

NEBRASKA

Good Life. Great Service.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

**2025 REPORTS AND OPINIONS  
OF THE PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR**

---

**HAYES COUNTY**



April 7, 2025

Jim Pillen, Governor

Commissioner Hotz :

The 2025 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been compiled for Hayes County pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027](#). This Report and Opinion will inform the Tax Equalization and Review Commission of the level of value and quality of assessment for real property in Hayes County.

The information contained within the County Reports of the Appendices was provided by the county assessor pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1514](#).

For the Tax Commissioner

Sincerely,

Sarah Scott  
Property Tax Administrator  
402-471-5962

cc: Susan Messersmith, Hayes County Assessor

# Table of Contents

---

## **2025 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator:**

- Certification to the Commission
- Introduction
- County Overview
- Residential Correlation
- Commercial Correlation
- Agricultural Land Correlation
- Property Tax Administrator's Opinion

## **Appendices:**

- Commission Summary

### ***Statistical Reports and Displays:***

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Chart of Net Sales Compared to Commercial Assessed Value
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Table-Average Value of Land Capability Groups
- Special Valuation Statistics (if applicable)
  
- Market Area Map
- Valuation History Charts

### ***County Reports:***

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared to the Prior Year
- Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- Assessor Survey
- Three-Year Plan of Assessment
- Special Value Methodology (if applicable)
- Ad Hoc Reports Submitted by County (if applicable)

## Introduction

---

Pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027](#) the Property Tax Administrator (PTA) shall annually prepare and deliver to each county assessor and to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (Commission) the Reports and Opinions (R&O). The R&O contains statistical and narrative reports informing the Commission of the certified opinion of the PTA regarding the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in each county. In addition, the PTA may make nonbinding recommendations for class or subclass adjustments to be considered by the Commission.

The statistical and narrative reports in the R&O provide an analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The PTA's opinion of the level of value and quality of assessment in each county, is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and information gathered by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) regarding the assessment activities in the county during the preceding year.

The statistical reports are developed using the statewide sales file that contains all transactions as required by [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327](#). From this state sales file, a statistical analysis comparing assessments to sale prices for arm's-length sales (assessment sales ratio) is prepared. After analyzing all available information to determine that the sales represent the class or subclass of real property being measured, inferences are drawn regarding the level of assessment and quality of assessment of that class or subclass of real property. The statistical reports contained in the R&O are developed based on standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO).

The analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio studies and the overall quality of assessment in the county. The assessment practices are evaluated in the county to ensure generally accepted mass appraisal techniques are used and that those methods will generally produce uniform and proportionate valuations.

The PTA considers the statistical reports and the analysis of assessment practices when forming conclusions for both the level of value and quality of assessment. The consideration of both the statistical indicators and assessment processes used to develop valuations is necessary to accurately determine the level of value and quality of assessment. Assessment practices that produce a biased sales file will generally produce a biased statistical indicator, which, on its face, would otherwise appear to be valid. Likewise, statistics produced on small, unrepresentative, or otherwise unreliable samples, may indicate issues with assessment uniformity and assessment level; however, a detailed review of the practices and valuation models may suggest otherwise. For these reasons, the detail of the PTA's analysis is presented and contained within the Residential, Commercial, and Agricultural land correlations of the R&O.

### **Statistical Analysis:**

Before relying upon any calculated statistical measures to evaluate the assessment performance of the county assessor, the Division teammates must evaluate whether the statistical sample is both representative of the population and statistically reliable.

A statistically sufficient reliable sample of sales is one in which the features of the sample contain information necessary to compute an estimate of the population. To determine whether the sample of sales is sufficient in size to evaluate the class of real property, measures of reliability are considered, such as the coefficient of dispersion (COD) or the width of the confidence interval. Generally, the broader the qualitative measures, the more sales will be needed to have reliability in the ratio study.

A representative sample is a group of sales from a larger population of parcels, such that statistical indicators calculated from the sample can be expected to reflect the characteristics of the sold and unsold population being studied. The accuracy of statistics as estimators of the population depends on the degree to which the sample represents the population.

Since multiple factors affect whether a sample is statistically sufficient, reliable, and representative, single test thresholds cannot be used to make determinations regarding sample reliability or representativeness.

For the analysis in determining a point estimate of the level of value, the PTA considers three measures as indicators of the central tendency of assessment: the median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. The use and reliability of each measure is based on inherent strengths and weaknesses which are the quantity and quality of the information from which it was calculated and the defined scope of the analysis.

The median ratio is considered the most appropriate statistical measure to determine a level of value for direct equalization, which is the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to an unacceptable required level of value. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, adjusting the class or subclass of properties based upon the median measure will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present in the class of property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers, which can skew the outcome in the other measures.

The weighted mean ratio best reflects a comparison of the fully assessable valuation of a jurisdiction, by measuring the total assessed values against the total of selling prices. The weighted mean ratio can be heavily influenced by sales of large-dollar property with extreme ratios.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the Price Related Differential (PRD) and Coefficient of Variation (COV). As a simple average of the ratios, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of the level of value because it assumes a normal

distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

The quality of assessment relies in part on statistical indicators as well. If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the mean ratio, it may be an indication of disproportionate assessments. Assessments are disproportionate when properties within a class are assessed at noticeably different levels of market value. The coefficient produced by this calculation is referred to as the PRD and measures the assessment level of lower-priced properties relative to the assessment level of higher-priced properties. The PRD range stated in IAAO standards is 98% to 103%. A perfect match in assessment level between the low-dollar properties and high-dollar properties indicates a PRD of 100%. The reason for the extended range on the high end is the recognition by IAAO of the inherent bias in assessment. The IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies notes that the PRD is sensitive to sales with higher prices even if the ratio on higher priced sales do not appear unusual relative to other sales, and that small samples, samples with high dispersion, or extreme ratios may not provide an accurate indication of assessment regressivity or progressivity, appraisal biases that occur when high-value properties are appraised higher or lower than low-value properties in relation to market values.

The Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) is a measure also used in the evaluation of assessment quality. The COD measures the average absolute deviation calculated about the median and is expressed as a percentage of the median. A COD of 15% indicates that half of the assessment ratios are expected to fall within 15% of the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median the more equitable the property assessments tend to be.

Nebraska law does not provide for a range of acceptability for the COD or PRD; however, the IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies establishes the following range of acceptability for the COD:

General Property Class	Jurisdiction Size/Profile/Market Activity	COD Range
Residential improved (single family dwellings, condominiums, manuf. housing, 2-4 family units)	Very large jurisdictions/densely populated/newer properties/active markets	5.0 to 10.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/older & newer properties/less active markets	5.0 to 15.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/older properties/depressed market areas	5.0 to 20.0
Income-producing properties (commercial, industrial, apartments,)	Very large jurisdictions/densely populated/newer properties/active markets	5.0 to 15.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/older & newer properties/less active markets	5.0 to 20.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/older properties/depressed market areas	5.0 to 25.0
Residential vacant land	Very large jurisdictions/rapid development/active markets	5.0 to 15.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/slower development/less active markets	5.0 to 20.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/little development/depressed markets	5.0 to 25.0
Other (non-agricultural) vacant land	Very large jurisdictions/rapid development/active markets	5.0 to 20.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/slower development/less active markets	5.0 to 25.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/little development/depressed markets	5.0 to 30.0

A COD under 5% indicates that the properties in the sample are either unusually homogenous, or possibly indicative of a non-representative sample due to the selective reappraisal of sold parcels. The IAAO utilizes varying upper bounds for the COD range to recognize that sample size, property type, variation of property ages and market conditions directly impact the COD. This chart and the analyses of factors impacting the COD are considered to determine whether the calculated COD is within an acceptable range. The reliability of the COD can also be directly affected by extreme ratios.

The confidence interval is another measure used to evaluate the reliability of the statistical indicators. The PTA primarily relies upon the median confidence interval, although the mean and weighted mean confidence intervals are calculated as well. While there are no formal standards regarding the acceptable width of such measure, the range established is often useful in determining the range in which the true level of value is expected to exist. Pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023](#), the acceptable range is 69% to 75% of actual value for agricultural land, except for taxes levied to pay school bonds passed after January 12, 2022 for which the acceptable range is 44% to 50% of actual value. For all other classes of real property, the acceptable range is 92% to 100% of actual value.

### **Analysis of Assessment Practices:**

A review of the assessment practices that ultimately affect the valuation of real property in each county is completed. This review is done to ensure the reliability of the statistical analysis and to ensure generally accepted mass appraisal techniques are used to establish uniform and proportionate valuations. The review of assessment practices is based on information provided by the county assessors in Assessment Surveys and Assessed Value Updates (AVU), along with observed assessment practices in the county.

To ensure county assessors are submitting all Real Estate Transfer Statements, required for the development of the state sales file pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327](#), a random sample from the county registers of deeds' records is audited to confirm that the required sales have been submitted and reflect accurate information. The timeliness of the submission is also reviewed to ensure the sales file allows analysis of up-to-date information. The sales verification and qualification procedures used by the county assessors are reviewed to ensure that sales are properly considered arm's-length transactions unless determined to be otherwise through the verification process. Proper sales verification practices ensure the statistical analysis is based on an unbiased sample of sales.

Comparison of valuation changes on sold and unsold properties is conducted to ensure that there is no bias in the assessment of sold parcels and that the sales file adequately represents the population of parcels in the county.

Valuation groups and market areas are also examined to identify whether the groups and areas being measured truly represent economic areas within the county. The measurement of economic areas is the method by which the PTA ensures intra-county equalization exists. The progress of the county assessor's six-year inspection and review cycle is documented to ensure compliance with [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1311.03](#) and also to confirm that all property is being uniformly listed and described for valuation purposes.

Valuation methodologies developed by the county assessor are reviewed for both appraisal logic and to ensure compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. Methods and sales used to develop lot values, agricultural outbuildings, and agricultural site values are also reviewed to ensure the land component of the valuation process is based on the local market and economic area.

