

# Table of Contents

## 2014 Commission Summary

## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Correlation

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Correlation

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Correlation
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable

### Statistical Reports

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

### County Reports

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- County Agricultural Land Detail
- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the Prior Year Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL).
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

### Certification

### Maps

- Market Areas

### Valuation History Charts



## 2014 Commission Summary for Custer County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	273	Median	94.50
Total Sales Price	\$18,678,368	Mean	111.64
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$18,678,368	Wgt. Mean	89.51
Total Assessed Value	\$16,718,752	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$51,663
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$68,419	Avg. Assessed Value	\$61,241

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.98 to 96.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	86.44 to 92.58
95% Mean C.I	101.62 to 121.66
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	10.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.82
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.90

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	197	98	97.64
2012	242	97	97.23
2011	232	97	97
2010	239	98	98

## 2014 Commission Summary for Custer County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	50	Median	95.10
Total Sales Price	\$3,206,258	Mean	97.44
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,183,258	Wgt. Mean	86.67
Total Assessed Value	\$2,758,896	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$126,076
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$63,665	Avg. Assessed Value	\$55,178

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	84.40 to 98.29
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.18 to 94.16
95% Mean C.I	83.70 to 111.18
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.29
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.19
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.71

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	47		95.58
2012	37		96.25
2011	55		96
2010	63	96	96



## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Custer County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>95</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>70</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2014 Residential Assessment Actions for Custer County**

A new appraisal cycle began in Custer County for 2014, the Villages of Callaway and Oconto were physically inspected and revalued as were the rural townships of Custer, Delight, Elim, Grant, Loup, Wayne and Wood River. The review process includes a physical inspection and exterior review of all parcels. The lister takes photographs, notates any physical changes, and checks measurements. The county assessor will review the pictures and data collected by the lister and will update the condition and effective age of the property when warranted. The effective age of all reviewed properties is calculated using a table available in the Marshall and Swift manual that is based on known improvements to the property.

After the review was completed, a costing update to Marshall Swift 2013 costing was implemented and new depreciation was applied to the reviewed properties. A sales study was completed that indicated that all rural properties were under assessed. To equalize the reviewed rural properties with those that were not reviewed this assessment year, the costing tables were updated for all properties and the rural land values were increased to more accurately reflect market values.

In the rest of the residential class, the sales study indicated that values were holding in the acceptable range; therefore, only routine maintenance occurred. The pickup work was completed timely.

## 2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Custer County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>														
	The part-time lister														
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>														
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>Broken Bow - the largest community in the county and is a hub for business, jobs, and shopping in both the county and the surrounding Sandhills communities. Both growth and demand for existing housing has been stable within the community.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Callaway - a unique small town in that it contains a hospital, nursing home, and assisted living complex as well as its own school system. These services provide jobs and a demand for housing that is not found in similar sized communities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Ansley, Arnold &amp; Merna - these communities are all located within easy commuting distance of jobs and services in larger communities. Each town has its own school system and has local organizations working to keep the towns viable. Growth has been minimal in these areas, and the market is softer than groups one and two but still relatively stable.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Anselmo, Mason City, Oconto &amp; Sargent - these are small communities, not within easy commuting distance to jobs. The towns have some sales activity annually, but the market is less organized. Values have been flat to slightly decreasing in recent years.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Berwyn &amp; Comstock - very small communities with few sales annually. Demand for housing is sporadic with no market organization.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td> <td>Rural - all properties not within the political boundaries of a town or subdivision. Growth and demand for rural housing continues to be strong throughout the county.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Broken Bow - the largest community in the county and is a hub for business, jobs, and shopping in both the county and the surrounding Sandhills communities. Both growth and demand for existing housing has been stable within the community.	02	Callaway - a unique small town in that it contains a hospital, nursing home, and assisted living complex as well as its own school system. These services provide jobs and a demand for housing that is not found in similar sized communities.	03	Ansley, Arnold & Merna - these communities are all located within easy commuting distance of jobs and services in larger communities. Each town has its own school system and has local organizations working to keep the towns viable. Growth has been minimal in these areas, and the market is softer than groups one and two but still relatively stable.	04	Anselmo, Mason City, Oconto & Sargent - these are small communities, not within easy commuting distance to jobs. The towns have some sales activity annually, but the market is less organized. Values have been flat to slightly decreasing in recent years.	05	Berwyn & Comstock - very small communities with few sales annually. Demand for housing is sporadic with no market organization.	06	Rural - all properties not within the political boundaries of a town or subdivision. Growth and demand for rural housing continues to be strong throughout the county.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>														
01	Broken Bow - the largest community in the county and is a hub for business, jobs, and shopping in both the county and the surrounding Sandhills communities. Both growth and demand for existing housing has been stable within the community.														
02	Callaway - a unique small town in that it contains a hospital, nursing home, and assisted living complex as well as its own school system. These services provide jobs and a demand for housing that is not found in similar sized communities.														
03	Ansley, Arnold & Merna - these communities are all located within easy commuting distance of jobs and services in larger communities. Each town has its own school system and has local organizations working to keep the towns viable. Growth has been minimal in these areas, and the market is softer than groups one and two but still relatively stable.														
04	Anselmo, Mason City, Oconto & Sargent - these are small communities, not within easy commuting distance to jobs. The towns have some sales activity annually, but the market is less organized. Values have been flat to slightly decreasing in recent years.														
05	Berwyn & Comstock - very small communities with few sales annually. Demand for housing is sporadic with no market organization.														
06	Rural - all properties not within the political boundaries of a town or subdivision. Growth and demand for rural housing continues to be strong throughout the county.														
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>														
	Only the cost approach is used.														
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>														
	The physical depreciation table is Marshall and Swift depreciation; economic depreciation is developed using local market information.														
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>														
	The physical depreciation table is the same; however, economic depreciation is developed by area.														
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>														
	Lot values are established using a price per square foot analysis.														

7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	01	2013	2008	2013
	02	2013	2013	2013
	03	2009-2011	2008	2007-2010
	04	2009-2013	2008-2013	2010-2013
	05	2011-2012	2008	2008
	06	2009-2013	2013	2013

In Custer County, all appraisal tables are updated at least once during the six year inspection cycle; this includes updated costing, updated depreciation, and a land study. Due to the size of the county, the review work is divided by location rather than by valuation grouping. Therefore, a portion of the rural is reviewed and revalued each year as are some of the towns/villages. In 2013, because the rural properties seemed to be under assessed new land and cost tables were implemented for all rural properties. As the remainder of the cycle is completed the rest of the valuation groupings will be updated to the 2013 costing. In order equalize changes made to the reviewed area with areas not reviewed, a sales study is conducted annually and economic depreciation and land tables are updated in the unreviewed areas as warranted to ensure all areas are consistently at uniform portions of market value.

# 2014 Residential Correlation Section for Custer County

---

## County Overview

The residential market in Custer County is strongest in Broken Bow. Broken Bow is the county seat and is a hub for goods and services in the Central Sandhills region; there are a number of jobs available locally including manufacturing companies and jobs in agriculture, healthcare, and education. The market in Broken Bow has shown some appreciation in recent years. The market in the smaller communities is strongly impacted by their distance to employment opportunities, and the availability of schools and amenities. Where schools and amenities are available, the market has generally been stable to slightly increasing.

## Description of Analysis

The assessor has stratified the residential class into six valuation groupings based on local economic influences. A comparison of the number of parcels and sales in each group supports that all valuation groupings have a proportionate representation in the sales file.

A review of the statistical profile shows that valuation groups five and six have measures of central tendency outside the acceptable range. Valuation group five is the smallest villages in the county and there is no organization in the market here; the COD of the sample is 95% and displays the impact of five extreme low dollar sales with ratios ranging from 102% to 509%. The statistics from this valuation group are not considered reliable.

Valuation group six, rural residential, has a median of 90%; rural residential parcels were revalued this year with updated costing tables and new land values. Analysis of the sold parcels indicates that those with ratios below the acceptable range are generally clustered around the more populated areas. Custer is a large county and the assessor has attempted to recognize differences in the rural residential parcels by using a lower site value in the Sandhills areas. Based on analysis of the sales, uniformity may be improved by restructuring the rural neighborhoods. Conversations with the assessor have indicated a willingness on the county's part to work with the Department to analyze the rural land values for 2015. An adjustment to the subclass based on the median would affect all rural residential and would not improve assessment uniformity, for that reason a non-binding recommendation will not be made.

For the remainder of the valuation grouping, the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The qualitative statistics are high, particularly outside Broken Bow where the market is less organized. A review of the sale price substrata shows the impact that 43 low dollar sales are having on the qualitative statistics and also indicates a pattern of regressive assessments. This pattern seems most prevalent in valuation groups three and four; some of these areas are due for a physical inspection in the next year. While the assessor needs to examine her valuation models for future assessments, quality determinations will not be made using statistics produced from small towns where the market is not organized.

