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

Summary

2015 Commission Summary

for Valley County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	104	Median	94.77
Total Sales Price	\$8,719,042	Mean	95.83
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,681,772	Wgt. Mean	91.25
Total Assessed Value	\$7,921,870	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$54,771
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$83,479	Avg. Assessed Value	\$76,172

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.23 to 96.97
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.61 to 94.88
95% Mean C.I	92.11 to 99.55
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	10.62
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.90
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.20

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	110	97	96.82
2013	104	99	98.96
2012	101	99	98.88
2011	108	97	97

2015 Commission Summary

for Valley County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	Median	95.52
Total Sales Price	\$625,000	Mean	86.82
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$625,000	Wgt. Mean	96.33
Total Assessed Value	\$602,075	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$103,112
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$56,818	Avg. Assessed Value	\$54,734

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	47.10 to 111.63
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	73.39 to 119.28
95% Mean C.I	66.73 to 106.91
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.15
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.01
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.60

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median	
2014	13	100	95.52	
2013	12		96.33	
2012	12		97.26	
2011	17		93	

Opinions

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Valley 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 95 Property		Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.	
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.	
Agricultural Land	75	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. Sources

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Valley County

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all residential sales. Questionnaires were sent out to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2015 assessment roll.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Valley County

	Valuation data collection done by:				
	Deputy Assessor				
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:				
	Description of unique characteristics				
	Grouping 01 Arcadia – is located in the southwest corner of the county and has a population of approximately 360. The town consists of a public school system, grocery store, post office, bank, lumber yard store, welding shop, public library, and bar/grill. 02 Elyria- is located on HWY 11 in the northern part of the county and has a population of approximately 54. The town consists of a bar/grill, grade school that is affiliated with Ord Public, and a greenhouse with restaurant.				
	03 North Loup- is located on HWY 22 in the southeast part of the county and has a population of approximately 340. The town consists of a convenience store/gas station, bar/grill, crop insurance business, lumberyard and the grade school. 04 Ord- is located in the center of the county on junction of HWY's 11 and 70. The population is approximately 2,270. K-12 Public School system. The town is a very progressive town with a variety of jobs, services, and goods that make living in it desirable.				
	05	Rural- The rural area in Valley County consists of all properties not located within any of the towns/villages.			
	06	Suburban- The suburban valuation grouping consists of all properties located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.			
	• List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of resi				
3.	List and properties.	describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential			
3.	properties. The Cost A	describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential			
	properties.The Cost Amarket valueIf the cost	approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the			
	properties.The Cost Amarket valueIf the costlocal market	approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on			
4.	properties. The Cost A market value If the cost local market The county d	approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?			
4.	properties. The Cost A market value If the cost local market The county d	approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? evelops depreciation studies based on local market information.			
4.	properties. The Cost A market value If the cost local market The county d Are individu Yes	approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? evelops depreciation studies based on local market information.			
4.	properties. The Cost A market value If the cost local market The county d Are individu Yes Describe the	approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on a information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? evelops depreciation studies based on local market information. al depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?			
4. 5. 6.	properties. The Cost A market value If the cost local market The county d Are individu Yes Describe the The lot value	Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? evelops depreciation studies based on local market information. al depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?			
3. 4. 5. 6. 7.	properties. The Cost A market value If the cost local market The county d Are individu Yes Describe the The lot value Describe the resale?	Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the of properties. approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on a information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? evelops depreciation studies based on local market information. al depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping? methodology used to determine the residential lot values? s were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.			

8.	<u>Valuation</u> Grouping	<u>Date of</u> Depreciation Tables	Date of Costing	Date of Lot Value Study	Date of Last Inspection	
	01	2012	2011	2008	2012	
	02	2012	2011	2008	2011	
	03	2012	2011	2008	2010	
	04	2012	2011	2008	2013-2014	
	05	2012	2011	2008	2009-2014	
	06	2012	2011	2008	2009-2014	
	The rural and suburban valuation groupings are reviewed on a rotating basis. There are fifthteen townships with four being reviewed each year.					

County Overview

Valley County is located in central Nebraska along Hwy's 11 and 70. Ord is the largest town as well as the county seat with a population of 2,078. Ord contains the majority of employment and business opportunities within the county. The Valley County Health System Hospital is located in Ord which is a major employer. Arcadia, North Loup and Elyria are the other smaller towns in the county. Ord, Arcadia and North Loup still have a public school system, as well as various types of services, goods and jobs.

Description of Analysis

There are 104 qualified sales in the residential sample. Six valuation groupings have been identified with differing market influences. The overall measure of central tendency will be used as the point estimate in determining the level of value for the residential class of property in Valley County. Both the median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, while the weighted mean is just under. The coefficient of dispersion is within the prescribed parameters of the IAAO. The price related differential is just slightly above the range.

The assessor's office stays on track with the three year plan of assessment, and work has already begun on the next six year review and physical inspection cycle.

Sales Qualification

Valley County has a consistent procedure that is utilized for sales verification. A Department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrated a sufficient explanation in the counties comment section for the reason to exclude any sales.

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. Valley County was selected for review in 2013. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median.

Level of Value

Based on all available information, the level of value of the residential property in Valley County is 95%.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Valley County

The only assessment actions for 2015 was sales review and pick up work.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Valley County

	Valuation data collection done by:				
	Deputy Assessor				
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:				
	Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics			
	01	Arcadia – is located in the southwest corner of the county and has a population of approximately 360. The town consists of a public school system, grocery store, post office, bank, lumber yard store, welding shop, public library, and bar/grill.			
	02	Elyria- is located on HWY 11 in the northern part of the county and has a population of approximately 54. The town consists of a bar/grill, grade school, and greenhouse with restaurant.			
	03	North Loup- is located on HWY 22 in the southeast part of the county and has a population of approximately 340. The town consists of a convenience store/gas station, bar/grill, crop insurance business, lumberyard and the grade school.			
	04 Ord- is located in the center of the county on junction of HWY's 11 and 70. The popula is approximately 2,270. K-12 Public school system. The town is a very progressive to with a variety of jobs, services, and goods that make living in it desirable. 05 Rural- The rural area in Valley County consists of all properties not located within any of towns/villages.				
	06	Suburban- The suburban valuation grouping consists of all properties located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.			
3.	List and properties.	describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial			
	The Cost Ap	pproach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market erties.			
3a.	Describe the	process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.			
	Unique prope	erties are valued by the contract appraiser.			
4.		approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?			
	The county d	evelops the depreciation studies based on local market information.			
5.	Are individu				
5.	Are individu Yes				
5. 6.	Yes	methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.			