Compliance with statutory reporting requirements is also a component of the assessment practices review. Late, incomplete, or excessive errors in statutory reports can be problematic for property owners, county officials, the Division, the Commission, and others. The late, incomplete, or excessive errors in statutory reporting highlights potential issues in other areas of the assessment process. Public trust in the assessment process demands transparency, and assessment practices are reviewed to ensure taxpayers are served with such transparency.



Comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county is conducted throughout the year. When practical, if potential issues are identified, they are presented to the county assessor for clarification and correction, if necessary. The county assessor can then work to implement corrective measures prior to establishing assessed values. The PTA's conclusion that assessment quality either meets or does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal techniques is based on the totality of the assessment practices in the county.

*\*Further information may be found in Exhibit 94*



# County Overview

With a total area of 713 square miles, Hayes County has 846 residents, per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2023, a 2% population decline from the 2020 U.S. Census. Reports indicate that 71% of county residents are homeowners and 93% of residents occupy the same residence as in the prior year (Census Quick Facts). The average home value is \$93,334 (2024 Average Residential Value, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-3506.02).



There are few commercial parcels in Hayes County and the majority are located in and around the county seat of Hayes Center. According to information available from the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 17 employer establishments with total employment of 46. Agricultural land is the single largest contributor to the county’s valuation base. Irrigated land makes up a majority of the land in the county. Hayes County is included in the Middle Republican Natural Resources District (NRD).

## 2025 Residential Correlation for Hayes County

### *Assessment Practices & Actions*

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) annually conducts a comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county. The review examines the integrity of the sales data provided to the Division for its ratio studies, as well as the more subjective aspects of the assessment process. The portions of the review that most significantly influence determinations of assessment quality are described herein, along with the assessment actions taken by the county assessor in the current assessment year.

Residential sales in Hayes County are qualified at a similar rate as the state average. For any sale that is potentially an arm's-length transaction, the county assessor mails questionnaires to both the buyer and seller. Review of qualified and non-qualified sales supported that qualification appears to have been made without bias.

Residential properties in Hayes County are identified by three valuation groups. Hayes Center is the county seat and serves as the primary hub in the county with the only school district in the county. The villages, Hamlet and one street of Palisade, have a less competitive market and comprise the second valuation group. The final group is rural residential, which has a high demand.

The county assessor is up-to-date with the six-year inspection and review cycle requirements. The assessor has an established review cycle with one township reviewed each year. A written valuation methodology has been provided to the Division.

2025 Residential Assessment Details for Hayes County						
Valuation Group	Assessor Locations within Valuation Group	Depreciation Table Year	Costing Year	Lot Value Study Year	Last Inspection Year(s)	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
1	Hayes Center	2023	2022	2024	2021	
2	Hamlet & Palisade	2023	2022	2022-2024	2021	
4	Rural	2023	2022	2023	2022-2024*	Township 8 physically reviewed
Additional comments: Pick-up work was completed.						
* = assessment action for current year						

### *Description of Analysis*

As a rural county, Hayes Center has a small statistical sample of residential sales over a two-year study period. Two measures of central tendency are within range, but the mean, COD and PRD are all high, indicating the lack of correlation in the ratios. With a small sample and lack of correlation, the assessment practices will be used to determine the level of value.

The majority of sales occur in Valuation Group 1, where the median is in range and the mean is high and weighted mean is low. Valuation Group 2 only has two qualified sales and there were no sales available for analysis for rural residential, Valuation Group 3.

## 2025 Residential Correlation for Hayes County

---

The statistical sample and the 2025 County Abstract of Assessment, Form 45 Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) both show minimal valuation changes which is reflective of the assessment actions performed by the county assessor.

### *Equalization and Quality of Assessment*

With a small sample and unreliable statistics, review of the assessment practices are used to determine the quality of assessment in Hayes County. The quality of assessment for the residential class of real property in Hayes County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

VALUATION GROUP						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
1	10	94.34	105.38	88.03	30.98	119.71
4	2	153.16	153.16	157.12	14.68	97.48
____ALL____	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83

### *Level of Value*

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the residential property in Hayes County is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value.

## 2025 Commercial Correlation for Hayes County

### *Assessment Practices & Actions*

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) annually conducts a comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county. The review examines the integrity of the sales data provided to the Division for its ratio studies, as well as the more subjective aspects of the assessment process. The portions of the review that most significantly influence determinations of assessment quality are described herein, along with the assessment actions taken by the county assessor in the current assessment year.

There are very few commercial sales in Hayes County from year to year. Historically the Hayes County Assessor qualifies a higher-than-average percentage of commercial sales for statistical study; however, some years with only a couple of sales, the qualification percentage has been zero. No bias has been detected in the sales qualification process.

There is one valuation group for the commercial class; there are too few commercial properties in the county and fewer sales in the study period to warrant additional stratification.

The Hayes County Assessor typically reviews all properties by township. This year the county assessor reviewed all commercial properties in the county. A contract appraiser reviewed the feedlots, self-service gas station, machinist shop and hog farm with the assessor.

2025 Commercial Assessment Details for Hayes County						
Valuation Group	Assessor Locations within Valuation Group	Depreciation Table Year	Costing Year	Lot Value Study Year	Last Inspection Year(s)	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
1	Entire county	2025*	2024*	2025*	2024-2025*	
<u>Additional comments:</u> All commercial properties in the county were physically reviewed for the 2025 Assessment Year. It had been many years since all commercial properties were reviewed in the same year. A contract appraiser was hired to assist with the unique properties. Pick-up work was completed.  * = assessment action for current year						

### *Description of Analysis*

There are only two qualified sales in the study period, one ratio is in the acceptable range and the other ratio is high. The sample is too small to rely upon statistics for assessment uniformity.

Analysis of the 2025 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) reflects a change in valuation to commercial properties in the county. This is attributed to the reappraisal of all commercial properties in the county this year. The two properties that sold decreased in value due to deferred maintenance of one building and the other costed lower with the new depreciation tables. As a whole, the commercial class increased in value with the reappraisal.

## **2025 Commercial Correlation for Hayes County**

---

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

Based on the review of the county assessor's assessment practices for commercial property, the quality of assessment complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

### ***Level of Value***

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the commercial property in Hayes County is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value.

## 2025 Agricultural Correlation for Hayes County

---

### *Assessment Practices & Actions*

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) annually conducts a comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county. The review examines the integrity of the sales data provided to the Division for its ratio studies, as well as the more subjective aspects of the assessment process. The portions of the review that most significantly influence determinations of assessment quality are described herein, along with the assessment actions taken by the county assessor in the current assessment year.

Agricultural land sales in Hayes County have consistently been qualified at a typical rate. Examination of the sales qualification process revealed no apparent bias in the qualification determination. All arm's-length sales have been included in the state sales file for measurement of agricultural land property in the county. Only one market area is used for the agricultural land class as there are no identifiable characteristics that separate the county.

Agricultural homes and outbuildings are physically reviewed as part of the systematic review of the county by township. Agricultural land use is reviewed using aerial imagery based on the same schedule as the physical review.

The county assessor's office annually reviews Conservation Resource Program (CRP) and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) contracts; updates are made as needed. A regional market analysis of both CRP and CREP sales was conducted this year. CRP is valued at 80% of dryland values. CREP is valued the at 75% of irrigated land values. Waste value changed from \$25 to \$300, which is 50% of grassland value. The CREP contracts that came to the assessor's office list both irrigated CREP and dryland CREP. The dryland CREP receives a lower payment so the assessor's office followed the same valuation method as irrigated CREP and used 75% of dryland values.

2025 Agricultural Assessment Details for Hayes County						
		Depreciation Tables Year	Costing Year	Lot Value Study Year	Last Inspection Year(s)	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
AG OB	Agricultural outbuildings	2023	2019-2022	2023	2022-2024*	Township 8 physically reviewed
AB DW	Agricultural dwellings	2023	2022	2023	2022-2024*	Township 8 physically reviewed
<u>Additional comments:</u> Barns were put on Marshall & Swift costing this year. The county assessor has been working on a multi-year project to put all agricultural outbuildings on current CAMA costing. * = assessment action for current year						

## 2025 Agricultural Correlation for Hayes County

Market Area	Description of Unique Characteristics	Land Use Reviewed Year	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
1	Entire county	2020-2024*	Township 8 aerial imagery was reviewed
<u>Additional comments:</u> Agland is reviewed using the same schedule as physical review for Residential properties.  Irrigated land increased 18% Dryland increase 27% Grassland increased 3% CRP 80% of dryland CREP irrigated 75% of irrigated land CREP dryland 75% of dryland			

### *Description of Analysis*

All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range for the overall agricultural class. The COD is within the standard range. When stratified by 80% Majority Land Use (MLU), the county has single digit irrigated and dryland sales. While the median is in range for both, the other measures of central tendency are out of range. Thus, the review of irrigated and dryland values for Hayes County is best served by comparison to neighboring counties' values. The Average Acre Value Comparison chart demonstrates the values for each class of agricultural land are equalized with regional values. Hayes County irrigated values fall in the middle of the neighboring value array, between the values for Red Willow and Hitchcock Counties.

Dryland values in Hayes County are consistent with those of Dundy County and Lincoln County Market Area 3 and the entire region is very comparable to one another. There is a sufficient number of grassland sales to support the use of statistics as a measure of value and both the median and the mean are within range.

The changes made to the agricultural land as shown in the 2025 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) supports the stated assessment actions.

### *Equalization and Quality of Assessment*

Agricultural homes are inspected and valued the same as rural residential parcels in Hayes County. Agricultural improvements are equalized at the statutory level. Agricultural land values are equalized, uniformly representing market value. The quality of assessment of agricultural property in Hayes County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

## 2025 Agricultural Correlation for Hayes County

80%MLU By Market Area						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
____Irrigated____						
County	4	69.51	79.05	76.26	15.80	103.66
1	4	69.51	79.05	76.26	15.80	103.66
____Dry____						
County	9	69.23	82.00	80.40	25.49	101.99
1	9	69.23	82.00	80.40	25.49	101.99
____Grass____						
County	17	73.16	69.47	67.65	10.84	102.69
1	17	73.16	69.47	67.65	10.84	102.69
____ALL____	42	74.17	75.14	75.27	16.18	99.83

### *Level of Value*

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Hayes County is 74%.



