

# 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 Saunders County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	501	Median	96.26
Total Sales Price	\$82,646,666	Mean	99.85
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$82,568,666	Wgt. Mean	94.60
Total Assessed Value	\$78,109,800	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$129,593
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$164,808	Avg. Assessed Value	\$155,908

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.22 to 96.93
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.26 to 95.94
95% Mean C.I	97.28 to 102.42
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	37.01
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.73
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.89

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	454	96	96.35
2012	381	96	95.76
2011	477	95	95
2010	506	95	95

## 2014 Commission Summary for Saunders County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	50	Median	95.96
Total Sales Price	\$9,403,021	Mean	93.08
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,403,021	Wgt. Mean	86.52
Total Assessed Value	\$8,135,695	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$138,774
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$188,060	Avg. Assessed Value	\$162,714

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.05 to 100.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	81.09 to 91.96
95% Mean C.I	85.77 to 100.39
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.90
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.81
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.82

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	50	93	92.93
2012	32	93	92.51
2011	44	98	98
2010	47	99	99



## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Saunders 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>	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	70	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Special Valuation of Agricultural Land</b>	70	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*

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



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

For the current assessment year, Saunders County (Saunders) conducted a market analysis of the residential parcels in the county. Residential areas and neighborhoods in Cedar Bluffs, Ashland, Cedar Bluffs rural, Fremont, Morse Bluffs Rural, Wahoo rural, Woodcliff, Yutan rural, and Central rural residential were reviewed. This consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures.

All sales were reviewed by Saunders by sending out questionnaires to the grantor and grantee. If there was no response, a follow-up call was made to gather as much information as possible about the sale. A spreadsheet analysis of all sales within the study period was completed.

Finally, all pickup work was completed by Saunders, as were onsite inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction.

## 2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Saunders County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																																
	Appraiser and Assistant																																
<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;"><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;">1</td> <td>Ashland Lake/River Area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Ashland</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Ceresco</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>East Lake/River (Championship Lake, Rustic Island, Leshara, Happy Farms, Shunk)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>North end of the county - consists of subdivisions near Fremont</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Lakes and Rivers (Morse Bluff-Wolfes, Whitetail, Hidden Cove) - average quality properties with lower values compared to other lakes in the county</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Mead and Cedar Bluffs - both have K-12 schools and are located along major highways</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Small Town Wahoo (Ithaca, Leshara, Colon, Swedeburg, Malmo) - no schools exist in this area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Unincorporated Areas (Wann, Memphis, Touhy) - relatively quiet markets</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Valparaiso</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td>Wahoo</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td>West Small Towns (Prague, Morse Bluff, Weston) - no high schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td>Woodcliff subdivision area</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">14</td> <td>Yutan</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Rural Residential</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Ashland Lake/River Area	2	Ashland	3	Ceresco	4	East Lake/River (Championship Lake, Rustic Island, Leshara, Happy Farms, Shunk)	5	North end of the county - consists of subdivisions near Fremont	6	Lakes and Rivers (Morse Bluff-Wolfes, Whitetail, Hidden Cove) - average quality properties with lower values compared to other lakes in the county	7	Mead and Cedar Bluffs - both have K-12 schools and are located along major highways	8	Small Town Wahoo (Ithaca, Leshara, Colon, Swedeburg, Malmo) - no schools exist in this area	9	Unincorporated Areas (Wann, Memphis, Touhy) - relatively quiet markets	10	Valparaiso	11	Wahoo	12	West Small Towns (Prague, Morse Bluff, Weston) - no high schools	13	Woodcliff subdivision area	14	Yutan	15	Rural Residential
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																																
1	Ashland Lake/River Area																																
2	Ashland																																
3	Ceresco																																
4	East Lake/River (Championship Lake, Rustic Island, Leshara, Happy Farms, Shunk)																																
5	North end of the county - consists of subdivisions near Fremont																																
6	Lakes and Rivers (Morse Bluff-Wolfes, Whitetail, Hidden Cove) - average quality properties with lower values compared to other lakes in the county																																
7	Mead and Cedar Bluffs - both have K-12 schools and are located along major highways																																
8	Small Town Wahoo (Ithaca, Leshara, Colon, Swedeburg, Malmo) - no schools exist in this area																																
9	Unincorporated Areas (Wann, Memphis, Touhy) - relatively quiet markets																																
10	Valparaiso																																
11	Wahoo																																
12	West Small Towns (Prague, Morse Bluff, Weston) - no high schools																																
13	Woodcliff subdivision area																																
14	Yutan																																
15	Rural Residential																																
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																																
	The cost approach is used in the county with market defined depreciation																																
<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 County uses local market information																																
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																																
	Yes, depreciation schedules exist for neighborhoods within many of the valuation groupings																																
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																																

The county uses vacant lot sales to determine residential lot values

7.

<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
1	2014	2012	2014
2	2014	2012	2014
3	2002	2012	2002
4	2006	2012	2006
5	2014	2012	2014
6	2007	2012	2007
7	2006	2012	2006
8	2005	2012	2005
9	2002	2012	2002
10	2007	2012	2007
11	2014	2012	2014
12	2007	2012	2007
13	2014	2012	2014
14	2014	2012	2014
15	2007	2012	2007

Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities. The groupings are then reviewed annually to ensure that those similarities remain.

# 2014 Residential Correlation Section for Saunders County

---

## County Overview

Saunders County (Saunders) was founded in 1856 and, after originally named for government surveyor Calhoun, it was renamed for the last Governor of the Nebraska Territory, Alvin Saunders. Saunders is located in the Eastern portion of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). The counties of Douglas, Sarpy, Cass, Lancaster, Butler, Colfax, and Dodge abut Saunders, which has a total area of 750 miles and 20,823 residents, per the Census Bureau's Quick Facts, of which 80.8% are homeowners. Since the State began monitoring county population growth, Saunders has experienced a .2% increase between 2010's population of 20,780 and the present. Per the US Census, there are 9,296 housing units in Saunders. Towns include Ashland, Wahoo, and Yutan, with Wahoo being the most populous at 4,508. Notable people with connections to Saunders include geneticist George Wells Beadle and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox studio founder Darryl F. Zanuck.

In total, there are 8,613 residential parcels in Saunders.

## Description of Analysis

The Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division (State) verifies the instruments used to analyze the residential data of every county every year. The two main areas where this occurs are a review of the county's valuation groups and an AVU review.

A review of Saunders's statistical analysis revealed 500 residential sales in the 15 valuation groupings, a 9% increase in qualified sales from the prior year. This sample is large enough to be evaluated for measurement purposes. Valuation Group 5, the North end of Saunders that is close to Fremont, has a Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) of 3.06. Because sub-divisions in the Northeast part of the county that border Fremont were inspected for assessment year 2014, there is not only a greater likelihood that sold and unsold properties would be valued in the same relation, but an actual expectation that that would be the result of the inspection. The stratification by valuation groupings reveals 12 groups with sufficient numbers of sales to perform measurement on and all are within range.

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a three year cyclical review in which thirty-one counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is adopted. The last cyclical review of Saunders's actions occurred in 2013 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

## Sales Qualification

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

---

The second review process is one of the sales verification and qualification procedure in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors.

The last review by the State occurred in 2013. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation. The review of Saunders revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determination, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property.

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

Saunders has an organized list of all neighborhoods in the county and when they were last inspected. Using this list, the county has structured a plan of inspection and review that will allow for a timely visit to all residential parcels in the county. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. For the current assessment year, neighborhoods in eight specific residential areas were inspected and reviewed, amounting to 1917 residential properties. Based on both Saunders's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the residential class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for residential property within Saunders is 96% of market value.



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

For the current assessment year, Saunders County (Saunders) conducted a market analysis of the commercial parcels in the county. Cedar Bluffs commercial and Condo Storage were physically inspected. The review consisted of a physical visit to each property with a record card copy, inspecting all property, and taking pictures. Any new additions were measured and any recorded improvements no longer existing were notated and removed from the parcel record.

All sales were reviewed by Saunders by sending out questionnaires to the grantor and grantee. If there was no response, a follow-up call was made to gather as much information as possible about the sale. A spreadsheet analysis of all sales with the study period was completed.

All pickup work was completed by Saunders, as were onsite inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction.

## 2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Saunders County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>		
	Appraiser and Staff		
<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>	
	1	Ashland - unique characteristics are tied to the local economic conditions of the area	
	2	Northern half of the county - mostly small town commercial property with influence from Fremont and Wahoo	
	3	Southern half of the county - small town and rural commercial with influence from Lincoln and Wahoo	
	4	Wahoo - unique characteristics are tied to the local economic conditions of the area	
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>		
	A market sale approach is used. A cost approach is used with depreciation established from sale information and an income approach is used when sufficient data is available.		
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>		
	The county looks outside of the county for comparable sales		
<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 tables are determined using local market information when sufficient information is available.		
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>		
	Yes		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>		
	Vacant sales analysis primarily.		
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>
	1	2012	2012
	2	2006	2012
	3	2006	2012
	4	2012	2012
	Valuation groupings are created by looking for similar characteristics, for example, proximity, size, and amenities. The groupings are then reviewed annually to ensure that those similarities remain.		

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

---

### **County Overview**

The majority of the commercial properties in Saunders County (Saunders) convene in and around Wahoo, the county seat, and Ashland, a suburb of Lincoln. The smaller community markets, while containing commercial properties of their own, are also guided by the proximity to the larger towns that serve as the area commercial hubs.

43% of the residents living in Saunders also work in Saunders. 3,371 people are employed in Saunders (U.S. Census Bureau, Local Employment Dynamics) and, per the Nebraska Department of Labor, there is an expected 3% job growth decrease in years 2010-2020. Among the top employers in Saunders are Saunders Medical Center, Advanced Building & Components, Wahoo Public School District, and South Haven (Nebraska Department of Labor). Saunders contains 7 grocery stores, 16 full-service restaurants, and 13 gas stations (city-data.com). The Barnes Oil Company is listed on the Register of Historic Places, as is the Wahoo Burlington Depot. Points of interest include the now defunct JFK College, a pioneer of early intercollegiate women's athletics and the town of Wahoo being designated the home office of the Late Show with David Letterman's Top 10 production.

