	17.10	109.44	68.80	122.28	69.96 to 115.04	370,966	307,716	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	78.96	84.58	80.97	11.80	104.46	69.98	112.96	N/A	409,236	331,364	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	64.95	64.62	66.53	18.52	97.13	45.13	83.45	N/A	511,763	340,495	
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	23	60.66	64.07	61.21	24.56	104.67	29.01	116.29	54.78 to 71.36	569,942	348,861	
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	5	43.99	43.28	41.92	08.32	103.24	37.10	51.31	N/A	798,798	334,853	
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	85.51	85.51	85.51	00.00	100.00	85.51	85.51	N/A	176,499	150,917	
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	4	55.41	50.88	50.37	15.94	101.01	29.65	63.05	N/A	857,176	431,793	
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	13	62.10	65.78	60.38	16.31	108.94	43.83	104.97	55.72 to 70.48	552,163	333,419	
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	6	61.20	69.87	65.66	21.05	106.41	54.81	108.47	54.81 to 108.47	583,090	382,842	
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	11	65.73	63.53	64.29	10.85	98.82	47.30	75.10	50.20 to 71.76	618,202	397,468	
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	79.79	79.79	81.65	28.74	97.72	56.86	102.72	N/A	326,580	266,665	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	32	79.21	80.30	76.89	17.46	104.43	45.13	122.28	69.96 to 83.87	421,837	324,363	
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	33	56.37	59.97	55.90	26.20	107.28	29.01	116.29	51.31 to 63.55	627,511	350,793	
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	32	63.37	66.65	63.63	16.63	104.75	43.83	108.47	57.35 to 70.48	566,564	360,531	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	42	69.97	72.92	67.52	24.90	108.00	29.01	122.28	60.87 to 78.71	497,894	336,185	
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	23	57.03	59.16	53.37	21.60	110.85	29.65	104.97	51.31 to 63.29	642,492	342,904	
<u>ALL</u>	97	66.29	68.88	63.99	23.10	107.64	29.01	122.28	60.87 to 70.48	539,553	345,286	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
1	97	66.29	68.88	63.99	23.10	107.64	29.01	122.28	60.87 to 70.48	539,553	345,286	
<u>ALL</u>	97	66.29	68.88	63.99	23.10	107.64	29.01	122.28	60.87 to 70.48	539,553	345,286	



**55 Lancaster**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 4/1/2015

Number of Sales : 97  
 Total Sales Price : 52,336,664  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 52,336,664  
 Total Assessed Value : 33,492,756  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 539,553  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 345,286

MEDIAN : 66  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 69  
 COD : 23.10  
 PRD : 107.64

COV : 28.98  
 STD : 19.96  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.31  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 122.28  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.01

95% Median C.I. : 60.87 to 70.48  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.52 to 67.47  
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.91 to 72.85

Printed:4/7/2015 4:01:14PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	56.07	57.47	56.48	10.17	101.75	49.62	66.73	N/A	557,100	314,630
1	3	56.07	57.47	56.48	10.17	101.75	49.62	66.73	N/A	557,100	314,630
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	21	60.66	65.78	58.25	28.29	112.93	29.65	116.29	50.20 to 69.49	701,919	408,864
1	21	60.66	65.78	58.25	28.29	112.93	29.65	116.29	50.20 to 69.49	701,919	408,864
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	10	61.79	65.23	56.54	34.70	115.37	29.01	99.01	35.15 to 95.27	269,296	152,256
1	10	61.79	65.23	56.54	34.70	115.37	29.01	99.01	35.15 to 95.27	269,296	152,256
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>66.29</b>	<b>68.88</b>	<b>63.99</b>	<b>23.10</b>	<b>107.64</b>	<b>29.01</b>	<b>122.28</b>	<b>60.87 to 70.48</b>	<b>539,553</b>	<b>345,286</b>

