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## 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-produding properties (commerdial, 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//ittle 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//ittle 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 674 square miles, Platte County has 34,296 residents, per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2024, a slight population increase over the 2023 U.S. Census. Reports indicate that $75 \%$ of county residents are homeowners and $89 \%$ of residents occupy the same residence as in the prior year (Census Quick Facts). The average home
 value is $\$ 214,812$ (2023 Average Residential Value, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-3506.02) The majority of the commercial properties in Platte County are located in and around Columbus, the county seat. The U.S. Census Bureau states there are 1,038 employer establishments with total employment of 16,430 , for a $3 \%$ increase in employment from 2019.
County Value Breakdown

CITY POPULATION CHANGE

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | Change |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| COLUMBUS | 22,111 | 24,028 | $8.7 \%$ |
| CORNLEA | - | 33 |  |
| CRESTON | 203 | 181 | $-10.8 \%$ |
| DUNCAN | 351 | 392 | $11.7 \%$ |
| HUMPHREY | 760 | 905 | $19.1 \%$ |
| LINDSAY | 255 | 283 | $11.0 \%$ |
| MONROE | 284 | 296 | $4.2 \%$ |
| NEWMAN GROVE | 721 | 667 | $-7.5 \%$ |
| PLATTE CENTER | 336 | 333 | $-0.9 \%$ |
| TARNOV | 46 | 52 | $13.0 \%$ |

Agricultural land makes up a significant percentage of the valuation base of the county. Platte County is included in the Lower Elkhorn, Lower Platte North, Lower Loup, and Central Platte Natural Resources Districts (NRD). When compared against the top crops of the other counties in Nebraska, Platte County ranks fifth in corn for silage. In value of sales by commodity group, Platte County ranks first in hogs and pigs and fourth in vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes (USDA AgCensus).

The ethanol plant located in Columbus contributes to the local agricultural economy.

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Platte County

## Assessment Actions

The assessment actions in Platte County included inspection and review of Valuation Groups 6, 11 and 15 . New photos were taken and attached to the property record card. A market analysis was completed on each of the remaining valuation groups and percentage increases of varying degrees were applied to the lots and improvements. Percentage increases ranged between $3 \%$ to $20 \%$. The home site is at $\$ 27,000$. All pick-up work was timely completed and added to the assessment roll.

## Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's-length transactions are used. The county assessor qualified an above average portion of sales in comparison to the statewide average. Further review of the disqualified sales support that all arm'slength transactions have been made available for measurement purposes.

Lot values are analyzed by comparing the land to building ratio for the residential class. Platte County has a satisfactory percentage ratio and all lot values have been studied between 2018 and 2024.

The appraisal tables including the cost and depreciation analysis are all dated between 2018 and 2024. Percentage adjustments are applied to the cost date to achieve uniform assessments on all improvements.

Platte County utilizes 15 Valuation Groups. The city of Columbus is the largest populated area, and the county has assigned valuation groups based on the characteristics, such as age, quality, and condition within the city of Columbus. This includes Valuation Groups 1 through 12. Valuation Group 13 is defined as the small towns and villages, combining eight assessor locations together. Valuation Group 15 is Humphrey.

The six-year inspection and review cycle are current with the dates ranging from 2018-2024. When completing the inspection process the county compares the parcel to the property record card for differences in appearances.

A written valuation methodology is on file in the office.

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Platte County

## Description of Analysis

The residential parcels are divided into 15 valuation groups. Twelve of the groups are within the political boundary of Columbus and the remainder are county assessor locations outside the city of Columbus.

| Valuation Group | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Columbus; Neighborhood - A |
| 2 | Columbus; Neighborhood - A1 |
| 3 | Columbus; Neighborhood - B |
| 4 | Columbus; Neighborhood - B1 |
| 5 | Columbus; Neighborhood - C |
| 6 | Columbus; Neighborhood - D |
| 7 | Columbus; Neighborhood - E |
| 8 | Columbus; Neighborhood - F |
| 9 | Columbus; Neighborhood - H |
| 10 | Columbus; Neighborhood - I |
| 11 | Columbus; Neighborhood - K |
| 12 | Columbus; Neighborhood - L |
| 13 | Small Towns \& Villages; (incl. Creston, Duncan, Lindsay, Monroe and |
| 15 | Platte Center, and villages Cornlea, Oconee and Tarnov) |
| 19 | Acreages |

The residential statistical profile was analyzed, all measures of central tendency were within the acceptable range. The COD and PRD are also within the IAAO standard range.

Valuation Group 13 has a high PRD, further analysis of the sales indicates that two outliers impact the PRD, if they were excluded the PRD would be within the acceptable range. Valuation Group 19 has one outlier affecting the PRD. If it were excluded the PRD would be within the acceptable range.

The statistical sample and the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment, Form 45 Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) indicated that the population changed in a similar manner to the sales. Changes to the population and the sample reflect the stated assessment actions.

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Platte County

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

A review of the statistics with sufficient sales along with all other information, and the assessment practices suggest the assessments within the county are valued within the acceptable range, and therefore considered equalized. The quality of assessment of the residential class of property in Platte County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

| VALUATION GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD |
| 1 | 175 | 94.13 | 97.69 | 94.92 | 15.79 | 102.92 |
| 2 | 37 | 95.28 | 95.85 | 95.26 | 11.30 | 100.62 |
| 3 | 52 | 97.94 | 98.45 | 97.68 | 08.75 | 100.79 |
| 4 | 41 | 95.58 | 96.43 | 92.79 | 16.22 | 103.92 |
| 5 | 128 | 95.28 | 97.80 | 96.36 | 13.27 | 101.49 |
| 6 | 56 | 96.25 | 97.37 | 96.08 | 09.02 | 101.34 |
| 7 | 71 | 95.08 | 96.83 | 96.25 | 08.69 | 100.60 |
| 8 | 68 | 95.36 | 96.02 | 96.28 | 06.89 | 99.73 |
| 9 | 57 | 93.17 | 94.22 | 93.94 | 08.05 | 100.30 |
| 10 | 24 | 92.75 | 92.00 | 91.96 | 11.12 | 100.04 |
| 11 | 58 | 92.44 | 93.72 | 93.49 | 08.57 | 100.25 |
| 12 | 127 | 95.37 | 98.95 | 95.94 | 14.63 | 103.14 |
| 13 | 52 | 96.31 | 102.72 | 96.19 | 21.46 | 106.79 |
| 15 | 37 | 94.81 | 96.27 | 93.86 | 16.66 | 102.57 |
| 19 | 30 | 98.86 | 101.86 | 96.79 | 24.15 | 105.24 |
| __ALL__ | 1,013 | 95.32 | 97.37 | 95.38 | 13.04 | 102.09 |

## Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the residential property in Platte County is $95 \%$.

## Assessment Actions

A reappraisal was completed in the small-town commercial parcels of eight villages. The pick-up work included the listing and assessment of a casino, which impacts the growth of the commercial class. Minimal changes were made to most of the commercial class and all other pick-up work was completed.

## Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's length transactions are used. The county assessor qualified a typical portion of sales in comparison to the statewide average. Further review of the disqualified sales support that all arm's-length transactions have been made available for the measurement of the commercial class.

The lot values were reviewed, and the downtown Columbus area review was last dated 2015. The 2023 assessment year addressed the $23^{\text {rd }}$ street corridor. The remainder of the lots are dated 2018.

The cost tables are dated 2022 except for Valuation Group 3, which are dated 2017. The commercial class is valued utilizing all three approaches to value, the cost, income, and sales comparison. Typical rent information is utilized for income producing parcels and applied to those parcels with similar characteristics.

The inspection and review of the commercial class has been completed beginning in 2021. Valuation Group 3 was completed most recently for the 2024 assessment year. New photos and comparison of property appearances are reviewed with the property record card.

## 2024 Commercial Correlation for Platte County

## Description of Analysis

The commercial parcels are analyzed utilizing three valuation groups that are defined as the assessor locations in the county.

| Valuation Group | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Columbus |
| 2 | All parcels in close proximity but outside Columbus city limits |
| 3 | All small towns and rural parcels |

The analysis of the statistical profile of the commercial class indicates that the median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The COD is within the IAAO standard range, and the PRD is high. There are two outlier ratios in the overall statistics, that if hypothetically removed would bring the PRD into the standard range. This largest outlier is a low dollar sale under $\$ 5,000$ in the small town of Creston and the removal of the outlier in Valuation Group 3 would bring the PRD closer to the standard range and the COD into the standard range.

The 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for the Real Property Form 45, Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) confirms the assessment actions of the county assessor.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

A review of the statistics with sufficient sales along with all other information, and the assessment practices suggest the assessments within the county are valued within the acceptable range, and therefore considered equalized. The quality of assessment of the commercial class of property in Platte County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

| VALUATION GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD |
| 1 | 82 | 95.65 | 92.19 | 84.66 | 15.21 | 108.89 |
| 2 | 8 | 96.47 | 97.75 | 96.99 | 03.87 | 100.78 |
| 3 | 20 | 97.89 | 125.19 | 93.49 | 39.78 | 133.91 |
| _ ALL | 110 | 96.17 | 98.59 | 86.59 | 18.97 | 113.86 |

## Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the commercial property in Platte County is $96 \%$.

## 2024 Agricultural Correlation for Platte County

## Assessment Actions

The County Assessor annually conducts a market analysis, leading to adjustments in the agricultural class. Market Areas 3 irrigated land was increased 15\%. In Market Area 6 irrigated land was increased $10 \%$ and grassland was increased $7 \%$. The county assessor also created soil adjustments for eight soil codes along the river. The dwellings and outbuildings received percentage adjustments. Pick-up work was completed and added to the assessment roll.

## Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's length transactions are used. The county assessor qualified sales near the statewide average. A large portion of the non-qualified sales are reflective of family transactions, splits, and partial interest transfers. Further review of the disqualified sales support that all arm's-length transactions have been made available for the measurement of the agricultural class.

The costing date for the dwellings and outbuildings is 2022, the last date of inspection was 2021 . The aerial imagery was utilized to inspect and review the rural properties. The land values tables were set in 2020 and updated each year.

There are two market areas identified in Platte County. The areas are defined geographically utilizing sold parcels to establish the boundaries. The smallest market area is located south of the Loup River and north of the Platte River. The last land use review was reported as 2021. A portion of the Conservation Reserve Acres (CRP) are identified. The county has made several attempts to identify the CRP. The intensive use parcels are identified in Platte County.

Non-agricultural influence is described in the county as recreational influence in the area between the Platte and Loup rivers. This area is majority grassland and will sell between $\$ 4,000$ to $\$ 5,000$ per acre. Sales of non-influence portion of the county is analyzed to develop grassland values. There are 105 special value applications on file.

## Description of Analysis

Platte County is divided into two market areas. Market Area 3 is predominantly irrigated cropland with little grassland and tends to have sandier soils compared to the rest of the county. The area is defined as the region between the Loup and Platte Rivers. Market Area 6 is the remainder of the county north of the Loup River.

The statistical sample for the agricultural class includes 75 qualified sales. The overall measures of central tendency are all within the acceptable range. The COD is within the IAAO standard range indicating the data used for measurement is reliable.

## 2024 Agricultural Correlation for Platte County

Both market areas are within the acceptable range for the measures of central tendency. Further review of the $80 \%$ Majority Land Use (MLU) indicates that sales with a sufficient sample are also within the acceptable range.

Where there are few sales, a review of the Average Acre Value Comparison of Platte County along with surrounding counties indicates that the values are comparable.

A comparison of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) support that the values were uniformly applied to the agricultural class and accurately reflect the assessment actions reported by the county assessor.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Agricultural homes and outbuildings have been valued using the same valuation process as rural residential improvements and are equalized at the statutorily required level. Agricultural land values are equalized at uniform portions of market value; all values have been determined to be acceptable and are reasonably comparable to adjoining counties. The quality of assessment of agricultural land in Platte County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.


## Level of Value

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

## Special Value

A review of agricultural land values in Platte County in area that have non-agricultural influences indicates that the assessed values used are like the assessed values in the areas of the county that do not have non-agricultural influences. Therefore, it is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land is $74 \%$

## 2024 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Platte 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 | 95 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. | No recommendation. |
| Commercial Real Property | 96 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. | No recommendation. |
| Agricultural Land | 74 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. | No recommendation. |
| Special Valuation of 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 5th day of April, 2024.