In total, there are 507 nonfarm establishments located in Saunders, per the 2007 Survey of Business Owners, and 723 commercial parcels.

### **Description of Analysis**

The Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division (State) verifies the instruments used to analyze the commercial data of every county every year. The two main areas where this occurs are a review of the county's valuation groups and an AVU review.

A review of Saunders's statistical analysis revealed 51 commercial sales in the 4 valuation groupings, a 2% increase in qualified sales from the prior year. This sample is large enough to be evaluated for measurement purposes. The stratification by valuation groupings reveals 3 groups have sufficient numbers of sales to perform measurement on. 14 Occupancy Codes were represented in the current assessment year's sales, including, but not limited to, office buildings, restaurants, storage warehouses, boat storage sheds, and kennels. The initial analysis of a grouped together data set in a county will occasionally uncover a number not falling in the range expected of it; upon further review, however, that number reveals itself to be a perfectly acceptable measurement level. The stratification by occupancy code shows occupancy code 353 (retail store) containing 11 sales and a median of 101.71. Because Saunders analyzes the commercial property in the context of geographical location comparability groupings rather than by occupancy code, the 3 measurable valuation groupings represented by this occupancy code were instead examined and all were within range, indicating uniformity and proportionality.

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

---

The State conducts two review processes annually. The first is a three year cyclical review in which thirty-one counties are gauged on their specific assessment practices per annum. This review verifies normal measurement trends in an effort to uncover any incongruities. Based on the findings of this review, a course of action is adopted. The last cyclical review of Saunders's actions occurred in 2013 and it was determined at that time that measurement trends were on point and that the assessment actions adhered to professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Sales Qualification**

The second review process is one of the sales verification and qualification procedure in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors.

The last review by the State occurred in 2013. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation. The review of Saunders revealed that no apparent bias existed in the qualification determination, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property.

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

Saunders has an organized list of all neighborhoods in the county and when they were last inspected. Using this list, the county has structured a plan of inspection and review that will allow for a timely visit to all commercial parcels in the county. The inspection and review consists of a reappraisal which necessitates a physical inspection of all properties; both exterior and interior reviews are conducted as permitted. For the current assessment year, neighborhoods in eight specific commercial areas were inspected and reviewed, amounting to 49 commercial properties. Based on both Saunders's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the commercial class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on a review of all available information, the Level of Value for commercial property within Saunders is 96% of market value.



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

For the current assessment year, Saunders County (Saunders) reviewed the land use of all CRP land in the county, using the latest imagery available, in preparation to verify changes with land owners and conduct visual inspections.

Land use changes in the county were monitored and reviewed, using FSA maps as provided by property owners. Based on the results of the land use monitoring, land use was updated accordingly.

The assessor analyzed the market areas for Saunders, looking for discernable geographic or general soil association differences, which would warrant additional market areas to be created. Based on this analysis, new market area boundaries were created. Additionally, market areas were reviewed to discover the marginal difference between the agricultural land value and the uninfluenced ag land value.

Saunders reviewed all sales by sending a questionnaire to both buyer and seller. If no response was received, a follow-up call was made to gather as much sale information as possible. A spreadsheet analysis of all usable sales within the study period was completed, analyzing Saunders's market areas.

Finally, all agricultural land in Saunders was updated with the values, as set.

## 2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Saunders County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>								
	Appraiser and Staff								
<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="width: 15%; 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;">1</td> <td>Market Area 1 is the western 1/3 of the county. This area consists of mainly dryland hills</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>The Todd Valley. This area is mainly level to nearly level and consists of substantial irrigation and top quality soils-</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Market Area 3 is the eastern and central part of the county. The area consists of some irrigation, better soils, and topography than Market Area 1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Market Area 1 is the western 1/3 of the county. This area consists of mainly dryland hills	2	The Todd Valley. This area is mainly level to nearly level and consists of substantial irrigation and top quality soils-	3	Market Area 3 is the eastern and central part of the county. The area consists of some irrigation, better soils, and topography than Market Area 1
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>								
1	Market Area 1 is the western 1/3 of the county. This area consists of mainly dryland hills								
2	The Todd Valley. This area is mainly level to nearly level and consists of substantial irrigation and top quality soils-								
3	Market Area 3 is the eastern and central part of the county. The area consists of some irrigation, better soils, and topography than Market Area 1								
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>								
	The county monitors the sales activity for agricultural land and forms the boundaries based on similar activity within each area.								
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>								
	The county identifies small tracts of land that sell in the rural areas and does not use them in the agricultural land analysis. The recreational properties are discovered during land use verification.								
<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>								
	Yes								
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>								
	Sales are monitored and questionnaires are reviewed to determine the types of influences present. The county also considers sales from uninfluenced areas outside the county as a comparison to the sale prices within Saunders County to gauge the degree of influence.								
<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>								
	Applications have been received and the county is determined to be completely influenced.								
<b>8.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>								
	Saunders County has had sales that are used to determine the value of the Wetland Reserve parcels.								

## Saunders County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Saunders	1	5,604	5,400	5,201	4,751	4,602	4,315	3,405	3,200	4,394
Butler	1	5,599	5,400	4,795	4,680	4,098	3,876	3,386	3,169	4,933
Colfax	1	5,500	5,300	5,100	5,000	4,750	4,750	4,500	4,000	5,031
Seward	2	5,675	5,650	5,200	N/A	5,200	3,800	3,675	2,900	5,354
Saunders	2	5,906	5,438	5,479	5,102	4,809	4,500	4,088	4,016	5,557
Dodge	1	5,529	5,383	5,231	5,080	4,777	4,755	4,590	4,280	5,126
Saunders	3	5,800	5,607	5,408	4,950	4,800	4,500	3,618	3,400	4,842
Burt	2	5,375	5,350	N/A	4,725	4,336	4,450	3,575	2,775	4,960
Cass	54	5,760	5,570	4,900	4,900	4,140	4,140	3,760	3,760	5,163
Lancaster	1	6,000	6,000	5,982	5,993	4,874	4,854	2,999	2,999	5,463
Sarpy	1	5,428	5,267	4,888	4,500	4,230	4,000	3,240	2,800	4,606
Washington	1	5,450	5,315	4,915	4,475	4,340	3,935	3,055	2,540	4,680

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Saunders	1	4,703	4,506	4,303	3,856	3,704	3,306	2,705	2,412	3,354
Butler	1	5,300	5,000	4,199	3,987	3,600	2,900	2,800	2,700	3,958
Colfax	1	4,955	4,980	4,748	4,748	4,494	4,494	3,996	3,500	4,586
Seward	2	5,675	5,650	5,200	5,200	5,200	3,800	3,675	2,900	4,755
Saunders	2	5,702	5,599	5,307	4,905	4,622	4,134	3,413	3,238	5,168
Dodge	1	5,360	5,300	5,270	5,100	4,500	4,440	4,025	3,550	4,939
Saunders	3	5,315	5,108	4,918	4,560	4,409	4,112	3,265	3,065	4,105
Burt	2	5,350	5,325	4,850	4,675	4,442	4,424	3,550	2,725	4,741
Cass	54	4,340	4,300	4,130	3,720	3,550	3,550	3,560	2,980	3,928
Lancaster	1	3,748	3,750	3,371	3,373	3,000	3,000	2,625	2,624	3,263
Sarpy	1	5,000	4,850	4,510	4,140	3,900	3,690	2,990	2,580	4,141
Washington	1	5,230	5,135	4,830	4,185	3,925	3,850	2,965	2,235	4,413

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Saunders	1	2,052	1,760	2,048	1,803	1,955	1,463	1,435	1,083	1,513
Butler	1	2,100	2,377	2,245	1,983	2,001	1,899	1,875	1,436	1,723
Colfax	1	1,700	1,700	1,600	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,300	1,300	1,479
Seward	2	1,489	1,589	1,471	1,420	1,279	1,394	1,199	1,073	1,254
Saunders	2	1,998	1,762	1,648	1,936	1,638	1,415	1,479	1,084	1,655
Dodge	1	1,900	1,956	1,760	1,832	1,815	1,650	1,643	1,477	1,731
Saunders	3	1,715	1,436	2,307	1,963	2,029	1,530	1,443	1,059	1,698
Burt	2	2,192	2,125	2,422	1,611	1,898	1,769	1,816	1,531	1,832
Cass	54	1,770	1,770	1,500	1,500	1,460	1,460	1,340	1,340	1,496
Lancaster	1	2,362	2,539	2,088	2,163	1,817	1,829	1,432	1,366	1,805
Sarpy	1	2,040	1,970	1,840	1,680	1,580	1,490	1,200	1,050	1,514
Washington	1	2,162	2,149	1,947	1,545	3,214	1,526	1,759	1,525	1,844



2014

## Methodology for Special Valuation

### Saunders County

The State Assessment office for Saunders County submits this report pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.004. The following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The following non-agricultural influences have been identified: Residential, Commercial and Recreational. The office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the State Assessment office for Saunders County by any interested person.

#### A. Identification of the influenced area:

The assumption is made that there is influence on agricultural sales in Saunders County. There are five market areas. There are three areas of special valuation for Saunders County.

Area 1 is the far western part of the county. Area 1 has least productive soils in the county and the least influence from sales other than ag. Area 1 has some irrigation but it is limited in both quality and quantity. Area 1 has some pasture grass, CRP and hay production. However, most of the land is row crop production.

