

# Table of Contents

## 2015 Commission Summary

## 2015 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



## 2015 Commission Summary for Cherry County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	106	Median	97.73
Total Sales Price	\$9,778,634	Mean	99.53
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,773,834	Wgt. Mean	94.97
Total Assessed Value	\$9,282,672	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$58,439
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$92,206	Avg. Assessed Value	\$87,572

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.99 to 101.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.91 to 98.04
95% Mean C.I	94.88 to 104.18
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	9.80
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.06
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.09

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	105	99	98.66
2013	105	99	98.53
2012	85	93	92.80
2011	112	98	98

## 2015 Commission Summary for Cherry County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	25	Median	97.98
Total Sales Price	\$2,603,211	Mean	99.53
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,545,989	Wgt. Mean	100.08
Total Assessed Value	\$2,547,943	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$122,179
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$101,840	Avg. Assessed Value	\$101,918

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.43 to 100.20
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.86 to 105.29
95% Mean C.I	96.10 to 102.96
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.66
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.21
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.51

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	32	96	99.96
2013	33	94	95.00
2012	23	95	95.12
2011	23	95	95



## 2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Cherry County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>69</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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



## **2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Cherry County**

Cherry County's housing market is strong. Reviewing the sales file, it appears that our levels of values are where they need to be. No action was taken to adjust residential property values. In 2013, Cherry County completed a residential review/revalue countywide.

Appraisal maintenance was completed by office staff.

All appropriate changes due to parcel splits and land use changes are mailed to our GIS Workshop vendor for updating on the website.

Updated all values on hard copy property record cards.

As a public service, updated office bulletin boards with news releases from Department of Property Assessment, sales maps and other informative aids.

## 2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Cherry County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																				
	Assessor and office staff.																				
<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="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Valentine: population – approximately 2800; schools – elementary, middle, and high school; full services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Rural V: population – approximately 100; within one mile jurisdiction of Valentine but out of city limits; school – attend Valentine schools; rely on services out of Valentine</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Cody: population – approximately 149; distance from Valentine – 38 miles west; school – a high school; Cody also can provide some services (now have a grocery store) to nearest villages not wanting to travel into Valentine</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Crookston: population – approximately 96; distance from Valentine – 12 miles west; no school or services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Kilgore: population – approximately 99; distance from Valentine – 23 miles west; school – an elementary, limited services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Merriman: population – approximately 118; distance from Valentine – 61 miles west; school – an elementary; services – welding shop, convenience store and bar</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Wood Lake: population – approximately 72; distance from Valentine – 25 miles east; school – an elementary; services – café, service station along highway 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Rural: countywide, will vary in distance from Valentine, is designated by neighborhoods, differing with location and aesthetic value</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Nenzel: population – approximately 13; distance from Valentine – 30 miles west; no school or services, does not even levy tax for the village; there is a Catholic church</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Valentine: population – approximately 2800; schools – elementary, middle, and high school; full services	2	Rural V: population – approximately 100; within one mile jurisdiction of Valentine but out of city limits; school – attend Valentine schools; rely on services out of Valentine	3	Cody: population – approximately 149; distance from Valentine – 38 miles west; school – a high school; Cody also can provide some services (now have a grocery store) to nearest villages not wanting to travel into Valentine	4	Crookston: population – approximately 96; distance from Valentine – 12 miles west; no school or services	5	Kilgore: population – approximately 99; distance from Valentine – 23 miles west; school – an elementary, limited services	6	Merriman: population – approximately 118; distance from Valentine – 61 miles west; school – an elementary; services – welding shop, convenience store and bar	7	Wood Lake: population – approximately 72; distance from Valentine – 25 miles east; school – an elementary; services – café, service station along highway 20	8	Rural: countywide, will vary in distance from Valentine, is designated by neighborhoods, differing with location and aesthetic value	9	Nenzel: population – approximately 13; distance from Valentine – 30 miles west; no school or services, does not even levy tax for the village; there is a Catholic church
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																				
1	Valentine: population – approximately 2800; schools – elementary, middle, and high school; full services																				
2	Rural V: population – approximately 100; within one mile jurisdiction of Valentine but out of city limits; school – attend Valentine schools; rely on services out of Valentine																				
3	Cody: population – approximately 149; distance from Valentine – 38 miles west; school – a high school; Cody also can provide some services (now have a grocery store) to nearest villages not wanting to travel into Valentine																				
4	Crookston: population – approximately 96; distance from Valentine – 12 miles west; no school or services																				
5	Kilgore: population – approximately 99; distance from Valentine – 23 miles west; school – an elementary, limited services																				
6	Merriman: population – approximately 118; distance from Valentine – 61 miles west; school – an elementary; services – welding shop, convenience store and bar																				
7	Wood Lake: population – approximately 72; distance from Valentine – 25 miles east; school – an elementary; services – café, service station along highway 20																				
8	Rural: countywide, will vary in distance from Valentine, is designated by neighborhoods, differing with location and aesthetic value																				
9	Nenzel: population – approximately 13; distance from Valentine – 30 miles west; no school or services, does not even levy tax for the village; there is a Catholic church																				
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																				
	All approaches; the cost, income and sales will be considered. However, the sales will be utilized most in building models.																				
<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>																				
	Sales will be reviewed and models built. The sales will be charted for a cost range per square foot based on style, quality, condition and age. Plus or minus adjustment factors will be developed for, but not limited to; basement, basement finish, number of garage stalls, fireplace, central air, and so on to arrive at a final value estimate per square foot.																				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																				
	No. Values are established from a model based on a cost range per square foot.																				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																				
	Vacant lot sales in similar neighborhoods are reviewed and a cost per square foot is derived from the market.																				

7. Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?

All lots are treated the same, currently there is no difference.

8.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	2	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	3	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	4	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	5	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	6	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	7	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	8	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013
	9	2013 by sq ft	2012	2012	2012-2013

Residential properties are valued based on a square foot method developed from models. The office staff is continually out and inspecting properties.

# **2015 Residential Correlation Section for Cherry County**

---

## **County Overview**

The residential market in Cherry County is influenced by better job opportunities within the City of Valentine (county seat/pop. 2,737), rural living which is enriched with the beauty of the canyon areas of the Niobrara and Snake rivers, and the strong agricultural economy. The residential market in the rural towns of Cody, Crookston, Kilgore, Merriman, Nenzel and Wood Lake (population ranging from 20 to 154) is heavily influenced by the distance from Valentine and the presence or absence of schools and other services. The valuation groupings have been structured around these influences.

## **Description of Analysis**

All residential parcels had been reappraised in 2013. No other adjustments were made to the residential class for assessment year 2015. The pick-up work was completed in a timely manner.

The statistical sampling of 106 residential sales appears to be an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Cherry County. But the subclass Valuation Grouping 01 (Valentine) is the only subclass with a sufficient sampling of 82 sales to have a reasonable degree of certainty in the statistical measures. The other subclasses are of smaller size and are being affected by different economic conditions, several of the valuation groupings could possibly be combined but at present the assessor still feels there is a difference to keep them separated; such as distance from Valentine, available services, an operating school or not.

The assessor stays on track with the three year plan of assessment, and work is beginning on the next six year review and physical inspection cycle.

## **Sales Qualification**

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates no apparent bias exists in the determination of qualified sales. A sufficient explanation exists in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. Measurement was done utilizing all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-half of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Cherry County was selected for review in 2014. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

## **2015 Residential Correlation Section for Cherry County**

---

Valuation Grouping 01(Valentine) is the only grouping with sufficient sales to measure the residential class; it will be considered as the best indicator of the level of value and is supported by the qualitative measures.

### **Level of Value**

Based on all available information, the level of value of the residential property in Cherry County is 98%.



## **2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Cherry County**

Cherry County contracted with Stanard Appraisal Company for a countywide commercial revaluation. This contract was approved by the Cherry County board, Cherry County Attorney, and the Property Tax Administrator. This contract included Valentine City, villages, and rural commercial properties. Stanard Appraisal utilized the three approaches to value, made physical inspections, and took new photos of properties.

For our appraisal company, our office compiled copies of 5 years of sales Form 521's, made copies of all commercial property record cards, did data entry on costing and sketches, imported new property photos, mailed preliminary notice of value change to taxpayers, and held informal hearing s on February 25th, 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>. Final notices of valuation change will be mailed on or before June 1, 2015.

This commercial revaluation completes the requirement for the second 6-year review cycle.

All commercial appraisal maintenance work was completed during the revaluation.

## 2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Cherry County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																				
	Stanard Appraisal Service and office staff.																				
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Valentine: population – approximately 2800; schools – elementary, middle, and high school; full services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Rural V: population – approximately 100; within one mile jurisdiction of Valentine but out of city limits; school – attend Valentine schools; rely on services out of Valentine</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Cody: population – approximately 149; distance from Valentine – 38 miles west; school – a high school; Cody also can provide some services (now have a grocery store) to nearest villages not wanting to travel into Valentine</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Crookston: population – approximately 96; distance from Valentine – 12 miles west; no school or services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Kilgore: population – approximately 99; distance from Valentine – 23 miles west; school – an elementary, limited services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Merriman: population – approximately 118; distance from Valentine – 61 miles west; school – an elementary; services – welding shop, convenience store and bar</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Wood Lake: population – approximately 72; distance from Valentine – 25 miles east; school – an elementary; services – café, service station along highway 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Rural: countywide, will vary in distance from Valentine, is designated by neighborhoods, differing with location and aesthetic value</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Nenzel: population – approximately 13; distance from Valentine – 30 miles west; no school or services, does not even levy tax for the village; there is a Catholic church</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Valentine: population – approximately 2800; schools – elementary, middle, and high school; full services	2	Rural V: population – approximately 100; within one mile jurisdiction of Valentine but out of city limits; school – attend Valentine schools; rely on services out of Valentine	3	Cody: population – approximately 149; distance from Valentine – 38 miles west; school – a high school; Cody also can provide some services (now have a grocery store) to nearest villages not wanting to travel into Valentine	4	Crookston: population – approximately 96; distance from Valentine – 12 miles west; no school or services	5	Kilgore: population – approximately 99; distance from Valentine – 23 miles west; school – an elementary, limited services	6	Merriman: population – approximately 118; distance from Valentine – 61 miles west; school – an elementary; services – welding shop, convenience store and bar	7	Wood Lake: population – approximately 72; distance from Valentine – 25 miles east; school – an elementary; services – café, service station along highway 20	8	Rural: countywide, will vary in distance from Valentine, is designated by neighborhoods, differing with location and aesthetic value	9	Nenzel: population – approximately 13; distance from Valentine – 30 miles west; no school or services, does not even levy tax for the village; there is a Catholic church
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																				
1	Valentine: population – approximately 2800; schools – elementary, middle, and high school; full services																				
2	Rural V: population – approximately 100; within one mile jurisdiction of Valentine but out of city limits; school – attend Valentine schools; rely on services out of Valentine																				
3	Cody: population – approximately 149; distance from Valentine – 38 miles west; school – a high school; Cody also can provide some services (now have a grocery store) to nearest villages not wanting to travel into Valentine																				
4	Crookston: population – approximately 96; distance from Valentine – 12 miles west; no school or services																				
5	Kilgore: population – approximately 99; distance from Valentine – 23 miles west; school – an elementary, limited services																				
6	Merriman: population – approximately 118; distance from Valentine – 61 miles west; school – an elementary; services – welding shop, convenience store and bar																				
7	Wood Lake: population – approximately 72; distance from Valentine – 25 miles east; school – an elementary; services – café, service station along highway 20																				
8	Rural: countywide, will vary in distance from Valentine, is designated by neighborhoods, differing with location and aesthetic value																				
9	Nenzel: population – approximately 13; distance from Valentine – 30 miles west; no school or services, does not even levy tax for the village; there is a Catholic church																				
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>																				
	All three approaches, the income, cost and sales, will be considered. However, a square foot method and the income approach, if enough information exists, will be used the most.																				
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>																				
	Stanard Appraisal will determine the most appropriate process depending on the property and the availability of market data.																				
<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>																				
	Sales will be reviewed and models built. The sales will be charted for a cost range per square foot based on occupancy code, quality, condition and age. Plus or minus adjustments will be applied when appropriate to arrive at estimated final values per square foot.																				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																				
	No																				