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	9	60.87	59.20	58.67	10.73	100.90	43.83	69.84	49.62 to 67.47	725,961	425,933
1	9	60.87	59.20	58.67	10.73	100.90	43.83	69.84	49.62 to 67.47	725,961	425,933
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	54	66.72	70.30	64.39	23.82	109.18	29.65	122.28	60.66 to 71.76	596,992	384,409
1	54	66.72	70.30	64.39	23.82	109.18	29.65	122.28	60.66 to 71.76	596,992	384,409
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	59.38	62.81	54.90	35.99	114.41	29.01	99.01	35.15 to 95.27	269,541	147,968
1	11	59.38	62.81	54.90	35.99	114.41	29.01	99.01	35.15 to 95.27	269,541	147,968
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>66.29</b>	<b>68.88</b>	<b>63.99</b>	<b>23.10</b>	<b>107.64</b>	<b>29.01</b>	<b>122.28</b>	<b>60.87 to 70.48</b>	<b>539,553</b>	<b>345,286</b>

AGRICULTURAL

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	97	Median :	72	COV :	28.98	95% Median C.I. :	65.73 to 76.12
Total Sales Price :	52,336,664	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	21.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	65.84 to 72.39
Total Adj. Sales Price :	52,336,664	Mean :	74	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.54	95% Mean C.I. :	70.10 to 78.68
Total Assessed Value :	36,172,175						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	539,553	COD :	23.10	MAX Sales Ratio :	132.06		
Avg. Assessed Value :	372,909	PRD :	107.64	MIN Sales Ratio :	31.33		

Printed : 04/08/2015

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>											
10/01/2011 To 12/31/2011	13	85.81	81.46	81.22	14.51	100.30	54.33	115.56	62.79 to 90.58	438,144	355,873
01/01/2012 To 03/31/2012	10	99.70	98.04	89.59	17.10	109.43	74.31	132.06	75.55 to 124.25	370,966	332,333
04/01/2012 To 06/30/2012	5	85.28	91.35	87.45	11.80	104.46	75.57	122.00	N/A	409,236	357,874
07/01/2012 To 09/30/2012	4	70.14	69.79	71.86	18.52	97.12	48.74	90.12	N/A	511,763	367,735
10/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	23	65.51	69.19	66.11	24.56	104.66	31.33	125.59	59.16 to 77.07	569,942	376,770
01/01/2013 To 03/31/2013	5	47.51	46.75	45.27	08.31	103.27	40.07	55.42	N/A	798,798	361,641
04/01/2013 To 06/30/2013	1	92.35	92.35	92.35	100.00	100.00	92.35	92.35	N/A	176,499	162,990
07/01/2013 To 09/30/2013	4	59.84	54.95	54.40	15.94	101.01	32.02	68.09	N/A	857,176	466,337
10/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	13	67.07	71.05	65.21	16.30	108.96	47.34	113.36	60.18 to 76.12	552,163	360,093
01/01/2014 To 03/31/2014	6	66.10	75.47	70.91	21.06	106.43	59.20	117.15	59.20 to 117.15	583,090	413,470
04/01/2014 To 06/30/2014	11	70.99	68.62	69.44	10.85	98.82	51.09	81.10	54.22 to 77.50	618,202	429,265
07/01/2014 To 09/30/2014	2	86.17	86.17	88.19	28.73	97.71	61.41	110.93	N/A	326,580	287,998
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2012	32	85.55	86.73	83.04	17.46	104.44	48.74	132.06	75.55 to 90.58	421,837	350,312
10/01/2012 To 09/30/2013	33	60.88	64.77	60.37	26.20	107.29	31.33	125.59	55.42 to 68.63	627,511	378,856
10/01/2013 To 09/30/2014	32	68.44	71.99	68.73	16.63	104.74	47.34	117.15	61.94 to 76.12	566,564	389,373
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2012 To 12/31/2012	42	75.56	78.76	72.92	24.89	108.01	31.33	132.06	65.73 to 85.01	497,894	363,080
01/01/2013 To 12/31/2013	23	61.59	63.89	57.64	21.61	110.84	32.02	113.36	55.42 to 68.35	642,492	370,337

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	97	71.60	74.39	69.11	23.10	107.64	31.33	132.06	65.73 to 76.12	539,553	372,909

AGRICULTURAL

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	97	Median :	72	COV :	28.98	95% Median C.I. :	65.73 to 76.12
Total Sales Price :	52,336,664	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	21.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	65.84 to 72.39
Total Adj. Sales Price :	52,336,664	Mean :	74	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.54	95% Mean C.I. :	70.10 to 78.68
Total Assessed Value :	36,172,175						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	539,553	COD :	23.10	MAX Sales Ratio :	132.06		
Avg. Assessed Value :	372,909	PRD :	107.64	MIN Sales Ratio :	31.33		