## APPENDICES

## 2024 Commission Summary

## for Platte County

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 1013 | Median | 95.32 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 263,611,685$ | Mean | 97.37 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 263,611,685$ | Wgt. Mean | 95.38 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 251,430,490$ | Average Assessed Value of the Base | $\$ 204,780$ |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 260,229$ | Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 248,204$ |

## Confidence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 94.64 to 96.30 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 94.41 to 96.35 |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 96.18 to 98.56 |
| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 40.75 |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.54 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 9.14 |

Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | 1,143 | 95 | 95.37 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 1,109 | 95 | 94.78 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 984 | 96 | 95.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 959 | 94 | 94.47 |

## 2024 Commission Summary

## for Platte County

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Commercial Real Property - Current |  |  |  |
| Number of Sales | 110 | Median | 96.17 |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 54,925,392$ | Mean | 98.59 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 54,925,392$ | Wgt. Mean | 86.59 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 47,557,850$ | Average Assessed Value of the Base | $\$ 610,459$ |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 499,322$ | Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 432,344$ |

## Confidence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 94.68 to 97.16 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 79.00 to 94.18 |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 87.53 to 109.65 |
| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 13.85 |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.18 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 5.09 |

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | 111 | 97 | 97.16 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 89 | 97 | 97.16 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 86 | 97 | 97.28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 90 | 98 | 97.65 |
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## 71 Platte

 RESIDENTIAL

## 71 Platte

COMMERCIAL

| Number of Sales : 110 | MEDIAN : 96 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price : 54,925,392 | WGT. MEAN : 87 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 54,925,392 | MEAN : 99 |
| Total Assessed Value : 47,557,850 |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 499,322 | COD : 18.97 |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 432,344 | PRD : 113.86 |

PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)
Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COV : } 60.04 \\
& \text { STD : } 59.19
\end{aligned}
$$

Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.24
95\% Median C.I. : 94.68 to 97.16
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.00 to 94.18
$95 \%$ Mean C.I. : 87.53 to 109.65

MAX Sales Ratio : 670.67
MIN Sales Ratio : 21.37

Printed:3/25/2024 5:55:32PM

| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd. Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. |  |  |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 TO 31-DEC-20 | 6 | 102.02 | 108.74 | 106.56 | 11.77 | 102.05 | 95.97 | 147.92 | 95.97 to 147.92 | 566,483 | 603,646 |
| 01-JAN-21 TO 31-MAR-21 | 10 | 100.40 | 101.37 | 100.77 | 08.17 | 100.60 | 80.16 | 121.01 | 92.19 to 111.33 | 203,100 | 204,673 |
| 01-APR-21 TO 30-JUN-21 | 8 | 96.74 | 99.81 | 98.47 | 13.29 | 101.36 | 67.03 | 124.88 | 67.03 to 124.88 | 205,044 | 201,898 |
| 01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21 | 5 | 100.20 | 94.17 | 92.23 | 06.58 | 102.10 | 76.34 | 101.25 | N/A | 188,288 | 173,660 |
| 01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21 | 16 | 94.51 | 98.03 | 94.76 | 08.68 | 103.45 | 77.88 | 139.75 | 90.57 to 99.00 | 454,675 | 430,855 |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22 | 10 | 97.64 | 99.26 | 95.93 | 06.40 | 103.47 | 84.27 | 111.96 | 90.94 to 111.92 | 651,708 | 625,156 |
| 01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22 | 16 | 95.89 | 91.25 | 81.15 | 07.75 | 112.45 | 57.40 | 104.65 | 91.61 to 99.24 | 621,493 | 504,337 |
| 01-JUL-22 TO 30-SEP-22 | 9 | 95.00 | 85.79 | 84.03 | 11.36 | 102.09 | 42.75 | 98.44 | 61.42 to 96.52 | 876,667 | 736,707 |
| 01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22 | 9 | 89.06 | 90.79 | 97.92 | 34.52 | 92.72 | 21.37 | 182.97 | 54.81 to 117.94 | 484,444 | 474,379 |
| 01-JAN-23 TO 31-MAR-23 | 4 | 95.07 | 84.75 | 96.24 | 22.90 | 88.06 | 33.75 | 115.10 | N/A | 369,250 | 355,360 |
| 01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23 | 11 | 90.53 | 79.45 | 61.14 | 22.06 | 129.95 | 34.88 | 110.79 | 37.92 to 101.26 | 629,091 | 384,641 |
| 01-JUL-23 TO 30-SEP-23 | 6 | 97.46 | 181.06 | 64.75 | 115.01 | 279.63 | 50.01 | 670.67 | 50.01 to 670.67 | 421,822 | 273,148 |
| Study Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 TO 30-SEP-21 | 29 | 100.11 | 101.22 | 101.75 | 10.09 | 99.48 | 67.03 | 147.92 | 94.85 to 105.88 | 276,265 | 281,106 |
| 01-OCT-21 TO 30-SEP-22 | 51 | 95.72 | 93.98 | 88.05 | 08.58 | 106.73 | 42.75 | 139.75 | 94.34 to 96.79 | 620,113 | 545,980 |
| 01-OCT-22 TO 30-SEP-23 | 30 | 92.84 | 103.88 | 75.62 | 45.38 | 137.37 | 21.37 | 670.67 | 70.31 to 100.00 | 509,598 | 385,360 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21 | 39 | 96.43 | 98.76 | 96.10 | 09.87 | 102.77 | 67.03 | 139.75 | 93.44 to 100.55 | 304,810 | 292,920 |
| 01-JAN-22 TO 31-DEC-22 | 44 | 95.96 | 91.86 | 87.84 | 13.46 | 104.58 | 21.37 | 182.97 | 93.31 to 97.28 | 652,522 | 573,198 |
| ALL | 110 | 96.17 | 98.59 | 86.59 | 18.97 | 113.86 | 21.37 | 670.67 | 94.68 to 97.16 | 499,322 | 432,344 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 1 | 82 | 95.65 | 92.19 | 84.66 | 15.21 | 108.89 | 21.37 | 182.97 | 93.75 to 97.28 | 557,373 | 471,851 |
| 2 | 8 | 96.47 | 97.75 | 96.99 | 03.87 | 100.78 | 90.94 | 110.79 | 90.94 to 110.79 | 877,638 | 851,190 |
| 3 | 20 | 97.89 | 125.19 | 93.49 | 39.78 | 133.91 | 54.81 | 670.67 | 93.31 to 107.59 | 109,984 | 102,827 |
| $\ldots$ | 110 | 96.17 | 98.59 | 86.59 | 18.97 | 113.86 | 21.37 | 670.67 | 94.68 to 97.16 | 499,322 | 432,344 |
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71 Platte
COMMERCIAL
Number of Sales: 110
Total Sales Price : $54,925,392$
Total Adj. Sales Price : $54,925,392$
Total Assessed Value : $47,557,850$
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 499,322
Avg. Assessed Value : 432,344

Total Sales Price : $54,925,392$
Total Assessed Value : 47,557,850 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 499,322 Avg. Assessed Value : 432,344

| OCCUPANCY CODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 185 | 1 | 34.88 | 34.88 | 34.88 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 34.88 | 34.88 | N/A | 2,500,000 | 872,090 |
| 300 | 1 | 118.32 | 118.32 | 118.32 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 118.32 | 118.32 | N/A | 240,000 | 283,970 |
| 303 | 1 | 96.19 | 96.19 | 96.19 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 96.19 | 96.19 | N/A | 1,000,000 | 961,875 |
| 304 | 2 | 99.12 | 99.12 | 99.24 | 00.12 | 99.88 | 99.00 | 99.24 | N/A | 177,500 | 176,150 |
| 306 | 1 | 123.53 | 123.53 | 123.53 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 123.53 | 123.53 | N/A | 57,000 | 70,410 |
| 319 | 1 | 95.42 | 95.42 | 95.42 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 95.42 | 95.42 | N/A | 2,800,000 | 2,671,875 |
| 334 | 2 | 93.49 | 93.49 | 91.97 | 02.73 | 101.65 | 90.94 | 96.04 | N/A | 907,500 | 834,608 |
| 341 | 1 | 93.44 | 93.44 | 93.44 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 93.44 | 93.44 | N/A | 610,000 | 570,000 |
| 344 | 18 | 97.21 | 97.84 | 97.14 | 17.92 | 100.72 | 42.75 | 182.97 | 91.61 to 103.62 | 359,963 | 349,659 |
| 349 | 1 | 90.53 | 90.53 | 90.53 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 90.53 | 90.53 | N/A | 637,500 | 577,125 |
| 350 | 5 | 93.31 | 93.76 | 95.29 | 01.68 | 98.39 | 91.61 | 95.97 | N/A | 544,200 | 518,553 |
| 352 | 12 | 93.84 | 92.48 | 84.08 | 07.58 | 109.99 | 61.39 | 111.96 | 90.43 to 96.52 | 821,250 | 690,539 |
| 353 | 21 | 99.75 | 120.70 | 87.84 | 42.84 | 137.41 | 21.37 | 670.67 | 93.75 to 107.59 | 159,483 | 140,093 |
| 381 | 1 | 98.44 | 98.44 | 98.44 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.44 | 98.44 | N/A | 760,000 | 748,125 |
| 401 | 1 | 95.00 | 95.00 | 95.00 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 95.00 | 95.00 | N/A | 900,000 | 855,000 |
| 406 | 8 | 97.06 | 103.45 | 101.74 | 16.44 | 101.68 | 67.03 | 147.92 | 67.03 to 147.92 | 761,875 | 775,114 |
| 407 | 1 | 107.44 | 107.44 | 107.44 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 107.44 | 107.44 | N/A | 1,445,000 | 1,552,500 |
| 413 | 2 | 77.33 | 77.33 | 67.68 | 35.33 | 114.26 | 50.01 | 104.65 | N/A | 1,227,736 | 830,915 |
| 419 | 3 | 89.06 | 81.83 | 63.78 | 16.72 | 128.30 | 55.88 | 100.55 | N/A | 811,980 | 517,907 |
| 423 | 1 | 67.18 | 67.18 | 67.18 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 67.18 | 67.18 | N/A | 175,000 | 117,565 |
| 442 | 6 | 95.34 | 93.49 | 94.88 | 05.46 | 98.53 | 77.88 | 101.26 | 77.88 to 101.26 | 108,333 | 102,784 |
| 444 | 2 | 98.74 | 98.74 | 97.68 | 01.48 | 101.09 | 97.28 | 100.20 | N/A | 464,000 | 453,250 |
| 447 | 1 | 80.16 | 80.16 | 80.16 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 80.16 | 80.16 | N/A | 160,000 | 128,250 |
| 458 | 1 | 106.88 | 106.88 | 106.88 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 106.88 | 106.88 | N/A | 400,000 | 427,500 |
| 470 | 1 | 97.16 | 97.16 | 97.16 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 97.16 | 97.16 | N/A | 55,000 | 53,440 |
| 471 | 1 | 111.33 | 111.33 | 111.33 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 111.33 | 111.33 | N/A | 64,000 | 71,250 |
| 476 | 1 | 97.07 | 97.07 | 97.07 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 97.07 | 97.07 | N/A | 17,900 | 17,375 |
| 490 | 1 | 84.27 | 84.27 | 84.27 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 84.27 | 84.27 | N/A | 62,000 | 52,245 |
| 526 | 1 | 98.62 | 98.62 | 98.62 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.62 | 98.62 | N/A | 204,000 | 201,175 |
| 528 | 8 | 92.60 | 80.11 | 82.10 | 15.67 | 97.58 | 33.75 | 96.79 | 33.75 to 96.79 | 313,500 | 257,391 |
| 531 | 1 | 61.42 | 61.42 | 61.42 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 61.42 | 61.42 | N/A | 2,610,000 | 1,603,125 |
| 841 | 1 | 101.16 | 101.16 | 101.16 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 101.16 | 101.16 | N/A | 561,100 | 567,600 |
| 999 | 1 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | N/A | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| _ ALL | 110 | 96.17 | 98.59 | 86.59 | 18.97 | 113.86 | 21.37 | 670.67 | 94.68 to 97.16 | 499,322 | 432,344 |
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| Tax <br> Year | Value |  |  | Growth Value | \% Growth of Value |  | Value Exclud. Growth | Ann.\%chg w/o grwth |  | Net Taxable Sales Value | \% Chg Net <br> Tax. Sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | \$ | 606,336,730 | \$ | 8,668,865 | 1.43\% | \$ | 597,667,865 |  | \$ | 391,259,772 |  |
| 2013 | \$ | 607,756,110 | \$ | 5,598,820 | 0.92\% | \$ | 602,157,290 | -0.69\% | \$ | 406,962,774 | 4.01\% |
| 2014 | \$ | 619,037,295 | \$ | 14,003,690 | 2.26\% | \$ | 605,033,605 | -0.45\% | \$ | 412,919,570 | 1.46\% |
| 2015 | \$ | 645,609,700 | \$ | 13,883,380 | 2.15\% | \$ | 631,726,320 | 2.05\% | \$ | 418,392,787 | 1.33\% |
| 2016 | \$ | 720,582,270 | \$ | 11,376,200 | 1.58\% | \$ | 709,206,070 | 9.85\% | \$ | 426,057,796 | 1.83\% |
| 2017 | \$ | 723,691,605 | \$ | 11,982,455 | 1.66\% | \$ | 711,709,150 | -1.23\% | \$ | 419,121,927 | -1.63\% |
| 2018 | \$ | 731,363,060 | \$ | 9,721,665 | 1.33\% | \$ | 721,641,395 | -0.28\% | \$ | 447,468,648 | 6.76\% |
| 2019 | \$ | 736,986,455 | \$ | 12,110,655 | 1.64\% | \$ | 724,875,800 | -0.89\% | \$ | 451,957,569 | 1.00\% |
| 2020 | \$ | 767,634,650 | \$ | 21,331,275 | 2.78\% | \$ | 746,303,375 | 1.26\% | \$ | 449,224,815 | -0.60\% |
| 2021 | \$ | 783,376,433 | \$ | 32,089,800 | 4.10\% | \$ | 751,286,633 | -2.13\% | \$ | 494,840,341 | 10.15\% |
| 2022 | \$ | 804,246,678 | \$ | 6,152,245 | 0.76\% | \$ | 798,094,433 | 1.88\% | \$ | 535,351,236 | 8.19\% |
| 2023 | \$ | 865,391,258 | \$ | 16,055,290 | 1.86\% | \$ | 849,335,968 | 5.61\% | \$ | 551,310,306 | 2.98\% |
| Ann \%chg |  | 3.60\% |  |  |  |  | erage | 1.36\% |  | 3.08\% | 3.23\% |