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices in which one-third of the counties are reviewed each year. This review was conducted in Custer County during 2012; the review confirmed that appraisal techniques were uniformly applied within the residential class.

## **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Custer County**

---

### **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties this year. The review involved an analysis of the sale utilization rate and screening the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. No apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations and all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

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

Based on the review of assessment practices, the quality of assessment of residential parcel is determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

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



## **2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Custer County**

Only routine maintenance was completed for 2014; the pickup work was completed timely and included some new hog confinements. As a result, all hog confinements were revalued county wide.

## 2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Custer County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>			
	Stanard Appraisal Services			
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>			
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>		
	01	The county does not recognize valuation groupings within the commercial class. Commercial properties are valued more by occupancy code than by location. Locational differences are usually accounted for in the land values.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>			
	All three approaches are developed by the contract appraisal service.			
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>			
	Unique commercial properties are valued by the contract appraisal service using sales data from outside the county when appropriate and available.			
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>			
	Depreciation studies are developed by the contract appraiser using local market information.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>			
	n/a			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>			
	A sales price per square foot analysis is used to determine commercial lot values.			
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	01	2012	2011	2012

# **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Custer County**

---

## **County Overview**

The majority of the commercial value in Custer County is within or around the City of Broken Bow; the town is a hub for employment and goods and services in the county and the surrounding Sandhills region. Some of the largest employers in the county include Becton-Dickinson, a medical equipment manufacturing facility and Adams Land & Cattle, the largest cattle research and development facility in the world. Additionally there are a number of jobs available in healthcare and education. In recent years, Broken Bow has experienced strong growth in the commercial class and the market for commercial property is showing some appreciation.

The market in the small communities is less organized, as commercial establishments will be more dependent on small local populations.

## **Description of Analysis**

In 2012 a reappraisal of commercial property in Custer County was completed; at that time the Department expressed concerns about the uniformity of assessments. An assessment practices review was conducted and highlighted inequities in the valuation of sold and unsold properties. For the past two years, the commercial statistics have produced overall measures of central tendency in the acceptable range; however, the sale date substrata continues to show significant differences between statistics calculated on sales occurring prior to the reappraisal and those occurring after the reappraisal. For this reason, the statistics cannot be analyzed for purposes of determining a level of value of the class.

In 2013, the Property Tax Administrator requested a narrative appraisal report from the County Assessor documenting how values were established within the class. A report was received in March 2014, but failed to adequately explain the valuation process. The Department will continue to pursue improvements to the assessment practices employed within the county.

## **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties in 2013. The review involved screening the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. The review revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

Based on the review of assessment practices within the county, the quality of assessment of the commercial class is not in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Custer County**

---

### **Level of Value**

After reviewing all available information, the level of value of the commercial class of property cannot be determined.



## **2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Custer County**

A new appraisal cycle began in 2013 for the agricultural improvements. Properties in Custer, Delight, Elim, Grant, Loup, Wayne, and Wood River Townships were reviewed and revalued. The review process includes a physical inspection and exterior review of all parcels. The lister takes new pictures, notes any physical changes, and checks measurements. The assessor will review the pictures and data collected by the lister and will update the condition when warranted. After the review, the costing and depreciation tables are updated to more closely reflect the market.

Only routine maintenance occurred in the townships that were not reviewed, the pickup work was completed timely.

A ratio study was completed for agricultural land in all five market areas. The study indicated that assessments in areas four and five should remain the same for 2014. These areas have been valued the same since 2012, but due to the small number of sales that exist in area four, the market area boundaries remain in place pending further analysis. After analysis, the following adjustments were made to land values.

- Area 1: irrigated and grass values increased 25%, dry land increased 41%
- Area 2: irrigated values increased 48%, dry values 18% and grass values 5%
- Area 3: irrigated values increased 26%, dry values 50% and grass 47%
- Area 4 & 5: irrigated values increased 44%, dry land 68% and grass 35%

## 2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Custer County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>										
	The part-time lister										
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>										
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>This area contains the best farm ground in the county; the soils are harder here than in the other areas and irrigation potential is generally best here.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>This is the Sandhills portion of the county; the majority of the area is Valentine Soil. There is little farming in this area as the ground is best suited to grazing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>This area is a transition area between areas one and two. The ground transitions from sandy to loamier soil, making some farming possible. The grass is also superior as the loamier soils will have better grass cover.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04 &amp; 05</td> <td>In area 4 the soils are similar to one; however, irrigation is not as plentiful and well depths are generally deeper. Area 5 is south of the South Loup River, the terrain is very rough and is primarily canyons. The majority of the land is used for grazing; however, there is some farming on the plateaus. Although the areas have some characteristic differences, sales have been indicating similar prices for the past several years, therefore, they have been combined for the R&amp;O statistics and all sales will appear under the area 5 substratum.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	This area contains the best farm ground in the county; the soils are harder here than in the other areas and irrigation potential is generally best here.	02	This is the Sandhills portion of the county; the majority of the area is Valentine Soil. There is little farming in this area as the ground is best suited to grazing.	03	This area is a transition area between areas one and two. The ground transitions from sandy to loamier soil, making some farming possible. The grass is also superior as the loamier soils will have better grass cover.	04 & 05	In area 4 the soils are similar to one; however, irrigation is not as plentiful and well depths are generally deeper. Area 5 is south of the South Loup River, the terrain is very rough and is primarily canyons. The majority of the land is used for grazing; however, there is some farming on the plateaus. Although the areas have some characteristic differences, sales have been indicating similar prices for the past several years, therefore, they have been combined for the R&O statistics and all sales will appear under the area 5 substratum.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>										
01	This area contains the best farm ground in the county; the soils are harder here than in the other areas and irrigation potential is generally best here.										
02	This is the Sandhills portion of the county; the majority of the area is Valentine Soil. There is little farming in this area as the ground is best suited to grazing.										
03	This area is a transition area between areas one and two. The ground transitions from sandy to loamier soil, making some farming possible. The grass is also superior as the loamier soils will have better grass cover.										
04 & 05	In area 4 the soils are similar to one; however, irrigation is not as plentiful and well depths are generally deeper. Area 5 is south of the South Loup River, the terrain is very rough and is primarily canyons. The majority of the land is used for grazing; however, there is some farming on the plateaus. Although the areas have some characteristic differences, sales have been indicating similar prices for the past several years, therefore, they have been combined for the R&O statistics and all sales will appear under the area 5 substratum.										
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>										
	When the market areas were established factors such as soil type, irrigation potential, land use, and topography were considered. Each year the assessor plots sales on a county map to monitor market differences in the established areas.										
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>										
	All parcels under 40 acres that do not have common ownership with adjoining agricultural parcels are reviewed to determine land use.										
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>										
	Farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued using the same tables; however, there are two home site values used. One value exists for the majority of the county, but a lower value is used in the more remote areas of the Sandhills.										
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>										
	The assessor monitors non-agricultural influences by plotting sales annually and sending sales verification questionnaires. Small acre sales are reviewed carefully for primary land use. The assessor has also identified frequently flooded soils along rivers and creeks so that she can monitor whether a recreational influence exists along the rivers.										
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>										
	No										

<b>8.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>
	Lands enrolled in the Wetlands Reserve Program are valued using agricultural land sales; it is assessed at 100% of market value.

## Custer County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Custer	1	N/A	3,999	3,727	3,352	3,155	2,884	2,872	2,868	3,470
Valley	1	N/A	4,600	4,600	3,480	3,045	3,045	2,400	2,400	3,700
Sherman	1	N/A	3,600	3,470	3,470	3,350	3,350	3,270	3,267	3,391
Buffalo	1	4,250	4,250	4,000	3,950	3,652	3,750	3,600	3,600	3,864
Custer	2	N/A	1,437	1,304	1,350	N/A	1,426	1,457	1,458	1,444
Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	1,475	#DIV/0!	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
Thomas	1	N/A	N/A	1,475	1,475	N/A	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
Custer	3	N/A	2,868	2,595	2,432	2,255	2,198	1,556	1,407	2,103
Loup	1	N/A	2,600	N/A	2,600	2,160	1,970	1,970	1,150	2,236
Garfield	1	N/A	3,520	3,060	2,660	2,610	2,500	1,580	1,530	2,355
Custer	4	N/A	3,333	3,053	2,576	2,382	2,310	2,161	2,028	2,737
Custer	5	N/A	3,324	3,051	2,569	2,373	2,283	2,148	2,009	2,822
Logan	1	N/A	2,650	2,550	2,450	2,390	2,390	2,390	2,390	2,469
Dawson	1	N/A	4,192	4,054	3,752	3,395	2,885	2,868	2,720	3,912