Printed : 04/08/2015

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	3	60.56	62.07	60.99	10.17	101.77	53.59	72.07	N/A	557,100	339,801
1	3	60.56	62.07	60.99	10.17	101.77	53.59	72.07	N/A	557,100	339,801
<u>Dry</u>											
County	21	65.51	71.05	62.91	28.29	112.94	32.02	125.59	54.22 to 75.05	701,919	441,574
1	21	65.51	71.05	62.91	28.29	112.94	32.02	125.59	54.22 to 75.05	701,919	441,574
<u>Grass</u>											
County	10	66.73	70.45	61.06	34.69	115.38	31.33	106.93	37.96 to 102.89	269,296	164,436
1	10	66.73	70.45	61.06	34.69	115.38	31.33	106.93	37.96 to 102.89	269,296	164,436
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	97	71.60	74.39	69.11	23.10	107.64	31.33	132.06	65.73 to 76.12	539,553	372,909

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	9	65.73	63.93	63.37	10.74	100.88	47.34	75.43	53.59 to 72.87	725,961	460,007
1	9	65.73	63.93	63.37	10.74	100.88	47.34	75.43	53.59 to 72.87	725,961	460,007
<u>Dry</u>											
County	54	72.07	75.92	69.54	23.81	109.17	32.02	132.06	65.51 to 77.50	596,992	415,161
1	54	72.07	75.92	69.54	23.81	109.17	32.02	132.06	65.51 to 77.50	596,992	415,161
<u>Grass</u>											
County	11	64.13	67.84	59.29	35.99	114.42	31.33	106.93	37.96 to 102.89	269,541	159,805
1	11	64.13	67.84	59.29	35.99	114.42	31.33	106.93	37.96 to 102.89	269,541	159,805
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2011 To 09/30/2014	97	71.60	74.39	69.11	23.10	107.64	31.33	132.06	65.73 to 76.12	539,553	372,909

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
ALL		Total	Increase	8%

What IF



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 107,531</b>	<b>Value : 21,669,961,270</b>	<b>Growth 305,684,298</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	4,925	179,924,261	0	0	5	258,500	4,930	180,182,761	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	87,843	3,214,047,583	0	0	38	2,126,000	87,881	3,216,173,583	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	87,843	10,942,028,904	0	0	38	8,052,300	87,881	10,950,081,204	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	92,768	14,336,000,748	0	0	43	10,436,800	92,811	14,346,437,548	255,687,906
<b>% of Res Total</b>	99.95	99.93	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.07	86.31	66.20	83.64
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	1,661	279,544,813	0	0	1	0	1,662	279,544,813	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	6,007	1,311,266,510	0	0	5	38,800	6,012	1,311,305,310	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	6,007	3,522,463,463	0	0	5	55,800	6,012	3,522,519,263	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	7,668	5,113,274,786	0	0	6	94,600	7,674	5,113,369,386	32,966,469
<b>% of Com Total</b>	99.92	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	7.14	23.60	10.78
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	6	860,200	0	0	0	0	6	860,200	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	196	104,263,886	0	0	0	0	196	104,263,886	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	196	263,865,850	0	0	0	0	196	263,865,850	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	202	368,989,936	0	0	0	0	202	368,989,936	4,547,470
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	1.70	1.49
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	92,768	14,336,000,748	0	0	43	10,436,800	92,811	14,346,437,548	255,687,906
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	99.95	99.93	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.07	86.31	66.20	83.64
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	7,870	5,482,264,722	0	0	6	94,600	7,876	5,482,359,322	37,513,939
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	99.92	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	7.32	25.30	12.27
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	100,638	19,818,265,470	0	0	49	10,531,400	100,687	19,828,796,870	293,201,845
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	99.95	99.95	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	93.64	91.50	95.92

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	392	20,573,418	38,923,352	0	0	0
19. Commercial	361	184,246,435	326,846,014	0	0	0
20. Industrial	15	5,410,031	29,845,364	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	392	20,573,418	38,923,352
19. Commercial	0	0	0	361	184,246,435	326,846,014
20. Industrial	0	0	0	15	5,410,031	29,845,364
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				768	210,229,884	395,614,730