**6. Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.**

A square foot cost was derived from the market.

<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
1	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
2	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
3	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
4	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
5	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
6	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
7	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
8	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014
9	2015 by sq ft	2012	2014	2014

The costing is predominantly by a square foot method unless enough income and expense information exists to utilize an income approach.

# 2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Cherry County

---

## County Overview

Within Cherry County the City of Valentine is the primary focal point of economic influence for the commercial market due to the distance to more populated retail areas. Valentine is a strong trade center for a less populated but geographically large area in north-central Nebraska as well as south-central South Dakota, the Rosebud Indian Reservation to the north strongly supports local trade. The traffic flow at the intersection of state highways 83 and 20 that occurs outside of Valentine will attest to this. Tourism is strong in the county as well because of the Niobrara River, the Prairie Club and Prairie Dunes championship golf course approximately 17 miles south of Valentine, and Merritt Reservoir State Recreation Area. Because of the distance from Valentine the less populated rural towns of Cherry County are lacking in services and there is not an organized market for these commercial properties.

## Description of Analysis

The assessor stays on track with the three year plan of assessment and the mandated cyclical review and inspection process.

Nine valuation groupings have been identified; however, Valuation Grouping 01 (Valentine) would probably be given the most consideration in developing a reliable sample that would be considered statistically sufficient in the analysis of the commercial real property class.

The commercial parcels in Cherry County are represented by 70 different occupancy codes; over 72% of the population consists of apartments, motels, office buildings, restaurants, retail, storage facilities, transient labor cabins (along the Niobrara River for tourists), grain facilities, service repair garages, and bar/taverns.

For 2015 Stanard Appraisal Service was contracted to reappraise the commercial class. The contract included Valentine City, villages, and rural commercial properties. As part of the contract a narrative appraisal report was to be provided to the assessor that would offer enough information to the reader that a similar value conclusion could be arrived at. As of this writing, a report has not been provided to the assessor.

An analysis comparing the sample to the population reflects a lesser increase to the sold parcels of approximately 11.01%. The county's abstract of assessment indicates a 21.09% change from the 2014 Certificates of Taxes Levied (CTL) to the 2015 Form 45 for the population.

The sold parcels also reflect an abnormally low amount of dispersion in the commercial assessments. Since the commercial sample is comprised of 10 different types of commercial properties in four different valuation groupings, it is unlikely that the coefficient of dispersion (COD) is a true reflection of the dispersion in the commercial market. Therefore, the COD is either a result of an unrepresentative group of sales or it indicates a bias in the assessment of sold

## **2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Cherry County**

---

parcels. The Division will conduct an expanded review of the commercial properties to verify consistent application of the reappraisal to the sold and unsold properties.

### **Sales Qualification**

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. The assessor has a very thorough documentation process. Measurement was done utilizing all available information; there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

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

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-half of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Cherry County was last done in 2014. At that time all available information confirmed assessment practices were reliable and applied consistently.

For measurement purposes the commercial sample is unreliable and does not represent the commercial class as a whole.

### **Level of Value**

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value for the commercial class of property.



## **2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Cherry County**

Cherry County has a strong agricultural market. The agricultural economy in 2014 advanced due to high cattle prices and good grass in which to pasture. As a result, we saw pasture prices far exceed anything we have seen before. Rising agland market prices stimulated another increase in land valuations.

In order to arrive at statutory requirements, we utilized spreadsheets with qualified sales to arrive at our new land values. We also try to network with neighboring counties in an effort to equalize values over county lines, especially where we share a common school district.

With “Google Earth” on our laptop, and TerraScan on our desktop, we are going county wide on improved agricultural parcels comparing what is displayed on Google Earth versus what we show on aerial photos that have been scanned into our TerraScan system. The 2009 aerial photos were excellent and easy to compare with Google Earth’s imagery. When differences occur, we will physically inspect the property. We are about 50% done with this project.

All “pick-up” work was completed by office staff. This is no small task in our county. Distance and weather are the major components that limit the parcels we can do over a given time. We usually start our pick up work in July, and try to get it finished by January 1<sup>st</sup>.