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Custer	1	N/A	1,935	1,710	1,620	1,530	1,395	1,390	1,385	1,606
Valley	1	N/A	1,955	1,955	1,955	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,465	1,709
Sherman	1	N/A	1,815	1,725	1,725	1,630	1,630	1,540	1,539	1,619
Buffalo	1	1,850	1,848	1,725	1,700	1,550	1,500	1,400	1,400	1,572
Custer	2	N/A	450	440	440	430	430	420	420	430
Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	400	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	400	400	400	400	400
Thomas	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Custer	3	N/A	915	910	910	905	905	900	900	906
Loup	1	N/A	705	N/A	570	545	475	350	350	487
Garfield	1	N/A	1,370	1,215	1,165	1,050	945	845	740	1,020
Custer	4	N/A	1,675	1,530	1,290	1,195	1,155	1,085	1,020	1,332
Custer	5	N/A	1,675	1,531	1,291	1,195	1,164	1,087	1,027	1,351
Logan	1	N/A	1,250	1,200	1,200	1,150	1,150	1,100	1,100	1,165
Dawson	1	N/A	1,900	1,780	1,675	1,555	1,439	1,200	1,200	1,564

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Custer	1	N/A	701	695	696	691	690	656	667	669
Valley	1	N/A	1,091	1,091	1,072	1,090	1,050	805	793	829
Sherman	1	N/A	851	824	821	784	782	771	770	775
Buffalo	1	986	1,004	909	900	875	823	790	781	816
Custer	2	N/A	330	330	330	330	333	331	330	330
Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	400	#DIV/0!	400	400	400	330	330	332
Thomas	1	N/A	N/A	280	280	N/A	280	280	280	280
Custer	3	N/A	622	622	620	621	620	607	532	552
Loup	1	N/A	640	N/A	495	375	375	375	375	376
Garfield	1	N/A	630	630	630	585	555	491	404	436
Custer	4	N/A	665	662	661	652	652	605	571	589
Custer	5	N/A	672	660	664	654	651	644	634	638
Logan	1	N/A	340	340	340	340	340	340	340	340
Dawson	1	N/A	1,220	1,030	955	910	835	830	820	849

Source: 2014 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

# 2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Custer County

---

## County Overview

Custer County is divided into five market areas which are primarily drawn around soil and topographical differences. The majority of the county is grassland, although, quality farmland exists in some areas. While the county assessor recognizes characteristic differences between market areas four and five, the disparity in assessed values diminished over time, prompting the assessor to value them the same since 2012; they have been combined for measurement purposes.

The characteristics of the individual market areas were analyzed and compared to the characteristics in the adjoining counties; all counties are comparable to Custer County except for Lincoln County. The political boundary between the counties clearly divides the Sandhills from the rolling hills and loamier soils found in Custer County. While parts of Dawson County are comparable to Custer, the comparable area is defined using a soil map and not by an absolute extension of the county line. Assessed values will vary more significantly between Custer and Dawson Counties due to the limited area that is truly comparable.

## Description of Analysis

Analysis of the sales within the county showed that all market area samples had disproportionate or unrelatively small groups of sales. All samples were expanded using sales from the comparable counties in a way that would achieve proportionate, representative samples while maximizing sample sizes. Value adjustments made by the assessor for this year were generally made at amounts typical for the market; only dry land in areas 1, 3, and 5 increased at an above market rate. Analysis of dry land sales showed that Custer, like many counties in Central Nebraska, had not been increasing dry land proportionately with the market in recent years. The assessor made significant increases to dry land to improve equalization this year.

The statistical profile suggests that all market areas have been assessed at similar portions of market value, and where there are sufficient sales the majority land use substrata also support that assessments are acceptable. Grass land in area 3 has 95% and 80% Majority Land Use medians below the acceptable range; however, the samples are very small. The assessor increased grass land in area 3 significantly resulting in values that are higher than the adjoining counties. For that reason, grass assessments within the market area are believed to be acceptable. The values established by the Custer County Assessor are generally comparable to the surrounding counties. The analysis suggests that agricultural assessments are acceptable.

## Sales Qualification

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties. This involved reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. No apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations and all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

## **2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Custer County**

---

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

The analysis supports that all agricultural subclasses have been assessed at uniform portions of market value; the quality of assessment of the class is in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Custer County is 70%.



**21 Custer**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 273  
Total Sales Price : 18,678,368  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,678,368  
Total Assessed Value : 16,718,752  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 68,419  
Avg. Assessed Value : 61,241

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 90  
MEAN : 112  
COD : 35.65  
PRD : 124.72

COV : 75.70  
STD : 84.51  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.69  
MAX Sales Ratio : 1095.30  
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.72

95% Median C.I. : 91.98 to 96.75  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.44 to 92.58  
95% Mean C.I. : 101.62 to 121.66

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:31PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	21	100.56	103.71	95.26	16.60	108.87	41.44	176.40	91.22 to 113.06	61,619	58,695
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	25	98.23	126.02	98.05	37.94	128.53	54.91	375.55	94.64 to 108.50	43,716	42,864
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	33	98.38	136.19	98.00	52.53	138.97	37.72	1095.30	91.62 to 102.20	52,709	51,652
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	44	97.06	125.10	99.14	35.36	126.19	80.66	468.81	94.50 to 110.21	74,566	73,923
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	34	94.54	101.53	94.60	20.29	107.33	54.40	230.60	90.90 to 103.02	74,929	70,886
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	25	87.35	112.00	78.82	48.70	142.10	51.54	443.77	73.77 to 96.20	82,461	64,998
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	36	86.30	98.72	82.08	31.26	120.27	33.21	249.36	77.43 to 90.61	59,458	48,802
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	55	82.95	97.17	81.07	37.54	119.86	30.72	508.73	74.63 to 93.57	82,210	66,645
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	123	98.38	124.61	98.03	37.20	127.11	37.72	1095.30	95.94 to 101.17	60,221	59,035
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	150	88.58	101.00	83.91	33.87	120.37	30.72	508.73	85.25 to 92.04	75,141	63,049
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	136	97.43	122.07	97.44	36.31	125.28	37.72	1095.30	94.91 to 99.91	63,682	62,051
<u>ALL</u>	273	94.50	111.64	89.51	35.65	124.72	30.72	1095.30	91.98 to 96.75	68,419	61,241

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	133	93.58	96.82	90.04	17.88	107.53	37.68	249.36	91.22 to 96.20	76,267	68,669
02	23	97.31	120.01	95.97	42.46	125.05	37.72	295.48	89.45 to 137.47	47,400	45,490
03	50	96.02	135.43	90.19	63.50	150.16	33.21	1095.30	86.38 to 108.50	57,514	51,870
04	28	96.48	114.13	87.96	39.28	129.75	54.40	250.40	79.01 to 137.86	34,148	30,037
05	13	106.37	176.90	70.84	94.69	249.72	30.72	508.73	73.77 to 371.73	32,723	23,182
06	26	90.17	98.95	87.96	23.31	112.49	47.68	203.77	84.03 to 105.88	122,591	107,830
<u>ALL</u>	273	94.50	111.64	89.51	35.65	124.72	30.72	1095.30	91.98 to 96.75	68,419	61,241

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	258	94.55	111.24	89.58	34.66	124.18	30.72	1095.30	92.04 to 96.75	70,259	62,940
06											
07	15	86.74	118.50	87.05	56.44	136.13	54.91	443.77	70.58 to 118.17	36,777	32,014
<u>ALL</u>	273	94.50	111.64	89.51	35.65	124.72	30.72	1095.30	91.98 to 96.75	68,419	61,241

**21 Custer**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 273  
Total Sales Price : 18,678,368  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,678,368  
Total Assessed Value : 16,718,752  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 68,419  
Avg. Assessed Value : 61,241

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 90  
MEAN : 112  
COD : 35.65  
PRD : 124.72

COV : 75.70  
STD : 84.51  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.69  
MAX Sales Ratio : 1095.30  
MIN Sales Ratio : 30.72

95% Median C.I. : 91.98 to 96.75  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.44 to 92.58  
95% Mean C.I. : 101.62 to 121.66