## 2025 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hayes 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 (R.R.S. 2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	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, 2025.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah Scott", written over a horizontal line.

Sarah Scott  
Property Tax Administrator

## APPENDICES

---

## 2025 Commission Summary for Hayes County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	Median	99.28
Total Sales Price	\$1,171,833	Mean	113.35
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,171,833	Wgt. Mean	93.04
Total Assessed Value	\$1,090,290	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$51,940
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$97,653	Avg. Assessed Value	\$90,858

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	82.85 to 147.86
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	76.86 to 109.23
95% Mean C.I	85.87 to 140.83
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.71
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.56
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.23

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2024	19	94	94.57
2023	21	94	93.89
2022	14	100	105.47
2021	10	100	99.94

## 2025 Commission Summary for Hayes County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	2	Median	125.54
Total Sales Price	\$315,000	Mean	125.54
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$315,000	Wgt. Mean	99.10
Total Assessed Value	\$312,175	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$213,999
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$157,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$156,088

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	-226.02 to 477.10
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.16
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.08
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.24

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2024	1	100	104.31
2023	0	100	00.00
2022	3	100	105.83
2021	2	100	135.54

**43 Hayes**  
**RESIDENTIAL**
**PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2022 To 9/30/2024    Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 1,171,833  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,171,833  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,090,290  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 97,653  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 90,858

MEDIAN : 99  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 113  
 COD : 34.02  
 PRD : 121.83

COV : 38.16  
 STD : 43.25  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.78  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 193.25  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.68

95% Median C.I. : 82.85 to 147.86  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 76.86 to 109.23  
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.87 to 140.83

Printed:3/20/2025 10:53:03AM

**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-22 To 31-DEC-22	2	99.28	99.28	99.48	02.68	99.80	96.62	101.94	N/A	130,000	129,330
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23											
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	2	133.85	133.85	109.11	31.23	122.67	92.05	175.64	N/A	122,500	133,658
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	1	82.85	82.85	82.85	00.00	100.00	82.85	82.85	N/A	120,000	99,425
01-OCT-23 To 31-DEC-23	4	140.63	140.81	105.76	21.15	133.14	88.74	193.25	N/A	62,958	66,583
01-JAN-24 To 31-MAR-24	1	61.44	61.44	61.44	00.00	100.00	61.44	61.44	N/A	140,000	86,015
01-APR-24 To 30-JUN-24											
01-JUL-24 To 30-SEP-24	2	93.18	93.18	72.61	40.24	128.33	55.68	130.67	N/A	77,500	56,273
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	5	96.62	109.82	100.06	21.26	109.75	82.85	175.64	N/A	125,000	125,080
01-OCT-23 To 30-SEP-24	7	130.67	115.86	85.01	29.37	136.29	55.68	193.25	55.68 to 193.25	78,119	66,413
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-23 To 31-DEC-23	7	133.40	130.54	102.63	27.11	127.19	82.85	193.25	82.85 to 193.25	88,119	90,439
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858

**VALUATION GROUP**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	10	94.34	105.38	88.03	30.98	119.71	55.68	193.25	61.44 to 147.86	108,683	95,674
4	2	153.16	153.16	157.12	14.68	97.48	130.67	175.64	N/A	42,500	66,778
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858

**43 Hayes**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2022 To 9/30/2024    Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 1,171,833  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,171,833  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,090,290  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 97,653  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 90,858

MEDIAN : 99  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 113  
 COD : 34.02  
 PRD : 121.83

COV : 38.16  
 STD : 43.25  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.78  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 193.25  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.68

95% Median C.I. : 82.85 to 147.86  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 76.86 to 109.23  
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.87 to 140.83

*Printed: 3/20/2025 10:53:03AM*

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	2	170.56	170.56	170.56	13.31	100.00	147.86	193.25	N/A	18,000	30,700
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858
Greater Than 14,999	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858
Greater Than 29,999	10	94.34	101.90	90.58	27.29	112.50	55.68	175.64	61.44 to 133.40	113,583	102,889
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	2	170.56	170.56	170.56	13.31	100.00	147.86	193.25	N/A	18,000	30,700
30,000 TO 59,999	3	133.40	146.57	150.93	11.24	97.11	130.67	175.64	N/A	38,333	57,858
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999	5	82.85	79.71	79.83	19.66	99.85	55.68	101.94	N/A	128,000	102,182
150,000 TO 249,999	2	90.40	90.40	90.43	01.84	99.97	88.74	92.05	N/A	190,417	172,203
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.28	113.35	93.04	34.02	121.83	55.68	193.25	82.85 to 147.86	97,653	90,858

**43 Hayes**  
**COMMERCIAL**
**PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024    Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 2  
 Total Sales Price : 315,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 315,000  
 Total Assessed Value : 312,175  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 157,500  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 156,088

MEDIAN : 126  
 WGT. MEAN : 99  
 MEAN : 126  
 COD : 22.04  
 PRD : 126.68

COV : 31.17  
 STD : 39.13  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 27.67  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 153.21  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 97.87

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
 95% Mean C.I. : -226.02 to 477.10

Printed:3/20/2025 10:53:05AM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21											
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22											
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22											
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22											
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23											
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23											
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23											
01-OCT-23 To 31-DEC-23											
01-JAN-24 To 31-MAR-24											
01-APR-24 To 30-JUN-24											
01-JUL-24 To 30-SEP-24	1	153.21	153.21	153.21	00.00	100.00	153.21	153.21	N/A	7,000	10,725
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22											
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
01-OCT-23 To 30-SEP-24	1	153.21	153.21	153.21	00.00	100.00	153.21	153.21	N/A	7,000	10,725
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
01-JAN-23 To 31-DEC-23											
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088

**VALUATION GROUP**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088

**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	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088
04											
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088

43 Hayes  
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)  
Qualified  
Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024    Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 2	MEDIAN : 126	COV : 31.17	95% Median C.I. : N/A
Total Sales Price : 315,000	WGT. MEAN : 99	STD : 39.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
Total Adj. Sales Price : 315,000	MEAN : 126	Avg. Abs. Dev : 27.67	95% Mean C.I. : -226.02 to 477.10
Total Assessed Value : 312,175			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 157,500	COD : 22.04	MAX Sales Ratio : 153.21	
Avg. Assessed Value : 156,088	PRD : 126.68	MIN Sales Ratio : 97.87	


Printed:3/20/2025 10:53:05AM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
___Low \$ Ranges___											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	1	153.21	153.21	153.21	00.00	100.00	153.21	153.21	N/A	7,000	10,725
Less Than 30,000	1	153.21	153.21	153.21	00.00	100.00	153.21	153.21	N/A	7,000	10,725
___Ranges Excl. Low \$___											
Greater Than 4,999	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088
Greater Than 14,999	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
Greater Than 29,999	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
___Incremental Ranges___											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	153.21	153.21	153.21	00.00	100.00	153.21	153.21	N/A	7,000	10,725
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 TO 1,999,999											
2,000,000 TO 4,999,999											
5,000,000 TO 9,999,999											
10,000,000 +											
___ALL___	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
344	1	97.87	97.87	97.87	00.00	100.00	97.87	97.87	N/A	308,000	301,450
470	1	153.21	153.21	153.21	00.00	100.00	153.21	153.21	N/A	7,000	10,725
___ALL___	2	125.54	125.54	99.10	22.04	126.68	97.87	153.21	N/A	157,500	156,088



### Commercial & Industrial Value Change Vs. Net Taxable Sales Change



Tax Year	Value	Growth Value	% Growth of Value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Net Taxable Sales Value	% Chg Net Tax. Sales
2013	\$ 2,151,880	\$ 77,530	3.60%	\$ 2,074,350		\$ 1,264,203	
2014	\$ 2,151,980	\$ 3,970	0.18%	\$ 2,148,010	-0.18%	\$ 1,310,222	3.64%
2015	\$ 2,124,625	\$ 102,105	4.81%	\$ 2,022,520	-6.02%	\$ 1,140,269	-12.97%
2016	\$ 2,239,965	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,239,965	5.43%	\$ 1,080,073	-5.28%
2017	\$ 2,269,563	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,269,563	1.32%	\$ 930,973	-13.80%
2018	\$ 9,496,603	\$ 15,178,430	159.83%	\$ (5,681,827)	-350.35%	\$ 1,023,975	9.99%
2019	\$ 9,496,603	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 9,496,603	0.00%	\$ 1,190,582	16.27%
2020	\$ 9,529,378	\$ 49,010	0.51%	\$ 9,480,368	-0.17%	\$ 1,324,547	11.25%
2021	\$ 9,732,510	\$ 133,535	1.37%	\$ 9,598,975	0.73%	\$ 1,324,521	0.00%
2022	\$ 9,824,515	\$ 51,200	0.52%	\$ 9,773,315	0.42%	\$ 1,432,031	8.12%
2023	\$ 10,760,465	\$ 618,230	5.75%	\$ 10,142,235	3.23%	\$ 1,581,768	10.46%
2024	\$ 11,107,765	\$ 367,625	3.31%	\$ 10,740,140	-0.19%	\$ 1,484,594	-6.14%
Ann %chg	17.84%			Average	-31.43%	1.26%	1.96%

Tax Year	Cumulative Change		
	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg Value	Cmltv%chg Net Sales
2013	-	-	-
2014	-0.18%	0.00%	3.64%
2015	-6.01%	-1.27%	-9.80%
2016	4.09%	4.09%	-14.56%
2017	5.47%	5.47%	-26.36%
2018	-364.04%	341.32%	-19.00%
2019	341.32%	341.32%	-5.82%
2020	340.56%	342.84%	4.77%
2021	346.07%	352.28%	4.77%
2022	354.18%	356.55%	13.28%
2023	371.32%	400.05%	25.12%
2024	399.10%	416.19%	17.43%

County Number	43
County Name	Hayes

**43 Hayes****AGRICULTURAL LAND****PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024    Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 42  
 Total Sales Price : 20,224,972  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,224,972  
 Total Assessed Value : 15,222,465  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 481,547  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 362,440