We continued to work with our two NRD’s to correctly update irrigated acres for our taxpayers.

As a public service, Cherry County maintains sales books on all property classes. These sales books are kept current and available for public inspection containing Form 521’s and supplemental sales sheets.

Update values on hard copy property record cards.

Update GIS workshop for parcel splits/land use changes.

## 2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Cherry County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>						
	Office staff and Stanard Appraisal Service.						
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; width: 15%;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>There are no market areas.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">continually</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	0	There are no market areas.	continually
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>					
0	There are no market areas.	continually					
	Land use is continually being reviewed with the aid of GIS, NRD certifications and Google Earth. Will be starting this year to do a parcel by parcel review and would like to hire someone to physically inspect and review each improved parcel.						
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>						
	Not applicable.						
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>						
	Agricultural land has the ability to conform to statutes 77-1359 and 77-1363 and based upon the standard agricultural practices of Cherry County. If it does not, it falls into the residential or recreational category. Use aids in making the decision. For residential or recreational site, amenities such as canyons, rivers, views, or lack of these bear differences in the market. Groupings of similar properties with similar amenities in similar areas form neighborhoods, not unlike other residential properties. It is the review of the market in these neighborhoods that form the basis for valuing of these properties.						
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>						
	Farm sites do not carry the same value as rural residential sites. Rural farm sites do not rely on amenities like the rural residential. Rural residential sites are valued like any other residential property at a dollar per square foot value, based on the market. Farm sites are valued at \$5,000 for the home site acre.						
<b>6.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>						
	The process would start with the sales review consisting of interviews, inspections, and possibly questionnaires. Current assessed values are then built up to 100% of market value.						
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:</b>						
	No						

## Cherry County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Cherry	1	n/a	2,300	2,300	2,298	2,087	2,067	2,092	2,100	<b>2,135</b>
Sheridan	1	n/a	1,690	1,625	1,500	1,495	1,480	1,470	1,440	<b>1,556</b>
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	<b>1,500</b>
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	<b>1,500</b>
Thomas	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	<b>2,100</b>
Blaine	1	n/a	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	<b>2,100</b>
Brown	1	n/a	2,962	3,076	3,185	2,538	2,543	2,220	2,400	<b>2,729</b>
Keya Paha	1	2,800	2,800	2,700	2,699	2,500	2,500	2,400	2,400	<b>2,523</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Cherry	1	n/a	725	725	700	700	700	700	700	<b>705</b>
Sheridan	1	n/a	635	605	575	565	535	525	520	<b>573</b>
Grant	1	n/a	<b>n/a</b>							
Hooker	1	n/a	<b>n/a</b>							
Thomas	1	n/a	<b>n/a</b>							
Blaine	1	n/a	515	n/a	n/a	n/a	515	515	515	<b>515</b>
Brown	1	n/a	950	950	950	865	705	705	705	<b>838</b>
Keya Paha	1	900	900	880	880	855	855	815	815	<b>865</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Cherry	1	n/a	590	560	540	499	445	295	295	<b>324</b>
Sheridan	1	n/a	430	430	420	410	410	335	300	<b>334</b>
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	315	315	315	<b>315</b>
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	320	320	310	310	<b>310</b>
Thomas	1	n/a	n/a	335	335	n/a	335	335	335	<b>335</b>
Blaine	1	n/a	515	n/a	515	515	515	390	390	<b>393</b>
Brown	1	n/a	680	679	679	636	515	390	390	<b>421</b>
Keya Paha	1	700	700	660	660	640	640	620	620	<b>628</b>

Source: 2015 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

# 2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Cherry County

---

## County Overview

Cherry County is widely recognized in the cattle industry. It was the early settlers, who brought their herds north for the Indians, that realized the region was ideal for open-range ranching. The Sand Hill soils in Cherry County are predominantly of the Valentine series, the ridges and dunes have been formed by wind and erosion and the native grasses provide a sod covering suitable to the grazing of livestock. There are better soils more appropriate for farming in the northern part of the county, many of the pivots serve for the production of corn; there is a large grain handling facility in Crookston and a smaller one in Merriman. Other pivots scattered across the county will be used to raise a supplemental feed source for the cattle on the ranches.

Cherry County abuts the State of South Dakota to the north and is Nebraska's largest county in land area at 6,048 square miles (96 miles by 63 miles). Unique to this county is the Valentine National Wildlife Refuge, Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge, Samuel R. McKelvie National Forest, and the Niobrara National Scenic River. Other rivers in the county are the Snake and the Loup; the rivers are noted throughout for their waterfalls, rapids and trout fishing.

Two natural resource districts split the county; the Middle Niobrara Natural Resource District governs the largest part of the county to the north while the Upper Loup governs the southern part. Both have moratoriums and well restrictions.

## Description of Analysis

A review of the agricultural sales over the three year study period indicates the sample does not contain a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period. The way the sales are distributed over the study period may cause Cherry County to be compared to a different time standard than others as the most current year of the study period is under-represented in comparison to the first and second years. Sales were sought from comparable areas surrounding Cherry County with similar soils and physical characteristics. A total of 79 sales were used in the analysis and the sales were proportionately distributed and representative of the land uses that exist within the county.

An analysis of the agricultural market in the Sand Hills region indicates the grassland to be increasing at higher rates than the irrigated land and since dry land farming is often not possible in the Sand Hills it is difficult to measure. The assessment actions for Cherry County reflect the general economic conditions; the values were increased in all land capability groupings for all three classes of agricultural land (grass, dry and irrigated). The assessment actions are also mirrored in the 2015 Abstract of Assessment (Form 45) that has been included in this Reports and Opinions.