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:31PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	9	371.73	377.87	331.68	54.33	113.93	96.63	1095.30	102.11 to 508.73	2,611	8,661	
Less Than 15,000	43	176.40	209.06	178.23	49.71	117.30	54.40	1095.30	146.58 to 215.20	7,717	13,755	
Less Than 30,000	80	127.81	166.01	131.86	57.68	125.90	37.72	1095.30	104.81 to 152.76	14,124	18,624	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	264	93.58	102.56	89.20	26.89	114.98	30.72	468.81	91.28 to 95.94	70,662	63,033	
Greater Than 14,999	230	91.90	93.42	87.90	18.92	106.28	30.72	468.81	89.45 to 93.88	79,767	70,119	
Greater Than 29,999	193	91.08	89.10	86.78	15.28	102.67	30.72	163.34	88.54 to 93.12	90,925	78,906	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	9	371.73	377.87	331.68	54.33	113.93	96.63	1095.30	102.11 to 508.73	2,611	8,661	
5,000 TO 14,999	34	153.74	164.38	166.53	29.89	98.71	54.40	295.48	145.58 to 197.94	9,069	15,103	
15,000 TO 29,999	37	99.51	115.97	112.58	34.04	103.01	37.72	468.81	91.62 to 108.50	21,569	24,284	
30,000 TO 59,999	71	93.47	92.39	92.32	13.54	100.08	54.91	133.12	88.81 to 96.85	43,324	39,998	
60,000 TO 99,999	56	92.01	90.87	90.03	15.57	100.93	37.68	163.34	87.38 to 94.63	75,783	68,227	
100,000 TO 149,999	43	90.90	86.71	86.33	15.97	100.44	33.21	137.14	80.91 to 94.83	125,279	108,152	
150,000 TO 249,999	17	80.66	75.93	77.07	17.94	98.52	30.72	107.96	61.06 to 89.45	187,480	144,488	
250,000 TO 499,999	6	86.82	88.14	88.33	07.80	99.78	74.89	98.95	74.89 to 98.95	275,750	243,577	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	273	94.50	111.64	89.51	35.65	124.72	30.72	1095.30	91.98 to 96.75	68,419	61,241	

**21 Custer**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 50  
Total Sales Price : 3,206,258  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,183,258  
Total Assessed Value : 2,758,896  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,665  
Avg. Assessed Value : 55,178

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 97  
COD : 30.78  
PRD : 112.43

COV : 50.86  
STD : 49.56  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.27  
MAX Sales Ratio : 308.79  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.06

95% Median C.I. : 84.40 to 98.29  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.18 to 94.16  
95% Mean C.I. : 83.70 to 111.18

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:32PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	97.61	96.76	98.20	01.65	98.53	93.92	98.76	N/A	24,133	23,698
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	96.73	96.91	97.37	01.78	99.53	94.86	99.34	N/A	37,021	36,047
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	6	97.74	98.68	96.97	02.56	101.76	95.34	106.93	95.34 to 106.93	71,463	69,299
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	125.65	125.65	141.20	21.77	88.99	98.29	153.01	N/A	63,750	90,018
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	91.51	91.61	93.10	01.16	98.40	90.07	93.26	N/A	123,333	114,822
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	2	49.45	49.45	49.45	55.39	100.00	22.06	76.83	N/A	50,000	24,723
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	6	101.84	103.09	78.09	42.22	132.01	54.92	166.42	54.92 to 166.42	53,583	41,845
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	6	64.39	71.52	71.16	30.27	100.51	40.06	108.97	40.06 to 108.97	32,167	22,889
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	8	68.62	72.26	73.22	25.77	98.69	44.24	113.00	44.24 to 113.00	113,250	82,926
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	75.50	75.50	75.50	00.00	100.00	75.50	75.50	N/A	160,000	120,806
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	3	99.21	86.49	98.66	13.09	87.66	60.64	99.62	N/A	89,833	88,632
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	6	153.84	169.38	133.36	48.34	127.01	40.20	308.79	40.20 to 308.79	14,417	19,227
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	15	97.85	101.42	104.42	05.63	97.13	93.92	153.01	95.52 to 98.78	51,784	54,074
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	17	76.83	83.61	79.46	37.26	105.22	22.06	166.42	56.76 to 108.97	57,912	46,018
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	18	86.68	107.18	81.96	52.84	130.77	40.20	308.79	60.64 to 113.00	79,000	64,748
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	15	97.62	100.39	100.94	06.56	99.46	90.07	153.01	94.86 to 98.78	71,624	72,299
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	22	69.53	78.39	72.43	37.34	108.23	22.06	166.42	55.75 to 93.58	69,114	50,057
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.10	97.44	86.67	30.78	112.43	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 98.29	63,665	55,178

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	50	95.10	97.44	86.67	30.78	112.43	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 98.29	63,665	55,178
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.10	97.44	86.67	30.78	112.43	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 98.29	63,665	55,178

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	98.76	98.76	98.76	00.00	100.00	98.76	98.76	N/A	57,900	57,181
03	49	94.86	97.41	86.44	31.40	112.69	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 97.93	63,783	55,137
04											
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.10	97.44	86.67	30.78	112.43	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 98.29	63,665	55,178

**21 Custer**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 50  
Total Sales Price : 3,206,258  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,183,258  
Total Assessed Value : 2,758,896  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,665  
Avg. Assessed Value : 55,178

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 97  
COD : 30.78  
PRD : 112.43

COV : 50.86  
STD : 49.56  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.27  
MAX Sales Ratio : 308.79  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.06

95% Median C.I. : 84.40 to 98.29  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.18 to 94.16  
95% Mean C.I. : 83.70 to 111.18

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:32PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___Low \$ Ranges___												
Less Than 5,000	3	60.64	69.48	68.74	17.78	101.08	57.72	90.07	N/A	3,333	2,291	
Less Than 15,000	14	102.27	128.19	136.07	50.63	94.21	40.06	308.79	60.64 to 166.42	8,413	11,447	
Less Than 30,000	21	98.29	117.59	112.51	40.79	104.52	40.06	308.79	91.51 to 135.08	13,708	15,422	
___Ranges Excl. Low \$___												
Greater Than 4,999	47	95.52	99.23	86.73	30.86	114.41	22.06	308.79	88.95 to 98.65	67,516	58,554	
Greater Than 14,999	36	93.42	85.48	84.77	21.72	100.84	22.06	153.01	73.39 to 97.93	85,152	72,184	
Greater Than 29,999	29	88.95	82.85	84.10	23.06	98.51	22.06	153.01	68.59 to 97.62	99,841	83,967	
___Incremental Ranges___												
0 TO 4,999	3	60.64	69.48	68.74	17.78	101.08	57.72	90.07	N/A	3,333	2,291	
5,000 TO 14,999	11	108.97	144.20	142.32	50.93	101.32	40.06	308.79	93.92 to 260.98	9,798	13,944	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	98.29	96.38	96.19	17.02	100.20	40.20	135.08	40.20 to 135.08	24,298	23,372	
30,000 TO 59,999	11	93.58	82.56	83.17	23.46	99.27	22.06	136.79	44.24 to 99.34	44,900	37,343	
60,000 TO 99,999	9	70.47	76.42	75.31	26.15	101.47	54.92	99.62	55.75 to 98.78	72,889	54,893	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	110.80	110.80	115.62	38.10	95.83	68.59	153.01	N/A	89,750	103,768	
150,000 TO 249,999	4	85.54	83.53	84.29	16.20	99.10	63.84	99.21	N/A	167,500	141,185	
250,000 TO 499,999	3	84.40	83.68	84.59	07.84	98.92	73.39	93.26	N/A	298,667	252,648	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ALL___	50	95.10	97.44	86.67	30.78	112.43	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 98.29	63,665	55,178	

**21 Custer**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 50  
Total Sales Price : 3,206,258  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,183,258  
Total Assessed Value : 2,758,896  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,665  
Avg. Assessed Value : 55,178

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 97  
COD : 30.78  
PRD : 112.43

COV : 50.86  
STD : 49.56  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.27  
MAX Sales Ratio : 308.79  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.06

95% Median C.I. : 84.40 to 98.29  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.18 to 94.16  
95% Mean C.I. : 83.70 to 111.18

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:32PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	3	90.07	96.00	95.13	07.41	100.91	88.95	108.97	N/A	15,833	15,062
309	1	308.79	308.79	308.79	00.00	100.00	308.79	308.79	N/A	10,000	30,879
326	2	60.42	60.42	66.55	63.49	90.79	22.06	98.78	N/A	59,500	39,597
341	1	161.47	161.47	161.47	00.00	100.00	161.47	161.47	N/A	13,500	21,798
343	1	113.00	113.00	113.00	00.00	100.00	113.00	113.00	N/A	15,000	16,950
344	8	94.22	97.94	96.62	24.10	101.37	55.75	153.01	55.75 to 153.01	86,260	83,343
350	3	98.29	94.10	87.90	05.16	107.05	84.40	99.62	N/A	130,833	114,996
352	2	86.08	86.08	78.05	14.74	110.29	73.39	98.76	N/A	157,450	122,891
353	4	96.57	95.83	96.02	02.39	99.80	91.51	98.65	N/A	41,250	39,606
406	8	78.11	106.40	89.22	67.93	119.26	40.06	260.98	40.06 to 260.98	36,563	32,622
428	1	99.21	99.21	99.21	00.00	100.00	99.21	99.21	N/A	200,000	198,413
442	5	70.47	74.44	75.17	23.88	99.03	40.20	97.61	N/A	48,000	36,081
444	1	106.93	106.93	106.93	00.00	100.00	106.93	106.93	N/A	9,775	10,452
451	1	99.34	99.34	99.34	00.00	100.00	99.34	99.34	N/A	56,000	55,630
470	2	121.63	121.63	94.17	36.83	129.16	76.83	166.42	N/A	31,000	29,192
491	1	93.92	93.92	93.92	00.00	100.00	93.92	93.92	N/A	6,500	6,105
528	5	63.84	67.18	71.20	23.39	94.35	44.24	97.85	N/A	92,800	66,070
557	1	56.76	56.76	56.76	00.00	100.00	56.76	56.76	N/A	85,000	48,243
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.10	97.44	86.67	30.78	112.43	22.06	308.79	84.40 to 98.29	63,665	55,178