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	2,895	0	9	2,904

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	4,269	904,417,900	4,269	904,417,900
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	2,573	486,135,900	2,573	486,135,900
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	2,575	450,610,600	2,575	450,610,600
30. Ag Total							6,844	1,841,164,400

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	8	31.88	279,200	8	31.88	279,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2,213	7,191.95	87,073,400	2,213	7,191.95	87,073,400	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2,213	0.00	414,191,600	2,213	0.00	414,191,600	12,399,873
34. HomeSite Total				<b>2,221</b>	<b>7,223.83</b>	<b>501,544,200</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	57	79.60	367,600	57	79.60	367,600	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,767	751.53	4,013,604	1,767	751.53	4,013,604	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,767	0.00	36,419,000	1,767	0.00	36,419,000	82,580
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,824</b>	<b>831.13</b>	<b>40,800,204</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	83.85	62,544	0	83.85	62,544	
41. Total Section VI				<b>4,045</b>	<b>8,138.81</b>	<b>542,406,948</b>	<b>12,482,453</b>



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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	15	1,266.58	2,412,700	15	1,266.58	2,412,700

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	6,842	392,901.40	1,840,755,700	6,842	392,901.40	1,840,755,700
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,093.65	10.97%	12,561,234	12.05%	5,999.68
46. 1A	5,339.68	27.97%	32,033,287	30.72%	5,999.10
47. 2A1	1,459.58	7.65%	8,729,675	8.37%	5,980.95
48. 2A	4,897.83	25.66%	29,352,550	28.15%	5,992.97
49. 3A1	2,668.03	13.98%	13,003,218	12.47%	4,873.72
50. 3A	387.14	2.03%	1,879,157	1.80%	4,853.95
51. 4A1	1,824.26	9.56%	5,467,075	5.24%	2,996.87
52. 4A	419.33	2.20%	1,257,225	1.21%	2,998.18
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>19,089.50</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>104,283,421</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5,462.87</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	18,202.11	6.70%	79,807,419	7.69%	4,384.51
55. 1D	57,628.95	21.22%	252,825,506	24.37%	4,387.13
56. 2D1	11,360.64	4.18%	44,789,885	4.32%	3,942.55
57. 2D	60,814.68	22.39%	239,981,088	23.14%	3,946.10
58. 3D1	69,698.32	25.66%	244,624,806	23.58%	3,509.77
59. 3D	22,141.46	8.15%	77,689,271	7.49%	3,508.77
60. 4D1	27,933.93	10.28%	85,779,652	8.27%	3,070.81
61. 4D	3,836.09	1.41%	11,774,648	1.14%	3,069.44
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>271,616.18</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,037,272,275</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,818.89</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	1,818.24	2.39%	4,287,972	3.11%	2,358.31
64. 1G	7,285.23	9.57%	18,507,412	13.44%	2,540.40
65. 2G1	2,947.23	3.87%	6,171,393	4.48%	2,093.96
66. 2G	9,503.78	12.49%	20,543,335	14.92%	2,161.60
67. 3G1	23,319.31	30.65%	42,362,692	30.77%	1,816.64
68. 3G	4,496.95	5.91%	8,212,861	5.97%	1,826.32
69. 4G1	16,360.76	21.50%	23,402,992	17.00%	1,430.43
70. 4G	10,362.81	13.62%	14,189,160	10.31%	1,369.24
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>76,094.31</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>137,677,817</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,809.31</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>19,089.50</b>	<b>4.86%</b>	<b>104,283,421</b>	<b>8.03%</b>	<b>5,462.87</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>271,616.18</b>	<b>69.14%</b>	<b>1,037,272,275</b>	<b>79.87%</b>	<b>3,818.89</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>76,094.31</b>	<b>19.37%</b>	<b>137,677,817</b>	<b>10.60%</b>	<b>1,809.31</b>
72. Waste	26,047.46	6.63%	19,523,939	1.50%	749.55
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,130.69	0.29%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>392,847.45</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,298,757,452</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,306.01</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	19,089.50	104,283,421	19,089.50	104,283,421
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	271,616.18	1,037,272,275	271,616.18	1,037,272,275
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	76,094.31	137,677,817	76,094.31	137,677,817
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	26,047.46	19,523,939	26,047.46	19,523,939
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,130.69	0	1,130.69	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>392,847.45</b>	<b>1,298,757,452</b>	<b>392,847.45</b>	<b>1,298,757,452</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	19,089.50	4.86%	104,283,421	8.03%	5,462.87
<b>Dry Land</b>	271,616.18	69.14%	1,037,272,275	79.87%	3,818.89
<b>Grass</b>	76,094.31	19.37%	137,677,817	10.60%	1,809.31
<b>Waste</b>	26,047.46	6.63%	19,523,939	1.50%	749.55
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	1,130.69	0.29%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>392,847.45</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,298,757,452</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,306.01</b>