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 75  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 16.18  
 PRD : 99.83

COV : 22.89  
 STD : 17.20  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.00  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 119.06  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.98

95% Median C.I. : 69.04 to 78.03  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.70 to 79.83  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.94 to 80.34

*Printed: 3/20/2025 10:53:07AM***DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	7	74.95	84.04	80.59	18.07	104.28	67.25	119.06	67.25 to 119.06	435,786	351,193
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	1	76.00	76.00	76.00	00.00	100.00	76.00	76.00	N/A	1,478,183	1,123,370
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	6	83.31	85.19	87.11	17.56	97.80	65.33	109.73	65.33 to 109.73	265,307	231,105
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	7	76.04	72.40	74.10	12.19	97.71	53.87	88.87	53.87 to 88.87	734,464	544,226
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22											
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	1	69.97	69.97	69.97	00.00	100.00	69.97	69.97	N/A	735,000	514,250
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	5	75.02	74.21	68.46	11.42	108.40	53.20	94.04	N/A	261,731	179,170
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	1	78.14	78.14	78.14	00.00	100.00	78.14	78.14	N/A	375,000	293,040
01-OCT-23 To 31-DEC-23	7	60.11	58.82	66.81	14.56	88.04	25.98	70.28	25.98 to 70.28	653,917	436,912
01-JAN-24 To 31-MAR-24	3	78.91	83.01	96.35	21.14	86.15	60.04	110.08	N/A	366,000	352,645
01-APR-24 To 30-JUN-24	3	73.16	70.55	68.04	07.94	103.69	60.53	77.96	N/A	208,770	142,047
01-JUL-24 To 30-SEP-24	1	81.93	81.93	81.93	00.00	100.00	81.93	81.93	N/A	242,812	198,930
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	21	76.04	80.11	77.94	16.06	102.78	53.87	119.06	67.25 to 86.62	536,275	417,997
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	7	75.02	74.17	70.42	09.72	105.33	53.20	94.04	53.20 to 94.04	345,522	243,306
01-OCT-23 To 30-SEP-24	14	68.08	68.17	72.45	17.67	94.09	25.98	110.08	59.89 to 78.91	467,467	338,671
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	14	77.50	78.14	76.96	14.80	101.53	53.87	109.73	65.33 to 88.87	586,520	451,399
01-JAN-23 To 31-DEC-23	14	69.51	66.49	68.06	14.54	97.69	25.98	94.04	59.33 to 75.41	499,720	340,109
<u>ALL</u>	42	74.17	75.14	75.27	16.18	99.83	25.98	119.06	69.04 to 78.03	481,547	362,440

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	42	74.17	75.14	75.27	16.18	99.83	25.98	119.06	69.04 to 78.03	481,547	362,440
<u>ALL</u>	42	74.17	75.14	75.27	16.18	99.83	25.98	119.06	69.04 to 78.03	481,547	362,440

**43 Hayes****AGRICULTURAL LAND****PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024    Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 42	MEDIAN : 74	COV : 22.89	95% Median C.I. : 69.04 to 78.03
Total Sales Price : 20,224,972	WGT. MEAN : 75	STD : 17.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.70 to 79.83
Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,224,972	MEAN : 75	Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.00	95% Mean C.I. : 69.94 to 80.34
Total Assessed Value : 15,222,465			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 481,547	COD : 16.18	MAX Sales Ratio : 119.06	
Avg. Assessed Value : 362,440	PRD : 99.83	MIN Sales Ratio : 25.98	

*Printed: 3/20/2025 10:53:07AM***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
____Dry____											
County	7	65.77	78.99	73.85	23.64	106.96	60.53	119.06	60.53 to 119.06	288,003	212,686
1	7	65.77	78.99	73.85	23.64	106.96	60.53	119.06	60.53 to 119.06	288,003	212,686
____Grass____											
County	15	72.80	68.07	66.97	11.07	101.64	53.20	80.00	59.89 to 75.41	325,267	217,836
1	15	72.80	68.07	66.97	11.07	101.64	53.20	80.00	59.89 to 75.41	325,267	217,836
____ALL____	42	74.17	75.14	75.27	16.18	99.83	25.98	119.06	69.04 to 78.03	481,547	362,440

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____Irrigated____											
County	4	69.51	79.05	76.26	15.80	103.66	67.11	110.08	N/A	930,325	709,465
1	4	69.51	79.05	76.26	15.80	103.66	67.11	110.08	N/A	930,325	709,465
____Dry____											
County	9	69.23	82.00	80.40	25.49	101.99	60.53	119.06	63.29 to 109.73	313,870	252,358
1	9	69.23	82.00	80.40	25.49	101.99	60.53	119.06	63.29 to 109.73	313,870	252,358
____Grass____											
County	17	73.16	69.47	67.65	10.84	102.69	53.20	86.62	59.89 to 77.96	300,555	203,326
1	17	73.16	69.47	67.65	10.84	102.69	53.20	86.62	59.89 to 77.96	300,555	203,326
____ALL____	42	74.17	75.14	75.27	16.18	99.83	25.98	119.06	69.04 to 78.03	481,547	362,440

## Hayes County 2025 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Hayes	1	3,810	3,810	3,680	3,680	3,545	3,545	3,410	3,410	<b>3,684</b>
Chase	1	4,669	4,670	4,545	4,545	4,415	4,415	4,415	4,398	<b>4,565</b>
Dundy	1	3,400	3,253	1,690	3,316	3,297	2,644	3,229	1,969	<b>3,252</b>
Frontier	1	4,143	4,156	4,082	4,139	4,100	4,076	4,029	3,958	<b>4,131</b>
Hitchcock	1	3,842	3,849	3,750	3,711	3,461	3,600	3,417	3,457	<b>3,799</b>
Lincoln	3	3,922	3,917	3,925	3,913	3,806	3,742	3,814	3,799	<b>3,838</b>
Lincoln	4	3,150	3,129	2,653	3,066	3,150	3,100	2,822	2,925	<b>3,059</b>
Perkins	1	5,692	5,718	4,903	5,553	5,488	5,020	5,373	5,362	<b>5,578</b>
Red Willow	1	3,660	3,660	3,499	3,430	3,315	2,117	2,851	2,823	<b>3,577</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Hayes	1	n/a	1,455	1,310	1,310	1,270	1,270	1,210	1,210	<b>1,404</b>
Chase	1	n/a	1,440	1,265	1,265	1,120	n/a	1,065	1,065	<b>1,350</b>
Dundy	1	n/a	1,690	n/a	1,290	1,290	n/a	1,050	1,050	<b>1,476</b>
Frontier	1	1,750	1,750	1,700	1,700	1,650	n/a	1,600	1,600	<b>1,727</b>
Hitchcock	1	1,570	1,570	1,470	1,470	1,370	1,370	1,220	1,220	<b>1,528</b>
Lincoln	3	n/a	1,425	1,425	1,425	1,375	1,375	1,375	1,375	<b>1,409</b>
Lincoln	4	1,275	1,275	1,275	1,275	1,275	1,200	1,200	1,200	<b>1,262</b>
Perkins	1	n/a	1,400	1,400	1,315	1,315	n/a	1,235	1,235	<b>1,356</b>
Red Willow	1	1,870	1,870	1,815	1,815	1,690	1,690	1,595	1,595	<b>1,833</b>


County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Hayes	1	600	600	n/a	600	600	600	600	600	<b>600</b>
Chase	1	821	n/a	1,050	834	660	708	692	698	<b>706</b>
Dundy	1	590	n/a	n/a	590	n/a	590	590	590	<b>590</b>
Frontier	1	765	765	765	n/a	765	765	765	765	<b>765</b>
Hitchcock	1	650	650	650	650	n/a	650	650	650	<b>650</b>
Lincoln	3	823	825	825	825	825	770	770	770	<b>775</b>
Lincoln	4	975	975	975	975	975	850	850	850	<b>966</b>
Perkins	1	690	n/a	n/a	690	n/a	690	690	690	<b>690</b>
Red Willow	1	1,085	1,019	846	838	835	841	844	933	<b>873</b>

County	Mkt Area	CRP	TIMBER	WASTE
Hayes	1	1,187	n/a	294
Chase	1	787	n/a	20
Dundy	1	800	n/a	75
Frontier	1	1,310	n/a	n/a
Hitchcock	1	1,676	n/a	n/a
Lincoln	3	1,105	n/a	425
Lincoln	4	n/a	n/a	430
Perkins	1	766	n/a	80
Red Willow	1	1,454	835	100

Source: 2025 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX and Grass Detail from Schedule XIII.

CRP and TIMBER values are weighted averages from Schedule XIII, line 104 and 113.