**21 Custer**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 179  
Total Sales Price : 94,218,663  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 94,133,818  
Total Assessed Value : 64,552,269  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 525,887  
Avg. Assessed Value : 360,627

MEDIAN : 70  
WGT. MEAN : 69  
MEAN : 77  
COD : 33.61  
PRD : 111.96

COV : 46.89  
STD : 36.00  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.50  
MAX Sales Ratio : 320.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 14.90

95% Median C.I. : 65.81 to 75.24  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.61 to 73.54  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.51 to 82.05

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:33PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qrtrs</b>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	98.28	101.80	98.40	20.01	103.46	59.05	146.14	87.74 to 116.47	454,458	447,207
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	21	95.50	111.46	97.86	32.13	113.90	63.17	320.50	81.95 to 121.49	259,609	254,046
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	81.58	83.07	88.40	15.65	93.97	64.74	103.28	64.74 to 103.28	1,077,916	952,854
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	12	76.07	85.69	67.96	26.76	126.09	55.96	149.95	65.81 to 101.44	980,967	666,709
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	17	75.24	83.06	78.25	21.17	106.15	47.29	153.81	68.54 to 89.41	341,571	267,267
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	11	71.52	75.87	70.51	18.71	107.60	51.26	110.74	56.90 to 96.86	646,867	456,105
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	21	58.50	68.43	61.33	36.15	111.58	25.29	217.68	54.71 to 70.59	390,113	239,273
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	79.03	80.40	78.63	08.84	102.25	71.16	92.39	N/A	331,230	260,437
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	35	57.41	57.81	54.36	22.57	106.35	14.90	105.09	48.89 to 62.70	633,000	344,120
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	8	55.65	59.37	62.60	20.38	94.84	38.57	96.62	38.57 to 96.62	325,196	203,565
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	18	50.61	58.67	48.33	37.34	121.39	20.14	218.11	42.52 to 59.76	470,888	227,572
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	6	47.92	53.17	48.44	21.93	109.76	39.79	73.73	39.79 to 73.73	739,125	358,005
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	59	93.49	99.42	85.25	25.45	116.62	55.96	320.50	83.39 to 103.20	576,728	491,662
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	53	70.86	75.57	69.64	26.35	108.52	25.29	217.68	63.45 to 76.78	423,387	294,852
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	67	52.97	57.81	52.88	27.71	109.32	14.90	218.11	48.89 to 60.50	562,199	297,269
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	58	82.88	93.89	80.57	27.80	116.53	47.29	320.50	77.53 to 94.42	545,749	439,687
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	71	61.06	65.02	59.63	27.32	109.04	14.90	217.68	56.12 to 69.24	546,308	325,744
<b>ALL</b>	179	69.92	76.78	68.58	33.61	111.96	14.90	320.50	65.81 to 75.24	525,887	360,627

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	93	70.17	79.74	68.15	37.41	117.01	20.14	320.50	63.25 to 75.36	449,581	306,403
2	22	69.67	69.73	73.09	23.07	95.40	24.74	113.79	56.32 to 81.95	1,108,464	810,139
3	21	69.22	75.59	64.53	28.73	117.14	45.60	146.14	54.71 to 83.24	514,535	332,029
5	43	68.54	74.58	65.73	33.63	113.46	14.90	149.19	62.51 to 82.39	398,404	261,886
<b>ALL</b>	179	69.92	76.78	68.58	33.61	111.96	14.90	320.50	65.81 to 75.24	525,887	360,627

**21 Custer**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 179  
Total Sales Price : 94,218,663  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 94,133,818  
Total Assessed Value : 64,552,269  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 525,887  
Avg. Assessed Value : 360,627

MEDIAN : 70  
WGT. MEAN : 69  
MEAN : 77  
COD : 33.61  
PRD : 111.96

COV : 46.89  
STD : 36.00  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.50  
MAX Sales Ratio : 320.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 14.90

95% Median C.I. : 65.81 to 75.24  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.61 to 73.54  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.51 to 82.05

Printed:3/31/2014 1:46:33PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	14	82.85	84.20	69.22	30.92	121.64	38.21	149.19	52.19 to 116.47	511,429	353,991
1	8	86.82	86.33	72.62	29.52	118.88	38.21	143.32	38.21 to 143.32	555,376	403,320
3	4	68.76	67.89	57.39	26.11	118.30	45.60	88.43	N/A	480,367	275,660
5	2	108.30	108.30	78.77	37.76	137.49	67.41	149.19	N/A	397,769	313,335
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	51.33	54.09	58.26	33.57	92.84	20.14	83.44	25.29 to 79.76	156,885	91,400
1	6	49.41	49.72	51.60	23.11	96.36	20.14	77.10	20.14 to 77.10	152,310	78,592
5	3	79.76	62.83	70.48	24.30	89.15	25.29	83.44	N/A	166,036	117,017
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	84	69.50	76.82	70.83	32.07	108.46	24.74	320.50	62.37 to 75.36	545,592	386,454
1	42	69.96	79.13	68.02	34.95	116.33	34.23	320.50	61.06 to 75.36	323,266	219,876
2	22	69.67	69.73	73.09	23.07	95.40	24.74	113.79	56.32 to 81.95	1,108,464	810,139
3	9	59.05	77.99	67.36	40.15	115.78	51.11	146.14	51.26 to 109.76	436,337	293,929
5	11	68.54	81.25	70.04	35.32	116.01	47.36	147.82	54.42 to 121.49	358,120	250,813
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>69.92</b>	<b>76.78</b>	<b>68.58</b>	<b>33.61</b>	<b>111.96</b>	<b>14.90</b>	<b>320.50</b>	<b>65.81 to 75.24</b>	<b>525,887</b>	<b>360,627</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	34	69.54	74.05	64.74	30.07	114.38	38.21	149.19	56.90 to 83.24	760,889	492,598
1	21	69.92	74.56	64.92	29.25	114.85	38.21	143.32	52.19 to 91.18	853,826	554,321
3	6	67.85	67.88	58.82	21.30	115.40	45.60	88.43	45.60 to 88.43	447,776	263,371
5	7	67.41	77.83	67.15	40.72	115.90	39.82	149.19	39.82 to 149.19	750,463	503,909
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	14	52.48	56.57	59.82	33.88	94.57	20.14	108.85	38.57 to 79.76	195,700	117,077
1	8	47.39	47.30	46.90	21.99	100.85	20.14	77.10	20.14 to 77.10	198,053	92,892
5	6	71.23	68.95	77.55	30.52	88.91	25.29	108.85	25.29 to 108.85	192,563	149,324
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	99	69.75	77.32	68.96	34.28	112.12	14.90	320.50	63.31 to 75.24	540,063	372,415
1	50	70.47	81.60	69.23	38.03	117.87	26.07	320.50	62.37 to 83.30	324,520	224,669
2	22	69.67	69.73	73.09	23.07	95.40	24.74	113.79	56.32 to 81.95	1,108,464	810,139
3	11	59.05	74.36	62.38	34.46	119.20	51.11	146.14	51.26 to 109.76	599,639	374,034
5	16	71.14	76.37	59.10	37.35	129.22	14.90	147.82	54.42 to 99.68	391,122	231,136
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>69.92</b>	<b>76.78</b>	<b>68.58</b>	<b>33.61</b>	<b>111.96</b>	<b>14.90</b>	<b>320.50</b>	<b>65.81 to 75.24</b>	<b>525,887</b>	<b>360,627</b>