7.	<u>Valuation</u> <u>Grouping</u>	Date of Depreciation Tables	Date of Costing	<u>Date of</u> Lot Value Study	Date of Last Inspection
	01	2012	2011	2010	2012
	02	2012	2011	2010	2012
	03	2012	2011	2010	2012
	04	2012	2011	2010	2012
	05	2012	2011	2010	2012
	06	2012	2011	2010	2012

County Overview

Valley County is located in central Nebraska along Hwy's 11 and 70. Ord is the largest town as well as the county seat with a population of 2,078. Ord contains the majority of employment and business opportunities within the county, however the market is sporadic. The Valley County Health System Hospital is located in Ord which is a major employer. Arcadia, North Loup and Elyria are the other smaller towns in the county with the commercial market much less organized. Ord, Arcadia and North Loup still have a public school system, as well as various types of services, goods and jobs.

Description of Analysis

The commercial parcels in Valley County are represented by 43 different occupancy codes and the majority of these will consist of only one parcel. Retail and office building would be the primary codes. There have been only eleven commercial sales during this study period distributed amongst seven occupancy codes. The sample is considered unrepresentative of the population as a whole and will not be relied on to determine a level of value for the County.

Sales Qualification

A Department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrated a sufficient explanation in the counties comment section for the reason to exclude any sales. Measurement was done utilizing all available information; there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-half of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Valley County was reviewed in 2013. It is believed that commercial property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

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

Level of Value

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value for the commercial class of property.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Valley County

A spreadsheet analysis was performed on all the qualified agricultural sales. From the analysis it was determined all land classes would be increased for 2015.

The four townships that were on schedule to be reviewed for the six year review and inspection requirement was performed and completed.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2015 assessment roll.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Valley County

1.					
	Assessor and Staff				
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific ch each unique.	aracteristics that make			
	Market Description of unique characteristics Area	Year Land Use Completed			
	1 Soils, land use and geographic characteristics.	2009-2014			
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.				
	Each year agricultural sales and characteristics are studied to see if the trend that may say a market area or areas are needed.	market is showing any			
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.				
	Residential is land directly associated with a residence, and is defined in Regulation 10.001.05A. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E.				
5.					
	Yes				
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values f the Wetland Reserve Program.	for parcels enrolled in			
	Sales are verified and values are set by using the value of current class of grass for the soi and factoring up to 100%.				
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the	following:			
	No				

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Valley	1	n/a	5,060	5,060	4,350	4,110	4,110	3,360	3,360	4,412
Sherman	1	n/a	4,680	4,510	4,510	4,355	4,355	4,250	4,246	4,406
Custer	1	n/a	5,240	4,950	4,430	4,200	3,820	3,815	3,810	4,577
Greeley	2	n/a	5,050	4,870	4,400	4,300	4,160	4,120	3,790	4,428
Howard	7200	4,950	4,950	4,500	4,400	4,100	3,900	3,600	3,600	4,459
Wheeler	1	3,760	3,680	3,570	3,480	3,390	3,310	3,235	3,140	3,260
Garfield	1	n/a	4,100	4,100	3,500	3,500	3,100	3,100	2,400	3,329
Loup	1	n/a	4,000	n/a	3,500	3,500	3,100	3,100	2,000	3,389
County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Valley	1	n/a	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,115	2,115	2,115	1,980	2,096
Sherman	1	n/a	2,180	2,070	2,070	1,960	1,960	1,850	1,848	1,946
Custer	1	n/a	2,420	2,140	2,025	1,910	1,745	1,740	1,735	2,009
Greeley	2	n/a	2,600	2,500	2,500	2,400	2,300	2,150	2,000	2,284
Howard	7200	2,600	2,600	2,500	2,500	2,400	2,300	2,150	2,000	2,273
Wheeler	1	1,785	1,695	1,540	1,470	1,410	1,350	1,270	1,205	1,354
Garfield	1	n/a	1,700	1,700	1,490	1,490	1,240	1,240	1,065	1,379
Loup	1	n/a	925	n/a	925	865	755	625	625	790
County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Valley	1	n/a	1,151	1,151	1,130	1,150	1,105	918	899	931
Sherman	1	n/a	1,171	1,134	1,131	1,079	1,077	1,061	1,059	1,066
Custer	1	n/a	930	925	925	920	920	877	867	874
Greeley	2	n/a	1,055	1,003	1,018	990	1,000	968	948	959
Howard	7200	1,450	1,450	1,306	1,326	1,250	1,248	1,177	1,150	1,195
Wheeler	1	1,250	1,180	1,110	1,045	1,005	930	878	780	839
Garfield	1	n/a	965	965	965	895	850	748	617	665
Loup	1	n/a	720	n/a	720	570	570	570	570	571

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

County Overview

Valley County is located in central Nebraska with Ord being the county seat. The county is comprised of 30% irrigated, 10% dry crop and 60% grass/pasture land. The Lower Loup Natural Resource District governs this county. The county currently has no defined market areas, however sales are reviewed and plotted annually to verify accuracy of the one market area determination.

Description of Analysis

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Valley County the land use of the sales generally matched the County as a whole. However, the sales were not proportionately distributed among the study years. To make the sample reliable and proportionate the agricultural land analysis was expanded using sales from the comparable areas surrounding Valley County with similar soils and physical characteristics. A total of 54 sales were used in the analysis and the sales were proportionately distributed and representative of the land uses that exist within the county. The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. Both majority land uses show the grass subclass falls within the acceptable range. The 80% irrigated land subclass also falls into the acceptable parameters.

Assessment actions taken by the Valley County assessor include adjustments to all property classes. Irrigated values amounted to an increase of 20%, dry land increased 21% and grass amounted to an increase of 12%. The statistics are within the acceptable range and are adequate for measurement purposes.

Sales Qualification

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

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The sales analysis supports that all subclasses of agricultural property have been assessed at acceptable portions of market value. A comparison of agricultural values in Valley County to the values used in all of the adjoining counties also supports that values are acceptable and equalized.

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Valley County is 75% of market value for the agricultural land class.