# HAYES COUNTY




## Legend

- Market\_Area
- County
- Registered\_WellsDNR
- geocode
- Federal Roads

## Soils CLASS

- Excessive drained sandy soils formed in alluvium in valleys and eolian sand on uplands in sandhills
- Excessively drained sandy soils formed in eolian sands on uplands in sandhills
- Moderately well drained silty soils on uplands and in depressions formed in loess
- Well drained silty soils formed in loess on uplands
- Well drained silty soils formed in loess and alluvium on stream terraces
- Well to somewhat excessively drained loamy soils formed in weathered sandstone and eolian material on uplands
- Somewhat poorly drained soils formed in alluvium on bottom lands
- Moderately well drained silty soils with clay subsoils on uplands
- Lakes

CHART 1 - REAL PROPERTY VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational (1)				Commercial & Industrial (1)				Total Agricultural Land (1)			
	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg
2014	9,189,579	-	-	-	2,151,980	-	-	-	385,807,875	-	-	-
2015	9,433,532	243,953	2.65%	2.65%	2,124,625	-27,355	-1.27%	-1.27%	466,606,880	80,799,005	20.94%	20.94%
2016	10,809,705	1,376,173	14.59%	17.63%	2,239,965	115,340	5.43%	4.09%	493,290,281	26,683,401	5.72%	27.86%
2017	10,820,030	10,325	0.10%	17.74%	2,269,563	29,598	1.32%	5.46%	482,461,115	-10,829,166	-2.20%	25.05%
2018	10,254,155	-565,875	-5.23%	11.58%	9,496,603	7,227,040	318.43%	341.30%	435,472,405	-46,988,710	-9.74%	12.87%
2019	11,237,755	983,600	9.59%	22.29%	9,496,603	0	0.00%	341.30%	403,933,340	-31,539,065	-7.24%	4.70%
2020	11,352,285	114,530	1.02%	23.53%	9,529,378	32,775	0.35%	342.82%	382,641,840	-21,291,500	-5.27%	-0.82%
2021	11,568,399	216,114	1.90%	25.89%	9,732,510	203,132	2.13%	352.26%	403,242,360	20,600,520	5.38%	4.52%
2022	12,620,749	1,052,350	9.10%	37.34%	9,826,305	93,795	0.96%	356.62%	426,250,445	23,008,085	5.71%	10.48%
2023	16,305,490	3,684,741	29.20%	77.43%	10,808,705	982,400	10.00%	402.27%	440,010,330	13,759,885	3.23%	14.05%
2024	17,363,865	1,058,375	6.49%	88.95%	11,099,970	291,265	2.69%	415.80%	490,844,825	50,834,495	11.55%	27.23%

Rate Annual %chg: Residential & Recreational **6.57%**

Commercial & Industrial **17.83%**

Agricultural Land **2.44%**

Cnty# **43**  
County **HAYES**


CHART 1

(1) Residential & Recreational excludes Agric. dwelling & farm home site land. Commercial & Industrial excludes minerals. Agricultural land includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste, & other agland, excludes farm site land.

Source: 2014 - 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

Prepared as of 02/11/2025

CHART 2 - REAL PROPERTY & GROWTH VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational (1)						Commercial & Industrial (1)					
	Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth
2014	9,189,579	228,800	2.49%	8,960,779	--	--	2,151,980	3,970	0.18%	2,148,010	--	--
2015	9,433,532	20,525	0.22%	9,413,007	2.43%	2.43%	2,124,625	102,105	4.81%	2,022,520	-6.02%	-6.02%
2016	10,809,705	104,210	0.96%	10,705,495	13.48%	16.50%	2,239,965	0	0.00%	2,239,965	5.43%	4.09%
2017	10,820,030	51,875	0.48%	10,768,155	-0.38%	17.18%	2,269,563	0	0.00%	2,269,563	1.32%	5.46%
2018	10,254,155	15,190	0.15%	10,238,965	-5.37%	11.42%	9,496,603	15,178,430	159.83%	-5,681,827	-350.35%	-364.03%
2019	11,237,755	483,375	4.30%	10,754,380	4.88%	17.03%	9,496,603	0	0.00%	9,496,603	0.00%	341.30%
2020	11,352,285	40,620	0.36%	11,311,665	0.66%	23.09%	9,529,378	49,010	0.51%	9,480,368	-0.17%	340.54%
2021	11,568,399	352,300	3.05%	11,216,099	-1.20%	22.05%	9,732,510	133,535	1.37%	9,598,975	0.73%	346.05%
2022	12,620,749	0	0.00%	12,620,749	9.10%	37.34%	9,826,305	51,200	0.52%	9,775,105	0.44%	354.24%
2023	16,305,490	258,675	1.59%	16,046,815	27.15%	74.62%	10,808,705	618,230	5.72%	10,190,475	3.71%	373.54%
2024	17,363,865	185,925	1.07%	17,177,940	5.35%	86.93%	11,099,970	367,625	3.31%	10,732,345	-0.71%	398.72%
Rate Ann%chg	6.57%	Resid & Recreat w/o growth				5.61%	17.83%	C & I w/o growth				-34.56%

Tax Year	Ag Improvements & Site Land (1)						Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth
	Agric. Dwelling & Homesite Value	Ag Outbldg & Farmsite Value	Ag Imprv+Site Total Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth		
2014	12,913,653	12,766,066	25,679,719	595,865	2.32%	25,083,854	--	--
2015	12,654,883	13,197,418	25,852,301	545,476	2.11%	25,306,825	-1.45%	-1.45%
2016	16,469,860	13,939,330	30,409,190	860,535	2.83%	29,548,655	14.30%	15.07%
2017	16,652,240	13,987,745	30,639,985	464,225	1.52%	30,175,760	-0.77%	17.51%
2018	17,385,865	14,185,560	31,571,425	191,620	0.61%	31,379,805	2.41%	22.20%
2019	16,951,560	14,139,255	31,090,815	50,000	0.16%	31,040,815	-1.68%	20.88%
2020	16,860,455	14,412,845	31,273,300	466,280	1.49%	30,807,020	-0.91%	19.97%
2021	16,908,950	14,412,080	31,321,030	169,790	0.54%	31,151,240	-0.39%	21.31%
2022	20,441,785	14,521,635	34,963,420	114,890	0.33%	34,848,530	11.26%	35.70%
2023	27,933,750	15,790,085	43,723,835	97,655	0.22%	43,626,180	24.78%	69.89%
2024	28,893,920	16,604,680	45,498,600	420,055	0.92%	45,078,545	3.10%	75.54%
Rate Ann%chg	8.39%	2.66%	5.89%	Ag Imprv+Site w/o growth			5.06%	

(1) Residential & Recreational excludes AgDwelling & farm home site land; Comm. & Indust. excludes minerals; Agric. land includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste & other agland, excludes farm site land.  
 Real property growth is value attributable to new construction, additions to existing buildings, and any improvements to real property which increase the value of such property.  
 Sources:  
 Value; 2014 - 2024 CTL  
 Growth Value; 2014 - 2024 Abstract of Asmnt Rpt.  
 Prepared as of 02/11/2025


Cnty# 43  
 County HAYES

CHART 2

NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division



CHART 3 - AGRICULTURAL LAND VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024



Tax Year	Irrigated Land				Dryland				Grassland			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2014	153,917,495	-	-	-	129,507,400	-	-	-	102,362,135	-	-	-
2015	195,864,390	41,946,895	27.25%	27.25%	149,360,835	19,853,435	15.33%	15.33%	121,337,765	18,975,630	18.54%	18.54%
2016	209,523,810	13,659,420	6.97%	36.13%	144,099,135	-5,261,700	-3.52%	11.27%	139,523,965	18,186,200	14.99%	36.30%
2017	203,277,610	-6,246,200	-2.98%	32.07%	136,447,150	-7,651,985	-5.31%	5.36%	142,548,840	3,024,875	2.17%	39.26%
2018	174,234,345	-29,043,265	-14.29%	13.20%	112,161,600	-24,285,550	-17.80%	-13.39%	148,802,325	6,253,485	4.39%	45.37%
2019	161,690,725	-12,543,620	-7.20%	5.05%	95,406,725	-16,754,875	-14.94%	-26.33%	146,560,820	-2,241,505	-1.51%	43.18%
2020	150,329,410	-11,361,315	-7.03%	-2.33%	86,529,275	-8,877,450	-9.30%	-33.19%	145,492,920	-1,067,900	-0.73%	42.14%
2021	172,233,695	21,904,285	14.57%	11.90%	86,047,595	-481,680	-0.56%	-33.56%	144,670,820	-822,100	-0.57%	41.33%
2022	195,416,725	23,183,030	13.46%	26.96%	85,905,950	-141,645	-0.16%	-33.67%	144,638,250	-32,570	-0.02%	41.30%
2023	196,689,710	1,272,985	0.65%	27.79%	91,746,125	5,840,175	6.80%	-29.16%	151,140,215	6,501,965	4.50%	47.65%
2024	217,285,605	20,595,895	10.47%	41.17%	109,730,020	17,983,895	19.60%	-15.27%	163,399,345	12,259,130	8.11%	59.63%

Rate Ann.%chg: Irrigated **3.51%** Dryland **-1.64%** Grassland **4.79%**

Tax Year	Waste Land (1)				Other Agland (1)				Total Agricultural			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2014	9,550	-	-	-	11,295	-	-	-	385,807,875	-	-	-
2015	17,470	7,920	82.93%	82.93%	26,420	15,125	133.91%	133.91%	466,606,880	80,799,005	20.94%	20.94%
2016	9,761	-7,709	-44.13%	2.21%	133,610	107,190	405.72%	1082.91%	493,290,281	26,683,401	5.72%	27.86%
2017	2,445	-7,316	-74.95%	-74.40%	185,070	51,460	38.52%	1538.51%	482,461,115	-10,829,166	-2.20%	25.05%
2018	1,690	-755	-30.88%	-82.30%	272,445	87,375	47.21%	2312.08%	435,472,405	-46,988,710	-9.74%	12.87%
2019	1,690	0	0.00%	-82.30%	273,380	935	0.34%	2320.36%	403,933,340	-31,539,065	-7.24%	4.70%
2020	16,855	15,165	897.34%	76.49%	273,380	0	0.00%	2320.36%	382,641,840	-21,291,500	-5.27%	-0.82%
2021	16,855	0	0.00%	76.49%	273,395	15	0.01%	2320.50%	403,242,360	20,600,520	5.38%	4.52%
2022	16,850	-5	-0.03%	76.44%	272,670	-725	-0.27%	2314.08%	426,250,445	23,008,085	5.71%	10.48%
2023	16,850	0	0.00%	76.44%	417,430	144,760	53.09%	3595.71%	440,010,330	13,759,885	3.23%	14.05%
2024	16,850	0	0.00%	76.44%	413,005	-4,425	-1.06%	3556.53%	490,844,825	50,834,495	11.55%	27.23%