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 14,399</b>	<b>Value : 2,373,722,029</b>	<b>Growth 18,075,230</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	611	1,252,047	159	1,780,605	64	695,046	834	3,727,698	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	3,205	12,859,939	311	10,286,251	272	8,021,530	3,788	31,167,720	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	3,241	143,159,893	312	33,828,362	304	30,468,637	3,857	207,456,892	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,852	157,271,879	471	45,895,218	368	39,185,213	4,691	242,352,310	2,790,879
<b>% of Res Total</b>	82.11	64.89	10.04	18.94	7.84	16.17	32.58	10.21	15.44
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	140	1,066,278	18	130,835	3	61,972	161	1,259,085	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	549	6,731,379	48	1,205,045	10	423,123	607	8,359,547	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	572	50,580,894	52	8,366,646	19	26,039,673	643	84,987,213	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	712	58,378,551	70	9,702,526	22	26,524,768	804	94,605,845	5,317,063
<b>% of Com Total</b>	88.56	61.71	8.71	10.26	2.74	28.04	5.58	3.99	29.42
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	2	84,813	2	331,278	0	0	4	416,091	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	2	244,968	2	6,602,672	0	0	4	6,847,640	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	2	329,781	2	6,933,950	0	0	4	7,263,731	600,474
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	50.00	4.54	50.00	95.46	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.31	3.32
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,852	157,271,879	471	45,895,218	368	39,185,213	4,691	242,352,310	2,790,879
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	82.11	64.89	10.04	18.94	7.84	16.17	32.58	10.21	15.44
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	714	58,708,332	72	16,636,476	22	26,524,768	808	101,869,576	5,917,537
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	88.37	57.63	8.91	16.33	2.72	26.04	5.61	4.29	32.74
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	4,566	215,980,211	543	62,531,694	390	65,709,981	5,499	344,221,886	8,708,416
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	83.03	62.74	9.87	18.17	7.09	19.09	38.19	14.50	48.18

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	27	1,844,814	13,673,895	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	27	1,844,814	13,673,895
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				27	1,844,814	13,673,895

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	496	48	535	1,079

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	45	827,080	17	1,130,186	6,651	1,240,435,773	6,713	1,242,393,039
28. Ag-Improved Land	7	120,173	18	851,924	2,102	624,665,446	2,127	625,637,543
29. Ag Improvements	11	267,325	18	1,449,269	2,158	159,752,967	2,187	161,469,561
30. Ag Total							8,900	2,029,500,143

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	5	5.00	48,575	13	14.00	188,130	
33. HomeSite Improvements	5	5.00	145,787	15	14.00	1,206,961	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	11	14.86	23,334	5	26.31	43,877	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	2.06	7,272	17	42.92	175,053	
37. FarmSite Improvements	11	0.00	121,538	16	0.00	242,308	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	1.30	0	0	7.68	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	14	14.00	159,700	14	14.00	159,700	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,344	1,452.04	16,696,404	1,362	1,471.04	16,933,109	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,343	1,423.04	89,998,856	1,363	1,442.04	91,351,604	9,366,814
34. HomeSite Total				<b>1,377</b>	<b>1,485.04</b>	<b>108,444,413</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	27	56.81	243,403	43	97.98	310,614	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,841	3,062.60	13,728,997	1,860	3,107.58	13,911,322	
37. FarmSite Improvements	2,073	0.00	69,754,111	2,100	0.00	70,117,957	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>2,143</b>	<b>3,205.56</b>	<b>84,339,893</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	15,524.40	0	0	15,533.38	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>3,520</b>	<b>20,223.98</b>	<b>192,784,306</b>	<b>9,366,814</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	14	2,512.94	548,320	14	2,512.94	548,320

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	79,685.14	40.42%	318,627,546	46.58%	3,998.58
47. 2A1	14,471.67	7.34%	53,936,930	7.89%	3,727.07
48. 2A	23,997.21	12.17%	80,441,248	11.76%	3,352.11
49. 3A1	14,956.22	7.59%	47,183,915	6.90%	3,154.80
50. 3A	6,355.21	3.22%	18,328,993	2.68%	2,884.09
51. 4A1	26,146.23	13.26%	75,093,789	10.98%	2,872.07
52. 4A	31,516.06	15.99%	90,386,055	13.21%	2,867.94
53. Total	197,127.74	100.00%	683,998,476	100.00%	3,469.82
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	26,342.79	26.58%	50,976,240	32.03%	1,935.11
56. 2D1	8,552.32	8.63%	14,624,519	9.19%	1,710.01
57. 2D	9,360.39	9.44%	15,163,832	9.53%	1,620.00
58. 3D1	15,727.06	15.87%	24,063,381	15.12%	1,530.06
59. 3D	1,083.70	1.09%	1,511,780	0.95%	1,395.02
60. 4D1	20,566.37	20.75%	28,587,349	17.96%	1,390.00
61. 4D	17,479.25	17.64%	24,209,652	15.21%	1,385.05
62. Total	99,111.88	100.00%	159,136,753	100.00%	1,605.63
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	18,567.04	3.00%	13,022,058	3.15%	701.35
65. 2G1	15,861.61	2.57%	11,028,290	2.67%	695.28
66. 2G	14,932.29	2.41%	10,399,144	2.51%	696.42
67. 3G1	8,310.14	1.34%	5,740,099	1.39%	690.73
68. 3G	9,769.81	1.58%	6,741,184	1.63%	690.00
69. 4G1	51,703.03	8.36%	33,930,454	8.20%	656.26
70. 4G	499,235.73	80.73%	332,770,216	80.45%	666.56
71. Total	618,379.65	100.00%	413,631,445	100.00%	668.90
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	197,127.74	21.52%	683,998,476	54.42%	3,469.82
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	99,111.88	10.82%	159,136,753	12.66%	1,605.63
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	618,379.65	67.50%	413,631,445	32.91%	668.90
72. Waste	1,375.60	0.15%	68,832	0.01%	50.04
73. Other	122.31	0.01%	31,800	0.00%	260.00
74. Exempt	5,301.12	0.58%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	916,117.18	100.00%	1,256,867,306	100.00%	1,371.95

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	16.10	0.91%	23,128	0.90%	1,436.52
47. 2A1	45.74	2.58%	59,667	2.33%	1,304.48
48. 2A	43.78	2.47%	59,117	2.31%	1,350.32
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	353.82	19.94%	504,501	19.69%	1,425.87
51. 4A1	662.86	37.36%	965,795	37.69%	1,457.01
52. 4A	651.88	36.74%	950,234	37.08%	1,457.68
53. Total	1,774.18	100.00%	2,562,442	100.00%	1,444.30
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	70.93	16.48%	31,919	17.23%	450.01
56. 2D1	41.71	9.69%	18,353	9.91%	440.01
57. 2D	38.55	8.96%	16,962	9.16%	440.00
58. 3D1	1.00	0.23%	430	0.23%	430.00
59. 3D	73.54	17.08%	31,623	17.07%	430.01
60. 4D1	94.46	21.94%	39,673	21.41%	420.00
61. 4D	110.25	25.61%	46,306	24.99%	420.01
62. Total	430.44	100.00%	185,266	100.00%	430.41
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	139.51	0.08%	46,040	0.08%	330.01
65. 2G1	192.29	0.11%	63,456	0.11%	330.00
66. 2G	1,388.42	0.81%	458,183	0.81%	330.00
67. 3G1	336.84	0.20%	111,158	0.20%	330.00
68. 3G	3,434.04	2.01%	1,143,152	2.03%	332.89
69. 4G1	13,860.64	8.12%	4,581,486	8.12%	330.54
70. 4G	151,347.27	88.66%	50,010,852	88.65%	330.44
71. Total	170,699.01	100.00%	56,414,327	100.00%	330.49
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	1,774.18	1.03%	2,562,442	4.33%	1,444.30
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	430.44	0.25%	185,266	0.31%	430.41
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	170,699.01	98.69%	56,414,327	95.35%	330.49
72. Waste	64.39	0.04%	1,611	0.00%	25.02
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	161.89	0.09%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	172,968.02	100.00%	59,163,646	100.00%	342.05

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3,207.78	18.24%	9,199,314	24.87%	2,867.81
47. 2A1	699.14	3.98%	1,814,214	4.90%	2,594.92
48. 2A	4,141.63	23.55%	10,073,698	27.24%	2,432.30
49. 3A1	756.12	4.30%	1,705,057	4.61%	2,255.01
50. 3A	1,637.44	9.31%	3,598,832	9.73%	2,197.84
51. 4A1	3,661.90	20.82%	5,699,137	15.41%	1,556.33
52. 4A	3,480.21	19.79%	4,897,416	13.24%	1,407.22
53. Total	17,584.22	100.00%	36,987,668	100.00%	2,103.46
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,730.08	15.39%	1,583,044	15.54%	915.01
56. 2D1	197.79	1.76%	179,987	1.77%	909.99
57. 2D	2,798.05	24.89%	2,546,231	25.00%	910.00
58. 3D1	1,257.00	11.18%	1,137,589	11.17%	905.00
59. 3D	647.32	5.76%	585,838	5.75%	905.02
60. 4D1	2,634.70	23.43%	2,371,230	23.28%	900.00
61. 4D	1,978.66	17.60%	1,780,794	17.48%	900.00
62. Total	11,243.60	100.00%	10,184,713	100.00%	905.82
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,865.33	1.88%	1,160,545	2.11%	622.17
65. 2G1	937.17	0.94%	583,183	1.06%	622.28
66. 2G	5,379.19	5.41%	3,336,962	6.07%	620.35
67. 3G1	2,277.85	2.29%	1,415,179	2.58%	621.28
68. 3G	2,210.76	2.22%	1,370,670	2.49%	620.00
69. 4G1	12,055.37	12.12%	7,314,498	13.31%	606.74
70. 4G	74,718.41	75.14%	39,758,337	72.37%	532.11
71. Total	99,444.08	100.00%	54,939,374	100.00%	552.47
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	17,584.22	13.70%	36,987,668	36.22%	2,103.46
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	11,243.60	8.76%	10,184,713	9.97%	905.82
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	99,444.08	77.46%	54,939,374	53.80%	552.47
72. Waste	111.59	0.09%	4,460	0.00%	39.97
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	314.65	0.25%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	128,383.49	100.00%	102,116,215	100.00%	795.40