Statistical Reports

88 Valley				PAD 201	5 R&O Statist	ics (Using 20 alified	15 Values)				0
RESIDENTIAL				Date Range:	10/1/2012 To 9/3		d on: 1/1/2015				
Number of Sales: 104			DIAN: 95			COV : 20.17			95% Median C.I.: 91.23	3 to 96 97	
Total Sales Price : 8,719,042			EAN: 95					05			
						STD: 19.33		95	% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 87.6		
Total Adj. Sales Price: 8,681,772 Total Assessed Value: 7,921,870		IVI	EAN: 96		AVG. ADS.	Dev: 14.17			95% Mean C.I.: 92.1	1 to 99.55	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 83,479		(COD: 14.95		MAX Sales I	Ratio : 173.13					
Avg. Assessed Value : 76,172			PRD: 105.02			Ratio : 53.16			Prin	ted:3/20/2015 10):17:51AM
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
Qrtrs											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	11	103.46	106.22	98.82	15.75	107.49	74.66	138.40	82.14 to 135.11	63,864	63,113
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	6	98.00	102.33	101.66	06.11	100.66	94.78	115.93	94.78 to 115.93	82,077	83,440
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	16	94.51	95.74	93.95	12.18	101.91	73.05	121.35	82.95 to 109.02	84,264	79,164
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	18	91.73	90.73	87.04	13.84	104.24	64.37	125.56	81.06 to 96.91	98,778	85,978
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	11	95.55	96.60	91.41	15.67	105.68	70.62	173.13	71.57 to 99.38	73,482	67,172
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	12	93.98	90.84	87.69	12.93	103.59	67.18	108.24	74.64 to 106.73	125,754	110,273
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	17	94.03	99.01	89.35	22.75	110.81	53.16	144.87	73.73 to 120.29	67,513	60,326
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	13	88.75	90.98	92.13	11.30	98.75	62.23	113.21	82.08 to 102.46	68,885	63,466
Study Yrs											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	51	95.08	97.01	92.78	13.60	104.56	64.37	138.40	93.29 to 100.24	84,729	78,610
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	53	94.03	94.69	89.73	16.28	105.53	53.16	173.13	87.41 to 98.05	82,275	73,826
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	51	94.85	94.93	91.57	12.95	103.67	64.37	173.13	89.27 to 96.97	86,804	79,485
ALL	104	94.77	95.83	91.25	14.95	105.02	53.16	173.13	91.23 to 96.97	83,479	76,172
VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	4	78.87	78.71	82.46	11.58	95.45	62.23	94.85	N/A	81,250	66,998
02	1	84.28	84.28	84.28	00.00	100.00	84.28	84.28	N/A	27,000	22,755
03	9	96.72	100.20	104.98	11.95	95.45	82.95	118.53	83.77 to 115.93	36,600	38,423
04	80	95.43	98.35	94.68	14.61	103.88	64.37	173.13	93.29 to 98.90	77,822	73,678
05	7	81.06	81.87	79.22	17.97	103.35	53.16	102.41	53.16 to 102.41	205,662	162,934
06	3	73.05	74.74	74.79	08.10	99.93	66.70	84.47	N/A	111,667	83,515
ALL	104	94.77	95.83	91.25	14.95	105.02	53.16	173.13	91.23 to 96.97	83,479	76,172
PROPERTY TYPE *											
RANGE	COUNT					חחם	MINI		05% Modian C	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01 06	102	94.77	95.85	91.16	15.08	105.14	53.16	173.13	91.23 to 96.97	84,086	76,649
06	2	94.77	94.77	98.77	08.07	95.95	87.12	102.41	N/A	52,500	51,855
ALL —	104	94.77	95.83	91.25	14.95	105.02	53.16	173.13	91.23 to 96.97	83,479	76,172
ALL	104	34.11	90.00	91.20	14.90	103.02	55.10	173.13	31.23 10 30.31	03,419	10,112

Page 1 of 2

88 Valley 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: 104		MED	DIAN: 95		(COV: 20.17			95% Median C.I.: 91.23	8 to 96.97	
Total Sale	es Price: 8,719	,042	WGT. M	EAN: 91			STD: 19.33		959	% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 87.61	to 94.88	
,	es Price: 8,681 ed Value: 7,921	,	М	EAN: 96		Avg. Abs.	Dev: 14.17			95% Mean C.I.: 92.11	to 99.55	
Avg. Adj. Sale	es Price : 83,47	9	C	COD: 14.95		MAX Sales F	Ratio : 173.13					
Avg. Assesse	ed Value : 76,17	2	F	PRD: 105.02		MIN Sales F	Ratio : 53.16			Print	ted:3/20/2015 10):17:51AM
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	1	88.75	88.75	88.75	00.00	100.00	88.75	88.75	N/A	4,000	3,550
Less Than	15,000	2	85.85	85.85	84.61	03.38	101.47	82.95	88.75	N/A	7,000	5,923
Less Than	30,000	14	87.94	95.92	98.42	21.58	97.46	62.23	173.13	71.63 to 118.53	20,814	20,486
Ranges Excl. Low	\$											
Greater Than	4,999	103	94.78	95.89	91.25	15.03	105.08	53.16	173.13	92.06 to 96.97	84,250	76,877
Greater Than	14,999	102	94.82	96.02	91.26	15.05	105.22	53.16	173.13	92.06 to 97.28	84,978	77,549
Greater Than	29,999	90	95.19	95.81	91.00	13.87	105.29	53.16	144.87	93.29 to 97.46	93,226	84,834
_Incremental Range	es											
0 TO	4,999	1	88.75	88.75	88.75	00.00	100.00	88.75	88.75	N/A	4,000	3,550
5,000 TO	14,999	1	82.95	82.95	82.95	00.00	100.00	82.95	82.95	N/A	10,000	8,295
15,000 TO	29,999	12	89.59	97.60	99.12	24.18	98.47	62.23	173.13	71.63 to 118.53	23,117	22,913
30,000 TO	59 , 999	29	108.24	107.97	108.73	14.20	99.30	73.73	144.87	94.78 to 119.59	43,860	47,688
60,000 TO	99,999	32	96.67	94.01	93.66	10.12	100.37	70.62	121.35	87.79 to 102.41	77,317	72,418
100,000 TO	149,999	16	94.33	90.83	90.99	10.29	99.82	66.70	110.30	80.81 to 97.28	122,585	111,539
150,000 TO	249 , 999	11	74.66	77.55	77.76	14.28	99.73	53.16	96.72	64.37 to 91.23	180,267	140,180
250,000 TO	499,999	2	88.47	88.47	86.88	08.38	101.83	81.06	95.87	N/A	350,000	304,070
500,000 TO	999 , 999											
1,000,000 +												
ALL		104	94.77	95.83	91.25	14.95	105.02	53.16	173.13	91.23 to 96.97	83,479	76,172