Area 2 is Todd Valley. Todd Valley is the old Platte River bed. This silted-in area has created an excellent agricultural production area. The Todd Valley area wanders throughout the county and is totally surrounded by the other market areas in the county. Topographically, Todd Valley is mainly a flat area consisting of better quality soils with unlimited irrigation. Area 2 consists of mostly row crop production of corn and soybeans.

Area 3 is the central part of the county. Area 3 has more irrigation than Area 1.

Area 4 is properties bordering the Platte River, located on the east and north boundaries of the county.

Area 5 is the area directly northeast of Todd Valley lying south and west of the Platte River. Area 5 is second only to Todd Valley in irrigation usage and quality soils.

Areas 3, 4 and 5 where the better soils are located, carry the same special value. Area 1 and 2 carry their own special value.

**B. Describe the highest and best use of the properties in the influenced area, and how this was determined:**

Residential acreages, rural suburbs and recreational usage are the highest and best use of properties in Saunders County. There are several highways connecting the county to Lincoln, Omaha and Fremont. Highways 77, 63 and 92 run through these areas making it easily accessible for outside residential use. The Platte River provides opportunities for recreational uses such as fishing, boating and hunting. Saunders County's close proximity to Omaha, Fremont, Lincoln places influences on sales with future development in mind.

**C. Describe the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates, and explain why and how they were selected:**

Two methods of valuation were analyzed for determining special valuation. Comparable sales of farm ground from uninfluenced counties and an income valuation method using cash rents and a cap rate from the market were considered. Sales of farm ground from uninfluenced counties were selected as the most accurate and reliable method of special valuation for Saunders County cropland.

**D. Describe which market areas were analyzed, both in the County and in any county deemed comparable:**

Comparable sales used are from Butler County and the southern part of Dodge County.

**E. Describe any adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

No adjustments were made to sales for any reason.

**F. Describe any estimates of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach. Include estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share:**

We have studied cash rents for these properties. Although rental information has been limited, appropriate information has been supportive of the assessed values.

**G. Describe the typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

**H. Describe the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

**I. Describe any other information used in supporting the estimate of actual and special value. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

Equalization with neighboring counties was also considered when determining the special values for Saunders County. We have several political sub-divisions crossing into other counties, as well as Saunders County property owners with property in neighboring counties.

Cathy Gusman  
Saunders County Assessor

Terry Kubik  
Saunders County Appraiser

# 2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Saunders County

---

## County Overview

Saunders County (Saunders) is a county with a 57% dry land majority composition that lies in the eastern half of the State of Nebraska (Nebraska). It falls within both the Lower Platte North and Lower Platte South Natural Resource Districts (NRD), which saw 1 water application and 224 new wells in Saunders for the current assessment year, bringing their total well count to 3,539 (DNR Monthly Apps). Per the most recent United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Census of Agriculture, there are 1,131 farms in Saunders, totaling 427,682 acres. When weighed against the rest of Nebraska, Saunders ranks first in soybeans, fifth for fruits, tree nuts, berries, fifth in nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, sod, and sixth in Christmas trees, respectively. Row crop production remains the predominant agricultural use in Saunders.

## Description of Analysis

For 2014, the county assessor analyzed Saunders as a whole and recognized geographic and general soil association differences. As a result, Saunders was divided, for valuation and measurement purposes, into three market areas. Area One is the northwest portion of the county. Area Two is made up of the Todd Valley region of the county. Area Three is comprised of the southwest portion of Saunders, as well as the eastern side of the county and the river.

A review of Saunders's statistical analysis revealed 25 qualified agricultural sales in Area One, 34 qualified agricultural sales in Area Two, and 44 qualified agricultural sales in Area Three, after ensuring that the acceptable thresholds for adequacy, time, and majority land use were met. A 2014 assessment level was estimated by Saunders and then measured against their sale prices. The results of this analysis conveyed that Saunders fell not only into the acceptable overall median range at 70.16%, but each market area was acceptable as well as each 80% majority land use (MLU) with sufficiently large enough samples.

## Sales Qualification

A review of the sales verification and qualification procedure is performed in every county in an effort to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. All sales are arms-length transactions unless determined otherwise. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales. To qualify sales, the county verifies the sale by authenticating the data relating to a given transaction with the buyer, seller, or authorized agent. Data may include the sale price, date of sale, terms of sale, terms of financing, and other motivating factors.

The last review by the State occurred in 2013. This review inspects the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the grounds for disqualifying sales were supported and documented. This review also involves an on-site dialogue with the assessor and a consideration of verification documentation. The review of Saunders revealed that no apparent bias existed in the

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

---

qualification determination, and that all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property.

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

After first ensuring that Saunders measured at an appropriate level for each of their three market areas, the county's resulting values were then compared with the average assessed values of the comparative counties of each to confirm equalization. In comparing the average assessed values by LCG of Saunders to adjacent counties, the evidence supported that the values were generally equalized, with no extreme outliers noted.

Saunders has an organized list of all parcels in the county and when they were last inspected. Using this list, the county has structured a plan of inspection and review that will allow for a timely viewing and physical inspection, if necessary, of all agricultural parcels in the county. For the current assessment year, parcels in specific sections were inspected and reviewed, amounting to 120 agricultural parcels. Based on both Saunders's commitment to prioritize adherence to all statutorily imposed inspection requirements and a review of all additional relevant information, the quality of assessment of the agricultural class has been determined to be in compliance with accepted general mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

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

### **Special Valuation**

A review of the agricultural land values in Saunders in areas that have non-agricultural influences indicates the assessed values used are similar to areas in the County where no non-agricultural influences exist. Based on analysis of this and all available information, the level of value of agricultural land special value in Saunders is 70%.



**78 Saunders**

**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 : 501  
 Total Sales Price : 82,646,666  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 82,568,666  
 Total Assessed Value : 78,109,800  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 164,808  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 155,908

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 14.75  
 PRD : 105.55

COV : 29.44  
 STD : 29.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 484.80  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.92

95% Median C.I. : 95.22 to 96.93  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.26 to 95.94  
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.28 to 102.42

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:38PM

DATE OF SALE *										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	59	96.79	102.20	96.25	16.87	106.18	56.60	192.26	94.42 to 100.18	130,981	126,065
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	44	96.49	99.56	94.97	15.41	104.83	55.27	195.88	94.66 to 100.43	153,412	145,692
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	72	97.69	99.97	96.57	10.18	103.52	62.66	213.94	94.62 to 99.85	208,268	201,128
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	83	96.37	100.41	96.36	13.54	104.20	57.57	226.43	93.51 to 99.47	159,336	153,535
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	39	95.64	101.08	93.47	19.53	108.14	43.02	303.40	89.89 to 102.01	136,720	127,790
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	43	96.17	101.72	92.64	19.79	109.80	38.92	235.86	93.69 to 99.56	169,597	157,122
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	80	96.08	102.25	94.72	17.08	107.95	68.74	484.80	93.50 to 98.09	172,538	163,431
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	81	94.51	93.64	90.92	10.60	102.99	61.97	135.45	91.69 to 96.43	165,960	150,894
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	258	96.80	100.55	96.19	13.70	104.53	55.27	226.43	95.82 to 98.46	165,497	159,197
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	243	95.46	99.10	92.89	15.86	106.69	38.92	484.80	94.00 to 96.51	164,076	152,415
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	238	96.55	100.23	95.82	13.89	104.60	43.02	303.40	95.10 to 98.37	169,338	162,264
<u>ALL</u>	501	96.26	99.85	94.60	14.75	105.55	38.92	484.80	95.22 to 96.93	164,808	155,908

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	13	93.43	93.54	92.82	07.77	100.78	70.37	111.37	85.99 to 103.54	363,353	337,260
02	67	96.77	98.67	95.46	13.03	103.36	56.60	213.94	92.45 to 100.43	142,188	135,734
03	23	96.58	101.32	97.27	13.92	104.16	75.87	195.88	89.28 to 100.45	115,274	112,129
04	1	105.95	105.95	105.95	00.00	100.00	105.95	105.95	N/A	145,000	153,630
05	22	96.01	96.61	96.66	03.06	99.95	86.91	105.99	94.35 to 100.49	220,955	213,564
06	3	94.03	95.84	94.48	02.31	101.44	93.49	100.00	N/A	189,667	179,193
07	21	98.88	105.06	102.20	11.15	102.80	80.71	136.63	96.75 to 114.50	86,155	88,050
08	13	98.62	105.41	89.18	26.15	118.20	57.12	161.70	80.59 to 147.40	87,481	78,019
09	1	104.10	104.10	104.10	00.00	100.00	104.10	104.10	N/A	50,000	52,050
10	11	97.48	112.04	94.73	28.52	118.27	69.35	303.40	74.62 to 110.06	111,082	105,226
11	132	96.05	101.89	95.30	16.34	106.92	60.86	484.80	94.00 to 97.33	123,675	117,859
12	13	92.30	90.32	80.70	20.82	111.92	57.57	127.74	62.52 to 111.76	60,548	48,863
13	40	94.47	96.32	95.24	07.78	101.13	79.97	123.63	91.42 to 99.53	282,518	269,056
14	37	98.96	100.32	99.05	08.04	101.28	70.02	119.27	95.19 to 103.48	175,662	173,998
15	104	95.05	98.52	91.58	19.41	107.58	38.92	235.86	92.62 to 96.85	201,551	184,586
<u>ALL</u>	501	96.26	99.85	94.60	14.75	105.55	38.92	484.80	95.22 to 96.93	164,808	155,908

**78 Saunders  
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 : 501  
 Total Sales Price : 82,646,666  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 82,568,666  
 Total Assessed Value : 78,109,800  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 164,808  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 155,908

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 14.75  
 PRD : 105.55

COV : 29.44  
 STD : 29.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 484.80  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.92

95% Median C.I. : 95.22 to 96.93  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.26 to 95.94  
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.28 to 102.42

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:38PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	501	96.26	99.85	94.60	14.75	105.55	38.92	484.80	95.22 to 96.93	164,808	155,908
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	501	96.26	99.85	94.60	14.75	105.55	38.92	484.80	95.22 to 96.93	164,808	155,908