| Tax <br> Year | Cmltv\%chg <br> w/o grwth | Cumulative Change <br> Caltvechg | Cmltv\%chg <br> Net Sales |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | - | - | - |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $-0.69 \%$ | $0.23 \%$ | $4.01 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $-0.21 \%$ | $2.09 \%$ | $5.54 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $4.19 \%$ | $6.48 \%$ | $6.93 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $16.97 \%$ | $18.84 \%$ | $8.89 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $17.38 \%$ | $19.35 \%$ | $7.12 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $19.02 \%$ | $20.62 \%$ | $14.37 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $19.55 \%$ | $21.55 \%$ | $15.51 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $23.08 \%$ | $26.60 \%$ | $14.81 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $23.91 \%$ | $29.20 \%$ | $26.47 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $31.63 \%$ | $32.64 \%$ | $36.83 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | $40.08 \%$ | $42.72 \%$ | $40.91 \%$ |


| County Number | 71 |
| ---: | :---: |
| County Name | Platte |
|  |  |

71 Platte
AGRICULTURAL LAND

| Number of Sales : 75 | MEDIAN : 74 |  |  |  | COV : 24.36 |  |  | 95\% Median C.I. : 64.98 to 77.51 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sales Price : 7 | WGT. MEAN : 69 |  |  |  | STD : 17.78 |  |  | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.31 to 73.55 |  |  |  |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 70 | MEAN : 73 |  |  |  | Avg. Abs. Dev: 14.24 |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. : 68.96 to 77.00 |  |  |  |
| Total Assessed Value : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 93 | COD : 19.26 |  |  |  | MAX Sales Ratio : 120.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 649,547 |  | PRD : 105.11 |  |  | MIN Sales Ratio : 21.72 |  |  | Printed:3/25/2024 5:55:34PM |  |  |  |
| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 TO 31-DEC-20 | 9 | 80.56 | 83.65 | 82.55 | 07.99 | 101.33 | 75.54 | 103.93 | 75.59 to 91.78 | 628,952 | 519,228 |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21 | 10 | 81.96 | 83.34 | 81.50 | 12.92 | 102.26 | 60.60 | 120.84 | 70.33 to 97.65 | 751,124 | 612,171 |
| 01-APR-21 To 30-JUN-21 | 8 | 90.16 | 88.41 | 85.79 | 11.77 | 103.05 | 69.73 | 100.94 | 69.73 to 100.94 | 698,112 | 598,904 |
| 01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21 | 11 | 67.10 | 66.79 | 64.91 | 20.30 | 102.90 | 21.72 | 101.98 | 54.56 to 95.78 | 998,698 | 648,229 |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22 | 3 | 74.37 | 73.41 | 72.02 | 10.60 | 101.93 | 61.12 | 84.75 | N/A | 1,004,000 | 723,038 |
| 01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22 | 5 | 79.10 | 86.37 | 87.73 | 11.96 | 98.45 | 75.23 | 103.15 | N/A | 954,400 | 837,277 |
| 01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22 | 5 | 64.98 | 64.18 | 60.98 | 09.70 | 105.25 | 55.43 | 72.44 | N/A | 993,682 | 605,904 |
| 01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22 | 13 | 56.01 | 60.33 | 60.25 | 15.84 | 100.13 | 45.35 | 98.90 | 52.43 to 64.39 | 1,065,205 | 641,807 |
| 01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23 | 5 | 59.56 | 55.06 | 53.19 | 09.87 | 103.52 | 44.90 | 61.31 | N/A | 1,511,768 | 804,047 |
| 01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23 | 3 | 59.16 | 70.18 | 66.94 | 24.22 | 104.84 | 54.19 | 97.19 | N/A | 1,108,667 | 742,183 |
| 01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23 | 3 | 70.90 | 67.31 | 68.85 | 09.48 | 97.76 | 55.43 | 75.60 | N/A | 980,070 | 674,755 |
| Study Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 To 30-SEP-21 | 27 | 82.23 | 84.95 | 83.10 | 11.29 | 102.23 | 60.60 | 120.84 | 76.80 to 91.78 | 694,693 | 577,259 |
| 01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22 | 24 | 69.99 | 71.15 | 69.57 | 18.16 | 102.27 | 21.72 | 103.15 | 61.99 to 77.51 | 989,087 | 688,147 |
| 01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23 | 24 | 57.57 | 61.34 | 60.04 | 16.45 | 102.17 | 44.90 | 98.90 | 54.19 to 63.22 | 1,153,030 | 692,272 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21 | 29 | 78.22 | 78.46 | 74.93 | 18.50 | 104.71 | 21.72 | 120.84 | 68.72 to 85.16 | 830,407 | 622,188 |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22 | 26 | 63.81 | 67.59 | 66.65 | 19.82 | 101.41 | 45.35 | 103.15 | 56.01 to 75.23 | 1,023,080 | 681,866 |
| ALL | 75 | 73.92 | 72.98 | 69.43 | 19.26 | 105.11 | 21.72 | 120.84 | 64.98 to 77.51 | 935,567 | 649,547 |
| AREA (MARKET) |  | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN |  |  |  |  | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT |  |  |  | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX |  | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 3 | 10 | 70.03 | 74.25 | 73.56 | 21.21 | 100.94 | 48.26 | 103.15 | 54.56 to 101.98 | 694,218 | 510,693 |
| 6 | 65 | 75.23 | 72.78 | 68.97 | 18.49 | 105.52 | 21.72 | 120.84 | 64.98 to 78.22 | 972,697 | 670,910 |
| ALL | 75 | 73.92 | 72.98 | 69.43 | 19.26 | 105.11 | 21.72 | 120.84 | 64.98 to 77.51 | 935,567 | 649,547 |

# PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values) 

Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COV : } 24.36 \\
& \text { STD : } 17.78
\end{aligned}
$$

AX Sales Ratio : 120.84
MIN Sales Ratio : 21.72
Printed:3/25/2024 5:55:34PM
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## 71 Platte

## AGRICULTURAL LAND

## PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

| Number of Sales : 75 | MEDIAN : 74 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price : $70,167,505$ | WGT. MEAN : 69 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : $70,167,505$ | MEAN : 73 |
| Total Assessed Value : $48,716,060$ |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 935,567 | COD : 19.26 |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 649,547 | PRD : 105.11 |

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { COV : } 24.36 \\
\text { STD : } 17.78 \\
\text { Avg. Abs. Dev : } 14.24
\end{array}
$$

95\% Median C.I. : 64.98 to 77.51
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.31 to 73.55
95\% Mean C.I. : 68.96 to 77.00

| 95\%MLU By Market Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd. Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. |  |  |
| Irrigated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 3 | 96.87 | 90.04 | 89.12 | 10.57 | 101.03 | 71.26 | 101.98 | N/A | 365,132 | 325,405 |
| 3 | 2 | 86.62 | 86.62 | 85.45 | 17.73 | 101.37 | 71.26 | 101.98 | N/A | 371,698 | 317,620 |
| 6 | 1 | 96.87 | 96.87 | 96.87 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 96.87 | 96.87 | N/A | 352,000 | 340,975 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 24 | 74.58 | 70.82 | 68.64 | 15.19 | 103.18 | 45.35 | 98.78 | 56.77 to 79.22 | 830,003 | 569,741 |
| 3 | 1 | 98.78 | 98.78 | 98.78 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.78 | 98.78 | N/A | 202,400 | 199,940 |
| 6 | 23 | 73.92 | 69.60 | 68.33 | 14.53 | 101.86 | 45.35 | 97.94 | 56.77 to 75.60 | 857,290 | 585,820 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 3 | 69.73 | 53.93 | 48.10 | 23.23 | 112.12 | 21.72 | 70.33 | N/A | 579,838 | 278,885 |
| 3 | 2 | 70.03 | 70.03 | 69.82 | 00.43 | 100.30 | 69.73 | 70.33 | N/A | 476,918 | 333,008 |
| 6 | 1 | 21.72 | 21.72 | 21.72 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 21.72 | 21.72 | N/A | 785,679 | 170,640 |
| ALL | 75 | 73.92 | 72.98 | 69.43 | 19.26 | 105.11 | 21.72 | 120.84 | 64.98 to 77.51 | 935,567 | 649,547 |
| 80\%MLU By Market Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| ___Irrigated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 29 | 70.90 | 73.21 | 67.87 | 20.44 | 107.87 | 44.90 | 103.93 | 61.12 to 82.38 | 1,169,819 | 793,924 |
| 3 | 5 | 71.26 | 77.57 | 76.42 | 26.28 | 101.50 | 48.26 | 103.15 | N/A | 935,190 | 714,665 |
| 6 | 24 | 69.59 | 72.31 | 66.50 | 19.54 | 108.74 | 44.90 | 103.93 | 59.56 to 82.38 | 1,218,701 | 810,436 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 27 | 75.23 | 72.22 | 70.54 | 16.67 | 102.38 | 45.35 | 98.90 | 56.77 to 80.56 | 838,151 | 591,199 |
| 3 | 1 | 98.78 | 98.78 | 98.78 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.78 | 98.78 | N/A | 202,400 | 199,940 |
| 6 | 26 | 74.58 | 71.20 | 70.28 | 16.24 | 101.31 | 45.35 | 98.90 | 56.77 to 79.22 | 862,603 | 606,247 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 3 | 69.73 | 53.93 | 48.10 | 23.23 | 112.12 | 21.72 | 70.33 | N/A | 579,838 | 278,885 |
| 3 | 2 | 70.03 | 70.03 | 69.82 | 00.43 | 100.30 | 69.73 | 70.33 | N/A | 476,918 | 333,008 |
| 6 | 1 | 21.72 | 21.72 | 21.72 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 21.72 | 21.72 | N/A | 785,679 | 170,640 |
| _ ALL | 75 | 73.92 | 72.98 | 69.43 | 19.26 | 105.11 | 21.72 | 120.84 | 64.98 to 77.51 | 935,567 | 649,547 |
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Platte County 2024 Average Acre Value Comparison

| County | Mkt <br> Area | $\mathbf{1 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 A}$ | $\mathbf{2 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 A}$ | $\mathbf{3 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 A}$ | 4A1 | 4A | WEIGHTED AVG <br> IRR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Platte | 3 | 7,015 | 6,664 | 6,664 | 6,154 | 5,875 | 5,260 | 4,500 | 4,000 | $\mathbf{6 , 1 5 1}$ |
| Butler | 1 | 6,422 | 6,286 | 6,286 | 6,101 | 5,761 | 5,484 | 5,068 | 4,977 | $\mathbf{6 , 3 3 8}$ |
| Polk | 1 | 6,457 | 6,100 | 6,100 | 5,725 | 5,240 | 5,209 | 5,020 | 4,438 | $\mathbf{6 , 6 2 9}$ |
| Merrick | 1 | 5,400 | 5,200 | 5,200 | 4,900 | 4,600 | 4,500 | 4,200 | 3,620 | $\mathbf{5 , 0 5 3}$ |
| Nance | 1 | 4,094 | 3,989 | 3,989 | 3,985 | 3,980 | 3,899 | 3,900 | 3,797 | $\mathbf{3 , 9 9 7}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Platte | 6 | 9,520 | 8,585 | 8,585 | 8,381 | 7,590 | 7,190 | 6,900 | 6,479 | $\mathbf{8 , 1 5 4}$ |
| Boone | 1 | 7,925 | 7,972 | 7,972 | 7,925 | 5,820 | 7,917 | 7,947 | 7,945 | $\mathbf{7 , 9 4 8}$ |
| Madison | 1 | 8,243 | 7,701 | 7,701 | 7,341 | 6,875 | 6,675 | 5,495 | 4,673 | $\mathbf{6 , 6 5 8}$ |
| Stanton | 1 | 5,769 | 6,385 | 6,385 | 5,555 | 4,819 | 5,704 | 5,021 | 4,852 | $\mathbf{5 , 6 2 4}$ |
| Colfax | 1 | 6,404 | 6,304 | 6,304 | 6,051 | 5,740 | 5,526 | 5,100 | 4,818 | $\mathbf{5 , 9 7 0}$ |
| Nance | 2 | 5,565 | 5,565 | 5,565 | 5,515 | 5,515 | 5,515 | 5,460 | 5,460 | $\mathbf{5 , 5 2 8}$ |