88 Valley				PAD 201	5 R&O Statist	ics (Using 201 Ilified	15 Values)				
COMMERCIAL				Date Range:	002 10/1/2011 To 9/3 :		l on: 1/1/2015				
Number of Sales: 11 Total Sales Price: 625,000 Total Adj. Sales Price: 625,000		WGT. M	DIAN : 96 IEAN : 96 IEAN : 87			COV : 34.44 STD : 29.90 Dev : 24.94		95	95% Median C.I.: 47.10 % Wgt. Mean C.I.: 73.39 95% Mean C.I.: 66.73	9 to 119.28	
Total Assessed Value : 602,075 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,818 Avg. Assessed Value : 54,734			COD: 26.11 PRD: 90.13			Ratio : 138.96 Ratio : 47.10			Prin	ted:3/20/2015 10	D:17:52AM
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
Qrtrs 01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11 01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	2	87.80	87.80	89.61	22.69	97.98	67.88	107.72	N/A	27,500	24,643
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12 01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12 01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	77.82	77.82	90.98	39.48	85.54	47.10	108.53	N/A	45,500	41,395
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13 01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13 01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2 2	82.55 102.23	82.55 102.23	79.04 119.73	21.27 35.93	104.44 85.38	64.99 65.50	100.11 138.96	N/A N/A	75,000 74,500	59,280 89,200
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13 01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	2	79.37	79.37	96.51	40.66	82.24	47.10	111.63	N/A	55,500	53,565
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14 01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14 Study Yrs	1	95.52	95.52	95.52	00.00	100.00	95.52	95.52	N/A	69,000	65,910
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	4 4	87.80 82.81	82.81 92.39	90.46 99.32	28.84 32.79	91.54 93.02	47.10 64.99	108.53 138.96	N/A N/A	36,500 74,750	33,019 74,240
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14 Calendar Yrs	3	95.52	84.75	96.13	22.52	88.16	47.10	111.63	N/A	60,000	57,680
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12 01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	2 6	77.82 82.81	77.82 88.05	90.98 98.56	39.48 34.84	85.54 89.34	47.10 47.10	108.53 138.96	N/A 47.10 to 138.96	45,500 68,333	41,395 67,348
ALL	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734
VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
03 04	2 9	47.10 100.11	47.10 95.65	47.10 100.80	00.00 19.20	100.00 94.89	47.10 64.99	47.10 138.96	N/A 65.50 to 111.63	26,000 63,667	12,245 64,176
ALL	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734
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	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734
04ALL	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734

Page 1 of 2

											Page 2 of 2
88 Valley				PAD 2015	R&O Statist)15 Values)				
COMMERCIAL				Date Range	Qua 10/1/2011 To 9/3	alified	n. 1/1/2015				
Number of Sales: 11			DIAN: 96	Date Hunge.		COV : 34.44			95% Median C.I.: 47.10) to 111 63	
Total Sales Price : 625,000			EAN: 96			STD : 29.90		05			
						Dev: 24.94		95	% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 73.3 95% Mean C.I.: 66.7		
Total Adj. Sales Price: 625,000 Total Assessed Value: 602,075		IVI	EAN: 87		Avy. Abs.	Dev. 24.94			95% Mean C.I 00.7	510106.91	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,818		(COD: 26.11		MAX Sales I	Ratio : 138.96					
Avg. Assessed Value : 54,734		I	PRD: 90.13		MIN Sales I	Ratio : 47.10			Prin	ted:3/20/2015 10):17:52AM
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	3	47.10	54.03	53.84	14.71	100.35	47.10	67.88	N/A	25,667	13,820
Ranges Excl. Low \$											
Greater Than 4,999	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734
Greater Than 14,999	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734
Greater Than 29,999	8	103.92	99.12	102.30	16.93	96.89	64.99	138.96	64.99 to 138.96	68,500	70,077
Incremental Ranges											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	17.10	54.00	50.04	44.74	100.05	17.10	07.00	N1/A	05 007	40.000
15,000 ТО 29,999 30,000 ТО 59,999	3 2	47.10 86.61	54.03 86.61	53.84 83.86	14.71 24.37	100.35 103.28	47.10 65.50	67.88 107.72	N/A N/A	25,667 34,500	13,820 28,930
60,000 TO 99,999	2 5	100.11	96.16	94.82	24.37 11.92	103.28	65.50 64.99	107.72	N/A N/A	73,800	28,930 69,980
100,000 TO 149,999	1	138.96	138.96	138.96	00.00	100.00	138.96	138.96	N/A	110,000	152,855
150,000 TO 249,999	Ĩ	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	1077	110,000	102,000
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
ALL	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734
OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
344	2	88.31	88.31	87.65	26.41	100.75	64.99	111.63	– – – N/A	87,500	76,690
350	1	107.72	107.72	107.72	00.00	100.00	107.72	107.72	N/A	30,000	32,315
353	3	108.53	114.34	118.57	13.34	96.43	95.52	138.96	N/A	81,333	96,437
384	1	100.11	100.11	100.11	00.00	100.00	100.11	100.11	N/A	60,000	60,065
406	1	67.88	67.88	67.88	00.00	100.00	67.88	67.88	N/A	25,000	16,970
459	1	65.50	65.50	65.50	00.00	100.00	65.50	65.50	N/A	39,000	25,545
528	2	47.10	47.10	47.10	00.00	100.00	47.10	47.10	N/A	26,000	12,245
ALL	11	95.52	86.82	96.33	26.11	90.13	47.10	138.96	47.10 to 111.63	56,818	54,734