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	4	225.40	255.43	217.68	61.53	117.34	86.10	484.80	N/A	9,038	19,673
Less Than 30,000	18	124.62	158.06	143.36	45.06	110.25	60.86	484.80	111.76 to 157.50	19,147	27,449
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	501	96.26	99.85	94.60	14.75	105.55	38.92	484.80	95.22 to 96.93	164,808	155,908
Greater Than 14,999	497	96.22	98.60	94.55	13.51	104.28	38.92	235.86	95.19 to 96.85	166,061	157,004
Greater Than 29,999	483	95.95	97.68	94.40	12.75	103.47	38.92	235.86	95.00 to 96.80	170,236	160,695
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	4	225.40	255.43	217.68	61.53	117.34	86.10	484.80	N/A	9,038	19,673
15,000 TO 29,999	14	119.72	130.24	134.65	24.12	96.72	60.86	219.60	96.75 to 157.50	22,036	29,671
30,000 TO 59,999	32	119.30	125.55	123.22	24.41	101.89	43.02	226.43	106.34 to 138.41	45,915	56,578
60,000 TO 99,999	88	100.09	103.35	102.74	13.74	100.59	61.97	161.65	97.48 to 104.55	81,669	83,911
100,000 TO 149,999	152	96.33	95.14	94.86	11.63	100.30	56.60	235.86	92.71 to 97.80	124,965	118,538
150,000 TO 249,999	109	95.10	94.30	93.63	09.38	100.72	57.12	213.94	93.87 to 96.51	195,846	183,378
250,000 TO 499,999	98	93.62	91.42	91.47	08.14	99.95	38.92	111.37	91.44 to 95.17	312,594	285,938
500,000 TO 999,999	4	92.59	91.83	92.34	02.78	99.45	86.38	95.76	N/A	647,922	598,294
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	501	96.26	99.85	94.60	14.75	105.55	38.92	484.80	95.22 to 96.93	164,808	155,908

**78 Saunders**  
**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 : 9,403,021  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,403,021  
Total Assessed Value : 8,135,695  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 188,060  
Avg. Assessed Value : 162,714

MEDIAN : 96  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 93  
COD : 20.53  
PRD : 107.58

COV : 28.34  
STD : 26.38  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.70  
MAX Sales Ratio : 158.62  
MIN Sales Ratio : 48.87

95% Median C.I. : 89.05 to 100.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.09 to 91.96  
95% Mean C.I. : 85.77 to 100.39

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:40PM

**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	5	60.84	64.63	64.81	18.31	99.72	49.22	95.98	N/A	209,600	135,837
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	77.78	77.78	77.78	00.00	100.00	77.78	77.78	N/A	65,000	50,560
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	100.00	85.77	88.52	14.23	96.89	57.30	100.00	N/A	433,167	383,423
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	6	115.45	112.13	89.64	26.75	125.09	56.44	158.62	56.44 to 158.62	478,013	428,472
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	94.54	103.81	101.73	11.06	102.04	92.76	124.14	N/A	65,233	66,360
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	96.25	94.80	90.78	11.59	104.43	69.89	115.67	69.89 to 115.67	68,167	61,883
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	6	97.50	102.00	99.44	08.22	102.57	91.24	129.48	91.24 to 129.48	144,000	143,198
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	60.30	77.50	65.23	35.84	118.81	53.69	118.51	N/A	128,022	83,503
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	4	99.18	105.36	107.18	09.11	98.30	95.94	127.13	N/A	71,250	76,365
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	84.70	84.70	91.82	15.88	92.25	71.25	98.15	N/A	85,000	78,045
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	5	96.61	99.59	86.19	29.78	115.55	58.55	155.46	N/A	206,755	178,210
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	6	83.96	84.90	83.52	19.49	101.65	48.87	115.39	48.87 to 115.39	130,150	108,695
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	15	87.33	88.73	84.29	31.02	105.27	49.22	158.62	57.30 to 100.00	352,039	296,723
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	18	95.56	95.82	90.68	14.50	105.67	53.69	129.48	91.24 to 102.11	102,931	93,338
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	17	96.61	94.01	88.33	19.48	106.43	48.87	155.46	71.25 to 115.39	133,510	117,928
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	13	100.00	101.49	89.67	22.08	113.18	56.44	158.62	77.78 to 130.89	340,637	305,442
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	19	96.70	96.56	91.99	13.73	104.97	53.69	129.48	91.24 to 102.11	102,214	94,024
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.96	93.08	86.52	20.53	107.58	48.87	158.62	89.05 to 100.00	188,060	162,714

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	94.17	107.01	88.81	18.48	120.49	87.33	139.52	N/A	877,000	778,827
02	13	95.94	92.35	93.69	14.18	98.57	54.08	130.89	71.25 to 100.00	143,592	134,530
03	6	74.12	88.92	69.76	38.48	127.47	53.69	158.62	53.69 to 158.62	162,250	113,193
04	28	97.38	92.82	85.74	19.98	108.26	48.87	155.46	78.73 to 101.65	140,422	120,399
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.96	93.08	86.52	20.53	107.58	48.87	158.62	89.05 to 100.00	188,060	162,714

**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	87.33	87.33	87.33	00.00	100.00	87.33	87.33	N/A	2,500,000	2,183,190
03	49	95.98	93.20	86.23	20.76	108.08	48.87	158.62	89.19 to 100.00	140,878	121,480
04											
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.96	93.08	86.52	20.53	107.58	48.87	158.62	89.05 to 100.00	188,060	162,714

**78 Saunders  
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 : 9,403,021  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,403,021  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,135,695  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 188,060  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 162,714

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 87  
 MEAN : 93  
 COD : 20.53  
 PRD : 107.58

COV : 28.34  
 STD : 26.38  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.70  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 158.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.87

95% Median C.I. : 89.05 to 100.00  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.09 to 91.96  
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.77 to 100.39

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:40PM

SALE PRICE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	155.46	155.46	155.46	00.00	100.00	155.46	155.46	N/A	3,776	5,870
Less Than 15,000	2	126.08	126.08	112.80	23.30	111.77	96.70	155.46	N/A	6,888	7,770
Less Than 30,000	4	126.08	116.22	108.53	32.38	107.09	54.08	158.62	N/A	16,194	17,575
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	49	95.94	91.81	86.49	19.69	106.15	48.87	158.62	89.05 to 99.18	191,821	165,915
Greater Than 14,999	48	95.24	91.70	86.48	20.23	106.04	48.87	158.62	87.33 to 100.00	195,609	169,170
Greater Than 29,999	46	95.24	91.07	86.37	18.72	105.44	48.87	139.52	87.33 to 100.00	203,005	175,335
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	155.46	155.46	155.46	00.00	100.00	155.46	155.46	N/A	3,776	5,870
5,000 TO 14,999	1	96.70	96.70	96.70	00.00	100.00	96.70	96.70	N/A	10,000	9,670
15,000 TO 29,999	2	106.35	106.35	107.37	49.15	99.05	54.08	158.62	N/A	25,500	27,380
30,000 TO 59,999	9	101.71	102.91	103.82	13.81	99.12	71.25	124.14	89.05 to 118.51	43,000	44,643
60,000 TO 99,999	9	100.50	109.68	109.09	18.52	100.54	77.78	139.52	89.19 to 130.89	73,333	79,997
100,000 TO 149,999	12	85.37	79.68	79.55	23.66	100.16	48.87	115.39	53.69 to 99.18	115,390	91,793
150,000 TO 249,999	8	84.64	82.26	80.92	18.30	101.66	58.55	102.11	58.55 to 102.11	185,508	150,112
250,000 TO 499,999	5	63.01	75.54	75.15	24.90	100.52	57.30	100.00	N/A	357,500	268,674
500,000 TO 999,999	2	98.31	98.31	98.21	01.73	100.10	96.61	100.00	N/A	567,500	557,330
1,000,000 +	1	87.33	87.33	87.33	00.00	100.00	87.33	87.33	N/A	2,500,000	2,183,190
<u>ALL</u>	50	95.96	93.08	86.52	20.53	107.58	48.87	158.62	89.05 to 100.00	188,060	162,714

**78 Saunders**  
**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 : 9,403,021  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,403,021  
Total Assessed Value : 8,135,695  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 188,060  
Avg. Assessed Value : 162,714

MEDIAN : 96  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 93  
COD : 20.53  
PRD : 107.58

COV : 28.34  
STD : 26.38  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.70  
MAX Sales Ratio : 158.62  
MIN Sales Ratio : 48.87

95% Median C.I. : 89.05 to 100.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.09 to 91.96  
95% Mean C.I. : 85.77 to 100.39

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:40PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	1	92.00	92.00	92.00	00.00	100.00	92.00	92.00	N/A	120,000	110,400
309	1	127.13	127.13	127.13	00.00	100.00	127.13	127.13	N/A	75,000	95,350
344	2	94.36	94.36	94.40	00.20	99.96	94.17	94.54	N/A	84,850	80,095
350	3	130.89	130.39	116.11	14.51	112.30	101.65	158.62	N/A	82,667	95,983
352	7	91.24	94.11	87.22	19.79	107.90	63.01	129.48	63.01 to 129.48	507,700	442,837
353	11	101.71	103.52	93.34	24.36	110.91	48.87	155.46	69.89 to 139.52	107,252	100,105
386	1	78.03	78.03	78.03	00.00	100.00	78.03	78.03	N/A	210,000	163,860
406	7	78.73	76.26	75.85	23.84	100.54	49.22	99.18	49.22 to 99.18	101,571	77,039
423	1	53.69	53.69	53.69	00.00	100.00	53.69	53.69	N/A	110,000	59,060
430	1	96.70	96.70	96.70	00.00	100.00	96.70	96.70	N/A	10,000	9,670
434	1	89.19	89.19	89.19	00.00	100.00	89.19	89.19	N/A	90,000	80,270
442	1	71.25	71.25	71.25	00.00	100.00	71.25	71.25	N/A	40,000	28,500
459	4	99.21	89.81	81.22	10.53	110.58	60.30	100.50	N/A	122,536	99,530
466	1	96.57	96.57	96.57	00.00	100.00	96.57	96.57	N/A	280,000	270,400
468	2	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	475,000	475,008
477	3	92.76	88.29	78.25	21.28	112.83	56.44	115.67	N/A	61,667	48,257
490	1	95.98	95.98	95.98	00.00	100.00	95.98	95.98	N/A	150,000	143,965
494	1	57.30	57.30	57.30	00.00	100.00	57.30	57.30	N/A	349,500	200,255
531	1	60.84	60.84	60.84	00.00	100.00	60.84	60.84	N/A	481,000	292,630
<u>    </u> ALL <u>    </u>	50	95.96	93.08	86.52	20.53	107.58	48.87	158.62	89.05 to 100.00	188,060	162,714