| County | Mkt <br> Area | 1D1 | 1D | 2D1 | 2D | 3D1 | 3D | 4D1 | 4D | WEIGHTED <br> AVG DRY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Platte | 3 | 5,200 | 5,050 | 4,783 | 4,700 | 4,304 | 3,871 | 3,300 | 2,800 | $\mathbf{4 , 4 3 9}$ |
| Butler | 1 | 6,700 | 6,100 | 5,850 | 5,750 | 5,500 | 5,000 | 3,950 | 3,825 | $\mathbf{5 , 3 9 8}$ |
| Polk | 1 | 5,710 | 5,410 | 4,160 | 4,150 | 3,740 | 3,620 | 3,490 | 3,510 | $\mathbf{5 , 0 3 7}$ |
| Merrick | 1 | 2,800 | 2,575 | 2,475 | 2,400 | 2,175 | 2,075 | 1,900 | 1,840 | $\mathbf{2 , 3 1 5}$ |
| Nance | 1 | 2,399 | 2,400 | 2,333 | 2,343 | 2,313 | 2,266 | 2,220 | 2,200 | $\mathbf{2 , 3 1 3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Platte | 6 | 7,841 | 7,350 | 6,729 | 6,639 | 6,347 | 5,938 | 4,900 | 3,724 | $\mathbf{6 , 4 6 1}$ |
| Boone | 1 | 5,474 | 5,434 | 5,474 | 5,080 | 4,527 | 5,442 | 5,438 | 5,437 | $\mathbf{5 , 4 3 7}$ |
| Madison | 1 | 7,816 | 7,631 | 7,107 | 6,743 | 6,439 | 6,164 | 4,798 | 3,825 | $\mathbf{6 , 7 1 9}$ |
| Stanton | 1 | 6,392 | 6,394 | 6,393 | 4,463 | 3,267 | 5,411 | 5,043 | 5,116 | $\mathbf{5 , 6 2 1}$ |
| Colfax | 1 | 7,434 | 7,317 | 7,007 | 6,878 | 6,399 | 6,329 | 5,846 | 5,382 | $\mathbf{6 , 6 5 1}$ |
| Nance | 2 | 4,595 | 4,560 | 4,535 | 4,535 | 4,480 | 4,450 | 4,390 | 4,390 | $\mathbf{4 , 5 0 0}$ |


| County | Mkt <br> Area | $\mathbf{1 G 1}$ | 1G | 2G1 | 2G | 3G1 | 3G | 4G1 | 4G | WEIGHTED <br> AVG GRASS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Platte | 3 | 2,003 | 1,924 | 1,905 | 1,512 | 1,735 | 1,566 | 1,562 | 1,442 | $\mathbf{1 , 8 7 6}$ |
| Butler | 1 | 2,796 | 2,771 | 2,716 | 2,721 | 2,255 | 2,594 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 2,525 | $\mathbf{2 , 7 6 4}$ |
| Polk | 1 | 1,600 | 1,595 | 1,590 | 1,585 | 1,580 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,510 | 1,500 | $\mathbf{1 , 5 9 1}$ |
| Merrick | 1 | 1,886 | 1,750 | 1,777 | 1,703 | 1,616 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,415 | 1,200 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 9 6}$ |
| Nance | 1 | 2,001 | 2,000 | 1,991 | 1,880 | 1,852 | 1,834 | 1,825 | 1,780 | $\mathbf{1 , 9 3 2}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Platte | 6 | 2,434 | 2,456 | 2,273 | 2,287 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,490 | 2,040 | 1,948 | $\mathbf{2 , 3 8 9}$ |
| Boone | 1 | 1,879 | 1,876 | 1,876 | 1,885 | 1,518 | 1,620 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 7 5}$ |
| Madison | 1 | 2,492 | 2,400 | 2,248 | 2,185 | 2,075 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 3 5 7}$ |
| Stanton | 1 | 2,244 | 2,372 | 1,860 | 2,325 | 1,605 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,878 | $\mathbf{2 , 0 8 5}$ |
| Colfax | 1 | 2,129 | 2,128 | 1,928 | 1,928 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,821 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,714 | $\mathbf{2 , 0 8 1}$ |
| Nance | 2 | 1,816 | 1,817 | 1,792 | 1,790 | 1,720 | 1,720 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1,675 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 9 9}$ |


| County | Mkt <br> Area | CRP | TIMBER | WASTE |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Platte | 3 | 1,933 | 1,674 | 200 |
| Butler | 1 | 3,183 | 1,725 | 755 |
| Polk | 1 | 2,200 | 1,150 | 300 |
| Merrick | 1 | 1,583 | 500 | 550 |
| Nance | 1 | 2,103 | 1,300 | 265 |

Source: 2024 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.


## Legend

| Market_Area | Soils |
| :---: | :---: |
| Registered_WellsDNR |  |
| geocode |  |
| Federal Roads |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Excesssive 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

(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: 2013-2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 12/29/2023



| Tax | Irrigated Land |  |  |  | Dryland |  |  |  | Grassland |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmltv\%chg |
| 2013 | 1,010,310,465 |  |  |  | 438,563,030 |  |  |  | 60,085,670 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 1,288,976,030 | 278,665,565 | 27.58\% | 27.58\% | 632,420,835 | 193,857,805 | 44.20\% | 44.20\% | 74,011,405 | 13,925,735 | 23.18\% | 23.18\% |
| 2015 | 1,479,097,320 | 190,121,290 | 14.75\% | 46.40\% | 733,832,500 | 101,411,665 | 16.04\% | 67.33\% | 78,576,425 | 4,565,020 | 6.17\% | 30.77\% |
| 2016 | 1,529,991,850 | 50,894,530 | 3.44\% | 51.44\% | 773,667,980 | 39,835,480 | 5.43\% | 76.41\% | 76,831,145 | -1,745,280 | -2.22\% | 27.87\% |
| 2017 | 1,534,311,935 | 4,320,085 | 0.28\% | 51.87\% | 776,159,155 | 2,491,175 | 0.32\% | 76.98\% | 77,027,910 | 196,765 | 0.26\% | 28.20\% |
| 2018 | 1,480,033,630 | -54,278,305 | -3.54\% | 46.49\% | 772,057,035 | -4,102,120 | -0.53\% | 76.04\% | 76,793,380 | -234,530 | -0.30\% | 27.81\% |
| 2019 | 1,457,889,835 | -22,143,795 | -1.50\% | 44.30\% | 704,281,935 | -67,775,100 | -8.78\% | 60.59\% | 64,422,350 | -12,371,030 | -16.11\% | 7.22\% |
| 2020 | 1,499,606,775 | 41,716,940 | 2.86\% | 48.43\% | 619,140,410 | -85,141,525 | -12.09\% | 41.17\% | 66,120,565 | 1,698,215 | 2.64\% | 10.04\% |
| 2021 | 1,489,388,535 | -10,218,240 | -0.68\% | 47.42\% | 616,687,885 | -2,452,525 | -0.40\% | 40.62\% | 65,490,265 | -630,300 | -0.95\% | 8.99\% |
| 2022 | 1,492,801,230 | 3,412,695 | 0.23\% | 47.76\% | 613,629,120 | -3,058,765 | -0.50\% | 39.92\% | 75,435,175 | 9,944,910 | 15.19\% | 25.55\% |
| 2023 | 1,496,531,175 | 3,729,945 | 0.25\% | 48.13\% | 697,341,695 | 83,712,575 | 13.64\% | 59.01\% | 83,448,900 | 8,013,725 | 10.62\% | 38.88\% |
| Rate Ann.\%chg: |  | Irrigated | 4.01\% |  |  | Dryland | 4.75\% |  |  | Grassland | 3.34\% |  |
| Tax | Waste Land ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ |  |  |  | Other Agland ${ }^{(1)}$ |  |  |  | Total Agricultural |  |  |  |
| Year | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmitv\%chg |
| 2013 | 255,905 |  |  |  | 12,560,020 |  |  |  | 1,521,775,090 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 257,350 | 1,445 | 0.56\% | 0.56\% | 12,543,345 | -16,675 | -0.13\% | -0.13\% | 2,008,208,965 | 486,433,875 | 31.96\% | 31.96\% |
| 2015 | 260,115 | 2,765 | 1.07\% | 1.65\% | 13,586,125 | 1,042,780 | 8.31\% | 8.17\% | 2,305,352,485 | 297,143,520 | 14.80\% | 51.49\% |
| 2016 | 40,450 | -219,665 | -84.45\% | -84.19\% | 2,883,360 | -10,702,765 | -78.78\% | -77.04\% | 2,383,414,785 | 78,062,300 | 3.39\% | 56.62\% |
| 2017 | 284,810 | 244,360 | 604.10\% | 11.30\% | 2,947,275 | 63,915 | 2.22\% | -76.53\% | 2,390,731,085 | 7,316,300 | 0.31\% | 57.10\% |
| 2018 | 289,640 | 4,830 | 1.70\% | 13.18\% | 2,923,745 | -23,530 | -0.80\% | -76.72\% | 2,332,097,430 | -58,633,655 | -2.45\% | 53.25\% |
| 2019 | 769,905 | 480,265 | 165.81\% | 200.86\% | 2,913,970 | -9,775 | -0.33\% | -76.80\% | 2,230,277,995 | -101,819,435 | -4.37\% | 46.56\% |
| 2020 | 705,780 | -64,125 | -8.33\% | 175.80\% | 9,326,800 | 6,412,830 | 220.07\% | -25.74\% | 2,194,900,330 | -35,377,665 | -1.59\% | 44.23\% |
| 2021 | 703,975 | -1,805 | -0.26\% | 175.09\% | 9,314,735 | -12,065 | -0.13\% | -25.84\% | 2,181,585,395 | -13,314,935 | -0.61\% | 43.36\% |
| 2022 | 686,300 | -17,675 | -2.51\% | 168.19\% | 9,303,045 | -11,690 | -0.13\% | -25.93\% | 2,191,854,870 | 10,269,475 | 0.47\% | 44.03\% |
| 2023 | 699,285 | 12,985 | 1.89\% | 173.26\% | 9,224,395 | -78,650 | -0.85\% | -26.56\% | 2,287,245,450 | 95,390,580 | 4.35\% | 50.30\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cnty\# } \\ \text { County } \end{gathered}$ | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rate Ann.\%chg: | Total Agric Land | 4.16\% |  |
|  | PLATTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: 2013-2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL |  |  | NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division |  |  | Prepared as of 12/29/2023 |  |  | CHART 3 |  |  |  |

CHART 4 - AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative \% Change 2013-2023 (from County Abstract Reports)(1)

|  | IRRIGATED LAND |  |  |  |  | DRYLAND |  |  |  |  | GRASSLAND |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmltv\%chg <br> 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 |
| 2013 | 1,010,500,885 | 212,372 | 4,758 |  |  | 438,175,810 | 122,848 | 3,567 |  |  | 60,361,005 | 49,318 | 1,224 |  |  |
| 2014 | 1,286,481,970 | 214,872 | 5,987 | 25.83\% | 25.83\% | 634,700,370 | 120,988 | 5,246 | 47.08\% | 47.08\% | 73,645,680 | 48,650 | 1,514 | 23.68\% | 23.68\% |
| 2015 | 1,479,652,135 | 215,930 | 6,852 | 14.45\% | 44.01\% | 734,378,210 | 119,978 | 6,121 | 16.68\% | 71.61\% | 78,228,015 | 48,458 | 1,614 | 6.64\% | 31.90\% |
| 2016 | 1,529,181,700 | 213,546 | 7,161 | 4.50\% | 50.50\% | 774,732,080 | 121,566 | 6,373 | 4.12\% | 78.67\% | 76,802,945 | 48,839 | 1,573 | -2.59\% | 28.49\% |
| 2017 | 1,534,760,420 | 213,283 | 7,196 | 0.49\% | 51.23\% | 776,594,610 | 121,314 | 6,402 | 0.45\% | 79.47\% | 76,998,235 | 49,098 | 1,568 | -0.28\% | 28.13\% |
| 2018 | 1,480,379,190 | 213,530 | 6,933 | -3.65\% | 45.70\% | 772,444,085 | 120,659 | 6,402 | 0.01\% | 79.49\% | 76,729,330 | 49,321 | 1,556 | -0.80\% | 27.11\% |
| 2019 | 1,469,967,955 | 213,444 | 6,887 | -0.66\% | 44.74\% | 707,520,070 | 120,274 | 5,883 | -8.11\% | 64.93\% | 67,726,850 | 49,487 | 1,369 | -12.03\% | 11.82\% |
| 2020 | 1,500,360,815 | 213,135 | 7,039 | 2.22\% | 47.95\% | 619,663,950 | 119,152 | 5,201 | -11.59\% | 45.81\% | 65,816,535 | 46,481 | 1,416 | 3.46\% | 15.69\% |
| 2021 | 1,489,240,750 | 213,107 | 6,988 | -0.73\% | 46.87\% | 617,138,665 | 118,786 | 5,195 | -0.10\% | 45.66\% | 65,533,185 | 46,471 | 1,410 | -0.41\% | 15.22\% |
| 2022 | 1,490,957,855 | 213,358 | 6,988 | 0.00\% | 46.86\% | 614,912,565 | 118,389 | 5,194 | -0.03\% | 45.62\% | 75,488,395 | 46,299 | 1,630 | 15.62\% | 33.21\% |
| 2023 | 1,495,111,960 | 213,925 | 6,989 | 0.01\% | 46.88\% | 698,992,085 | 117,418 | 5,953 | 14.61\% | 66.90\% | 83,929,495 | 46,206 | 1,816 | 11.41\% | 48.41\% |