## **2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Cherry County**

---

### **Sales Qualification**

A review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. The assessor has a very thorough documentation process. Measurement was done utilizing all available information; there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

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

The values established by the assessor have created intra-county and inter-county equalization. The calculated statistics also indicate that an acceptable level of value has been attained; because the county is almost purely grassland the 95% MLU median of grass is considered to be the best indicator of the level of value for the county.

### **Level of Value**

Based on all available information; the level of value of agricultural land in Cherry County is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class.



**16 Cherry  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 106  
 Total Sales Price : 9,778,634  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,773,834  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,282,672  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 92,206  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 87,572

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 14.87  
 PRD : 104.80

COV : 24.52  
 STD : 24.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.53  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 236.67  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 10.11

95% Median C.I. : 95.99 to 101.13  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.91 to 98.04  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.88 to 104.18

Printed:3/11/2015 9:21:23AM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	12	98.49	97.60	94.58	03.26	103.19	84.23	105.97	95.99 to 100.18	113,232	107,097
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	10	104.44	109.85	104.08	10.65	105.54	96.77	152.91	97.43 to 129.57	65,850	68,538
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	12	98.95	103.15	96.00	12.13	107.45	76.98	149.56	91.60 to 105.83	84,663	81,274
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	14	101.89	100.08	98.48	13.84	101.62	62.21	129.77	80.85 to 121.47	77,571	76,390
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	15	105.72	110.60	101.69	18.08	108.76	78.74	236.67	92.39 to 110.51	91,580	93,127
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	9	97.75	97.61	93.01	23.10	104.95	10.11	150.77	89.04 to 124.94	98,856	91,948
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	16	91.92	97.13	92.89	14.46	104.56	73.96	155.19	79.66 to 101.70	136,294	126,598
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	18	88.15	86.12	84.05	15.98	102.46	34.15	114.78	81.38 to 97.61	67,250	56,521
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	48	99.28	102.26	97.48	10.60	104.90	62.21	152.91	97.43 to 104.02	85,817	83,652
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	58	93.56	97.27	93.15	18.68	104.42	10.11	236.67	90.46 to 101.60	97,493	90,817
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	51	102.65	105.81	99.83	14.29	105.99	62.21	236.67	97.43 to 106.10	81,062	80,922
<u>ALL</u>	106	97.73	99.53	94.97	14.87	104.80	10.11	236.67	95.99 to 101.13	92,206	87,572

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	82	97.98	101.21	96.57	12.89	104.80	62.21	155.19	95.99 to 101.63	85,699	82,764
02	6	93.96	88.08	89.63	17.19	98.27	34.15	116.20	34.15 to 116.20	155,667	139,525
03	3	102.65	96.56	97.84	09.53	98.69	78.85	108.18	N/A	30,500	29,842
05	4	88.83	106.11	68.59	70.90	154.70	10.11	236.67	N/A	33,571	23,026
06	4	102.74	90.36	94.79	14.03	95.33	50.30	105.65	N/A	7,550	7,157
07	1	80.85	80.85	80.85	00.00	100.00	80.85	80.85	N/A	30,000	24,255
08	6	94.40	94.31	93.31	05.78	101.07	84.23	105.72	84.23 to 105.72	254,417	237,399
<u>ALL</u>	106	97.73	99.53	94.97	14.87	104.80	10.11	236.67	95.99 to 101.13	92,206	87,572

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	104	97.66	99.39	94.88	14.98	104.75	10.11	236.67	95.31 to 100.39	93,261	88,490
06											
07	2	106.77	106.77	106.74	01.74	100.03	104.91	108.63	N/A	37,350	39,867
<u>ALL</u>	106	97.73	99.53	94.97	14.87	104.80	10.11	236.67	95.99 to 101.13	92,206	87,572

**16 Cherry  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2012 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 106  
 Total Sales Price : 9,778,634  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,773,834  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,282,672  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 92,206  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 87,572

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 14.87  
 PRD : 104.80

COV : 24.52  
 STD : 24.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.53  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 236.67  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 10.11

95% Median C.I. : 95.99 to 101.13  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.91 to 98.04  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.88 to 104.18

Printed:3/11/2015 9:21:23AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	10	104.76	113.49	119.22	28.54	95.19	50.30	236.67	78.74 to 152.91	7,920	9,443	
Less Than 30,000	19	109.79	118.70	124.33	26.23	95.47	50.30	236.67	88.50 to 149.56	13,774	17,125	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	106	97.73	99.53	94.97	14.87	104.80	10.11	236.67	95.99 to 101.13	92,206	87,572	
Greater Than 14,999	96	97.56	98.08	94.78	13.03	103.48	10.11	155.19	94.29 to 100.18	100,986	95,711	
Greater Than 29,999	87	97.41	95.34	94.17	10.88	101.24	10.11	129.57	92.90 to 98.59	109,335	102,957	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	10	104.76	113.49	119.22	28.54	95.19	50.30	236.67	78.74 to 152.91	7,920	9,443	
15,000 TO 29,999	9	129.77	124.50	126.55	15.76	98.38	78.85	155.19	88.50 to 150.77	20,278	25,662	
30,000 TO 59,999	17	97.98	96.15	94.65	15.65	101.58	10.11	124.94	92.19 to 114.78	41,999	39,753	
60,000 TO 99,999	30	99.58	98.59	98.50	09.37	100.09	65.11	129.57	96.77 to 104.02	77,317	76,154	
100,000 TO 149,999	24	94.25	91.40	90.92	10.77	100.53	34.15	124.53	90.05 to 98.38	122,298	111,189	
150,000 TO 249,999	12	96.45	94.62	94.54	07.55	100.08	73.96	116.20	89.70 to 101.62	192,583	182,076	
250,000 TO 499,999	4	91.91	93.44	92.77	06.23	100.72	84.23	105.72	N/A	308,125	285,855	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	106	97.73	99.53	94.97	14.87	104.80	10.11	236.67	95.99 to 101.13	92,206	87,572	