Cnty# **43**  
County **HAYES**

Rate Ann.%chg: Total Agric Land **2.44%**

**CHART 4 - AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024 (from County Abstract Reports)(<sup>1</sup>)**

Tax Year	IRRIGATED LAND					DRYLAND					GRASSLAND				
	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre
2014	153,738,415	67,366	2,282			133,390,660	115,077	1,159			100,004,165	270,495	370		
2015	194,031,675	67,238	2,886	26.45%	26.45%	150,450,715	111,411	1,350	16.50%	16.50%	120,939,045	272,844	443	19.89%	19.89%
2016	208,782,060	68,962	3,028	4.91%	32.66%	144,951,840	109,072	1,329	-1.59%	14.66%	139,473,575	271,056	515	16.09%	39.18%
2017	203,251,635	68,715	2,958	-2.30%	29.61%	136,708,820	103,857	1,316	-0.95%	13.56%	142,379,265	274,587	519	0.77%	40.25%
2018	173,874,695	68,831	2,526	-14.60%	10.69%	114,815,360	102,780	1,117	-15.13%	-3.63%	146,609,430	274,842	533	2.88%	44.28%
2019	161,707,580	68,818	2,350	-6.98%	2.96%	95,425,935	100,328	951	-14.86%	-17.95%	146,543,900	277,311	528	-0.93%	42.94%
2020	150,329,410	69,123	2,175	-7.45%	-4.70%	86,529,275	100,339	862	-9.33%	-25.60%	145,492,925	276,369	526	-0.38%	42.39%
2021	172,824,515	69,092	2,501	15.02%	9.61%	86,443,965	100,218	863	0.02%	-25.59%	145,419,755	276,567	526	-0.12%	42.22%
2022	195,075,635	68,892	2,832	13.20%	24.08%	85,921,600	99,586	863	0.03%	-25.57%	144,701,680	275,340	526	-0.05%	42.15%
2023	196,829,740	69,512	2,832	0.00%	24.08%	91,710,785	99,535	921	6.79%	-20.51%	151,134,010	274,759	550	4.67%	48.78%
2024	217,282,375	69,570	3,123	10.30%	36.86%	109,873,125	99,456	1,105	19.90%	-4.69%	163,827,690	275,046	596	8.29%	61.11%

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre:

3.52%

-1.92%

5.06%

Tax Year	WASTE LAND (2)					OTHER AGLAND (2)					TOTAL AGRICULTURAL LAND (1)				
	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre
2014	12,735	508	25			2,450	5	490			387,148,425	453,451	854		
2015	9,125	364	25	0.06%	0.06%	16,075	33	490	0.02%	0.02%	465,446,635	451,890	1,030	20.64%	20.64%
2016	10,046	178	56	124.87%	125.00%	113,560	232	490	-0.01%	0.01%	493,331,081	449,499	1,098	6.55%	28.55%
2017	2,445	98	25	-55.62%	-0.15%	185,070	378	490	0.00%	0.01%	482,527,235	447,634	1,078	-1.78%	26.26%
2018	1,690	68	25	-0.27%	-0.42%	274,375	560	490	0.00%	0.01%	435,575,550	447,080	974	-9.62%	14.11%
2019	1,690	68	25	0.00%	-0.42%	272,445	556	490	0.00%	0.00%	403,951,550	447,081	904	-7.26%	5.83%
2020	16,855	674	25	0.28%	-0.14%	273,380	558	490	0.00%	0.00%	382,641,845	447,063	856	-5.27%	0.25%
2021	16,855	674	25	0.00%	-0.14%	273,395	558	490	0.00%	0.00%	404,978,485	447,109	906	5.83%	6.09%
2022	16,855	674	25	0.00%	-0.14%	272,670	556	490	0.00%	0.00%	425,988,440	445,048	957	5.67%	12.11%
2023	16,850	674	25	-0.03%	-0.17%	417,430	556	750	53.09%	53.10%	440,108,815	445,036	989	3.32%	15.83%
2024	16,850	674	25	0.00%	-0.17%	417,430	556	750	0.00%	53.10%	491,417,470	445,301	1,104	11.59%	29.26%

43

HAYES

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre:

2.41%

(1) Valuations from County Abstracts vs Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports (CTL) will vary due to different reporting dates. Source: 2014 - 2024 County Abstract Reports  
Agland Assessment Level 1998 to 2006 = 80%; 2007 & forward = 75% NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 02/11/2025

CHART 4

Pop.	County:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsdReal	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
856	HAYES	33,449,182	4,146,311	6,302,189	17,363,865	11,099,970	0	0	490,844,825	28,893,920	16,604,680	1,046,740	609,751,682
cnty sectorvalue % of total value:		5.49%	0.68%	1.03%	2.85%	1.82%			80.50%	4.74%	2.72%	0.17%	100.00%
Pop.	Municipality:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsd Real	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
27	HAMLET	153	70,532	340,875	895,075	349,855	0	0	19,365	0	3,130	0	1,678,985
3.15%	%sector of county sector	0.00%	1.70%	5.41%	5.15%	3.15%			0.00%		0.02%		0.28%
	%sector of municipality	0.01%	4.20%	20.30%	53.31%	20.84%			1.15%		0.19%		100.00%
224	HAYES CENTER	92,692	282,467	32,195	7,637,745	2,612,240	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,657,339
26.17%	%sector of county sector	0.28%	6.81%	0.51%	43.99%	23.53%							1.75%
	%sector of municipality	0.87%	2.65%	0.30%	71.67%	24.51%							100.00%
294	PALISADE	0	5,073	827	427,370	26,845	0	0	0	0	0	0	460,115
34.35%	%sector of county sector		0.12%	0.01%	2.46%	0.24%				0.24%			0.08%
	%sector of municipality		1.10%	0.18%	92.86%	5.83%							100.00%
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
546	Total Municipalities	92,845	358,072	373,897	8,960,193	2,988,941	0	0	19,365	0	3,130	0	12,796,442
63.74%	%all municip.sectors of cnty	0.28%	8.64%	5.93%	51.60%	26.93%			0.00%		0.02%		2.10%

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 2,523	Value : 645,281,510	Growth 1,772,980	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
---	-----------------	---------------------	------------------	------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	49	202,120	0	0	58	365,025	107	567,145	
02. Res Improve Land	158	840,945	0	0	52	1,301,500	210	2,142,445	
03. Res Improvements	161	7,924,215	0	0	69	6,869,965	230	14,794,180	
04. Res Total	210	8,967,280	0	0	127	8,536,490	337	17,503,770	165,755
% of Res Total	62.31	51.23	0.00	0.00	37.69	48.77	13.36	2.71	9.35
05. Com UnImp Land	12	37,315	0	0	1	1,275	13	38,590	
06. Com Improve Land	38	191,820	0	0	13	144,090	51	335,910	
07. Com Improvements	39	3,044,215	0	0	13	10,491,220	52	13,535,435	
08. Com Total	51	3,273,350	0	0	14	10,636,585	65	13,909,935	541,410
% of Com Total	78.46	23.53	0.00	0.00	21.54	76.47	2.58	2.16	30.54
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. 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	210	8,967,280	0	0	127	8,536,490	337	17,503,770	165,755
% of Res & Rec Total	62.31	51.23	0.00	0.00	37.69	48.77	13.36	2.71	9.35
Com & Ind Total	51	3,273,350	0	0	14	10,636,585	65	13,909,935	541,410
% of Com & Ind Total	78.46	23.53	0.00	0.00	21.54	76.47	2.58	2.16	30.54
17. Taxable Total	261	12,240,630	0	0	141	19,173,075	402	31,413,705	707,165
% of Taxable Total	64.93	38.97	0.00	0.00	35.07	61.03	15.93	4.87	39.89

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		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		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					0	0	0

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	10	885,540	10	885,540	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	10	885,540	10	885,540	0

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	41	0	48	89

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,657	418,317,995	1,657	418,317,995
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	20,860	0	0	443	157,110,010	444	157,130,870
29. Ag Improvements	1	2,130	0	0	453	37,531,270	454	37,533,400

30. Ag Total				2,111	612,982,265
--------------	--	--	--	-------	-------------

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	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	1	1.00	1,000	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	2,130	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	1	7.40	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	12	11.02	275,500	12	11.02	275,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	246	261.38	6,534,500	246	261.38	6,534,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	256	0.00	22,864,660	256	0.00	22,864,660	724,155
34. HomeSite Total				268	272.40	29,674,660	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	93	174.59	174,590	93	174.59	174,590	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	415	1,946.72	1,946,720	416	1,947.72	1,947,720	
37. FarmSite Improvements	444	0.00	14,666,610	445	0.00	14,668,740	341,660
38. FarmSite Total				538	2,122.31	16,791,050	
39. Road & Ditches	1,414	5,311.87	0	1,415	5,319.27	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				806	7,713.98	46,465,710	1,065,815

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	2	98.42	46,265	2	98.42	46,265

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. Market Value	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

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	6,833.63	10.10%	26,036,140	10.45%	3,810.00
46. 1A	28,403.79	42.00%	108,218,490	43.43%	3,810.00
47. 2A1	955.63	1.41%	3,516,725	1.41%	3,680.01
48. 2A	7,264.67	10.74%	26,733,950	10.73%	3,680.00
49. 3A1	16,330.03	24.14%	57,889,935	23.23%	3,545.00
50. 3A	339.43	0.50%	1,203,305	0.48%	3,545.08
51. 4A1	6,019.46	8.90%	20,526,390	8.24%	3,410.01
52. 4A	1,489.10	2.20%	5,077,840	2.04%	3,410.01
53. Total	67,635.74	100.00%	249,202,775	100.00%	3,684.48
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	72,510.03	73.12%	105,502,150	75.77%	1,455.00
56. 2D1	1,946.42	1.96%	2,549,795	1.83%	1,309.99
57. 2D	5,982.73	6.03%	7,837,430	5.63%	1,310.01
58. 3D1	11,243.28	11.34%	14,279,020	10.25%	1,270.00
59. 3D	349.72	0.35%	444,165	0.32%	1,270.06
60. 4D1	3,776.04	3.81%	4,569,000	3.28%	1,210.00
61. 4D	3,361.53	3.39%	4,067,550	2.92%	1,210.03
62. Total	99,169.75	100.00%	139,249,110	100.00%	1,404.15
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,323.75	0.48%	1,448,360	0.82%	1,094.13
64. 1G	1,008.49	0.36%	2,341,390	1.32%	2,321.68
65. 2G1	67.30	0.02%	159,825	0.09%	2,374.81
66. 2G	1,020.02	0.37%	902,450	0.51%	884.74
67. 3G1	357.12	0.13%	908,500	0.51%	2,543.96
68. 3G	174,625.08	63.04%	111,167,855	62.72%	636.61
69. 4G1	96,832.27	34.96%	59,018,645	33.30%	609.49
70. 4G	1,771.87	0.64%	1,284,250	0.72%	724.80
71. Total	277,005.90	100.00%	177,231,275	100.00%	639.81
Irrigated Total	67,635.74	15.20%	249,202,775	43.99%	3,684.48
Dry Total	99,169.75	22.28%	139,249,110	24.58%	1,404.15
Grass Total	277,005.90	62.24%	177,231,275	31.28%	639.81
72. Waste	673.69	0.15%	197,870	0.03%	293.71
73. Other	556.70	0.13%	635,525	0.11%	1,141.59
74. Exempt	2,517.44	0.57%	1,684,445	0.30%	669.11
75. Market Area Total	445,041.78	100.00%	566,516,555	100.00%	1,272.95



Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	67,635.74	249,202,775	67,635.74	249,202,775
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	99,169.75	139,249,110	99,169.75	139,249,110
78. Grass	33.10	19,860	0.00	0	276,972.80	177,211,415	277,005.90	177,231,275
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	673.69	197,870	673.69	197,870
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	556.70	635,525	556.70	635,525
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,517.44	1,684,445	2,517.44	1,684,445
82. Total	33.10	19,860	0.00	0	445,008.68	566,496,695	445,041.78	566,516,555

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	67,635.74	15.20%	249,202,775	43.99%	3,684.48
Dry Land	99,169.75	22.28%	139,249,110	24.58%	1,404.15
Grass	277,005.90	62.24%	177,231,275	31.28%	639.81
Waste	673.69	0.15%	197,870	0.03%	293.71
Other	556.70	0.13%	635,525	0.11%	1,141.59
Exempt	2,517.44	0.57%	1,684,445	0.30%	669.11
Total	445,041.78	100.00%	566,516,555	100.00%	1,272.95

Schedule XI : Residential Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line#</u> <u>Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
83.1 Hamlet	26	83,715	33	123,790	33	678,745	59	886,250	0
83.2 Hayes Center	21	105,260	115	654,660	118	6,883,395	139	7,643,315	1,820
83.3 Palisade	1	2,800	10	62,495	10	362,075	11	427,370	0
83.4 Rural	59	375,370	52	1,301,500	69	6,869,965	128	8,546,835	163,935
84 Residential Total	107	567,145	210	2,142,445	230	14,794,180	337	17,503,770	165,755

Schedule XII : Commercial Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line#</u>	<u>I Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
		<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
85.1	Hamlet	6	14,365	9	48,440	10	374,435	16	437,240	0
85.2	Hayes Center	5	20,550	35	222,380	35	3,089,950	40	3,332,880	228,865
85.3	Palisade	1	2,400	0	0	0	0	1	2,400	0
85.4	Rural	1	1,275	7	65,090	7	10,071,050	8	10,137,415	312,545
86	Commercial Total	13	38,590	51	335,910	52	13,535,435	65	13,909,935	541,410

## Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area

## Market Area 1

Pure Grass	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
87. 1G1	1,024.83	0.40%	614,865	0.40%	599.97
88. 1G	230.64	0.09%	138,395	0.09%	600.05
89. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
90. 2G	873.90	0.34%	524,340	0.34%	600.00
91. 3G1	18.80	0.01%	11,280	0.01%	600.00
92. 3G	159,033.28	61.59%	95,420,100	61.59%	600.00
93. 4G1	95,401.12	36.94%	57,240,685	36.94%	600.00
94. 4G	1,650.71	0.64%	990,415	0.64%	599.99
95. Total	258,233.28	100.00%	154,940,080	100.00%	600.00
CRP					
96. 1C1	298.92	1.59%	833,495	3.74%	2,788.35
97. 1C	777.85	4.14%	2,202,995	9.88%	2,832.16
98. 2C1	67.30	0.36%	159,825	0.72%	2,374.81
99. 2C	146.12	0.78%	378,110	1.70%	2,587.67
100. 3C1	338.32	1.80%	897,220	4.02%	2,651.99
101. 3C	15,591.80	83.06%	15,747,755	70.65%	1,010.00
102. 4C1	1,431.15	7.62%	1,777,960	7.98%	1,242.33
103. 4C	121.16	0.65%	293,835	1.32%	2,425.18
104. Total	18,772.62	100.00%	22,291,195	100.00%	1,187.43
Timber					
105. 1T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
106. 1T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
107. 2T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
108. 2T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
109. 3T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
110. 3T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
111. 4T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
112. 4T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
113. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	258,233.28	93.22%	154,940,080	87.42%	600.00
CRP Total	18,772.62	6.78%	22,291,195	12.58%	1,187.43
Timber Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
114. Market Area Total	277,005.90	100.00%	177,231,275	100.00%	639.81

**2025 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45**  
**Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL)**

**43 Hayes**

	<b>2024 CTL County Total</b>	<b>2025 Form 45 County Total</b>	<b>Value Difference (2025 form 45 - 2024 CTL)</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>2025 Growth (New Construction Value)</b>	<b>Percent Change excl. Growth</b>
01. Residential	17,363,865	17,503,770	139,905	0.81%	165,755	-0.15%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	28,893,920	29,674,660	780,740	2.70%	724,155	0.20%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>46,257,785</b>	<b>47,178,430</b>	<b>920,645</b>	<b>1.99%</b>	<b>889,910</b>	<b>0.07%</b>
05. Commercial	11,099,970	13,909,935	2,809,965	25.32%	541,410	20.44%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
<b>07. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-6)</b>	<b>11,099,970</b>	<b>13,909,935</b>	<b>2,809,965</b>	<b>25.32%</b>	<b>541,410</b>	<b>20.44%</b>
08. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	16,604,680	16,791,050	186,370	1.12%	341,660	-0.94%
09. Minerals	1,046,740	885,540	-161,200	-15.40	0	-15.40%
10. Non Ag Use Land	0	0	0			
<b>11. Total Non-Agland (sum lines 8-10)</b>	<b>17,651,420</b>	<b>17,676,590</b>	<b>25,170</b>	<b>0.14%</b>	<b>341,660</b>	<b>-1.79%</b>
12. Irrigated	217,285,605	249,202,775	31,917,170	14.69%		
13. Dryland	109,730,020	139,249,110	29,519,090	26.90%		
14. Grassland	163,399,345	177,231,275	13,831,930	8.47%		
15. Wasteland	16,850	197,870	181,020	1,074.30%		
16. Other Agland	413,005	635,525	222,520	53.88%		
<b>17. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>490,844,825</b>	<b>566,516,555</b>	<b>75,671,730</b>	<b>15.42%</b>		
<b>18. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>565,854,000</b>	<b>645,281,510</b>	<b>79,427,510</b>	<b>14.04%</b>	<b>1,772,980</b>	<b>13.72%</b>

## 2025 Assessment Survey for Hayes County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	2
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$125,772
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$7,750
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:
	\$15,000
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,800
12.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$3,367

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS
4.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	They are rarely used; no longer maintained.
5.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	N/A
6.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
7.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes, hayes.gworks.com
8.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	The assessor and staff
9.	<b>What type of aerial imagery is used in the cyclical review of properties?</b>
	GIS
10.	<b>When was the aerial imagery last updated?</b>
	2024

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes

<b>3.</b>	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Hayes Center and Palisade are zoned.
<b>4.</b>	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1998, updated in 2011

#### **D. Contracted Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Pritchard & Abbott for the appraisal of oil and gas mineral interests
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	gWorks, Inc
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	NA

#### **E. Appraisal /Listing Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>List any outside appraisal or listing services employed by the county for the current assessment year</b>
	Yes, Pritchard & Abbott, Lake Mac Assessment
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	The county does not specify qualifications.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	The oil and gas mineral values are established by Pritchard and Abbott. The review of unusual commercial properties was done with Lake Mac Assessment.



## 2025 Residential Assessment Survey for Hayes County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>
	The assessor and staff.
<b>2.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>
	Only the cost approach is used by the county when developing residential property values.
<b>3.</b>	<b>For the cost approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>
	Yes, depreciation tables are developed using local market information. Lake Mac Blue Appraisal assisted in developing new residential depreciation tables for 2023 assessment year.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust depreciation tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are adjusted.</b>
	Yes
<b>5.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	Sales studies are conducted and values are applied by the square foot. Additionally, the assessor consults with neighboring assessors regarding lot values, particularly since one town is in two different counties.
<b>6.</b>	<b>How are rural residential site values developed?</b>
	Rural residential sites have 25 acres or less and the values were set by market analysis. Additionally, the assessor researches costs of well drilling, septic and electricity.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Are there form 191 applications on file?</b>
	No
<b>8.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?</b>
	Lots being held for sale or resale are valued the same as all other lots within the village that they are located.

## 2025 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hayes County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>
	The assessor and staff. Commercial feed lots and hog farm are appraised by contract appraiser.
<b>2.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>
	The cost approach is primarily relied upon; a contract appraiser used the income approach for storage units.
<b>2a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>
	Contract appraiser is relied upon to determine the value of unique commercial properties.
<b>3.</b>	<b>For the cost approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>
	The physical depreciation is derived from an appraiser's study of regional sales due to a lack of sales in the county.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust depreciation tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are adjusted.</b>
	N/A
<b>5.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>
	Commercial lots are valued the same as residential lots, by the square foot.