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	11,844.25	37.24%	39,478,414	45.35%	3,333.13
47. 2A1	2,439.13	7.67%	7,446,681	8.55%	3,053.01
48. 2A	3,392.46	10.67%	8,737,361	10.04%	2,575.52
49. 3A1	4,876.75	15.33%	11,614,199	13.34%	2,381.54
50. 3A	412.89	1.30%	953,777	1.10%	2,310.00
51. 4A1	6,710.33	21.10%	14,503,303	16.66%	2,161.34
52. 4A	2,126.16	6.69%	4,312,468	4.95%	2,028.29
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>31,801.97</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>87,046,203</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,737.13</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	8,290.51	29.39%	13,886,715	36.95%	1,675.01
56. 2D1	1,931.76	6.85%	2,955,593	7.86%	1,530.00
57. 2D	2,570.66	9.11%	3,316,153	8.82%	1,290.00
58. 3D1	7,153.21	25.35%	8,548,156	22.75%	1,195.01
59. 3D	132.86	0.47%	153,456	0.41%	1,155.02
60. 4D1	6,557.35	23.24%	7,114,828	18.93%	1,085.02
61. 4D	1,575.96	5.59%	1,607,473	4.28%	1,020.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>28,212.31</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>37,582,374</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,332.13</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,501.90	5.42%	3,658,871	6.12%	665.02
65. 2G1	2,584.20	2.55%	1,711,023	2.86%	662.11
66. 2G	3,734.60	3.68%	2,466,751	4.13%	660.51
67. 3G1	3,230.55	3.18%	2,106,255	3.52%	651.98
68. 3G	701.03	0.69%	457,225	0.76%	652.22
69. 4G1	10,979.37	10.81%	6,643,813	11.11%	605.12
70. 4G	74,790.03	73.67%	42,741,058	71.49%	571.48
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>101,521.68</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>59,784,996</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>588.89</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>31,801.97</b>	<b>19.67%</b>	<b>87,046,203</b>	<b>47.20%</b>	<b>2,737.13</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>28,212.31</b>	<b>17.45%</b>	<b>37,582,374</b>	<b>20.38%</b>	<b>1,332.13</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>101,521.68</b>	<b>62.78%</b>	<b>59,784,996</b>	<b>32.42%</b>	<b>588.89</b>
72. Waste	114.91	0.07%	5,746	0.00%	50.00
73. Other	58.50	0.04%	15,210	0.01%	260.00
74. Exempt	647.05	0.40%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>161,709.37</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>184,434,529</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,140.53</b>

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

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	14,398.38	42.69%	47,859,350	50.28%	3,323.94
47. 2A1	3,869.13	11.47%	11,804,985	12.40%	3,051.07
48. 2A	4,738.76	14.05%	12,172,641	12.79%	2,568.74
49. 3A1	2,408.00	7.14%	5,714,039	6.00%	2,372.94
50. 3A	1,376.62	4.08%	3,143,495	3.30%	2,283.49
51. 4A1	3,988.82	11.83%	8,566,008	9.00%	2,147.50
52. 4A	2,949.73	8.75%	5,926,234	6.23%	2,009.08
53. Total	33,729.44	100.00%	95,186,752	100.00%	2,822.07
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	5,721.97	31.29%	9,585,122	38.80%	1,675.14
56. 2D1	2,004.64	10.96%	3,069,007	12.42%	1,530.95
57. 2D	1,879.28	10.28%	2,426,576	9.82%	1,291.23
58. 3D1	2,756.15	15.07%	3,293,606	13.33%	1,195.00
59. 3D	461.87	2.53%	537,480	2.18%	1,163.70
60. 4D1	3,098.18	16.94%	3,366,728	13.63%	1,086.68
61. 4D	2,364.16	12.93%	2,427,415	9.83%	1,026.76
62. Total	18,286.25	100.00%	24,705,934	100.00%	1,351.07
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,424.63	3.03%	3,644,437	3.19%	671.83
65. 2G1	5,506.04	3.07%	3,635,940	3.18%	660.35
66. 2G	3,818.46	2.13%	2,535,679	2.22%	664.06
67. 3G1	2,832.65	1.58%	1,851,577	1.62%	653.66
68. 3G	1,570.14	0.88%	1,022,330	0.90%	651.11
69. 4G1	12,163.19	6.79%	7,834,710	6.86%	644.13
70. 4G	147,802.84	82.52%	93,678,927	82.03%	633.81
71. Total	179,117.95	100.00%	114,203,600	100.00%	637.59
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	33,729.44	14.55%	95,186,752	40.65%	2,822.07
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	18,286.25	7.89%	24,705,934	10.55%	1,351.07
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	179,117.95	77.26%	114,203,600	48.78%	637.59
72. Waste	674.41	0.29%	33,747	0.01%	50.04
73. Other	15.80	0.01%	4,108	0.00%	260.00
74. Exempt	668.49	0.29%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	231,823.85	100.00%	234,134,141	100.00%	1,009.97

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	213.85	740,420	274.74	985,123	281,528.96	904,055,998	282,017.55	905,781,541
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	26.54	47,410	195.98	331,639	157,061.96	231,415,991	157,284.48	231,795,040
<b>78. Grass</b>	118.14	80,242	386.83	257,888	1,168,657.40	698,635,612	1,169,162.37	698,973,742
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	8.00	400	2,332.90	113,996	2,340.90	114,396
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	196.61	51,118	196.61	51,118
<b>81. Exempt</b>	64.33	0	269.44	0	6,759.43	0	7,093.20	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>358.53</b>	<b>868,072</b>	<b>865.55</b>	<b>1,575,050</b>	<b>1,609,777.83</b>	<b>1,834,272,715</b>	<b>1,611,001.91</b>	<b>1,836,715,837</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	282,017.55	17.51%	905,781,541	49.32%	3,211.79
<b>Dry Land</b>	157,284.48	9.76%	231,795,040	12.62%	1,473.73
<b>Grass</b>	1,169,162.37	72.57%	698,973,742	38.06%	597.84
<b>Waste</b>	2,340.90	0.15%	114,396	0.01%	48.87
<b>Other</b>	196.61	0.01%	51,118	0.00%	260.00
<b>Exempt</b>	7,093.20	0.44%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,611,001.91</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,836,715,837</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,140.11</b>

## 2014 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2013 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

### 21 Custer

	2013 CTL County Total	2014 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2014 form 45 - 2013 CTL)	Percent Change	2014 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	228,243,419	242,352,310	14,108,891	6.18%	2,790,879	4.96%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	98,188,616	108,444,413	10,255,797	10.44%	9,366,814	0.91%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>326,432,035</b>	<b>350,796,723</b>	<b>24,364,688</b>	<b>7.46%</b>	<b>12,157,693</b>	<b>3.74%</b>
05. Commercial	88,809,061	94,605,845	5,796,784	6.53%	5,317,063	0.54%
06. Industrial	6,663,257	7,263,731	600,474	9.01%	600,474	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	63,180,045	84,339,893	21,159,848	33.49%	0	33.49%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>158,652,363</b>	<b>186,209,469</b>	<b>27,557,106</b>	<b>17.37%</b>	<b>5,917,537</b>	<b>13.64%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>485,084,398</b>	<b>537,006,192</b>	<b>51,921,794</b>	<b>10.70%</b>	<b>18,075,230</b>	<b>6.98%</b>
11. Irrigated	703,820,011	905,781,541	201,961,530	28.70%		
12. Dryland	156,892,448	231,795,040	74,902,592	47.74%		
13. Grassland	559,208,381	698,973,742	139,765,361	24.99%		
14. Wasteland	111,523	114,396	2,873	2.58%		
15. Other Agland	38,564	51,118	12,554	32.55%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>1,420,070,927</b>	<b>1,836,715,837</b>	<b>416,644,910</b>	<b>29.34%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,905,155,325</b>	<b>2,373,722,029</b>	<b>468,566,704</b>	<b>24.59%</b>	<b>18,075,230</b>	<b>23.65%</b>

**CUSTER COUNTY PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2014, 2015, AND 2016**

**Introduction**

Pursuant to LB 263, Section 9 the assessor shall submit a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter to the county board of equalization on or before July 31, 2013. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. After the budget is approved by the county board a copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31 each year.