**16 Cherry**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 25  
Total Sales Price : 2,603,211  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,545,989  
Total Assessed Value : 2,547,943  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 101,840  
Avg. Assessed Value : 101,918

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 100  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 05.22  
PRD : 99.45

COV : 08.36  
STD : 08.32  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.11  
MAX Sales Ratio : 123.90  
MIN Sales Ratio : 89.52

95% Median C.I. : 96.43 to 100.20  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.86 to 105.29  
95% Mean C.I. : 96.10 to 102.96

Printed:3/11/2015 9:21:26AM

**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-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	3	99.42	96.98	95.40	04.18	101.66	89.52	102.00	N/A	116,667	111,305
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	111.52	111.03	110.71	11.34	100.29	97.19	123.90	N/A	133,750	148,073
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	97.14	97.14	97.14	00.00	100.00	97.14	97.14	N/A	140,000	136,000
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	102.14	102.14	102.04	01.17	100.10	100.94	103.33	N/A	49,000	50,000
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	3	96.43	95.39	95.33	03.55	100.06	89.75	100.00	N/A	59,663	56,876
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	94.65	94.65	94.47	00.69	100.19	94.00	95.29	N/A	117,500	111,000
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	97.76	97.50	98.09	01.63	99.40	94.29	100.20	N/A	119,000	116,725
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	1	104.84	104.84	104.84	00.00	100.00	104.84	104.84	N/A	10,000	10,484
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	4	96.01	96.21	99.01	04.68	97.17	90.21	102.63	N/A	108,250	107,181
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1	96.67	96.67	96.67	00.00	100.00	96.67	96.67	N/A	90,000	87,000
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	8	99.50	104.03	103.63	08.25	100.39	89.52	123.90	89.52 to 123.90	128,125	132,776
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	7	96.43	97.11	96.22	03.73	100.92	89.75	103.33	89.75 to 103.33	73,141	70,375
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	10	97.76	97.64	98.43	03.32	99.20	90.21	104.84	93.24 to 102.63	100,900	99,311
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	10	100.26	103.65	103.49	07.06	100.15	89.52	123.90	97.14 to 123.46	112,300	116,221
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	9	96.43	96.16	96.58	02.58	99.57	89.75	100.20	94.00 to 100.00	98,888	95,503
<u>ALL</u>	25	97.98	99.53	100.08	05.22	99.45	89.52	123.90	96.43 to 100.20	101,840	101,918

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	20	97.17	97.92	100.00	04.39	97.92	89.52	123.46	94.29 to 99.42	118,690	118,692
05	3	100.20	108.03	100.84	07.95	107.13	100.00	123.90	N/A	36,399	36,705
06	1	104.84	104.84	104.84	00.00	100.00	104.84	104.84	N/A	10,000	10,484
07	1	100.94	100.94	100.94	00.00	100.00	100.94	100.94	N/A	53,000	53,500
<u>ALL</u>	25	97.98	99.53	100.08	05.22	99.45	89.52	123.90	96.43 to 100.20	101,840	101,918

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	25	97.98	99.53	100.08	05.22	99.45	89.52	123.90	96.43 to 100.20	101,840	101,918
04											
<u>ALL</u>	25	97.98	99.53	100.08	05.22	99.45	89.52	123.90	96.43 to 100.20	101,840	101,918

**16 Cherry**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 25  
Total Sales Price : 2,603,211  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,545,989  
Total Assessed Value : 2,547,943  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 101,840  
Avg. Assessed Value : 101,918

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 100  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 05.22  
PRD : 99.45

COV : 08.36  
STD : 08.32  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.11  
MAX Sales Ratio : 123.90  
MIN Sales Ratio : 89.52

95% Median C.I. : 96.43 to 100.20  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.86 to 105.29  
95% Mean C.I. : 96.10 to 102.96