**78 Saunders**

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

Qualified

**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

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

Number of Sales : 103  
 Total Sales Price : 61,475,008  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 61,475,008  
 Total Assessed Value : 43,032,947  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 596,845  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 417,796

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 22.29  
 PRD : 106.21

COV : 29.63  
 STD : 22.03  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.51  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 148.52  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.66

95% Median C.I. : 65.71 to 73.58  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.84 to 74.16  
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.10 to 78.60

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:41PM

**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	15	87.71	95.54	91.27	23.19	104.68	68.05	140.59	74.58 to 115.26	505,050	460,951
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	98.67	92.19	88.99	12.35	103.60	58.79	110.59	74.56 to 107.70	507,815	451,902
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	6	69.88	68.64	70.49	07.78	97.38	57.28	78.16	57.28 to 78.16	488,133	344,084
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	62.52	61.83	60.49	11.32	102.22	48.95	73.34	N/A	397,309	240,333
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	13	66.42	68.24	68.70	11.16	99.33	52.27	81.70	60.03 to 76.36	755,135	518,766
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	67.27	80.40	73.55	28.65	109.31	43.16	148.52	63.98 to 93.61	660,186	485,545
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	12	69.06	74.86	67.49	19.82	110.92	54.29	110.29	59.99 to 92.98	585,497	395,152
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	67.48	67.48	53.21	30.32	126.82	47.02	87.94	N/A	1,140,500	606,873
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	17	57.27	59.63	58.08	17.85	102.67	40.66	88.27	49.02 to 68.94	498,780	289,684
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	5	53.73	54.18	54.35	11.80	99.69	43.90	62.97	N/A	1,035,798	562,910
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	5	74.16	70.67	66.46	10.72	106.33	59.13	81.32	N/A	495,169	329,079
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	66.13	66.13	64.86	12.54	101.96	57.84	74.41	N/A	485,335	314,765
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	34	78.45	85.94	84.06	23.26	102.24	48.95	140.59	70.41 to 98.67	490,121	411,977
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	40	67.62	74.14	68.62	20.50	108.04	43.16	148.52	63.98 to 75.22	692,653	475,291
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	29	60.57	61.04	58.55	16.25	104.25	40.66	88.27	52.45 to 68.67	589,819	345,314
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	32	72.96	74.25	73.19	16.64	101.45	48.95	110.59	62.81 to 78.16	590,785	432,404
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	44	66.30	70.28	65.20	22.32	107.79	40.66	148.52	59.99 to 70.02	599,287	390,734
<u>ALL</u>	103	69.57	74.35	70.00	22.29	106.21	40.66	148.52	65.71 to 73.58	596,845	417,796

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	25	70.16	75.68	70.99	24.05	106.61	40.66	132.40	62.74 to 78.16	410,407	291,330
2	34	69.60	77.38	72.45	24.76	106.80	43.16	140.93	63.52 to 82.63	823,852	596,873
3	44	68.75	71.25	66.61	19.46	106.97	42.78	148.52	62.37 to 75.22	527,360	351,273
<u>ALL</u>	103	69.57	74.35	70.00	22.29	106.21	40.66	148.52	65.71 to 73.58	596,845	417,796

**78 Saunders**  
**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 : 103  
Total Sales Price : 61,475,008  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 61,475,008  
Total Assessed Value : 43,032,947  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 596,845  
Avg. Assessed Value : 417,796

MEDIAN : 70  
WGT. MEAN : 70  
MEAN : 74  
COD : 22.29  
PRD : 106.21

COV : 29.63  
STD : 22.03  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.51  
MAX Sales Ratio : 148.52  
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.66

95% Median C.I. : 65.71 to 73.58  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.84 to 74.16  
95% Mean C.I. : 70.10 to 78.60

Printed:4/1/2014 12:53:41PM

**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	6	79.95	81.36	89.85	14.61	90.55	67.94	103.46	67.94 to 103.46	694,676	624,151
2	6	79.95	81.36	89.85	14.61	90.55	67.94	103.46	67.94 to 103.46	694,676	624,151
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	42	69.88	74.84	68.83	26.27	108.73	40.66	148.52	62.37 to 75.69	501,102	344,897
1	6	58.92	72.24	62.75	36.17	115.12	40.66	132.40	40.66 to 132.40	461,666	289,687
2	10	69.12	79.39	73.88	32.62	107.46	43.16	140.93	49.02 to 108.88	481,977	356,101
3	26	73.46	73.69	68.27	20.41	107.94	42.78	148.52	62.37 to 78.15	517,558	353,329
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	3	93.61	95.98	91.86	12.89	104.49	79.06	115.26	N/A	244,265	224,375
1	2	97.16	97.16	90.47	18.63	107.39	79.06	115.26	N/A	204,398	184,910
3	1	93.61	93.61	93.61	00.00	100.00	93.61	93.61	N/A	324,000	303,305
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>69.57</b>	<b>74.35</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>22.29</b>	<b>106.21</b>	<b>40.66</b>	<b>148.52</b>	<b>65.71 to 73.58</b>	<b>596,845</b>	<b>417,796</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	18	69.82	72.28	71.24	13.15	101.46	47.02	103.46	63.52 to 72.57	1,010,222	719,700
1	1	70.16	70.16	70.16	00.00	100.00	70.16	70.16	N/A	500,000	350,800
2	15	70.02	73.76	72.68	14.24	101.49	47.02	103.46	66.89 to 87.71	1,025,600	745,390
3	2	62.22	62.22	61.87	01.22	100.57	61.46	62.97	N/A	1,150,000	711,475
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	56	73.75	76.90	70.90	24.33	108.46	40.66	148.52	66.42 to 78.16	487,352	345,545
1	14	70.72	79.13	71.39	30.83	110.84	40.66	132.40	57.27 to 112.34	456,668	326,008
2	11	69.57	81.51	77.15	33.79	105.65	43.16	140.93	49.02 to 108.88	494,130	381,209
3	31	73.91	74.26	68.51	19.06	108.39	42.78	148.52	65.51 to 78.74	498,804	341,713
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	7	79.06	86.21	82.33	31.53	104.71	52.27	140.59	52.27 to 140.59	227,147	187,021
1	4	70.90	77.33	72.08	27.97	107.28	52.27	115.26	N/A	242,757	174,988
2	2	100.28	100.28	103.69	40.21	96.71	59.96	140.59	N/A	147,500	152,945
3	1	93.61	93.61	93.61	00.00	100.00	93.61	93.61	N/A	324,000	303,305
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>69.57</b>	<b>74.35</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>22.29</b>	<b>106.21</b>	<b>40.66</b>	<b>148.52</b>	<b>65.71 to 73.58</b>	<b>596,845</b>	<b>417,796</b>



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 15,782</b>	<b>Value : 3,063,616,102</b>	<b>Growth 21,141,155</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>	464	5,303,120	267	5,420,270	385	17,801,380	1,116	28,524,770	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	4,354	79,257,450	1,239	81,728,120	1,992	122,529,290	7,585	283,514,860	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	4,354	332,303,680	1,239	184,738,260	1,992	300,683,731	7,585	817,725,671	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	4,818	416,864,250	1,506	271,886,650	2,377	441,014,401	8,701	1,129,765,301	16,696,624
<b>% of Res Total</b>	55.37	36.90	17.31	24.07	27.32	39.04	55.13	36.88	78.98
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	103	2,146,900	18	695,540	21	862,180	142	3,704,620	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	596	12,374,635	71	1,889,890	51	3,206,780	718	17,471,305	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	596	77,153,290	71	13,236,576	51	7,779,905	718	98,169,771	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	699	91,674,825	89	15,822,006	72	11,848,865	860	119,345,696	1,044,151
<b>% of Com Total</b>	81.28	76.81	10.35	13.26	8.37	9.93	5.45	3.90	4.94
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	5	195,840	28	2,373,270	33	2,569,110	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	32,000	14	1,007,740	15	1,039,740	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	1	28,230	14	410,950	15	439,180	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	6	256,070	42	3,791,960	48	4,048,030	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	12.50	6.33	87.50	93.67	0.30	0.13	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	4,818	416,864,250	1,512	272,142,720	2,419	444,806,361	8,749	1,133,813,331	16,696,624
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	55.07	36.77	17.28	24.00	27.65	39.23	55.44	37.01	78.98
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	699	91,674,825	89	15,822,006	72	11,848,865	860	119,345,696	1,044,151
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	81.28	76.81	10.35	13.26	8.37	9.93	5.45	3.90	4.94
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	5,517	508,539,075	1,601	287,964,726	2,491	456,655,226	9,609	1,253,159,027	17,740,775
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	57.41	40.58	16.66	22.98	25.92	36.44	60.89	40.90	83.92