Rate Annual \%chg Average Value/Acre:
3.92\%
$5.26 \%$
$4.03 \%$

|  | WASTE LAND (2) |  |  |  |  | OTHER AGLAND (2) |  |  |  |  | TOTAL AGRICULTURAL LAND (1) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmltv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmitv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmilv\%chg AvgVal/Acre |
| 2013 | 255,655 | 2,557 | 100 |  |  | 2,936,275 | 3,438 | 854 |  |  | 1,512,229,630 | 390,532 | 3,872 |  |  |
| 2014 | 254,990 | 2,550 | 100 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3,001,810 | 3,493 | 859 | 0.61\% | 0.61\% | 1,998,084,820 | 390,554 | 5,116 | 32.12\% | 32.12\% |
| 2015 | 257,605 | 2,576 | 100 | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 2,989,745 | 3,463 | 863 | 0.46\% | 1.08\% | 2,295,505,710 | 390,405 | 5,880 | 14.93\% | 51.85\% |
| 2016 | 274,645 | 2,746 | 100 | 0.01\% | 0.01\% | 2,887,835 | 3,370 | 857 | -0.74\% | 0.33\% | 2,383,879,205 | 390,068 | 6,111 | 3.94\% | $57.83 \%$ |
| 2017 | 284,830 | 2,848 | 100 | -0.01\% | 0.00\% | 2,955,125 | 3,474 | 851 | -0.74\% | -0.41\% | 2,391,593,220 | 390,018 | 6,132 | 0.34\% | 58.36\% |
| 2018 | 289,680 | 2,897 | 100 | -0.01\% | -0.01\% | 2,927,820 | 3,469 | 844 | -0.78\% | -1.19\% | 2,332,770,105 | 389,877 | 5,983 | -2.42\% | 54.52\% |
| 2019 | 288,700 | 2,887 | 100 | 0.00\% | -0.01\% | 2,939,215 | 3,465 | 848 | 0.52\% | -0.67\% | 2,248,442,790 | 389,557 | 5,772 | -3.54\% | 49.06\% |
| 2020 | 691,280 | 6,913 | 100 | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 9,335,600 | 3,468 | 2,692 | 217.28\% | 215.15\% | 2,195,868,180 | 389,151 | 5,643 | -2.24\% | 45.72\% |
| 2021 | 704,095 | 7,041 | 100 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 9,351,600 | 3,455 | 2,706 | 0.55\% | 216.89\% | 2,181,968,295 | 388,860 | 5,611 | -0.56\% | 44.91\% |
| 2022 | 686,545 | 6,875 | 100 | -0.12\% | -0.13\% | 9,305,055 | 3,419 | 2,722 | 0.57\% | 218.70\% | 2,191,350,415 | 388,339 | 5,643 | 0.56\% | 45.73\% |
| 2023 | 699,715 | 7,007 | 100 | -0.01\% | -0.13\% | 9,204,400 | 3,430 | 2,683 | -1.43\% | 214.16\% | 2,287,937,655 | 387,985 | 5,897 | 4.50\% | 52.29\% |


| 71 |
| :---: |
| PLATTE |

Rate Annual \%chg Average Value/Acre:

CHART 5-2023 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type

| Pop. | County: | Personal Prop | StateAsd PP | StateAsdReal | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | Agdwell\&HS | Aglmprves | Minerals | Total Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34,296 | PLATTE | 380,105,144 | 46,744,447 | 111,571,847 | 2,458,487,731 | 583,644,253 | 280,587,025 | 8,598,060 | 2,287,245,450 | 218,143,780 | 191,639,090 | 166,575 | 6,566,933,402 |
| cnty sectorvalu | Pue \% of total value: | 5.79\% | 0.71\% | 1.70\% | 37.44\% | 8.89\% | 4.27\% | 0.13\% | 34.83\% | 3.32\% | 2.92\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Pop. | Municipality: | Personal Prop | StateAsd PP | StateAsd Real | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | Agdwell\&HS | Aglmprives | Minerals | Total Value |
| 24,028 | COLUMBUS | 82,971,898 | 11,944,974 | 11,606,621 | 1,708,638,601 | 449,366,740 | 25,451,945 | 301,470 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,290,282,249 |
| 70.06\% | \%sector of county sector | 21.83\% | 25.55\% | 10.40\% | 69.50\% | 76.99\% | 9.07\% | 3.51\% |  |  |  |  | 34.88\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.62\% | 0.52\% | 0.51\% | 74.60\% | 19.62\% | 1.11\% | 0.01\% |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 33 | CORNLEA | 520,363 | 0 | 0 | 1,930,225 | 777,605 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,228,193 |
| 0.10\% | \%sector of county sector | $0.14 \%$ |  |  | 0.08\% | 0.13\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 16.12\% |  |  | 59.79\% | 24.09\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 181 | CRESTON | 420,342 | 1,923 | 434 | 9,863,955 | 2,551,795 | 0 | 0 | 6,210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,844,659 |
| $0.53 \%$ | \%sector of county sector | 0.11\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.40\% | 0.44\% |  |  | 0.00\% |  |  |  | 0.20\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.27\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 76.79\% | 19.87\% |  |  | 0.05\% |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 392 | DUNCAN | 50,755 | 366,670 | 2,578,549 | 28,076,070 | 4,206,190 | 886,270 | 0 | 133,615 | 0 | 192,820 | 0 | 36,490,939 |
| 1.14\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.01\% | 0.78\% | 2.31\% | 1.14\% | 0.72\% | 0.32\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.10\% |  | $0.56 \%$ |
|  | \%sector of municipaliy | 0.14\% | 1.00\% | 7.07\% | $76.94 \%$ | 11.53\% | 2.43\% |  | 0.37\% |  | 0.53\% |  | 100.00\% |
| 905 | HUMPHREY | 4,347,644 | 481,905 | 1,177,749 | 84,972,175 | 22,646,430 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113,625,903 |
| 2.64\% | \%sector of county sector | 1.14\% | 1.03\% | 1.06\% | 3.46\% | 3.88\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.73\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.83\% | 0.42\% | 1.04\% | 74.78\% | 19.93\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 283 | LINDSAY | 12,048,212 | 205,591 | 21,441 | 21,832,170 | 9,608,410 | 5,039,560 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48,755,384 |
| 0.83\% | \%sector of county sector | 3.17\% | 0.44\% | 0.02\% | 0.89\% | 1.65\% | 1.80\% |  |  |  |  |  | 0.74\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 24.71\% | 0.42\% | $0.04 \%$ | 44.78\% | 19.71\% | 10.34\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 296 | MONROE | 4,830,417 | 201,379 | 705,578 | 15,613,695 | 19,413,630 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40,764,699 |
| 0.86\% | \%sector of county sector | 1.27\% | 0.43\% | 0.63\% | $0.64 \%$ | 3.33\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.62\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 11.85\% | 0.49\% | 1.73\% | 38.30\% | 47.62\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 667 | NEWMAN GROVE | 17 | 3,885 | 367 | 543,770 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 548,039 |
| 1.94\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.00\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 0.02\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 0.00\% | 0.71\% | 0.07\% | 99.22\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 333 | PLATTE CENTER | 286,214 | 139,793 | 729,250 | 20,256,105 | 2,032,095 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33,420 | 0 | 23,476,877 |
| 0.97\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.08\% | 0.30\% | 0.65\% | 0.82\% | 0.35\% |  |  |  |  | 0.02\% |  | $0.36 \%$ |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 1.22\% | 0.60\% | 3.11\% | 86.28\% | $8.66 \%$ |  |  |  |  | 0.14\% |  | 100.00\% |
| 52 | TARNOV | 4,189 | 20,395 | 210,796 | 1,922,715 | 135,460 | 0 | 0 | 14,265 | 0 | 905 | 0 | 2,308,725 |
| 0.15\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.00\% | 0.04\% | 0.19\% | 0.08\% | 0.02\% |  |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.04\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 0.18\% | 0.88\% | $9.13 \%$ | 83.28\% | 5.87\% |  |  | 0.62\% |  | 0.04\% |  | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27,171 | Total Municipalities | 105,480,052 | 13,366,515 | 17,030,785 | 1,893,649,489 | 510,738,358 | 31,377,775 | 301,470 | 154,090 | 0 | 227,145 | 0 | 2,572,325,677 |
| 79.22\% | \%all municip.sectors of cnty | 27.75\% | 28.59\% | 15.26\% | 77.02\% | 87.51\% | 11.18\% | 3.51\% | 0.01\% |  | 0.12\% |  | 39.17\% |


| Total Real Property |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sum Lines $17,25, \& 30$ |$\quad$ Records : 20,278 $\quad$ Value : 6,752,995,910 $\quad$ Growth 99,685,881 $\quad$ Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 41


| Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 663 | 17,518,151 | 341 | 16,045,180 | 922 | 20,588,260 | 1,926 | 54,151,591 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 8,986 | 233,365,290 | 790 | 32,686,415 | 1,087 | 35,766,885 | 10,863 | 301,818,590 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 9,196 | 1,781,538,378 | 1,038 | 278,655,490 | 1,198 | 325,071,274 | 11,432 | 2,385,265,142 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 9,859 | 2,032,421,819 | 1,379 | 327,387,085 | 2,120 | 381,426,419 | 13,358 | 2,741,235,323 | 37,737,521 |
| \% of Res Total | 73.81 | 74.14 | 10.32 | 11.94 | 15.87 | 13.91 | 65.87 | 40.59 | 37.86 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 211 | 24,257,420 | 32 | 3,109,245 | 13 | 598,843 | 256 | 27,965,508 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 1,029 | 105,388,710 | 92 | 11,528,050 | 46 | 3,878,590 | 1,167 | 120,795,350 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 1,048 | 438,342,160 | 103 | 45,628,465 | 58 | 21,060,610 | 1,209 | 505,031,235 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 1,259 | 567,988,290 | 135 | 60,265,760 | 71 | 25,538,043 | 1,465 | 653,792,093 | 56,802,120 |
| \% of Com Total | 85.94 | 86.88 | 9.22 | 9.22 | 4.85 | 3.91 | 7.22 | 9.68 | 56.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 2 | 244,745 | 9 | 829,085 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1,073,830 |  |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 7 | 661,565 | 46 | 21,375,690 | 3 | 3,073,890 | 56 | 25,111,145 |  |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 7 | 30,554,750 | 46 | 205,912,010 | 3 | 18,779,395 | 56 | 255,246,155 |  |
| 12. Ind Total | 9 | 31,461,060 | 55 | 228,116,785 | 3 | 21,853,285 | 67 | 281,431,130 | 300,620 |
| \% of Ind Total | 13.43 | 11.18 | 82.09 | 81.06 | 4.48 | 7.77 | 0.33 | 4.17 | 0.30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 3 | 253,750 | 14 | 971,850 | 46 | 4,833,990 | 63 | 6,059,590 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 1 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2,237,020 | 13 | 2,242,020 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 1 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2,097,285 | 16 | 2,097,555 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 4 | 259,020 | 14 | 971,850 | 61 | 9,168,295 | 79 | 10,399,165 | 0 |
| \% of Rec Total | 5.06 | 2.49 | 17.72 | 9.35 | 77.22 | 88.16 | 0.39 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Res \& Rec Total | 9,863 | 2,032,680,839 | 1,393 | 328,358,935 | 2,181 | 390,594,714 | 13,437 | 2,751,634,488 | 37,737,521 |
| \% of Res \& Rec Total | 73.40 | 73.87 | 10.37 | 11.93 | 16.23 | 14.20 | 66.26 | 40.75 | 37.86 |
| Com \& Ind Total | 1,268 | 599,449,350 | 190 | 288,382,545 | 74 | 47,391,328 | 1,532 | 935,223,223 | 57,102,740 |
| \% of Com \& Ind Total | 82.77 | 64.10 | 12.40 | 30.84 | 4.83 | 5.07 | 7.55 | 13.85 | 57.28 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 11,131 | 2,632,130,189 | 1,583 | 616,741,480 | 2,255 | 437,986,042 | 14,969 | 3,686,857,711 | 94,840,261 |
| \% of Taxable Total | 74.36 | 71.39 | 10.58 | 16.73 | 15.06 | 11.88 | 73.82 | 54.60 | 95.14 |



| 30. Ag Total |  |  |  |  |  | 5,308 | 3,065,949,414 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban <br> Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 45 | 46.47 | 1,410,000 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 48 | 0.00 | 13,470,420 |  |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 21 | 19.83 | 148,725 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 58 | 121.14 | 908,550 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 64 | 0.00 | 1,994,490 |  |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 1 | 0.98 | 0 | 150 | 210.89 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 Records | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & \quad \text { Rural } \\ & \text { Acres } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ | 29 Records | $185.70$ <br> Total Acres | $163,710$ <br> Value | Growth |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 8 | 7.00 | 210,000 | 8 | 7.00 | 210,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 934 | 955.54 | 28,883,400 | 979 | 1,002.01 | 30,293,400 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 959 | 0.00 | 232,614,480 | 1,007 | 0.00 | 246,084,900 | 4,075,995 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,015 | 1,009.01 | 276,588,300 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 310 | 383.61 | 2,879,630 | 331 | 403.44 | 3,028,355 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 1,156 | 3,947.69 | 29,607,675 | 1,214 | 4,068.83 | 30,516,225 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 1,315 | 0.00 | 181,989,824 | 1,379 | 0.00 | 183,984,314 | 769,625 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,710 | 4,472.27 | 217,528,894 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 4,208 | 8,073.26 | 0 | 4,359 | 8,285.13 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 164 | 1,849.36 | 8,770,015 | 193 | 2,035.06 | 8,933,725 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 2,725 | 15,801.47 | 503,050,919 | 4,845,620 |


|  | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1 | 6.15 | 6,090 |
|  | Records | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 13 | 1,903.63 | 6,617,840 | 14 | 1,909.78 | 6,623,930 |
| Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrb <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 6 | 795.51 | 1,886,775 |
| 44. Market Value | 0 <br> Records |  |  | Records 6 |  | $2,656,290$ <br> Value |
| 43. Special Value | 91 | 9,423.75 | 26,750,610 | 97 | 10,219.26 | 28,637,385 |
| 44. Market Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## County 71 Platte