											Page 1 of 2
88 Valley				PAD 201	5 R&O Statisti		15 Values)				
AGRICULTURAL LAND				Data Danga		lified	an: 1/1/201E				
				Date Range	: 10/1/2011 To 9/3		d on: 1/1/2015				
Number of Sales : 54			IAN: 75			COV: 29.50			95% Median C.I.: 72.8	4 to 80.99	
Total Sales Price: 28,338,409		WGT. MI	EAN: 75			STD: 23.96		95	% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 69.0	0 to 81.39	
Total Adj. Sales Price: 28,305,641 Total Assessed Value: 21,284,039		M	EAN: 81		Avg. Abs.	Dev: 16.95			95% Mean C.I.: 74.8	3 to 87.61	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 524,179		C	OD: 22.47		MAX Sales F	Ratio : 158.99					
Avg. Assessed Value : 394,149			PRD: 108.02			Ratio : 45.19			Prin	ted:3/20/2015 10):17:53AM
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
Qrtrs											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	107.86	110.61	96.35	21.98	114.80	67.74	158.99	N/A	297,685	286,819
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	83.17	86.66	83.56	13.77	103.71	70.66	118.36	70.66 to 118.36	525,851	439,407
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	74.79	74.79	75.85	02.43	98.60	72.97	76.60	N/A	447,968	339,766
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	74.15	76.60	81.15	07.38	94.39	69.62	86.02	N/A	319,032	258,895
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12 1	13	80.45	88.40	87.57	24.45	100.95	58.79	139.44	61.86 to 115.16	458,935	401,880
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	81.28	81.28	78.35	29.18	103.74	57.56	104.99	N/A	541,818	424,530
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	3	59.80	63.29	62.46	15.08	101.33	51.51	78.57	N/A	601,167	375,498
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	76.52	76.52	75.52	08.60	101.32	69.94	83.09	N/A	364,210	275,042
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13 1	10	75.16	80.46	77.38	24.10	103.98	49.28	131.24	56.56 to 103.89	439,044	339,725
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	6	54.86	60.32	55.99	20.32	107.73	45.19	83.68	45.19 to 83.68	1,032,561	578,080
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	3	75.43	74.28	73.65	01.55	100.86	71.95	75.47	N/A	646,417	476,100
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14											
Study Yrs											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 1	15	80.99	89.45	84.53	20.52	105.82	67.74	158.99	72.97 to 106.06	413,258	349,329
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13 2	20	77.63	82.73	80.88	23.44	102.29	51.51	139.44	61.86 to 97.61	479,085	387,504
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14 1	19	72.84	73.12	66.22	20.58	110.42	45.19	131.24	56.56 to 78.58	659,214	436,528
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12 2	24	78.57	85.35	84.90	19.07	100.53	58.79	139.44	73.97 to 90.63	457,262	388,212
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13 1	17	72.84	77.06	73.98	22.75	104.16	49.28	131.24	57.56 to 101.65	470,941	348,405
ALL5	54	75.45	81.22	75.19	22.47	108.02	45.19	158.99	72.84 to 80.99	524,179	394,149
AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE C	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
1 5	54	75.45	81.22	75.19	22.47	108.02	45.19	158.99	72.84 to 80.99	524,179	394,149
ALL5	54	75.45	81.22	75.19	22.47	108.02	45.19	158.99	72.84 to 80.99	524,179	394,149

88 Valley				PAD 2015	5 R&O Statisti		15 Values)				
AGRICULTURAL LAND				Date Range:	Qua 10/1/2011 To 9/3	llified 0/2014 Poste	d on: 1/1/2015				
Number of Sales: 54		MED	DIAN: 75			COV: 29.50			95% Median C.I.: 72.8	4 to 80.99	
Total Sales Price : 28,3	338,409	WGT. M	EAN: 75			STD : 23.96		95	% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 69.0	0 to 81.39	
Total Adj. Sales Price: 28,3 Total Assessed Value: 21,2		М	EAN: 81			Dev: 16.95			95% Mean C.I.: 74.8		
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 524		C	COD: 22.47		MAX Sales F	Ratio : 158.99					
Avg. Assessed Value : 394	,149	F	PRD: 108.02		MIN Sales F	Ratio : 45.19			Prin	nted:3/20/2015 10	D:17:53AM
95%MLU By Market Area										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	6	65.37	75.14	65.34	26.77	115.00	56.56	127.40	56.56 to 127.40	592,584	387,204
1	6	65.37	75.14	65.34	26.77	115.00	56.56	127.40	56.56 to 127.40	592,584	387,204
Dry											
County	1	85.34	85.34	85.34	00.00	100.00	85.34	85.34	N/A	523,600	446,833
1	1	85.34	85.34	85.34	00.00	100.00	85.34	85.34	N/A	523,600	446,833
Grass											
County	20	75.09	81.29	76.69	22.97	106.00	45.19	158.99	69.94 to 77.47	301,563	231,266
1	20	75.09	81.29	76.69	22.97	106.00	45.19	158.99	69.94 to 77.47	301,563	231,266
ALL	54	75.45	81.22	75.19	22.47	108.02	45.19	158.99	72.84 to 80.99	524,179	394,149
80%MLU By Market Area										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	17	70.66	72.89	66.94	21.09	108.89	50.05	127.40	57.44 to 86.02	849,518	568,640
1	17	70.66	72.89	66.94	21.09	108.89	50.05	127.40	57.44 to 86.02	849,518	568,640
Dry											
County	2	73.60	73.60	80.87	15.95	91.01	61.86	85.34	N/A	323,416	261,535
1	2	73.60	73.60	80.87	15.95	91.01	61.86	85.34	N/A	323,416	261,535
Grass											
County	22	75.09	82.96	76.86	24.72	107.94	45.19	158.99	69.62 to 78.58	301,142	231,455
1	22	75.09	82.96	76.86	24.72	107.94	45.19	158.99	69.62 to 78.58	301,142	231,455
ALL	54	75.45	81.22	75.19	22.47	108.02	45.19	158.99	72.84 to 80.99	524,179	394,149