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	25	27,900	680,140	0	0	0
19. Commercial	7	1,426,715	10,275,045	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	1	250,305	551,455	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	25	27,900	680,140
19. Commercial	1	20,540	58,460	8	1,447,255	10,333,505
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	1	250,305	551,455
22. Total Sch II				<b>34</b>	<b>1,725,460</b>	<b>11,565,100</b>

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
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	395	195	334	924

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	2	1,271,835	430	95,409,770	4,203	1,076,754,850	4,635	1,173,436,455
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	120	45,835,650	1,333	442,185,240	1,453	488,020,890
29. Ag Improvements	14	35,550	128	13,843,990	1,396	135,120,190	1,538	148,999,730
30. Ag Total							<b>6,173</b>	<b>1,810,457,075</b>

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	0	0.00	0	86	95.00	2,413,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	86	0.00	10,780,030	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	14	25.99	120,150	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	116	270.57	1,252,180	
37. FarmSite Improvements	14	0.00	35,550	124	0.00	3,063,960	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	6.12	0	0	748.13	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	8	8.00	199,000	8	8.00	199,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	992	1,040.03	25,853,500	1,078	1,135.03	28,266,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	992	0.00	105,197,250	1,078	0.00	115,977,280	3,271,450
34. HomeSite Total				<b>1,086</b>	<b>1,143.03</b>	<b>144,442,780</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	206	1,100.96	3,414,780	220	1,126.95	3,534,930	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,276	3,756.72	16,009,340	1,392	4,027.29	17,261,520	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,339	0.00	29,922,940	1,477	0.00	33,022,450	128,930
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,697</b>	<b>5,154.24</b>	<b>53,818,900</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,514.95	0	0	9,269.20	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	698.58	1,397,760	0	698.58	1,397,760	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,783</b>	<b>16,265.05</b>	<b>199,659,440</b>	<b>3,400,380</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	10	705.18	1,466,240	10	705.18	1,466,240

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	1	193.07	1,021,530	512	32,955.38	149,829,990
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	5,336	388,883.45	1,604,351,880	5,849	422,031.90	1,755,203,400
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	1,696.35	11.88%	9,507,070	15.15%	5,604.43
46. 1A	918.26	6.43%	4,958,600	7.90%	5,400.00
47. 2A1	2,885.38	20.20%	15,007,270	23.91%	5,201.14
48. 2A	1,153.69	8.08%	5,481,360	8.73%	4,751.15
49. 3A1	1,063.65	7.45%	4,894,390	7.80%	4,601.50
50. 3A	677.08	4.74%	2,921,850	4.66%	4,315.37
51. 4A1	5,588.31	39.12%	19,027,390	30.32%	3,404.86
52. 4A	302.00	2.11%	966,400	1.54%	3,200.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>14,284.72</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>62,764,330</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,393.81</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	3,315.55	3.58%	15,594,500	5.02%	4,703.44
55. 1D	5,356.27	5.79%	24,135,780	7.77%	4,506.08
56. 2D1	18,709.31	20.21%	80,497,530	25.93%	4,302.54
57. 2D	3,049.59	3.29%	11,758,350	3.79%	3,855.72
58. 3D1	5,466.28	5.90%	20,244,470	6.52%	3,703.52
59. 3D	10,168.70	10.98%	33,620,910	10.83%	3,306.31
60. 4D1	42,367.11	45.76%	114,620,910	36.92%	2,705.42
61. 4D	4,146.15	4.48%	9,998,810	3.22%	2,411.59
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>92,578.96</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>310,471,260</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,353.58</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	806.80	2.76%	1,655,700	3.74%	2,052.18
64. 1G	1,259.20	4.31%	2,215,760	5.01%	1,759.66
65. 2G1	2,978.92	10.19%	6,100,220	13.79%	2,047.80
66. 2G	983.89	3.36%	1,774,090	4.01%	1,803.14
67. 3G1	3,375.66	11.54%	6,599,230	14.92%	1,954.95
68. 3G	5,159.79	17.64%	7,548,280	17.06%	1,462.90
69. 4G1	6,953.40	23.78%	9,976,400	22.55%	1,434.75
70. 4G	7,727.89	26.42%	8,372,820	18.92%	1,083.45
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>29,245.55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>44,242,500</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,512.79</b>
<hr/>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>14,284.72</b>	<b>10.25%</b>	<b>62,764,330</b>	<b>15.02%</b>	<b>4,393.81</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>92,578.96</b>	<b>66.41%</b>	<b>310,471,260</b>	<b>74.28%</b>	<b>3,353.58</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>29,245.55</b>	<b>20.98%</b>	<b>44,242,500</b>	<b>10.58%</b>	<b>1,512.79</b>
72. Waste	3,301.45	2.37%	516,420	0.12%	156.42
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>139,410.68</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>417,994,510</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,998.30</b>

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	32,278.12	62.38%	190,625,540	66.28%	5,905.72
46. 1A	857.09	1.66%	4,660,815	1.62%	5,437.95
47. 2A1	7,190.62	13.90%	39,395,940	13.70%	5,478.80
48. 2A	1,729.97	3.34%	8,827,050	3.07%	5,102.43
49. 3A1	5,961.11	11.52%	28,665,960	9.97%	4,808.83
50. 3A	530.87	1.03%	2,388,930	0.83%	4,500.03
51. 4A1	2,363.30	4.57%	9,661,170	3.36%	4,088.00
52. 4A	836.85	1.62%	3,361,200	1.17%	4,016.49
53. Total	51,747.93	100.00%	287,586,605	100.00%	5,557.45
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	14,727.16	49.21%	83,972,920	54.29%	5,701.91
55. 1D	1,487.77	4.97%	8,329,920	5.39%	5,598.93
56. 2D1	4,719.28	15.77%	25,046,720	16.19%	5,307.32
57. 2D	1,662.86	5.56%	8,156,350	5.27%	4,905.01
58. 3D1	3,065.45	10.24%	14,167,490	9.16%	4,621.67
59. 3D	806.16	2.69%	3,333,060	2.15%	4,134.49
60. 4D1	2,687.23	8.98%	9,171,890	5.93%	3,413.14
61. 4D	772.82	2.58%	2,502,620	1.62%	3,238.30
62. Total	29,928.73	100.00%	154,680,970	100.00%	5,168.31
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	652.57	22.12%	1,303,600	26.70%	1,997.64
64. 1G	145.22	4.92%	255,830	5.24%	1,761.67
65. 2G1	480.17	16.28%	791,140	16.20%	1,647.62
66. 2G	175.19	5.94%	339,250	6.95%	1,936.47
67. 3G1	663.93	22.51%	1,087,430	22.27%	1,637.87
68. 3G	211.19	7.16%	298,870	6.12%	1,415.17
69. 4G1	335.36	11.37%	495,830	10.16%	1,478.50
70. 4G	286.27	9.70%	310,440	6.36%	1,084.43
71. Total	2,949.90	100.00%	4,882,390	100.00%	1,655.10
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	51,747.93	60.84%	287,586,605	64.30%	5,557.45
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	29,928.73	35.18%	154,680,970	34.59%	5,168.31
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	2,949.90	3.47%	4,882,390	1.09%	1,655.10
72. Waste	435.04	0.51%	77,300	0.02%	177.68
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	85,061.60	100.00%	447,227,265	100.00%	5,257.69

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,052.15	11.86%	11,902,690	14.21%	5,800.11
46. 1A	1,128.98	6.53%	6,330,450	7.56%	5,607.23
47. 2A1	3,911.66	22.61%	21,153,950	25.25%	5,407.92
48. 2A	4,785.95	27.67%	23,691,450	28.28%	4,950.21
49. 3A1	654.70	3.78%	3,142,560	3.75%	4,800.00
50. 3A	449.11	2.60%	2,021,010	2.41%	4,500.03
51. 4A1	3,887.52	22.47%	14,063,840	16.79%	3,617.69
52. 4A	429.22	2.48%	1,459,350	1.74%	3,400.00
53. Total	17,299.29	100.00%	83,765,300	100.00%	4,842.12
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	4,144.81	4.44%	22,029,040	5.75%	5,314.85
55. 1D	4,463.84	4.79%	22,801,660	5.96%	5,108.08
56. 2D1	23,976.20	25.70%	117,906,140	30.79%	4,917.63
57. 2D	14,714.40	15.77%	67,101,010	17.52%	4,560.23
58. 3D1	1,579.36	1.69%	6,963,580	1.82%	4,409.12
59. 3D	1,708.56	1.83%	7,025,150	1.83%	4,111.74
60. 4D1	40,971.56	43.92%	133,785,240	34.94%	3,265.32
61. 4D	1,722.16	1.85%	5,277,740	1.38%	3,064.60
62. Total	93,280.89	100.00%	382,889,560	100.00%	4,104.69
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	1,565.09	15.90%	2,683,910	16.06%	1,714.86
64. 1G	405.23	4.12%	581,810	3.48%	1,435.75
65. 2G1	1,037.02	10.54%	2,392,090	14.31%	2,306.70
66. 2G	1,092.43	11.10%	2,144,820	12.83%	1,963.35
67. 3G1	1,700.32	17.28%	3,449,780	20.64%	2,028.90
68. 3G	628.81	6.39%	962,190	5.76%	1,530.18
69. 4G1	2,308.06	23.46%	3,330,470	19.93%	1,442.97
70. 4G	1,103.36	11.21%	1,168,250	6.99%	1,058.81
71. Total	9,840.32	100.00%	16,713,320	100.00%	1,698.45
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	17,299.29	14.05%	83,765,300	17.32%	4,842.12
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	93,280.89	75.76%	382,889,560	79.15%	4,104.69
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	9,840.32	7.99%	16,713,320	3.45%	1,698.45
72. Waste	2,700.21	2.19%	402,290	0.08%	148.98
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	123,120.71	100.00%	483,770,470	100.00%	3,929.24