Printed:3/11/2015 9:21:26AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
___Low \$ Ranges___												
Less Than 5,000	1	123.90	123.90	123.90	00.00	100.00	123.90	123.90	N/A	3,000	3,717	
Less Than 15,000	3	104.84	109.58	106.26	07.60	103.12	100.00	123.90	N/A	6,399	6,799	
Less Than 30,000	5	100.00	103.25	98.64	08.24	104.67	93.24	123.90	N/A	9,939	9,804	
___Ranges Excl. Low \$___												
Greater Than 4,999	24	97.76	98.52	100.05	04.35	98.47	89.52	123.46	95.29 to 100.20	105,958	106,009	
Greater Than 14,999	22	97.36	98.16	100.03	04.30	98.13	89.52	123.46	94.29 to 100.20	114,854	114,888	
Greater Than 29,999	20	97.76	98.60	100.11	04.33	98.49	89.52	123.46	96.43 to 100.20	124,815	124,946	
___Incremental Ranges___												
0 TO 4,999	1	123.90	123.90	123.90	00.00	100.00	123.90	123.90	N/A	3,000	3,717	
5,000 TO 14,999	2	102.42	102.42	102.99	02.36	99.45	100.00	104.84	N/A	8,099	8,341	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	93.77	93.77	93.84	00.57	99.93	93.24	94.29	N/A	15,250	14,311	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	99.60	98.07	98.85	04.62	99.21	89.75	103.33	N/A	41,198	40,723	
60,000 TO 99,999	4	95.98	95.78	95.61	03.16	100.18	90.21	100.94	N/A	73,250	70,034	
100,000 TO 149,999	5	97.98	98.23	98.13	01.23	100.10	96.43	100.20	N/A	129,700	127,273	
150,000 TO 249,999	6	98.15	97.01	97.45	03.38	99.55	89.52	102.63	89.52 to 102.63	190,000	185,147	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	123.46	123.46	123.46	00.00	100.00	123.46	123.46	N/A	250,000	308,650	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ALL___	25	97.98	99.53	100.08	05.22	99.45	89.52	123.90	96.43 to 100.20	101,840	101,918	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
Blank	2	108.57	108.57	98.99	14.12	109.68	93.24	123.90	N/A	8,000	7,919	
303	1	98.77	98.77	98.77	00.00	100.00	98.77	98.77	N/A	165,000	162,970	
344	2	99.77	99.77	98.32	02.25	101.47	97.53	102.00	N/A	142,500	140,100	
350	3	100.94	100.74	98.02	02.77	102.77	96.43	104.84	N/A	67,667	66,328	
353	5	97.14	98.75	98.46	03.15	100.29	94.00	103.33	N/A	123,000	121,100	
380	1	123.46	123.46	123.46	00.00	100.00	123.46	123.46	N/A	250,000	308,650	
406	5	94.29	94.73	95.66	04.13	99.03	89.75	100.00	N/A	53,298	50,985	
442	1	100.20	100.20	100.20	00.00	100.00	100.20	100.20	N/A	100,000	100,200	
444	1	97.98	97.98	97.98	00.00	100.00	97.98	97.98	N/A	123,500	121,000	
459	1	89.52	89.52	89.52	00.00	100.00	89.52	89.52	N/A	155,000	138,750	
528	3	97.19	97.35	98.34	01.47	98.99	95.29	99.58	N/A	122,333	120,308	
___ALL___	25	97.98	99.53	100.08	05.22	99.45	89.52	123.90	96.43 to 100.20	101,840	101,918	

**16 Cherry**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 79  
Total Sales Price : 79,361,688  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 79,226,053  
Total Assessed Value : 47,547,044  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,002,861  
Avg. Assessed Value : 601,861

MEDIAN : 69  
WGT. MEAN : 60  
MEAN : 72  
COD : 26.88  
PRD : 120.33

COV : 32.50  
STD : 23.47  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.63  
MAX Sales Ratio : 147.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 19.89

95% Median C.I. : 61.76 to 76.83  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.29 to 65.74  
95% Mean C.I. : 67.03 to 77.39

Printed:3/11/2015 9:21:29AM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	77.51	74.32	76.32	18.69	97.38	19.89	100.10	64.80 to 98.80	258,040	196,924
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	12	80.75	74.38	58.39	19.76	127.38	44.23	100.11	50.76 to 89.39	789,154	460,777
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	7	70.83	74.05	76.79	11.34	96.43	60.70	88.39	60.70 to 88.39	1,565,909	1,202,390
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	12	79.09	81.59	69.87	19.77	116.77	58.66	118.00	62.87 to 92.47	807,858	564,420
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	7	74.89	87.88	68.76	33.88	127.81	52.63	147.50	52.63 to 147.50	714,647	491,407
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	38.43	38.43	38.43	00.00	100.00	38.43	38.43	N/A	152,000	58,420
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	8	93.24	91.69	73.02	20.52	125.57	50.47	128.09	50.47 to 128.09	387,952	283,294
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	9	49.17	55.27	53.35	15.84	103.60	46.05	90.95	46.74 to 57.98	1,622,638	865,746
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	6	47.37	50.36	50.64	08.82	99.45	44.56	59.35	44.56 to 59.35	1,674,833	848,147
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	6	52.53	55.50	45.55	23.38	121.84	42.34	73.55	42.34 to 73.55	2,232,925	1,017,185
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1	52.14	52.14	52.14	00.00	100.00	52.14	52.14	N/A	211,700	110,390
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	29	76.83	74.28	69.16	17.90	107.40	19.89	100.11	66.16 to 85.08	793,504	548,803
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	28	84.86	84.50	69.84	25.23	120.99	38.43	147.50	68.90 to 92.47	641,159	447,773
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	22	49.16	53.85	49.90	16.19	107.92	42.34	90.95	46.74 to 57.98	1,739,182	867,913
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	31	76.83	77.09	68.78	18.53	112.08	44.23	118.00	66.81 to 88.39	971,791	668,358
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	25	59.28	75.38	59.30	41.38	127.12	38.43	147.50	52.63 to 90.95	914,476	542,253
<u>ALL</u>	79	69.31	72.21	60.01	26.88	120.33	19.89	147.50	61.76 to 76.83	1,002,861	601,861

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
1	79	69.31	72.21	60.01	26.88	120.33	19.89	147.50	61.76 to 76.83	1,002,861	601,861
<u>ALL</u>	79	69.31	72.21	60.01	26.88	120.33	19.89	147.50	61.76 to 76.83	1,002,861	601,861