Page 2 of 2

County Reports

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30		Records : 4,260	1	Value : 909	9,268,340	Grov	wth 5,765,650	Sum Lines 17,	25, & 41
Schedule I : Non-Agricul	tural Records								
	U	rban	Sut	oUrban		Rural	T	otal	Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	213	1,199,945	14	203,235	10	131,535	237	1,534,715	
2. Res Improve Land	1,321	7,264,930	53	988,375	115	3,299,210	1,489	11,552,515	
3. Res Improvements	1,343	65,426,650	54	5,054,440	129	12,993,585	1,526	83,474,675	
94. Res Total	1,556	73,891,525	68	6,246,050	139	16,424,330	1,763	96,561,905	1,777,180
% of Res Total	88.26	76.52	3.86	6.47	7.88	17.01	41.38	10.62	30.82
5. Com UnImp Land	58	235,570	6	36,550	11	134,275	75	406,395	
6. Com Improve Land	222	1,811,845	6	79,630	7	195,645	235	2,087,120	
7. Com Improvements	229	20,525,280	7	496,320	13	2,336,325	249	23,357,925	
)8. Com Total	287	22,572,695	13	612,500	24	2,666,245	324	25,851,440	475,890
% of Com Total	88.58	87.32	4.01	2.37	7.41	10.31	7.61	2.84	8.25
9. Ind UnImp Land	16	127,390	2	9,815	1	198,460	19	335,665	
0. Ind Improve Land	18	256,030	2	130,265	1	18,110	21	404,405	
11. Ind Improvements	20	8,460,325	2	2,510,895	1	176,225	23	11,147,445	
2. Ind Total	36	8,843,745	4	2,650,975	2	392,795	42	11,887,515	1,889,725
% of Ind Total	85.71	74.40	9.52	22.30	4.76	3.30	0.99	1.31	32.78
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,556	73,891,525	68	6,246,050	139	16,424,330	1,763	96,561,905	1,777,180
% of Res & Rec Total	88.26	76.52	3.86	6.47	7.88	17.01	41.38	10.62	30.82
Com & Ind Total	323	31,416,440	17	3,263,475	26	3,059,040	366	37,738,955	2,365,615
% of Com & Ind Total	88.25	83.25	4.64	8.65	7.10	8.11	8.59	4.15	41.03
17. Taxable Total	1,879	105,307,965	85	9,509,525	165	19,483,370	2,129	134,300,860	4,142,795
% of Taxable Total	88.26	78.41	3.99	7.08	7.75	14.51	49.98	14.77	71.85

County 88 Valley

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

		Urban			SubUrban	
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	3	21,700	478,855	0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	27,110	3,038,705	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	3	21,700	478,855
19. Commercial	0	0	0	2	27,110	3,038,705
20. Industrial	1	198,460	20,412,430	1	198,460	20,412,430
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				6	247,270	23,929,990

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records Urb	an _{Value}	Records Subl	rban _{Value}	Records Rura	al _{Value}	Records Tot	al Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

-	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	216	35	235	486

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

8	Urban		SubUrban		Rural			Total		`otal
	Records	Value	Records	Value		Records	Value		Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	89	19,890,885		1,284	384,788,315		1,373	404,679,200
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	70	15,224,740		642	303,879,380		712	319,104,120
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	72	5,657,990		686	45,526,170		758	51,184,160
30. Ag Total									2,131	774,967,480

County 88 Valley

2015 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail									
	Records	Urban Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value	Ύ.		
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0			
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	52	53.00	424,000			
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	52	53.00	3,756,400			
34. HomeSite Total									
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0			
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	66	204.37	531,365			
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	68	0.00	1,901,590			
38. FarmSite Total									
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	239.09	0			
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.04	5			
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth		
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	5	5.00	40,000	5	5.00	40,000			
32. HomeSite Improv Land	414	436.00	3,488,000	466	489.00	3,912,000			
33. HomeSite Improvements	410	420.00	28,829,355	462	473.00	32,585,755	1,622,855		
34. HomeSite Total				467	494.00	36,537,755			
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	10	33.00	106,000	10	33.00	106,000			
36. FarmSite Improv Land	613	1,336.89	4,474,665	679	1,541.26	5,006,030			
37. FarmSite Improvements	658	0.00	16,696,815	726	0.00	18,598,405	0		
38. FarmSite Total				736	1,574.26	23,710,435			
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,773.53	0	0	5,012.62	0			
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	42.87	4,290	0	42.91	4,295			
41. Total Section VI				1,203	7,123.79	60,252,485	1,622,855		

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

	Urban			(SubUrban				
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value		
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0		
	Rural					Total			
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value		
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0		

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

		Urban			SubUrban	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
		Rural			Total	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

County 88 Valley

2015 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	44,349.54	43.35%	224,408,670	49.72%	5,060.00
47. 2A1	6,514.84	6.37%	32,965,065	7.30%	5,060.00
48. 2A	11,536.30	11.28%	50,182,925	11.12%	4,350.00
49. 3A1	9,034.03	8.83%	37,129,885	8.23%	4,110.00
50. 3A	3,914.91	3.83%	16,090,290	3.56%	4,110.00
51. 4A1	13,511.14	13.21%	45,397,450	10.06%	3,360.00
52. 4A	13,449.53	13.15%	45,190,350	10.01%	3,359.99
53. Total	102,310.29	100.00%	451,364,635	100.00%	4,411.72
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	8,072.43	24.09%	17,355,755	24.70%	2,150.00
56. 2D1	1,919.70	5.73%	4,127,360	5.87%	2,150.00
57. 2D	4,538.45	13.54%	9,757,660	13.89%	2,150.00
58. 3D1	3,084.62	9.20%	6,524,060	9.29%	2,115.03
59. 3D	434.70	1.30%	919,395	1.31%	2,115.01
60. 4D1	7,073.39	21.11%	14,960,390	21.29%	2,115.02
61. 4D	8,390.81	25.04%	16,614,010	23.65%	1,980.02
62. Total	33,514.10	100.00%	70,258,630	100.00%	2,096.39
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	7,289.69	3.53%	8,391,805	4.37%	1,151.19
65. 2G1	2,537.81	1.23%	2,921,870	1.52%	1,151.34
66. 2G	7,091.40	3.43%	8,010,885	4.17%	1,129.66
67. 3G1	3,677.83	1.78%	4,229,505	2.20%	1,150.00
68. 3G	3,991.25	1.93%	4,410,245	2.29%	1,104.98
69. 4G1	32,277.72	15.63%	29,621,410	15.41%	917.70
70. 4G	149,683.57	72.47%	134,638,270	70.04%	899.49
71. Total	206,549.27	100.00%	192,223,990	100.00%	930.64
Irrigated Total	102,310.29	29.55%	451,364,635	63.15%	4,411.72
Dry Total	33,514.10	9.68%	70,258,630	9.83%	2,096.39
Grass Total	206,549.27	59.67%	192,223,990	26.90%	930.64
72. Waste	2,956.95	0.85%	740,215	0.10%	250.33
73. Other	845.72	0.24%	127,525	0.02%	150.79
74. Exempt	6,753.22	1.95%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	346,176.33	100.00%	714,714,995	100.00%	2,064.60

Schedule X : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Ru	ral	Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	6,083.42	26,841,570	96,226.87	424,523,065	102,310.29	451,364,635
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	871.32	1,826,740	32,642.78	68,431,890	33,514.10	70,258,630
78. Grass	0.00	0	5,539.84	5,407,630	201,009.43	186,816,360	206,549.27	192,223,990
79. Waste	0.00	0	301.17	75,310	2,655.78	664,905	2,956.95	740,215
80. Other	0.00	0	109.96	9,005	735.76	118,520	845.72	127,525
81. Exempt	0.00	0	361.86	0	6,391.36	0	6,753.22	0
82. Total	0.00	0	12,905.71	34,160,255	333,270.62	680,554,740	346,176.33	714,714,995