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 3

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 3,006.26 | 12.12\% | 22,089,015 | 14.48\% | 7,347.67 |
| 46. 1A | 3,657.36 | 14.75\% | 25,656,360 | 16.82\% | 7,014.99 |
| 47. 2A1 | 4,606.89 | 18.57\% | 30,698,790 | 20.12\% | 6,663.67 |
| 48. 2A | 6,344.29 | 25.58\% | 39,039,590 | 25.59\% | 6,153.50 |
| 49.3A1 | 1,740.35 | 7.02\% | 10,224,620 | 6.70\% | 5,875.04 |
| 50.3A | 1,233.27 | 4.97\% | 6,486,695 | 4.25\% | 5,259.75 |
| 51.4A1 | 3,030.68 | 12.22\% | 13,638,050 | 8.94\% | 4,500.00 |
| 52.4A | 1,182.76 | 4.77\% | 4,731,040 | 3.10\% | 4,000.00 |
| 53. Total | 24,801.86 | 100.00\% | 152,564,160 | 100.00\% | 6,151.32 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 277.31 | 13.19\% | 1,442,015 | 15.44\% | 5,200.01 |
| 55. 1D | 318.27 | 15.13\% | 1,607,295 | 17.22\% | 5,050.10 |
| 56. 2D1 | 315.44 | 15.00\% | 1,508,725 | 16.16\% | 4,782.92 |
| 57. 2D | 299.86 | 14.26\% | 1,409,355 | 15.10\% | 4,700.04 |
| 58.3D1 | 511.89 | 24.34\% | 2,203,405 | 23.60\% | 4,304.45 |
| 59.3D | 86.77 | 4.13\% | 335,930 | 3.60\% | 3,871.50 |
| 60.4D1 | 15.02 | 0.71\% | 49,570 | 0.53\% | 3,300.27 |
| 61.4D | 278.63 | 13.25\% | 780,160 | 8.36\% | 2,799.99 |
| 62. Total | 2,103.19 | 100.00\% | 9,336,455 | 100.00\% | 4,439.19 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 6,899.64 | 40.18\% | 13,822,145 | 43.55\% | 2,003.31 |
| 64. 1G | 710.10 | 4.13\% | 1,366,585 | 4.31\% | 1,924.50 |
| 65. 2G1 | 1,377.70 | 8.02\% | 2,624,535 | 8.27\% | 1,905.01 |
| 66. 2G | 61.23 | 0.36\% | 113,170 | 0.36\% | 1,848.28 |
| 67.3G1 | 5,223.56 | 30.42\% | 9,062,865 | 28.56\% | 1,735.00 |
| 68. 3G | 625.59 | 3.64\% | 1,039,385 | 3.28\% | 1,661.45 |
| 69.4G1 | 328.70 | 1.91\% | 514,375 | 1.62\% | 1,564.88 |
| 70. 4G | 1,946.86 | 11.34\% | 3,193,115 | 10.06\% | 1,640.14 |
| 71. Total | 17,173.38 | 100.00\% | 31,736,175 | 100.00\% | 1,847.99 |
| Irrigated Total | 24,801.86 | 53.86\% | 152,564,160 | 78.18\% | 6,151.32 |
| Dry Total | 2,103.19 | 4.57\% | 9,336,455 | 4.78\% | 4,439.19 |
| Grass Total | 17,173.38 | 37.29\% | 31,736,175 | 16.26\% | 1,847.99 |
| 72. Waste | 1,219.35 | 2.65\% | 243,865 | 0.12\% | 200.00 |
| 73. Other | 749.87 | 1.63\% | 1,273,305 | 0.65\% | 1,698.03 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 46,047.65 | 100.00\% | 195,153,960 | 100.00\% | 4,238.09 |

## County 71 Platte

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 6

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 29,178.96 | 15.50\% | 287,122,160 | 18.70\% | 9,840.04 |
| 46. 1A | 20,459.20 | 10.87\% | 194,770,800 | 12.69\% | 9,519.96 |
| 47. 2A1 | 25,769.99 | 13.69\% | 221,235,095 | 14.41\% | 8,584.99 |
| 48. 2A | 40,233.58 | 21.37\% | 337,192,685 | 21.96\% | 8,380.88 |
| 49.3A1 | 296.50 | 0.16\% | 2,250,440 | 0.15\% | 7,590.02 |
| 50.3A | 4,322.81 | 2.30\% | 31,081,445 | 2.02\% | 7,190.10 |
| 51.4A1 | 49,440.49 | 26.26\% | 341,139,035 | 22.22\% | 6,899.99 |
| 52.4A | 18,576.71 | 9.87\% | 120,367,165 | 7.84\% | 6,479.47 |
| 53. Total | 188,278.24 | 100.00\% | 1,535,158,825 | 100.00\% | 8,153.67 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 13,707.06 | 11.76\% | 107,477,910 | 14.27\% | 7,841.06 |
| 55. 1D | 34,994.92 | 30.02\% | 257,213,765 | 34.15\% | 7,350.03 |
| 56.2D1 | 12,515.57 | 10.74\% | 84,214,695 | 11.18\% | 6,728.79 |
| 57. 2D | 1,714.61 | 1.47\% | 11,383,275 | 1.51\% | 6,638.99 |
| 58.3D1 | 1,765.71 | 1.51\% | 11,207,830 | 1.49\% | 6,347.49 |
| 59.3D | 39,667.53 | 34.03\% | 235,537,150 | 31.27\% | 5,937.78 |
| 60.4D1 | 628.30 | 0.54\% | 3,078,685 | 0.41\% | 4,900.02 |
| 61. 4D | 11,589.08 | 9.94\% | 43,161,835 | 5.73\% | 3,724.35 |
| 62. Total | 116,582.78 | 100.00\% | 753,275,145 | 100.00\% | 6,461.29 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 8,914.25 | 29.39\% | 21,737,015 | 30.80\% | 2,438.46 |
| 64. 1G | 9,278.92 | 30.59\% | 22,816,970 | 32.33\% | 2,459.01 |
| 65. 2G1 | 4,524.37 | 14.92\% | 10,300,515 | 14.59\% | 2,276.67 |
| 66. 2G | 1,900.24 | 6.26\% | 4,341,305 | 6.15\% | 2,284.61 |
| 67.3G1 | 160.08 | 0.53\% | 352,200 | 0.50\% | 2,200.15 |
| 68.3G | 1,055.10 | 3.48\% | 2,167,415 | 3.07\% | 2,054.23 |
| 69.4G1 | 556.19 | 1.83\% | 1,145,710 | 1.62\% | 2,059.93 |
| 70. 4G | 3,943.21 | 13.00\% | 7,720,410 | 10.94\% | 1,957.90 |
| 71. Total | 30,332.36 | 100.00\% | 70,581,540 | 100.00\% | 2,326.94 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 188,278.24 | 55.15\% | 1,535,158,825 | 64.84\% | 8,153.67 |
| Dry Total | 116,582.78 | 34.15\% | 753,275,145 | 31.81\% | 6,461.29 |
| Grass Total | 30,332.36 | 8.88\% | 70,581,540 | 2.98\% | 2,326.94 |
| 72. Waste | 3,360.85 | 0.98\% | 672,130 | 0.03\% | 199.99 |
| 73. Other | 2,840.73 | 0.83\% | 8,056,895 | 0.34\% | 2,836.21 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 341,394.96 | 100.00\% | 2,367,744,535 | 100.00\% | 6,935.50 |

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 18.74 | 157,415 | 7,613.23 | 64,654,430 | 205,448.13 | 1,622,911,140 | 213,080.10 | 1,687,722,985 |
| 77. Dry Land | 50.22 | 354,820 | 1,876.65 | 12,433,785 | 116,759.10 | 749,822,995 | 118,685.97 | 762,611,600 |
| 78. Grass | 9.30 | 21,605 | 2,120.00 | 4,424,995 | 45,376.44 | 97,871,115 | 47,505.74 | 102,317,715 |
| 79. Waste | 1.69 | 335 | 336.23 | 67,225 | 4,242.28 | 848,435 | 4,580.20 | 915,995 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 151.14 | 412,000 | 3,439.46 | 8,918,200 | 3,590.60 | 9,330,200 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 79.95 | 534,175 | 12,097.25 | 81,992,435 | 375,265.41 | 2,480,371,885 | 387,442.61 | 2,562,898,495 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | $213,080.10$ | $55.00 \%$ | $1,687,722,985$ | $65.85 \%$ | $7,920.60$ |
| Dry Land | $118,685.97$ | $30.63 \%$ | $762,611,600$ | $29.76 \%$ | $6,425.46$ |
| Grass | $47,505.74$ | $12.26 \%$ | $102,317,715$ | $3.99 \%$ | $2,153.80$ |
| Waste | $4,580.20$ | $1.18 \%$ | 915,995 | $0.04 \%$ | 199.99 |
| Other | $3,590.60$ | $0.93 \%$ | $9,330,200$ | $0.36 \%$ | $2,598.51$ |
| Exempt | 0.00 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 8 7 , 4 4 2 . 6 1}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 , 5 6 2 , 8 9 8 , 4 9 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $6,614.91$ |

## County 71 Platte

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XI : Residential Records - Assessor Location Detail

| $\underline{\text { Line\# IAssessor Location }}$ | Unimproved Land |  | Improved Land |  | Improvements |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 83.1 Columbus A | 23 | 365,135 | 1,462 | 29,626,615 | 1,462 | 184,598,515 | 1,485 | 214,590,265 | 778,306 |
| 83.2 Columbus A-1 | 102 | 4,857,005 | 563 | 33,993,975 | 563 | 265,937,885 | 665 | 304,788,865 | 8,686,975 |
| 83.3 Columbus B | 83 | 1,169,950 | 591 | 15,516,435 | 591 | 133,772,183 | 674 | 150,458,568 | 469,185 |
| 83.4 Columbus B-1 | 292 | 11,846,750 | 663 | 18,691,950 | 668 | 170,263,255 | 960 | 200,801,955 | 4,580,815 |
| 83.5 Columbus C | 28 | 251,705 | 1,222 | 33,583,410 | 1,222 | 228,922,745 | 1,250 | 262,757,860 | 386,210 |
| 83.6 Columbus D | 66 | 2,146,510 | 666 | 16,352,435 | 660 | 136,049,800 | 726 | 154,548,745 | 1,885,050 |
| 83.7 Columbus E | 22 | 357,225 | 714 | 20,279,690 | 714 | 172,052,060 | 736 | 192,688,975 | 146,285 |
| 83.8 Columbus F | 87 | 2,800,010 | 633 | 25,082,755 | 633 | 230,088,100 | 720 | 257,970,865 | 1,621,620 |
| 83.9 Columbus H | 38 | 1,313,360 | 482 | 10,362,670 | 455 | 88,118,195 | 493 | 99,794,225 | 712,790 |
| 83.10 Columbus I | 29 | 4,452,675 | 283 | 21,279,590 | 352 | 90,704,830 | 381 | 116,437,095 | 486,515 |
| 83.11 Columbus J | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 486 | 10,076,140 | 486 | 10,076,140 | 496,595 |
| 83.12 Columbus K | 28 | 444,880 | 328 | 5,878,495 | 287 | 69,264,140 | 315 | 75,587,515 | 7,683,860 |
| 83.13 Columbus L | 57 | 827,556 | 1,309 | 33,934,775 | 1,309 | 188,553,965 | 1,366 | 223,316,296 | 1,925,365 |
| 83.14 Comml-col | 1 | 5,190 | 2 | 367,500 | 2 | 858,960 | 3 | 1,231,650 | 0 |
| 83.15 Comm3-smtown/other | 1 | 9,525 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9,525 | 0 |
| 83.16 Humphrey D3 | 36 | 906,530 | 395 | 7,261,145 | 395 | 86,985,150 | 431 | 95,152,825 | 1,378,410 |
| 83.17 Nbhd 13 Smtown | 137 | 1,484,905 | 752 | 5,256,760 | 758 | 105,050,090 | 895 | 111,791,755 | 985,205 |
| 83.18 Platte Acreage | 899 | 21,030,415 | 799 | 24,845,480 | 876 | 223,330,544 | 1,775 | 269,206,439 | 5,514,335 |
| 83.19 Platte Center 12 | 2 | 57,635 | 2 | 9,540 | 2 | 127,610 | 4 | 194,785 | 0 |
| 83.20 Platte Cnty Farm | 58 | 5,884,220 | 10 | 1,737,390 | 13 | 2,608,530 | 71 | 10,230,140 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 84 Residential Total | 1,989 | 60,211,181 | 10,876 | 304,060,610 | 11,448 | 2,387,362,697 | 13,437 | 2,751,634,488 | 37,737,521 |