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	763.40	10.90%	4,427,720	13.06%	5,800.00
46. 1A	226.87	3.24%	1,270,470	3.75%	5,599.99
47. 2A1	330.10	4.71%	1,782,540	5.26%	5,400.00
48. 2A	2,684.36	38.31%	13,287,610	39.20%	4,950.01
49. 3A1	1,140.41	16.28%	5,473,940	16.15%	4,799.98
50. 3A	1,145.31	16.35%	5,153,890	15.20%	4,500.00
51. 4A1	326.82	4.66%	1,176,550	3.47%	3,599.99
52. 4A	389.55	5.56%	1,324,470	3.91%	3,400.00
53. Total	7,006.82	100.00%	33,897,190	100.00%	4,837.74
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	483.35	3.33%	2,569,760	4.04%	5,316.56
55. 1D	699.72	4.82%	3,597,090	5.65%	5,140.76
56. 2D1	1,646.49	11.34%	8,088,840	12.71%	4,912.78
57. 2D	5,456.98	37.57%	24,725,930	38.86%	4,531.06
58. 3D1	2,326.97	16.02%	10,289,030	16.17%	4,421.64
59. 3D	1,944.60	13.39%	8,040,300	12.63%	4,134.68
60. 4D1	1,552.35	10.69%	5,057,660	7.95%	3,258.07
61. 4D	413.36	2.85%	1,266,820	1.99%	3,064.69
62. Total	14,523.82	100.00%	63,635,430	100.00%	4,381.45
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	246.93	2.30%	386,550	2.28%	1,565.42
64. 1G	106.27	0.99%	183,630	1.09%	1,727.96
65. 2G1	296.05	2.76%	533,650	3.15%	1,802.57
66. 2G	2,499.62	23.27%	4,753,910	28.09%	1,901.85
67. 3G1	3,211.09	29.89%	4,946,040	29.23%	1,540.30
68. 3G	2,797.48	26.04%	4,162,290	24.59%	1,487.87
69. 4G1	434.38	4.04%	663,720	3.92%	1,527.97
70. 4G	1,151.06	10.71%	1,293,600	7.64%	1,123.83
71. Total	10,742.88	100.00%	16,923,390	100.00%	1,575.31
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	7,006.82	20.74%	33,897,190	29.50%	4,837.74
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	14,523.82	43.00%	63,635,430	55.37%	4,381.45
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	10,742.88	31.80%	16,923,390	14.73%	1,575.31
72. Waste	1,506.09	4.46%	464,400	0.40%	308.35
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	33,779.61	100.00%	114,920,410	100.00%	3,402.06

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

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	875.00	8.20%	5,077,200	10.27%	5,802.51
46. 1A	352.80	3.30%	1,982,680	4.01%	5,619.84
47. 2A1	3,655.55	34.24%	19,747,960	39.96%	5,402.19
48. 2A	846.79	7.93%	4,195,020	8.49%	4,954.03
49. 3A1	24.00	0.22%	115,200	0.23%	4,800.00
50. 3A	650.47	6.09%	2,927,120	5.92%	4,500.01
51. 4A1	4,099.99	38.41%	14,788,780	29.93%	3,607.03
52. 4A	171.00	1.60%	581,400	1.18%	3,400.00
53. Total	10,675.60	100.00%	49,415,360	100.00%	4,628.81
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	958.51	4.16%	5,102,380	5.37%	5,323.24
55. 1D	793.53	3.44%	4,067,840	4.28%	5,126.26
56. 2D1	7,055.62	30.60%	34,658,550	36.49%	4,912.19
57. 2D	2,154.48	9.34%	9,811,500	10.33%	4,554.00
58. 3D1	95.00	0.41%	419,600	0.44%	4,416.84
59. 3D	2,227.28	9.66%	9,131,850	9.62%	4,100.00
60. 4D1	9,616.97	41.71%	31,309,640	32.97%	3,255.67
61. 4D	153.77	0.67%	471,640	0.50%	3,067.18
62. Total	23,055.16	100.00%	94,973,000	100.00%	4,119.38
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	122.40	8.22%	221,860	9.09%	1,812.58
64. 1G	75.55	5.07%	135,650	5.56%	1,795.50
65. 2G1	175.63	11.80%	346,340	14.20%	1,971.99
66. 2G	144.98	9.74%	285,860	11.72%	1,971.72
67. 3G1	241.17	16.20%	491,890	20.16%	2,039.60
68. 3G	317.15	21.30%	347,770	14.25%	1,096.55
69. 4G1	361.49	24.28%	536,570	21.99%	1,484.33
70. 4G	50.40	3.39%	73,710	3.02%	1,462.50
71. Total	1,488.77	100.00%	2,439,650	100.00%	1,638.70
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	10,675.60	29.96%	49,415,360	33.64%	4,628.81
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	23,055.16	64.71%	94,973,000	64.66%	4,119.38
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	1,488.77	4.18%	2,439,650	1.66%	1,638.70
72. Waste	409.16	1.15%	56,970	0.04%	139.24
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	35,628.69	100.00%	146,884,980	100.00%	4,122.66

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	252.80	894,305	10,549.15	55,703,830	90,212.41	460,830,650	101,014.36	517,428,785
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	69.90	377,530	18,704.73	77,621,200	234,592.93	928,651,490	253,367.56	1,006,650,220
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	2,798.54	3,947,380	51,468.88	81,253,870	54,267.42	85,201,250
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	749.88	187,680	7,602.07	1,329,700	8,351.95	1,517,380
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>322.70</b>	<b>1,271,835</b>	<b>32,802.30</b>	<b>137,460,090</b>	<b>383,876.29</b>	<b>1,472,065,710</b>	<b>417,001.29</b>	<b>1,610,797,635</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	101,014.36	24.22%	517,428,785	32.12%	5,122.33
<b>Dry Land</b>	253,367.56	60.76%	1,006,650,220	62.49%	3,973.08
<b>Grass</b>	54,267.42	13.01%	85,201,250	5.29%	1,570.03
<b>Waste</b>	8,351.95	2.00%	1,517,380	0.09%	181.68
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>417,001.29</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,610,797,635</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,862.81</b>

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

78 Saunders

	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	1,045,753,176	1,129,765,301	84,012,125	8.03%	16,696,624	6.44%
02. Recreational	3,165,210	4,048,030	882,820	27.89%	0	27.89%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	164,912,920	144,442,780	-20,470,140	-12.41%	3,271,450	-14.40%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>1,213,831,306</b>	<b>1,278,256,111</b>	<b>64,424,805</b>	<b>5.31%</b>	<b>19,968,074</b>	<b>3.66%</b>
05. Commercial	116,195,356	119,345,696	3,150,340	2.71%	1,044,151	1.81%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	58,695,180	53,818,900	-4,876,280	-8.31%	128,930	-8.53%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>174,890,536</b>	<b>173,164,596</b>	<b>-1,725,940</b>	<b>-0.99%</b>	<b>1,173,081</b>	<b>-1.66%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>1,388,721,842</b>	<b>1,452,818,467</b>	<b>64,096,625</b>	<b>4.62%</b>	<b>21,141,155</b>	<b>3.09%</b>
11. Irrigated	437,789,345	517,428,785	79,639,440	18.19%		
12. Dryland	887,587,000	1,006,650,220	119,063,220	13.41%		
13. Grassland	75,785,440	85,201,250	9,415,810	12.42%		
14. Wasteland	1,552,380	1,517,380	-35,000	-2.25%		
15. Other Agland	1,066,610	0	-1,066,610	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>1,403,780,775</b>	<b>1,610,797,635</b>	<b>207,016,860</b>	<b>14.75%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>2,792,502,617</b>	<b>3,063,616,102</b>	<b>271,113,485</b>	<b>9.71%</b>	<b>21,141,155</b>	<b>8.95%</b>

**2013 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
SAUNDERS COUNTY  
By Cathy Gusman and Terry Kubik**

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. 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. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division 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 VIII, or 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.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (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 land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

**General Description of Real Property in Saunders County:** Per the 2012 County Abstract, Saunders County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	<b>8437</b>	<b>53.88%</b>	<b>37.54%</b>
Commercial	<b>855</b>	<b>5.46%</b>	<b>4.21%</b>
Recreational	<b>39</b>	<b>.02%</b>	<b>.01%</b>
Agricultural	<b>6329</b>	<b>40.20%</b>	<b>58.24%</b>
Agricultural land - taxable acres	<b>418,843.84</b>		

Other pertinent facts: *40.20% of Saunders County value comes from agricultural parcels. 61.49% of the agricultural acres are in dry farming, 23.42% is irrigated and 13.12% is in grasslands. Saunders County has 5,955 parcels in special value. The county consists of two smaller cities and 13 villages. The commercial properties are limited to mainly small operations.*

New Property: For assessment year 2013 an estimated 500 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

### **Current Resources:**

#### A. Staff/Budget/Training

1 Assessment Manager, 1 Assessment Assistant, 2 Assessment Clerks, 1 Appraiser I and 1 Appraiser Assistant II. The Assessment Manager is also shared with Dodge County effective January 1, 2011 through June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

The total budget for Saunders County for 2011-2012 was \$329,815. Included in the total is funds for the Orion CAMA/assessment administration package, and appraisal work with continuing education.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor is working on educational hours required. This is the second year of the 4 year requirement. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field.

The assessment staff at this time does not have continuing education requirements. The staff has voluntarily taken classes such as Windows, Orion user education and webinars, as well as IAAO classes.

Along with voluntary educational classes, Appraisers attend classes throughout the year to maintain current licenses.

#### B. Cadastral Maps

The Saunders County cadastral maps were up-dated in June of 1989. The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

#### C. Property Record Cards

The property record cards in Saunders County were new in 1990. Ownership transfers are no longer being kept up to date on paper property record cards. Changes in the property structures are no longer being kept current on the property record cards. A concentrated effort towards a "paperless" property record card is in effect. Saunders

County Assessment Office went on-line in June of 2006 with the property record information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

The provider for our CAMA and assessment administration is provided by Orion by Tyler Technologies. Saunders County went live with the Orion CAMA and assessment administration software in May of 2011. Currently, Saunders County recently signed a contract with GIS Workshop to begin setting up GIS for the county. GIS will be available July 1, 2013. Agridata program is also used to assist with new soil conversion.