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	102,310.29	29.55%	451,364,635	63.15%	4,411.72
Dry Land	33,514.10	9.68%	70,258,630	9.83%	2,096.39
Grass	206,549.27	59.67%	192,223,990	26.90%	930.64
Waste	2,956.95	0.85%	740,215	0.10%	250.33
Other	845.72	0.24%	127,525	0.02%	150.79
Exempt	6,753.22	1.95%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	346,176.33	100.00%	714,714,995	100.00%	2,064.60

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

88 Valley

	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	94,168,500	96,561,905	2,393,405	2.54%	1,777,180	0.65%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	36,771,375	36,537,755	-233,620	-0.64%	1,622,855	-5.05%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	130,939,875	133,099,660	2,159,785	1.65%	3,400,035	-0.95%
05. Commercial	35,232,825	25,851,440	-9,381,385	-26.63%	475,890	-27.98%
06. Industrial	0	11,887,515	11,887,515		1,889,725	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	23,080,210	23,710,435	630,225	2.73%	0	2.73%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	58,313,035	61,449,390	3,136,355	5.38%	2,365,615	1.32%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	189,252,910	194,553,345	5,300,435	2.80%	5,765,650	-0.25%
11. Irrigated	376,906,105	451,364,635	74,458,530	19.76%	Ď	
12. Dryland	58,031,425	70,258,630	12,227,205	21.07%	0	
13. Grassland	171,273,960	192,223,990	20,950,030	12.23%	ó	
14. Wasteland	741,465	740,215	-1,250	-0.17%	,)	
15. Other Agland	131,820	127,525	-4,295	-3.26%	ó	
16. Total Agricultural Land	607,084,775	714,714,995	107,630,220	17.73%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property	796,337,685	909,268,340	112,930,655	14.18%	5,765,650	13.46%
(Locally Assessed)						

Pamella K. Arnold Valley County Assessor 125 S. 15th Ord, NE 68862 (308) 728-5081 Fax: (308) 728-7725

2014

Plan of Assessment OCTOBER 31, 2014

Introduction:

Required by Law. Pursuant to Section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, the assessor shall submit a 3 Year Plan of Assessment to the County Board of Equalization on or before June 15, 2006, and every year thereafter. The Plan of Assessment shall be updated each year, on or before June 15th. This plan and any update is to examine the level of value, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county and include any proposed actions to be taken for the following year for the purpose of assuring uniform and proportionate assessments of real property.

Personnel Policy:

Valley County has a Personnel Policy last revised in January, 2010.

Personnel Count:

The office is comprised of the County Assessor, the Deputy Assessor and one full-time clerk. One hourly clerk is employed to certain assigned duties to help ease the work burden.

<u>Responsibilities:</u>

Record Maintenance / Mapping – Reg. 10-004.03:

The County Assessor has cadastral maps. The Cadastral Maps are circa 1965. The condition of the four books would best be described as Poor. New maps would be beneficial; however, I do not foresee such changes occurring due to financial restraints. We have a GIS mapping system.

Property Record Cards – Reg 10-004:

The County Assessor maintains both a computer ATR (Assessment Tax Record) / Appraisal record and a physical file folder. To the best of my knowledge, the rules and regulations are followed and include the required legal description, ownership, classification coding and all other pertinent information.

Report Generation:

This includes the Abstract of Assessment – Reg. 60-004.02 due March 19th, the Certificate of Valuation due August 20th, the School District Value Report due August 25th, the Certificate of Taxes Levied due December 1st, the Tax List Corrections- Reason

(Reg. 10-0029A) and the generation of the Tax Roll to be delivered to the Treasurer by November 22^{nd} .

Filing for Homestead Exemption:

All applications for Homestead Exemption and related forms are accepted per §77-3510 through §77-3528.

The full time clerk now oversees the daily administration of this program and provides verbal progress reports to the County Assessor. Courtesy correspondence is mass-mailed to all pre-printed form applicants and other individuals noted on a separate roster. Upon request from the applicant or agent thereof, applicable forms are mailed. Advertisements are posted in the local designated newspaper and other public relations acts may also occur. As a final courtesy, another correspondence is mailed approximately two weeks prior to the deadline to the remaining individuals to encourage their participation. The final weeks often illustrate the staff's diligent attempts to have complete success with the homestead exemption program.

For 2014 the county board did not vote to extend the deadline to July 20th under §77-3512.

The Department of Revenue count for Homestead Exemption for 2013 was 233 applications approved . Form 458S exempted \$9,966,235 in valuation and the tax loss was \$235,739.34.

Filing for Personal Property:

As per Reg. 20 and applicable statutes. Staff oversees the daily administration of personal property and provides County Assessor with verbal progress reports. Local addresses are abstracted from the first mass mailing of personal property forms in January to reduce costs. Schedules that bear out-of-county/state are mailed Advertisements are placed in the local newspaper to attract public awareness. A mass mailing of all remaining schedules / correspondence occurs by April. Due to the high cost of postage we no longer mail courtesy reminders. After May 1st we mail out schedules that haven't been filed with a 10% penalty & encourage them to file prior to July 1st to avoid a 25% penalty. The Personal Property Abstract is generated by June 15th deadline and is based upon all known schedules at this point in time. Even though Personal Property Abstract isn't filed with the State any longer.

Real Estate:

Real Property:

Level of Value:

2014 Level of Value for Residential is 97%; quality of assessment is acceptable. Commercial at 96%, quality of assessment is acceptable. Agricultural Land at 72%, quality of assessment is acceptable.

PA&T 2014 R&O Statistics dated	05/10/2014 read as follows:
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Residential:	# Sales	Med ian	COD (Median)	PRD
Qualified	110	97	11.88	102.83
Commercial				
Qualified	13	96	20.93	89.90
Agricultural				
Unimproved				

<u>Residential</u>: The city and villages are driven on an annual basis to review the exterior of the residential housing units and other neighborhood improvements. Data entry of the components is revised upon the discovery with the following year's "pick-up" work. This does not occur as readily in the rural areas because of time, access and budget restraints. All Residential improvements are on M&S pricing for 06/2011..

<u>Commercial</u>: Sales properties are reviewed and questionnaire's sent out at the time of sale to get as much information as possible. Commercial properties are also on M & S pricing for 06/11.