## County 71 Platte

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XII : Commercial Records - Assessor Location Detail

| $\underline{\text { Line\# I Assessor Location }}$ | Unimproved Land |  | Improved Land |  | Improvements |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 85.1 Columbus A | 1 | 573,390 | 3 | 105,500 | 2 | 266,425 | 3 | 945,315 | 0 |
| 85.2 Columbus B-1 | 1 | 32,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32,500 | 0 |
| 85.3 Comm1-col | 169 | 23,990,863 | 863 | 106,947,950 | 876 | 431,163,150 | 1,045 | 562,101,963 | 53,753,475 |
| 85.4 Comm2-col Sd | 36 | 3,071,540 | 104 | 30,129,885 | 107 | 233,414,770 | 143 | 266,616,195 | 200,120 |
| 85.5 Comm3-smtown/other | 58 | 1,273,820 | 251 | 7,984,205 | 275 | 95,061,315 | 333 | 104,319,340 | 3,006,960 |
| 85.6 Comm4-other | 1 | 75,000 | 1 | 177,140 | 1 | 53,775 | 2 | 305,915 | 142,185 |
| 85.7 Nbhd 13 Smtown | 1 | 22,225 | 1 | 561,815 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 584,040 | 0 |
| 85.8 Platte Cnty Farm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 317,955 | 4 | 317,955 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 86 Commercial Total | 267 | 29,039,338 | 1,223 | 145,906,495 | 1,265 | 760,277,390 | 1,532 | 935,223,223 | 57,102,740 |

## County 71 Platte

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area
Market Area 3

| Pure Grass | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87. 1G1 | 6,572.25 | 46.55\% | 13,166,630 | 49.70\% | 2,003.37 |
| 88. 1G | 693.33 | 4.91\% | 1,333,745 | 5.03\% | 1,923.68 |
| 89. 2G1 | 1,277.88 | 9.05\% | 2,434,375 | 9.19\% | 1,905.01 |
| 90. 2G | 2.11 | 0.01\% | 3,190 | 0.01\% | 1,511.85 |
| 91. 3G1 | 5,078.60 | 35.97\% | 8,811,365 | 33.26\% | 1,735.00 |
| 92. 3G | 170.18 | 1.21\% | 266,495 | 1.01\% | 1,565.96 |
| 93. 4G1 | 66.48 | 0.47\% | 103,865 | 0.39\% | 1,562.35 |
| 94. 4G | 257.28 | 1.82\% | 371,100 | 1.40\% | 1,442.40 |
| 95. Total | 14,118.11 | 100.00\% | 26,490,765 | 100.00\% | 1,876.37 |
| CRP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 96. 1C1 | 298.66 | 59.05\% | 601,800 | 61.56\% | 2,015.00 |
| 97. 1C | 14.66 | 2.90\% | 29,540 | 3.02\% | 2,015.01 |
| 98. 2 C 1 | 74.16 | 14.66\% | 141,280 | 14.45\% | 1,905.07 |
| 99. 2 C | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 100. 3C1 | 116.70 | 23.07\% | 202,480 | 20.71\% | 1,735.05 |
| 101.3C | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 102. 4C1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 103.4C | 1.61 | 0.32\% | 2,520 | 0.26\% | 1,565.22 |
| 104. Total | 505.79 | 100.00\% | 977,620 | 100.00\% | 1,932.86 |
| Timber |  |  |  |  |  |
| 105. 1T1 | 28.73 | 1.13\% | 53,715 | 1.26\% | 1,869.65 |
| 106. 1T | 2.11 | 0.08\% | 3,300 | 0.08\% | 1,563.98 |
| 107. 2 T 1 | 25.66 | 1.01\% | 48,880 | 1.15\% | 1,904.91 |
| 108.2T | 59.12 | 2.32\% | 109,980 | 2.58\% | 1,860.28 |
| 109.3T1 | 28.26 | 1.11\% | 49,020 | 1.15\% | 1,734.61 |
| 110.3T | 455.41 | 17.86\% | 772,890 | 18.11\% | 1,697.13 |
| 111.4T1 | 262.22 | 10.29\% | 410,510 | 9.62\% | 1,565.52 |
| 112.4T | 1,687.97 | 66.21\% | 2,819,495 | 66.06\% | 1,670.35 |
| 113. Total | 2,549.48 | 100.00\% | 4,267,790 | 100.00\% | 1,673.98 |
| Grass Total | 14,118.11 | 82.21\% | 26,490,765 | 83.47\% | 1,876.37 |
| CRP Total | 505.79 | 2.95\% | 977,620 | 3.08\% | 1,932.86 |
| Timber Total | 2,549.48 | 14.85\% | 4,267,790 | 13.45\% | 1,673.98 |
| 114. Market Area Total | 17,173.38 | 100.00\% | 31,736,175 | 100.00\% | 1,847.99 |

## County 71 Platte

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area
Market Area 6

| Pure Grass | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87. 1G1 | 8,208.55 | 34.87\% | 19,981,090 | 35.53\% | 2,434.18 |
| 88. 1G | 8,884.49 | 37.75\% | 21,823,285 | 38.81\% | 2,456.34 |
| 89. 2G1 | 4,073.42 | 17.31\% | 9,258,815 | 16.47\% | 2,272.98 |
| 90. 2G | 1,733.78 | 7.37\% | 3,965,620 | 7.05\% | 2,287.27 |
| 91. 3G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 92. 3G | 87.91 | 0.37\% | 130,975 | 0.23\% | 1,489.88 |
| 93. 4G1 | 17.52 | 0.07\% | 35,735 | 0.06\% | 2,039.67 |
| 94. 4G | 532.15 | 2.26\% | 1,036,820 | 1.84\% | 1,948.36 |
| 95. Total | 23,537.82 | 100.00\% | 56,232,340 | 100.00\% | 2,389.02 |
| CRP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 96. 1C1 | 473.30 | 55.17\% | 1,166,030 | 55.63\% | 2,463.62 |
| 97. 1C | 201.87 | 23.53\% | 508,705 | 24.27\% | 2,519.96 |
| 98. 2 C 1 | 113.49 | 13.23\% | 262,165 | 12.51\% | 2,310.03 |
| 99. 2 C | 66.66 | 7.77\% | 153,990 | 7.35\% | 2,310.08 |
| 100. 3C1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 101.3C | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 102. 4C1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 103.4C | 2.61 | 0.30\% | 5,325 | 0.25\% | 2,040.23 |
| 104. Total | 857.93 | 100.00\% | 2,096,215 | 100.00\% | 2,443.34 |
| Timber |  |  |  |  |  |
| 105. 1T1 | 232.40 | 3.91\% | 589,895 | 4.81\% | 2,538.27 |
| 106. 1T | 192.56 | 3.24\% | 484,980 | 3.96\% | 2,518.59 |
| 107. 2 T1 | 337.46 | 5.68\% | 779,535 | 6.36\% | 2,310.01 |
| 108.2T | 99.80 | 1.68\% | 221,695 | 1.81\% | 2,221.39 |
| 109.3T1 | 160.08 | 2.70\% | 352,200 | 2.87\% | 2,200.15 |
| 110.3T | 967.19 | 16.29\% | 2,036,440 | 16.62\% | 2,105.52 |
| 111. 4T1 | 538.67 | 9.07\% | 1,109,975 | 9.06\% | 2,060.58 |
| 112.4T | 3,408.45 | 57.41\% | 6,678,265 | 54.50\% | 1,959.33 |
| 113. Total | 5,936.61 | 100.00\% | 12,252,985 | 100.00\% | 2,063.97 |
| Grass Total | 23,537.82 | 77.60\% | 56,232,340 | 79.67\% | 2,389.02 |
| CRP Total | 857.93 | 2.83\% | 2,096,215 | 2.97\% | 2,443.34 |
| Timber Total | 5,936.61 | 19.57\% | 12,252,985 | 17.36\% | 2,063.97 |
| 114. Market Area Total | 30,332.36 | 100.00\% | 70,581,540 | 100.00\% | 2,326.94 |

> 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
> Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL)

|  | 2023 CTL County Total | 2024 Form 45 <br> County Total | Value Difference <br> (2024 form 45-2023 CTL) | Percent <br> Change | 2024 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | Percent Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. Residential | 2,458,487,731 | 2,741,235,323 | 282,747,592 | 11.50\% | 37,737,521 | 9.97\% |
| 02. Recreational | 8,598,060 | 10,399,165 | 1,801,105 | 20.95\% | 0 | 20.95\% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 218,143,780 | 276,588,300 | 58,444,520 | 26.79\% | 4,075,995 | 24.92\% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 2,685,229,571 | 3,028,222,788 | 342,993,217 | 12.77\% | 41,813,516 | 11.22\% |
| 05. Commercial | 583,644,253 | 653,792,093 | 70,147,840 | 12.02\% | 56,802,120 | 2.29\% |
| 06. Industrial | 280,587,025 | 281,431,130 | 844,105 | 0.30\% | 300,620 | 0.19\% |
| 07. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-6) | 864,231,278 | 935,223,223 | 70,991,945 | 8.21\% | 57,102,740 | 1.61\% |
| 08. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 183,135,520 | 217,528,894 | 34,393,374 | 18.78\% | 769,625 | 18.36\% |
| 09. Minerals | 166,575 | 188,785 | 22,210 | 13.33 | 0 | 13.33\% |
| 10. Non Ag Use Land | 8,503,570 | 8,933,725 | 430,155 | 5.06\% |  |  |
| 11. Total Non-Agland (sum lines 8-10) | 191,805,665 | 226,651,404 | 34,845,739 | 18.17\% | 769,625 | 17.77\% |
| 12. Irrigated | 1,496,531,175 | 1,687,722,985 | 191,191,810 | 12.78\% |  |  |
| 13. Dryland | 697,341,695 | 762,611,600 | 65,269,905 | 9.36\% |  |  |
| 14. Grassland | 83,448,900 | 102,317,715 | 18,868,815 | 22.61\% |  |  |
| 15. Wasteland | 699,285 | 915,995 | 216,710 | 30.99\% |  |  |
| 16. Other Agland | 9,224,395 | 9,330,200 | 105,805 | 1.15\% |  |  |
| 17. Total Agricultural Land | 2,287,245,450 | 2,562,898,495 | 275,653,045 | 12.05\% |  |  |
| 18. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed) | 6,028,511,964 | 6,752,995,910 | 724,483,946 | 12.02\% | 99,685,881 | 10.36\% |

## 2024 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | One |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff: |
|  | 0 |
| 3. | Other full-time employees: |
|  | Four |
| 4. | Other part-time employees: |
|  | One at 30 hours a week |
| 5. | Number of shared employees: |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: |
|  | $\$ 444,370$ |
| 7. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: |
|  | $\$ 444,370-$ all health care, retirement and social security costs are paid from county general. |
| 8. | Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work: |
|  | $\$ 15,000$ |
| 9. | If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount: |
|  | N/A |
| $\mathbf{1 0 .}$ | Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system: |
| $\mathbf{1 2 .}$ | Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used: |
|  | Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops: |
|  | $\$ 0$ |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| $\mathbf{1 .}$ | Administrative software: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | MIPS |
| 2. | CAMA software: |
|  | MIPS |
| 3. | Personal Property software: |
|  | MIPS |
| 4. | Are cadastral maps currently being used? |
|  | Yes |
| $\mathbf{5 .}$ | If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | Deputy and Staff |
| $\mathbf{6 .}$ | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | Yes |
| 7. | Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address? |
|  | Yes; platte.gworks.com |
| $\mathbf{8 .}$ | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | Staff and gWorks |
| $\mathbf{9 .}$ | What type of aerial imagery is used in the cyclical review of properties? |
|  | Obliques through gWorks and flood area aerials |
| $\mathbf{1 0 .}$ | When was the aerial imagery last updated? |
|  | 2020 Flood Aerials, 2020 FSA and 2020 Obliques |
|  |  |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | No not in the rural areas |
| 2. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
|  | N/A |
|  |  |


| 3. | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Columbus, Duncan, Humphrey, Platte Center, and Monroe are all zoned. |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
|  | Uncertain of the date in Columbus but many years ago; Humphrey is not known; zoning was <br> implemented in Duncan and Platte Center in 2009; and zoning was implemented in Monroe in <br> 2015. |

D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Thomas W. Kubert, hired for specialty commercial appraisals |
| 2. | GIS Services: |
|  | gWorks |
| 3. | Other services: |
|  | None |

## E. Appraisal /Listing Services

| 1. | List any outside appraisal or listing services employed by the county for the current <br> assessment year |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Thomas W. Kubert, hired for specialty commercial appraisals |
| 2. | If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract? |
|  | Yes, Dated 11/8/2023 |
| 3. | What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require? |
|  | Certifications are secondary to qualifications. They want an appraiser to know the county, know <br> mass appraisal processes and know how to appraise and defend the specific property type being <br> appraised. |
| 4. | Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA? |
|  | Yes |
| 5. | Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county? |
|  | All value set by the County Assessor |