## 2025 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hayes County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>
	The assessor and staff.
2.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>
	Sales are mapped, reviewed and monitored to determine what characteristics are impacting the market
3.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>
	Parcels that are under 25 acres are reviewed for primary use. If a parcel is adjacent to an agricultural parcel of the same owner, then the parcel is considered agricultural.
4.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not what methodology is used to determine market value?</b>
	Farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued the same.
5.	<b>What separate market analysis has been conducted where intensive use is identified in the county?</b>
	A contract appraiser was hired to help establish building values for the feed lot and hog confinement barn in 2025. Intensive use is valued using a multi-county regional study.
6.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>
	N/A
6a.	<b>Are any other agricultural subclasses used? If yes, please explain.</b>
	CRP, CREP irrigated, CREP dryland
	<u><i>If your county has special value applications, please answer the following</i></u>
7a.	<b>How many parcels have a special valuation application on file?</b>
	N/A
7b.	<b>What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist in the county?</b>
	The assessor sends sales questionnaires. If they are not returned, the assessor may attempt to contact the buyer or seller by phone for more information about the sale.
	<u><i>If your county recognizes a special value, please answer the following</i></u>
7c.	<b>Describe the non-agricultural influences recognized within the county.</b>
	N/A
7d.	<b>Where is the influenced area located within the county?</b>
	N/A

7e.	<b>Describe in detail how the special values were arrived at in the influenced area(s).</b>
	N/A

**2024 Plan of Assessment for Hayes County**  
**Assessment Years 2025, 2026 and 2027**  
**July 31, 2024**

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

Pursuant to NE State Statute, 77-1311.02, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. This plan is to be presented to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 each year and to the Department of Revenue on or before October 31 each year.

**Assessment requirements for Real Property**

All real property in the State of Nebraska is subject to taxation unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Statutes or the Nebraska Constitution. All real property other than agricultural land and horticultural land shall be valued at 92-100% of its actual value. Agricultural and horticultural land shall be valued at 69-75% of the actual value. Personal Property shall be valued at its net book value.

**General description of Real Property in Hayes County**

Per the March 2023 County Abstract, prior to protests, Hayes County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	Land/Min Value	Impr Value	Total Value	% Value
Residential/Rec	327	\$2,567,430.00	\$14,419,515.00	\$16,986,945.00	3.00
Commercial/Ind	64	\$367,900.00	\$10,739,865.00	\$11,107,765.00	1.96
Agricultural	2109	\$500,599,290.00	\$36,733,560.00	\$537,332,850.00	94.85
Mineral	11	\$1,046,740.00	\$	\$1,046,740.00	0.19
Total	2511	\$504,581,360.00	\$61,892,940.00	\$566,474,300.00	100

**Current Resources:**

**Staff & Training**

Due to the population of Hayes County, the County Clerk is required to be an ex-officio County official who must perform the duties of the Assessor, Clerk, Register of Deeds, Clerk of District Court and Election Commissioner. A valid Nebraska Assessor's Certificate is required in order to file for or assume the position of County Clerk. Current staff consists of the Clerk/Assessor, one full time Deputy and one part time office helper. The Clerk and Deputy Clerk hold valid Nebraska Assessor Certificates.

The 60 hours of education required during the current re-certification period ending December 31, 2026 will be met by all office personnel currently holding an assessor certificate.

**Budget**

The Assessor's budget is sufficient to cover the upcoming expenses of office operation.

**2024-2025 Proposed Budget**

Salaries	\$100,602.00
Office Operation & Misc	\$15,000.00
Office Equip & Supply & Training	\$2400.00
Pickup appraisal work	\$7,750.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 125,752.00

## **Hardware and Software:**

Hayes County uses MIPs CAMA and Administrative software for parcel record keeping. GIS Workshop is used to map parcels, land use and soil type. This system replaces the need to update the current cadastral maps. Three new computers, with required hardware specifications to run GIS workshop and maps, were purchased in 2020. We also purchased a Microsoft Surface Pro Tablet in 2020 that will be used for pickup work.

Gworks has built a web-based appraisal /assessment page for Hayes County. The web page allows anyone with internet access to search for real estate records and information via the internet. We have made efforts to notify the public of this web page through publication in the newspaper, mailings, and informing people in person and by phone.

## **Property Record Cards**

All property record cards are updated annually, or as needed, with hard copies of the current information. Each Property Record Card includes the following information:

- Current owner and address (if applicable, a situs address if different from owners mailing address)
- Legal description of parcel
- A property record break down report detailing:
  - History of property
  - Codes relating to taxing districts,
  - Property classification codes,
  - Soil types and use by acre and total acres
  - Current and previous valuation
  - Book and pages of last deed record

## **Assessment Procedures**

### **Discover, List and Inventory all property:**

All real and personal property subject to taxation shall be assessed as of January 1, current year. The appropriate paperwork for ownership changes, splits and combinations are completed according to statutory requirements. All sales are considered to be arm's length, unless through the verification process, it is proven to be otherwise. Sales questionnaires are sent to both seller and buyer to assist in completing the sales review process.

**Data Collection:** Hayes County has implemented procedures to complete a physical inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

**Real Property Improvements:** Hayes County uses various methods of discovering changes in real property. County and village zoning permits, personal property depreciation schedules, reports of taxpayers, realtors and appraisers, information on sales questionnaires and ongoing physical inspections by staff and other sources are all used as means of discovery.

**Homestead Exemptions:** Homestead exemption applications are normally accepted in the office from February 1<sup>st</sup> through June 30 of each year. Letters containing pre-printed applications are sent to previous applicants. When returned, they are verified that the applicant is owner/occupant. Applications are entered in the Centurion Program and are then forwarded to the Nebraska Department of Revenue for income verification.

**Personal Property:** Personal property data is gathered primarily using the taxpayer’s federal income tax depreciation schedules. All Real Estate Transfer Form 521’s with non-real property value excluded from the purchase price are required to provide an itemized listing of such personal property. This information is used the following year for personal property schedule updates. Personal property filing forms are sent to each property owner the beginning of March and deadline reminders are published in the local paper twice prior to the filing deadline. Non-responders are contacted by phone prior to the deadline.

**Ag Land:** Currently, ag land details are gathered from several sources. Irrigated land acres are cross referenced with a listing of owner certified acres at the NRD. CREP and CRP contracts are also used as information sources. Visual inspection along with surveys verifies land usage and size. We use GIS to identify and keep current on ag land use.

**Improvements on Leased Land:** IOLL data is gathered in the same manner as real property improvements. Current ownership of IOLL’s on school land is updated after each Board of Educational Lands and Funds auction.

### **Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2024**

Sales rosters provided by the state along with the “what if” spread sheet are used when reviewing the level of value. Information for the following chart was taken from the summary sheets of 2024 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator.

<b>Property Class</b>	<b>Median</b>
Residential	95
Commercial	100
Agriculture	72

The office will continue to work with our Liaison to maintain appraisal ratios which comply with Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division requirements.

	<b>Median</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>Residential</b>	92-100%	< 15	98-103%
<b>Commercial</b>	92-100%	< 20	98-103%
<b>Agland</b>	69-75%	< 20	98-103%

### **Other Functions Performed by the Assessor’s Office**

1. Record Maintenance, mapping updates, ownership changes and pickup work
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - \* Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - \* Assessor survey
  - \* Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - \* Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - \* School District Taxable Value Report
  - \* Homestead Exemption and Tax Loss Report
  - \* Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - \* Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - \* Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - \* Report of average assessed value in Hayes County of single-family residential property
  - \* Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Send Personal Property schedules; administer annual filing of personal property schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property; annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates-management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Send Notice of Valuation Changes
10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to County Treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections-prepare tax list correction documents for County Board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization; attend County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals; prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuations.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization; attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education; Assessor education- attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain 60 hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2025**

Ag Land: A market analysis of ag sales by land classification groups will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments needed to comply with statistical range requirements. All qualified sales information will be plotted on a county map to aid in public education of the 3-year sales study process. Review of land use will be completed with GIS system.

Residential and Commercial: Residential and commercial parcels will be reviewed based on sales information and statistical data. Pickup work of new construction, remodeling and removals will be completed annually as well as a review of all sales. Depreciation tables for dwellings will be reviewed and updated according to current sales information. The miscellaneous building component value pricing sheet will be reviewed.

Pick-up work for all classes of property will be conducted. County and Village building and zoning permits will be monitored and inspected along with new land sale locations. A pickup list of sites for future visits will be continuously updated. Sales questionnaires will be sent to all sellers and buyers to assist in the maintenance of the sales file. Hayes County will comply with the systematic inspection and review requirements of §77-1311.03. A physical inspection and a GIS review of Township 8-N will be completed this year. Lake Mac Assessment, LLC, will assist in an update of depreciation tables for commercial property for 2025

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2026**

Ag Land: A market analysis of ag sales by land classification groups will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments needed to comply with statistical range requirements. All qualified sales with sale



information (ie, date of sale, type of land, selling price) are plotted on a county map to aid in the public education process. Reviews will be done based on GIS aerial maps.

Residential and Commercial: Residential and commercial parcels will be reviewed based on sales information and statistical data. Pickup work of new construction, remodeling and removals will be completed annually as well as a review of all sales. Depreciation tables for dwellings will be reviewed and updated according to current sales information. The miscellaneous building component value pricing sheet pricing will be reviewed.

Pick-up work for all classes of property will be conducted. County & Village building and zoning permits will be monitored and inspected along with new land sales locations. A pickup list for future site visits is continuously being updated. We will continue the current process of sending sales questionnaires to all sellers and buyers to assist in the maintenance of the sales file. Hayes County will comply with the systematic inspection and review requirements of §77-1311.03. A physical inspection and a GIS Review of all villages will be completed this year.

#### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2027**

Ag Land: A market analysis of ag sales by land classification groups will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments needed to comply with statistical range requirements. All qualified sales with sale information (ie, date of sale, type of land, selling price) are plotted on a county map to aid in the public education process. Reviews will be done based on GIS aerial maps.

Residential and Commercial: Residential and commercial parcels will be reviewed based on sales information and statistical data. Pickup work of new construction, remodeling and removals will be completed annually as well as a review of all sales. Depreciation tables for dwellings will be reviewed and updated according to current sales information. The miscellaneous building component value pricing sheet pricing will be reviewed.

Pick-up work for all classes of property will be conducted. County & Village building and zoning permits will be monitored and inspected along with new land sales locations. A pickup list for future site visits is continuously being updated. We will continue the current process of sending sales questionnaires to all sellers and buyers to assist in the maintenance of the sales file. Hayes County will comply with the systematic inspection and review requirements of §77-1311.03. A physical inspection and a GIS Review of Township 5-N will be completed this year.

Respectfully Submitted:

Susan Messersmith  
Hayes County Assessor  
7/1/24