E. Web based – property record information access

Property record cards are available online.

**Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:**

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.

Step 1-Building permits are gathered from all the permitting entities, separated into separate categories (rural, towns, etc), entered into the computer system and a plan of action is developed based on the number and location of each permit.

Step 2-A complete review of the readily accessible areas of the improvement is conducted. Measurements and photos are taken; and physical characteristics are noted at the time of inspection.

Step 3-Inspection data is entered into the CAMA system, using marshal and swift cost tables; and market data; a value is generated for each property inspected.

Step 4-The value generated for each property is compared to similar properties in the area, for equalization purposes.

Step 5-Permits are closed and notes are made in the file to roll the value for the following assessment year.

B. Data Collection.

All relevant sales are gathered, analyzed, and separated into groupings. These groupings are properties in similar areas with similar characteristics, purchased at similar rates. A study is conducted to determine if there are patterns, or similarities in sales prices etc, market areas are then developed. Once the market area is determined sales data is analyzed to ascertain what aspects of real property affects value. This information is carefully studied and a model is created to assist in determining property values. At the conclusion of the value generation, a ratio study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations. Individual property information is gathered in the same manner as

properties that have building permits.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

Part of market analysis and data collection. Market areas are reviewed on a yearly basis.

1) Approaches to Value;

All three approaches are considered when determining market values. The extent each approach is used depends upon the property type and market data available. The cost approach is most heavily relied upon in the initial evaluation process. All relevant sales are gathered, and analyzed to develop a market generated depreciation table. The market approach is used to support the value generated by the cost approach, broken down price per square foot. Commercial properties are valued in a manner similar to residential properties; however each classification is broken down into a value per square foot in the initial stage of valuation. Comparable agricultural sales from non-influenced counties are used to determine land values. The income approach is used to support agricultural land values in special value areas, properties under rent restrictions, and used to affirm property values for small downtown commercial shops, apartment complexes and income producing properties that are commonly leased or where lease information is available.

2) Market Approach; sales comparisons, See above

3) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study:

6/1/2012 for residential and 7/1/2012 for commercial

4) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

See above

5) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

All relevant sales are gathered, analyzed, and separated into groupings. These groupings are properties in similar areas with similar characteristics, purchased at similar rates. When setting agricultural land values, sales are gathered from the entire county. A study is conducted to determine if there are patterns, or similarities in soil classification, sales prices etc. Market areas are then developed and values generated using sales from each market area. Once the market area is determined sales data is analyzed to ascertain what aspects of real property affects value. This information is carefully studied and a model is created to assist in determining property values. At the conclusion of the value generation, a ratio study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations.

Special value generation: Sales from comparable areas from non-influenced counties are used to set agricultural values. To support this value, a study is conducted to determine market rental rates for each market area. This information is compared to the study conducted by the Bruce Johnson from the University of Nebraska (using land and funds information). Using market rent information, a rent value is assigned to each soil classification. A capitalization rate is supplied by the Department of Revenue. Using this capitalization rate and the market rental rates, a value is generated for each property in the market area. At the conclusion of the value generation, a comparison study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations.

- D. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation See above
- E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions. See above
- F. Notices and Public Relations

A new valuation notice is mailed to any property that experiences a valuation change on or before June 1 of each year. The protest process then begins. In the beginning of the process, informal meetings are conducted with individual taxpayers to discuss individual property valuations. Information is provided to each taxpayer both written and verbal, explaining current property valuations. Next step in the process, written and verbal communication is presented to the county boards. A portion of those values need to be later defended in an informal court situation at the Tax Equalization & Review Commission. A more in-depth report is supplied for this process and verbal testimony presented defending each property value in question. On occasion written communication or an explanation of a property value is prepared for the Governor’s office or a State Senator.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2013:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	96	18.62	109.58
Commercial	93	36.26	123.75
Agricultural Land	69	26.08	104.30
Special Value Agland	69	26.08	104.30

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2013 Reports & Opinions.

Saunders County recently converted to the Orion software system provided by Tyler Technologies out of Plano, Texas. The appraisal conversion will take quite some time to clean up to make this a usable tool. Workable sketches did not convert very well and most will have to be re-sketched. Our previous vendor did not have the appraisal data connect directly with Marshall and Swift, but replicated it. Our current vendor connects directly with

Marshall and Swift and will require each building in the county to be reviewed in the system to have new values calculate with the new system.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:**

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: Review residential parcels in Cedar Bluffs, Woodcliff, Yutan, Ceresco, Willow Point and continue a review of rural acreages in 2014.

Commercial: Review commercial properties in Yutan and Mead

Agricultural & Special Value-Agland: Analyze market areas and review the marginal difference between the agricultural land value and the uninfluenced ag land value. Begin rural review, including homes and outbuildings. It will continue into 2014. GIS ag use clean up as needed.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:**

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: Continue with the review of rural acreages and the residential properties in Wahoo as well as the surrounding sub-divisions.

Commercial: Review the commercial properties in Wahoo and the surrounding sub-divisions. Review of gravel pits. Review any commercial properties at lake sub-divisions.

Agricultural & Special Value-Agland: Analyze market areas and review the marginal difference between the agricultural land value and the uninfluenced ag land value. Continue rural review, including homes and outbuildings.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:**

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: Review residential properties in Ashland and the surrounding sub-divisions. Review all lake properties.

Commercial: Review commercial properties in Fremont Subs, Ashland, and the surrounding sub-divisions.

Agricultural Land: Begin review of rural properties, including homes and outbuildings. It will continue into the 2016 year.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:**

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential- Review small towns of Prague, Weston, Valparaiso.

Commercial: Review small towns of Prague, Weston, Valparaiso, Malmo and Morse Bluff

Agland- Verify ag use on agricultural properties and special value Continue review of rural properties, including homes and outbuildings.

The staff will continue to do data cleanup in the Orion system if needed.

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes

Deeds are received daily from the Register of Deeds office. Sales are updated in the computer and in the cadastral maps. Splits and new subdivisions are also completed in the computer system, cadastral maps updated for ownership and parcel size accordingly. The County Surveyor provides assistance to the office when needed.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:

- a. Real Property Abstract
- b. Assessor Survey
- c. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
- d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
- e. School District Taxable Value Report
- f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
- g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
- h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
- i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
- j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 1516 personal property returns, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.

Reminder personal property postcards are mailed each year to those that filed a return the prior year, as well as any new businesses/agricultural equipment owners that are discovered by the assessment office. Notice was given in 2010 to all preprinted recipients that due to budgetary constraints, this would be the last year that preprinted returns would be sent and a postcard reminder would be sent in the future as access to blank forms is available on the Department of Revenue website.

4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

Saunders County currently has 82 approved permissive exemption applications on file.

5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

Reminder notices are sent annually each year to political subdivisions who own property to notify them of their requirements on new or updated contracts for leases they may have.

6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 773 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.

The Saunders County Board of Equalization annually extends the filing deadline for those applicants that request an extension for homestead exemptions as allowed by Nebraska Statute 77-3512.

7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

Information provided by PAD is reviewed and verified for accuracy in balancing with the county.

8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.

Saunders County has 8 Tax Increment Financing projects throughout the county; one in Mead and seven in Wahoo. The projects affect 34 parcels in the county.

9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

The assessor works with both the Treasurer and the Clerk to ensure accuracy.

10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

The Saunders County Treasurer and Assessor are not on the same computer systems. A conversion must be done each year with the two vendors for the tax list and tax bills to be completed.

11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

Tax list corrections are prepared and given to the County Clerk to be put on the Board of Equalizations agenda. Assessment manager or representative meets with the Board during the meeting and offers explanation of correction(s)

12. County Board of Equalization - attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.

Due to budgetary constraints, this year Saunders County is asking each protester if they would like to request a referee hearing, or allow Saunders County Board of Equalization with assistance from the assessment office to determine whether a change in the valuation is warranted or not for their property. A representative from the appraisal staff or the assessment manager sits in on referee hearings at the time of protest if deemed necessary. The appraisal staff assists the referees as requested on information needed for protests. Assessor and head appraiser attend the final hearings of all protests, providing any additional information as requested by the Board.

13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

The appraiser meets with the County Attorney prior to the hearing to prepare exhibits and work on case matters.

14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

Appraiser and assessment manager works directly with liaison and applicable staff members from PAD in preparation of evidence to bring forward to the commission.

15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc.

Assessment manager is currently working on education requirements to maintain her assessor certification.

**Conclusion:**

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Cathy Gusman 6-14-2013  
Saunders County Assessment Manager

Terry Kubik 6-14-2013  
Saunders County Appraiser

## 2014 Assessment Survey for Saunders 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>
	1 and 1 appraiser assistant
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	3
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$352,593.57
<b>7.</b>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	N/A
<b>9.</b>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$24,067.80
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,155
<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>
	Previously was a State County; as a result, this information is unknown

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Orion
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Orion
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	N/A
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>
	Yes, <a href="http://www.saunders.gisworkshop.com">www.saunders.gisworkshop.com</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Orion

## 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>
	Ashland, Cedar Bluffs, Ceresco, Colon, Ithaca, Leshara, Mead, Memphis, Morse Bluff, Prague, Valparaiso, Wahoo, Weston, and Yutan
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	Zoning was originally implemented in 1966, but the comprehensive plan has been updated since originally implemented

### D. Contracted Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	Pictometry Agri Data Inc. is contracted for counting the acres of the various soils as the county worked to implement the most recent soil survey from the USDA

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	No
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	N/A
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	N/A
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	N/A
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	N/A



# 2014 Certification for Saunders 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 Saunders County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