## 2024 Residential Assessment Survey for Platte County



|  | 13 | Small Towns: the three small villages, Cornlea, Oconee, and Tarnov; and five of the small towns, Creston, Duncan, Lindsay, Monroe and Platte Center; into a single residential valuation group. All have limited commercial services and most are part of consolidated schools located in other towns. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 | Town of Humphrey <br> Of the small towns outside of Columbus, Humphrey has a strong school system and a fair amount of commercial activity so it is measured individually for the residential class. |
|  | 19 | Acreages that consists of all rural residential parcels in the county. Review is conducted by township. When the dates for inspection and review, costing, depreciation tables and lot value study are reviewed. |
|  | AG OB | Agricultural outbuilding |
|  | AG DW | Agricultural dwelling |
| 3. | List and d | ibe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties. |
|  | The county | es the cost approach and applies market derived depreciation. |
| 4. | For the market inf | approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local ation or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? |
|  | Depreciation | udies are based on local market information. |
| 5. | Are indivi depreciatio adjusted. | al depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are |
|  | Yes; and al | for each assessor location in the consolidated group. |
| 6. | Describe th | methodology used to determine the residential lot values? |
|  | Valued by | are foot primarily with values derived from vacant lot sales. |
| 7. | How are ru | I residential site values developed? |
|  | Vacant acr typically be | e site sales are reviewed throughout the county. The site values near Columbus have at a higher value than the other areas of the county. |
| 8. | Are there f | m 191 applications on file? |
|  | Yes. |  |
| 9. | Describe resale? | methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or |
|  | There are depending subdivision | rrently two subdivisions under development and the build-out timeframe is different, the size of the development. A discounted cash flow model has been utilized for each r LB 191. |
|  |  |  |


| 10. | Valuation Group | Date of <br> Depreciation Tables | Date of Costing | Date of <br> Lot Value Study | Date of <br> Last Inspection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2024 | 2022 | 2024 | 2021 |
|  | 2 | 2024 | 2022 | 2021 | 2023 |
|  | 3 | 2024 | 2022 | 2024 | 2022 |
|  | 4 | 2018 | 2022 | 2018 | 2018-2024MH |
|  | 5 | 2024 | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 |
|  | 6 | 2024 | 2022 | 2024 | 2024 |
|  | 7 | 2024 | 2022 | 2024 | 2022 |
|  | 8 | 2024 | 2022 | 2021 | 2022 |
|  | 9 | 2024 | 2022 | 2018 | 2022 |
|  | 10 | 2024 | 2022 | 2024 | 2019 |
|  | 11 | 2020 | 2022 | 2019 | 2024 |
|  | 12 | 2024 | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 |
|  | 13 | 2024 | 2022 | 2012-2018 | 2020 |
|  | 15 | 2024 | 2022 | 2020 | 2024 |
|  | 19 | 2024 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 |
|  | AG OB | 2021 | 2022 | 2020 | 2021 |
|  | AG DW | 2021 | 2022 | 2020 | 2021 |
|  | ----The county has developed the valuation groups partly based on the original assessor locations and partly on the way they organize their work. They typically inspect, review and analyze each town or valuation group separately. The county has identified characteristics that make each town unique. Those characteristics vary, but are usually related to the population, schools, location, businesses and services in each town. Of the 15 valuation groups, the first 12 are sub-strata of the city of Columbus; Valuation Group \#13 is a consolidation of 3 small villages and 5 small towns. This was first created for use in 2016. Humphrey is the only remaining individual small town. Unlike the others it has strong schools and a fair amount of commercial activity. Last is the valuation group named acreages, also known as rural residential; (the houses on agricultural parcels and agricultural buildings buildings tend to be represented by this group and are valued like the acreages). |  |  |  |  |

## 2024 Commercial Assessment Survey for Platte County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | County Assessor and Staff |
| 2. | List the valuation group recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each: |
|  | Valuation <br> Group$\quad$ Description of unique characteristics |
|  | All commercial in the town of Columbus. |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|l} 2 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Commercial in close proximity to Columbus, but outside the city limits. These parcels are } \\ \text { inspected, reviewed and revalued as an independent subclass. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | All small town parcels and rural parcels throughout the county. <br> The small town parcels are inspected, reviewed and revalued at the same time as their residential counterparts. The rural parcels that are not in close proximity to Columbus are usually inspected, reviewed and revalued in the same time frame as the small town or the rural residential that they are near. |
| 3. | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties. |
|  | The county uses the cost approach with depreciation developed from the market for all parcels and the income approach is used when information is available. That is mostly available for apartments, some general retail and warehouse type occupancies. |
| 3a. | Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties. |
|  | The major unique commercial or industrial properties are valued by an outside appraiser with expertise in appraising such property. Otherwise, they are valued by the assessor and staff along with the more typical commercial properties. |
| 4. | 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? |
|  | Platte County uses local sales data to develop market derived depreciation. |
| 5. | 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. |
|  | The depreciation in commercial property tends to be developed more toward individual or like occupancies than just the valuation group. There can also be variation between valuation groups due to locational differences. |
| 6. | Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values. |
|  | Vacant lot sales are analyzed to establish land values. |
|  |  |


| 7. | Valuation <br> Group | Date of <br> Depreciation Tables | $\underline{\text { Date of }}$ <br> Costing | Date of <br> Lot Value Study | $\underline{\text { Date of }}$ <br> Last Inspection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2022 | 2022 | $2015-2022$ | $2021-2022$ |  |
| 2 | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 |  |
| 3 | 2022 | 2022 | 2018 | 2024 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2024 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Platte County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |
| 2. | List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique. |
|  | Market Description of unique characteristics Year Land Use <br> Area  Completed |
|  | Area 3 was newly created for use in 2015. This area exists in the southern part of the county, south of the Loup river and north of the Platte River. The soils in this region tend to be sandier and less productive than the northern part of the county and sale analysis has revealed that the values in this area have not kept pace with the northern part of the county. This is a small area estimated to be only about $15 \%$ of the agricultural acres in the county. |
|  | 6 This area contains the majority of the agricultural acres in the county. It <br> consists of all of the land in the county north of the Loup River. This part <br> of the county generally has superior soils and sales analysis has shown the <br> values tend to be noticeably higher than those in Area 3. 2023 |
|  | ----The county is in a continuous process of updating the use of agricultural land. Every year, they review the certifications, the NRCS maps, and FSA maps provided by farmers. The GIS photo base is the primary source for land use verification and it is monitored for changes. When the county inspects and reviews the improvements in the rural areas of the county, they also review the land use that they are able to observe. The county completed the review of all of the land use throughout the county by comparing the 2020 photo base to the 2020 GIS photo base on a parcel by parcel basis. This review was completed during 2023 for use in the 2024 assessment year. |
| 3. | Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas. |
|  | The county monitors sales activity throughout the county to determine if measureable differences exist. |
| 4. | Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land. |
|  | The primary use of the parcel is determined based on physical inspections and questionnaires and similar properties are used to determine the valuation. |
| 5. | Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not what methodology is used to determine market value? |
|  | Yes; the first (home site) acre, for both farm home and rural residential home sites is valued the same at $\$ 30,000$. This home site acre value is the same throughout the county. |
| 6. | What separate market analysis has been conducted where intensive use is identified in the county? |


|  | The county values intensive use agricultural land for chicken barns by taking the value of the land which includes site prep work and adding in the necessary amenities such as septic, well, electrical, etc... For feedlots, the value has been static for many years and the county is unsure of the methodology that was used to create this value. Feedlots will be revalued in 2020 and a current methodology will be in place. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7. | If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program. |
|  | There are a minimal number of acres known to be in the Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) program in Platte County. Neither the FSA nor the land owners have reported actual WRP acres. The values used for WRP Acres have been set using data from the sales that have occurred in or near Platte County. CRP is also identified. |
| 7a. | Are any other agricultural subclasses used? If yes, please explain. |
|  | Yes, The county has established that soils identified as $9903,8425,2100,8420,2288,8425,8573$, and 2331 overlap between the two market areas and are being valued the same in each market area. |
|  | If your county has special value applications, please answer the following |
| 8a. | How many parcels have a special valuation application on file? |
|  | 105 |
| 8b. | What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist in the county? |
|  | Need more info. |
|  | If vour county recognizes a special value, please answer the following |
| 8c. | Describe the non-agricultural influences recognized within the county. |
|  | The non-agricultural influence has come from the development of residential or recreational sites or developments near the rivers. |
| 8d. | Where is the influenced area located within the county? |
|  | The influenced area in Platte County occurs along the rivers and is sometimes used for residential and recreational purposes. |
| 8 e. | Describe in detail how the special values were arrived at in the influenced area(s). |
|  | The sales of similar land that occur in the non-influenced part of the county are analyzed to develop the values throughout the county. These values are also applied to the qualified parcels that exist in the influenced parts of the county. |
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Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9.

## County Description of Real Property in Platte County:

Per the 2023 County Abstract, Platte County consists of the following real property types:

|  | Parcels | \% of Total Parcels | \% of Value | Value Base |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Residential | 13228 | $65.4 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ | $2,462,542,141$ |
| Commercial | 1448 | $7.2 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $584,657,428$ |
| Industrial | 69 | $.34 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $280,733,830$ |
| Recreational | 69 | $.34 \%$ | $.1 \%$ | $8,015,715$ |
| Agricultural | 5319 | $26.3 \%$ | $44.6 \%$ | $2,697,604,375$ |
| Special Value | 97 | $.5 \%$ | $.3 \%$ | $20,105,030$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20230 |  |  | $6,053,658,519$ |

New Property: For assessment year 2023 an estimated 350 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

## Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

STAFF
1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
2 Appraiser Assistants-Part-Time

Assessor prints and checks all reports. Helps with the sales review process for residential, Ag , and commercial properties. Tax corrections are written by the Assessor/Deputy Assessor.

Assessor, Deputy Assessor, and 2 Appraiser Assistants work on Personal Property \& Homestead Exemptions \& answers the phone.

Deputy Assessor---Works on CAMA system (data entry \& problem solving) in addition to Homestead Exemption \& Personal Property \& Maintenance of Cadastral Books.

Clerks in the assessor's office assist in all the general duties in the office. Personal property, Homestead exemptions, entering data in the Cama real estate system \& GIS data implementation.

Assessor and Appraiser Assistants-Sales review and appraisal review and pickup work for Residential, Commercial and Ag properties and Ag Land sales review \& GIS data implementation. Assessor sets/approves all valuations.

## Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Real Estate Transfers Statements are updated within a couple weeks of when received from The Register of Deeds Office. The Assessor reviews the sales. Once reviewed the transfer statements are passed to the Deputy who will update the computer \& GIS Sys with the new information and transfer 521 information electronically to the Department of Assessment and Taxation.

Sales information sheets are filled out either by making phone calls or mail. We also send letters for appointments so the Assessor or Appraiser Assistant can make a physical review of the property.
B. Internal sales ratio studies are done by neighborhoods and Platte County works well with State of Nebraska Field Liaison and review results.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2023:

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 95 | 14.32 | 102.52 |
| Commercial | 97 | 12.03 | 103.19 |
| Agricultural Land | 74 | 19.96 | 106.25 |

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2024:

## Residential

Sales review of all Neighborhoods and Pickup work. Revaluations D, A-1, Humphrey, Mobile homes

## Commercial

Sales review of Commercial and Industrial. Pickup work. Revaluations Small Town Commercial

## Agricultural

Sales review on land sales \& Pickup work.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2025:

## Residential

Sales Review of all neighborhoods and pickup work. Revalue B-1, I, L

## Commercial

Sale Review of Commercial and Industrial. Pickup work. Small town revaluation. Nursing homes/Assisted Living \& Skilled Care Units

## Agricultural

Pickup work \& Sales review of land sales.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2026:

## Residential

Sales review of all neighborhoods \& pickup work. Revaluation Neighborhoods A, C, \& Small Towns Pickup Work

## Commercial

Sales Review \& Pickup work. Apartments (Comm)

## Agricultural

Pick up work \& Sales review of land sales Acreage review (obliques)


# KARI S URKOSKI <br> PLATTE COUNTY ASSESSOR 

$261014^{\text {th }}$ STREET- COLUMBUS NE 68601
PHONE (402) 563-4902 - FAX (402) 562-6965

February 27, 2024

## 2024

Methodology for Special Valuation
Platte County

Platte County submits this report pursuant to Title 350, Neb Regulation - 11-005.04.
Platte County has instituted Special Valuation along the Loup and Platte Rivers. The following methodology is used to value agricultural land following non-agricultural influences have been identified.

Sales along the rivers have indicated that grass and tree cover are selling for approximately $\$ 4,000-\$ 5,000$ per acre.

In this process, I have determined that market value for grass land and tree cover in this area has been driven up by purchases for hunting and other recreational type uses.

The "special valuation" for qualified parcels was determined by using sales away from the river in an "uninfluenced" area.

Sincerely,

Kari S Urkoski
Platte County Assessor

