

## Rob M. Ogden

---

**From:** Barclay Sudol, Bridget <bridget.sudol@nebraska.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 27, 2015 12:00 PM  
**To:** Rob M. Ogden  
**Subject:** Lancaster Sales  
**Attachments:** Lancaster Analysis.xlsx; Lancaster Analysis.pdf

Rob,

I want to begin by apologizing for my late turnaround in getting this information to you. Our ag group was finally able to meet just yesterday regarding your ag sales and preliminary measurement.

Attached, you'll find both a spreadsheet and a pdf copy of that spreadsheet for ease of reading. Within it are the sales I intend to use to measure Lancaster County, located in the "Lancaster Sales" tab, as well as unofficial measurement results, located in the "Proposed Value Stats" tab.

The sales brought in as Lancaster's surrogate sales come from the counties that surround Lancaster. No sales were brought in from influenced portions of any county, no influenced sales were used in your measurement, and only sales with a comparable composition to Lancaster County were utilized.

You'll notice a few things in the measurements. I did split the county in half and do an analysis on the northern half versus the southern half, but the county-wide measurement is included as well. This was necessary because your comparable counties to the north and the comparable counties to the south are different from one another and sell differently from one another. Because of this, your northern half will always measure low and your southern half will always measure high. I've included hypothetical values (tab "Value Sets") to see what might work to not only ensure Lancaster measures in the acceptable range but also that it is as equalized as much as possible with the surrounding counties. You'll note that the overall measurement, while in range, comes in towards the top of the range. That is due to more sales from the southern half than the northern half being used in the analysis. No matter what values you end up using for 2015, your overall measurement should be on the high end for this same reasoning. If I had randomly selected sales to exclude from the southern half until the sample size was identical to the northern half, the measurement would also be lower. I didn't take this step, though, because you officially only have one market area and therefore it wasn't necessary. If you did have two market areas, they would have values independent of one another, again making the need to even up sales between northern and southern areas not necessary.

In the "Final Report" tab, the sales brought in for Lancaster are broken down into the subclasses and then compared to Lancaster's abstract of the same. County-wide, the sample brought in as Lancaster's surrogate sales are incredibly close to Lancaster's own agland. When the sample is broken down into the southern half and northern half, the northern half has more dry and the southern half has less dry than Lancaster's ag as a whole. My suspicion is that, if Lancaster's ag was also broken down into its northern half and southern half, those portions of the county would match up as well with their sample counterparts as the overall sample does with the entirety of Lancaster.

Now that you have this information, please let me know if you have any questions or have values you would like me to input into a measurement. So that you have time to review this information, I'll wait to hear from you regarding a meeting time to go over everything for the year.