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

55 Lancaster

	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	13,392,746,841	14,346,437,548	953,690,707	7.12%	255,687,906	5.21%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	445,204,500	501,544,200	56,339,700	12.65%	12,399,873	9.87%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>13,837,951,341</b>	<b>14,847,981,748</b>	<b>1,010,030,407</b>	<b>7.30%</b>	<b>268,087,779</b>	<b>5.36%</b>
05. Commercial	4,802,264,660	5,113,369,386	311,104,726	6.48%	32,966,469	5.79%
06. Industrial	358,311,836	368,989,936	10,678,100	2.98%	4,547,470	1.71%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	35,697,400	40,800,204	5,102,804	14.29%	82,580	14.06%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>5,196,273,896</b>	<b>5,523,159,526</b>	<b>326,885,630</b>	<b>6.29%</b>	<b>37,596,519</b>	<b>5.57%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>19,034,225,237</b>	<b>20,371,203,818</b>	<b>1,336,978,581</b>	<b>7.02%</b>	<b>305,684,298</b>	<b>5.42%</b>
11. Irrigated	102,451,744	104,283,421	1,831,677	1.79%		
12. Dryland	1,041,670,226	1,037,272,275	-4,397,951	-0.42%		
13. Grassland	135,283,681	137,677,817	2,394,136	1.77%		
14. Wasteland	19,189,549	19,523,939	334,390	1.74%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>1,298,595,200</b>	<b>1,298,757,452</b>	<b>162,252</b>	<b>0.01%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>20,332,820,437</b>	<b>21,669,961,270</b>	<b>1,337,140,833</b>	<b>6.58%</b>	<b>305,684,298</b>	<b>5.07%</b>

## **Lancaster County's Three Year Assessment Plan**

Norman H. Agena, Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds

### **Introduction**

Pursuant to 77-1311.02, the following Three Year Assessment Plan has been prepared by Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office.

### **Tax Year 2015**

A complete reappraisal of all property will be completed for this year. This reappraisal consists of remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. It includes an on-site property inspection of all sales and pickup work, and a general site review of more than one sixth of the data base as well as a complete review of all parcels in the county to set final values. We expect the statistical ratios for residential and commercial properties to be near the 100% mark and the quality stats to be within the acceptable range.

### **Tax Year 2016**

We anticipate this to be a "clean up" year. In addition to the routine annual work, we will be focusing on properties that may have slipped through the cracks, as well as conduct a close review of the 2015 protests to see if we concur with changes made by the referees. We will continue field inspections of one sixth of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes on an annual basis.

### **Tax Year 2017**

A complete reappraisal of all property will be initiated this year for application in 2018. We will continue field inspections of one sixth of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes during the intervening years.

## 2015 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	12
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	28 includes 6 ROD
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$3,894,466
<b>7.</b>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	N/A
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	N/A
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$155,000
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$13,000
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	N/A
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$58,263

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Orion
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Orion
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	GIS electronic maps
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Office Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes; <a href="http://lincoln.ne.gov/gis/gisviewer/index.html">http://lincoln.ne.gov/gis/gisviewer/index.html</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Office staff
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Orion

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All cities and incorporated villages are zoned
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	Approximately 30+ years ago

**D. Contracted Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	In-house
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	In-house
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	Orion/Eagle(ROD)

**E. Appraisal /Listing Services**

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





# 2015 Certification for Lancaster 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 Lancaster County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2015.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