**Real Property Assessment Requirements**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade” NE Rev. Stat. 77-112. (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land that meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

**General Description of Real Property in Custer County**

Per the 2012 county Abstract, Custer County consists of the following real property types;

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value</u>
Residential	4686	32.66%	12.02%
Commercial	795	5.54%	4.56%
Industrial	4	.03%	.35%
Recreational	0	.00%	.00%
Agricultural	8861	61.77%	83.07%
Special Value	0	.00%	.00%

Agricultural land-taxable acres were 1,611,398.05 Acres.

Other pertinent facts: Custer County is predominately agricultural and 72% is grassland.

For more information see 2013 Reports and Opinions, Abstract, and Assessor Survey.

### **Current Resources**

**A. Staff/Budget/Training:**

Assessor/\$45,568/I hold the assessor's certificate when I passed the test in the early 1980's. I have attended many of the IAAO courses and classes of the PA&T. I have all the hours needed at this time to keep the certificate current.

Deputy Assessor/\$34176/She also holds the assessor's certificate, passing the test in 2004. She has completed all her hours needed at this time to keep the certificate current.

3 full time clerks-One clerk has 10 years experience in the assessor's office and one has 5 years experience and the third was hired in 2011.

1 part-time listers. The lister was hired in August 2007.

- B.** The Cadastral Maps were flown in the 1970's but are in good condition. They are kept current with monthly land sales. The county board agreed to hire GIS Workshop to measure acres within soil types and land use.
- C.** The Property Record cards list all information required by statute with current photos and sketches.
- D.** The county uses the TERASCAN software package. There are 5 terminals and 1 public-use terminal.
- E.** The county has a Web-site with all parcels listed.

### **Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

- A. Discovery:** The County now has zoning and has a zoning administrator. Before any construction is allowed, the property owner must file a permit with the zoning administrator and in turn the assessor is notified. At the beginning of the year each property is reviewed for % of completion and valued accordingly. In Real Estate Transfers the name is changed within the month the deed is filed, cadastral maps updated, and a sales review is mailed to the new owner.
- B. Data Collection:** The part-time lister travels throughout the different areas each year, measuring each home, and outbuilding, taking new pictures, and interviewing each property owner as to the interior work. In new construction & remodeling the property is inspected

inside and out. As sales occur, the sale is used for 3 years to set property values.

- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions: The area Field Liaison works very hard with the assessor and staff and with the help of an excel program we enter sales data to be able to adjust the problem areas.
- D. Approaches to Value:
  - 1. Market Approach; sales comparison: Using the sales of the various styles, conditions, and ages, I use the information to adjust the depreciation.
  - 2. Cost Approach: The RCN (replacement cost new) is figured with the July 2007 Marshall and Swift values from the TerraScan software system.
  - 3. Income Approach: income and expense data collection/analysis from the market is done by the Commercial Appraiser that is hired to value commercial and industrial properties.
  - 4. Sales of agricultural land are mapped out and when a trend in sales indicate a market area change is required will be the only time areas will change. One market area is set with soil type boundaries and one with natural boundaries such as rivers.

After assessment action, a review of the sales ratio is a top priority.

Notices of valuation changes are mailed to all property owners that have a change of value and notices are also published in the local newspaper.

#### **Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity of Assessment Year 2013**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>
Residential	98%
Commercial	0%
Agricultural Land	74%
Special Value Ag-land	00%

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2012 Reports and Opinions.

#### **2009 ACTION TAKEN:**

The villages of Arnold, and Anselmo were physically viewed and revalued. Also the improvements in the townships of Grant, Wayne, Elim, Arnold, Hayes, Triumph, Ryno, Kilfoil and Cliff were physically viewed and revalued.

#### **2010 ACTION TAKEN:**

The village of Merna and the improvements in the townships of Loup, Lillian, Victoria, Milburn, West Union, Sargent, Corner, Comstock, Spring Creek, Myrtle, and Garfield was physically viewed and revalued. Land values were adjusted because of sales ratios in the villages of Oconto, Ansley, & Anselmo, the Suburban areas, the Commercial land in the Suburban areas and all homesites and farmsites in the rural.

2011 ACTION TAKEN:

The villages of Sargent, Comstock, and Ansley and the improvements in the townships of Algernon, Ansley, Westerville, and Douglas Grove were viewed and revalued.

2012 ACTION TAKEN

The village of Berwyn, Mason City, and ½ Broken Bow City and the townships of Elk Creek, Berwyn, East Custer and Broken Bow will be physically viewed and revalued. Reappraisal and revalue all the Commercial properties in compliance with the 6 year review statute.

2013 ACTION TAKEN

Finish the reappraisal of the city of Broken Bow and maintain the median level of value on the other villages and townships.

RESIDENTIAL PLAN:

2014 Begin the 6 year review of the townships and villages that were addressed in 2009.

Maintain the level of assessment as required by statute.

2015 If I decide to stay at this job and am re-elected I will continue with the 6 year review of the townships and villages and maintain the level of assessment as required by statute.

2016 Continue to review the townships and villages and maintain the level assessment as required by statute.

COMMERCIAL:

2014 Only new construction and change of use on commercial properties will need to be revalued by Standard Appraisal Service unless sales indicate a need for further action.

2015 Only new construction and change of use on commercial properties will need to be revalued by Standard Appraisal Service unless sales indicate a need for further action.

2016 Only new construction and change of use on commercial properties will need to be revalued by Standard Appraisal Service unless sales indicate a need for further action.

AGRICULTURAL LAND:

2014 The land values will be figured at 75% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area.

2015 The land values will be figured at 75% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area.

2016 The land values will be figured at 75% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area.

**Other functions preformed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:**

I will continue to maintain the parcel records on each property owner making changes monthly of ownership and maintain accurate cadastral maps with ownership changes.

I will continually perform the duties required of me by law to serve the property owners of Custer County and to maintain equality in assessment for all. I will file all the administrative reports required by law/regulations such as abstracts, both real and personal property, the assessor's survey, the sales information to PA&T rosters & annual assessed value updates, school district taxable value report, homestead exemption tax loss report, and certificate of taxes levied report. I will certify the value to political subdivisions, and report the current values to the Board of Education Lands & Funds of properties they own and report the exempt property and taxable property owned by governmental subdivisions. I will also report to the county board the annual plan of assessment.

I will continually administer the annual filing of all personal property schedules and notify the taxpayer of incomplete filings, failure to file and penalties applied.

I will send the applications for annual filings for permissive exemptions, review and make recommendations to the county board.

I will administer approximately 650 annual filings of applications for homestead exemptions and assist where necessary and continue to monitor approval/denial process and send out denial notification.

I will continue to review the centrally assessed valuation certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, and establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

I will continue to manage the record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment project (TIFF) and administer the reports and allocate the ad valorem tax.

I will continue to manage the tax entity boundaries making changes only when legal changes dictate and review the tax rates used for the tax billing process.

I will continue to prepare tax lists and certify these to the county treasurer for real estate, personal, and centrally assessed.

I will continue to attend the county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests and assemble and provide necessary information.

I will prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC (tax equalization and review commission) to defend county valuations.

I will continue to attend hearing if applicable to the county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

I will continue to attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education for maintaining my assessor's certificate.

**CONCLUSION:**

The assessor maintains two budgets; the assessor's functions budget and the reappraisal budget. The assessor's office budget will be over \$156,041.86. The reappraisal budget will be over \$67,700.00.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Custer County Assessor

## 2014 Assessment Survey for Custer County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	3
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1 part-time lister
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	1
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$169,426
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$167,930
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	n/a
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$47,600
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	The clerk controls a budget for the computer system for the entire courthouse.
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$500
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	n/a
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$5,179

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The maintenance of the cadastral maps is shared between the Assessor's office and the Register of Deeds office. The maps that are currently in use are not digitized and were flown in the 1970's.
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	The GIS data is not available to the public at this time, but will be when the system is fully implemented.
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	The office staff has all be trained to maintain the GIS system, the vendor will also assist with maintenance.
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Ansley, Arnold and Broken Bow
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>

	2005
--	------

**D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	The county contracts with Stanard Appraisal Services for the commercial class of property only.
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop, Inc.
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	none

**E. Appraisal /Listing Services**

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes, only for the commercial class
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	The contract does not specify certifications or qualifications; however, the appriasal service does employ both a Certified General and a Licensed appraiser who will both work within the county.
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	The appraisal service will establish valuation models; however, final values are determined by the assessor.



# 2014 Certification for Custer County

---

This is to certify that the 2014 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Custer County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