Agricultural: The improvements in the rural areas are now all on M & S 06/11 pricing. We continue to do sales studies to keep depreciation updated. Real estate sales transactions, UCC filings, "drive-by" observances, etc. Property owners brought in maps to check their irrigated acres so we could certify them to NRD. We typed labels for all parcels that have irrigated acres so NRD can do a mass mailing to get their irrigated acres certified. Irrigated acres were certified to FSA by January 1, 2008. Farmers have been certifying more irrigated acres since that January deadline.

No market areas have been defined as I continue to study sales and seek expertise from local representatives regarding this situation.

Computer Review:

The computer system is Terra-Scan, Manatron, A Thomson Reuters Business. of Lincoln, NE. GIS system is now being implemented. Ages of all photos range from current back to 1997 on all classes of property. A digital camera, which is compatible, was recently purchased and such photography project is in process as time permits. Sketches regarding residential housing units exist in each respective file folder. Maintenance as indicated.

Sketches of the commercial properties exist in each respective file folder. The commercial sketches have been entered into the computer system. This is a project intended for further revision / completion as physical review occurs.

Sketches of the rural housing exist in each respective file folder. Maintenance as indicated. The rural improvement site sketches are entered into the computer system. Information is available in each respective physical file folder.

Pricing / Depreciation:

New pricing, M&S 6/2011 was implemented for 2012. New depreciation tables were established for 2012 based upon sales study on residential properties in Valley County using the new Replacement Cost New due to the new cost tables. New depreciation tables were implemented for each City & Village & rural residential houses. Some pricing also affected some outbuilding codes.

Pickup Work:

The resources used to collect this data include building permits, zoning permits, owner (or other interested person) reporting, UCC filings, real estate sales transaction reviews, Register of Deed's Miscellaneous Book contents, anonymous leads, the local newspaper, drive-by observances, etc.

All classes of property are monitored for the collection of specific data relative to new construction, remodeling, renovations, additions, alterations and removals of existing improvements / structures, land use changes, etc. See 50-001.06. The field data is ordinary monitored by the full-time clerk throughout the course of the tax year and provides progress reports to the County Assessor. Data collection includes photography of the subject property. The purchase of a video camera occurred June 2002 and will assist with future appraisal maintenance. The County Assessor determines the assessed value and in recent years, expanded the Deputy Assessor duties to provide assistance. The majority of all "pick-up work" is completed by the office and not from outside appraisal services.

Sales Review:

Every attempt to timely file the 521's – Reg. 12-003 does occur on a monthly basis.

The real estate transfers once received from the Register of Deeds are given priority attention. It is a joint venture with contributions from the entire staff. The Assessor mails questionnaires and correspondence out to the Grantor and Grantee. Policy is to allow two weeks response time prior to any follow-up activity. All office records, computer, cadastral maps are updated. Sales book and photo bulletin board on residential transaction is staff-maintained for the benefit of the public sector.

Correspondence is mailed to current property owner to schedule appointment to complete an on-site physical inspection to review accuracy of property record file two to three times annually. The goal this year is to set aside specific dates each month to physically review the real estate transaction prior to mailing such forms and supplements to PA&T. Currently, such inspections are underway to bring the office closer to this goal and then proceed on a regular basis. Another procedure that is being done is to take adjacent property record files and complete an exterior review of the properties that aren't included with the sales file. Usually, a drive by of the neighborhood will include watching for new construction, renovations, etc. Any changes noted will result in the respective file being tagged for further review.

Office is striving to complete interior/exterior review of each residential and commercial transaction. More focus does need to occur on the rural residential and agricultural transactions. Agricultural properties have a high ratio of FSA section maps and land use reviews occurring. The County Assessor reviews each real estate transfer and ensuing information so collected prior to forwarding Form 521 to P.A.T. for their processing. The worksheets are now sent over the computer to P.A.T. The review includes discussion of the questionnaire responses, interviews that occurred with grantor, grantee, realtors, etc along with land use review, possible zoning use changes, coding changes, data listing, discovery as examples to determine whether transaction is a qualified sale or not. Further research may occur. The Assessor assigns a preliminary use coding and County Assessor assigns a final use coding. It is interesting to note that all the responses received from grantor and grantee may differ to a great extent; the same is true in discussion with information given to this office verses information given to state personnel or what a participating realtor may provide in sharing of information.

Valley County usually averages 100-150 real estate transfer forms on an annual basis. This office has taken great strides to monitor this program with greater accuracy in recent years. The questionnaire response rate is good; averaging at a 50% response overall and has been a good indicator that the majority of our records are accurate in listing data. The majority of the on-site physical reviews have been representative of the data listing of the property file also.

2015: Continue to review Residential properties in Ord City, to be completed by March, 2015. So far have done interior reviews on most of the homes. My staff & an outside lister are doing the reviews. Complete review of third tier of Rural properties in the County, houses & outbuildings. These would be Arcadia Township, Yale Township, Davis Creek Township, and Independent Township..

2016: Review North Loup Village.

2017: Review Elyria Village.

Property record files reflect a computer code for tax districts. The real estate cards also show school district codes. New cards are being made for all the parcels in the County.

We have completed entering information in the GIS mapping program & will use deeded acres.

Budget:

The fiscal budget submitted by the Assessor for 2014/2015 was \$143,482. Of the 143,482 submitted, 115,346 is associated with salaries & 9,200 is associated with office services, expenses and supplies, 7,000 for appraisal fees & 11,936 for data processing costs.

The County Board had me add my appraisal fees to my budget. I no longer have a separate appraisal budget. Now that we have GIS mapping and a web site, we have to pay maintenance on those. I would like to have GIS Workshop to do a fly over of our County.

Pamella K. Arnold Valley County Assessor Date

2015 Assessment Survey for Valley County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	One
4.	Other part-time employees:
	One
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$143,482
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	same as above
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$7,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$11,936 is for maintaince and licensing for GIS. The CAMA system comes from the general budget not from assessors budget.
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	none
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	1,284.24

1.	Administrative software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	N/A
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes – valley.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS
8.	Personal Property software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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?
	Ord, North Loup, Arcadia and Elyria
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal for commercial properties when needed.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	None

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Only on an as needed basis.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Meet the qualifications of the NE Real Property Appraiser Board.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	N/A
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	When they're used they provide a value subject to assessor's opinion.

Certification

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 Valley County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.

Ruth a. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrator



County 88 - Page 48