<b>95%MLU By Market Area</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	3	73.55	76.33	63.96	25.90	119.34	49.15	106.29	N/A	527,027	337,106
1	3	73.55	76.33	63.96	25.90	119.34	49.15	106.29	N/A	527,027	337,106
<u>Grass</u>											
County	56	69.38	74.54	58.27	29.86	127.92	38.43	147.50	60.70 to 85.08	873,019	508,698
1	56	69.38	74.54	58.27	29.86	127.92	38.43	147.50	60.70 to 85.08	873,019	508,698
<u>ALL</u>	79	69.31	72.21	60.01	26.88	120.33	19.89	147.50	61.76 to 76.83	1,002,861	601,861

**16 Cherry**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2015 R&O Statistics (Using 2015 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2014 Posted on: 1/1/2015

Number of Sales : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 79,361,688  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 79,226,053  
 Total Assessed Value : 47,547,044  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,002,861  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 601,861

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 60  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 26.88  
 PRD : 120.33

COV : 32.50  
 STD : 23.47  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.63  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 147.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 19.89

95% Median C.I. : 61.76 to 76.83  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.29 to 65.74  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.03 to 77.39

Printed:3/11/2015 9:21:29AM

**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	10	69.38	67.41	56.74	17.97	118.81	44.23	106.29	49.15 to 76.83	1,006,440	571,075
1	10	69.38	67.41	56.74	17.97	118.81	44.23	106.29	49.15 to 76.83	1,006,440	571,075
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	1	90.95	90.95	90.95	00.00	100.00	90.95	90.95	N/A	630,000	572,970
1	1	90.95	90.95	90.95	00.00	100.00	90.95	90.95	N/A	630,000	572,970
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	65	68.90	72.79	60.11	28.72	121.09	19.89	147.50	60.70 to 80.58	1,036,176	622,801
1	65	68.90	72.79	60.11	28.72	121.09	19.89	147.50	60.70 to 80.58	1,036,176	622,801
<b>_____ALL_____</b>											
	79	69.31	72.21	60.01	26.88	120.33	19.89	147.50	61.76 to 76.83	1,002,861	601,861



**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

**Records : 14,545**

**Value : 1,556,072,637**

**Growth 4,860,119**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	543	1,314,693	58	810,087	180	2,841,515	781	4,966,295	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,458	8,539,266	93	1,867,075	211	4,561,954	1,762	14,968,295	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,510	92,424,390	94	13,483,620	225	26,683,902	1,829	132,591,912	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,053	102,278,349	152	16,160,782	405	34,087,371	2,610	152,526,502	2,572,357
<b>% of Res Total</b>	78.66	67.06	5.82	10.60	15.52	22.35	17.94	9.80	52.93
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	147	1,047,896	33	450,554	13	2,867,286	193	4,365,736	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	356	4,980,329	21	424,407	16	1,304,569	393	6,709,305	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	362	49,176,800	21	3,529,737	18	8,792,836	401	61,499,373	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	509	55,205,025	54	4,404,698	31	12,964,691	594	72,574,414	484,969
<b>% of Com Total</b>	85.69	76.07	9.09	6.07	5.22	17.86	4.08	4.66	9.98
<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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,053	102,278,349	152	16,160,782	405	34,087,371	2,610	152,526,502	2,572,357
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	78.66	67.06	5.82	10.60	15.52	22.35	17.94	9.80	52.93
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	509	55,205,025	54	4,404,698	31	12,964,691	594	72,574,414	484,969
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	85.69	76.07	9.09	6.07	5.22	17.86	4.08	4.66	9.98
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,562	157,483,374	206	20,565,480	436	47,052,062	3,204	225,100,916	3,057,326
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	79.96	69.96	6.43	9.14	13.61	20.90	22.03	14.47	62.91

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	6	458,062	4,551,033	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	6	458,062	4,551,033
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				6	458,062	4,551,033

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	6	6,405	6	6,405	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	6	6,405	6	6,405	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	276	29	546	851

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	19	358,094	10,220	1,097,128,588	10,239	1,097,486,682
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	6	780,428	1,004	156,075,558	1,010	156,855,986
29. Ag Improvements	2	4,707	7	405,699	1,087	76,212,242	1,096	76,622,648
30. Ag Total							11,335	1,330,965,316

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	5	5.00	25,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	6	5.00	349,429	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	3	11.00	3,245	
37. FarmSite Improvements	2	0.00	4,707	5	0.00	56,270	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	14.16	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	30	30.00	150,000	30	30.00	150,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	790	788.46	3,941,050	795	793.46	3,966,050	
33. HomeSite Improvements	827	729.46	50,307,892	833	734.46	50,657,321	1,802,793
34. HomeSite Total				<b>863</b>	<b>823.46</b>	<b>54,773,371</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	35	745.92	359,376	35	745.92	359,376	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	665	2,565.95	978,390	668	2,576.95	981,635	
37. FarmSite Improvements	962	0.00	25,904,350	969	0.00	25,965,327	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,004</b>	<b>3,322.87</b>	<b>27,306,338</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,477.81	0	0	10,491.97	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	105.81	0	0	105.81	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,867</b>	<b>14,744.11</b>	<b>82,079,709</b>	<b>1,802,793</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	23	4,023.52	1,004,326	23	4,023.52	1,004,326

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	397.82	0.75%	914,986	0.81%	2,300.00
47. 2A1	4,312.58	8.11%	9,918,934	8.74%	2,300.00
48. 2A	7,473.88	14.06%	17,178,524	15.13%	2,298.47
49. 3A1	4,534.36	8.53%	9,465,330	8.34%	2,087.47
50. 3A	9,458.18	17.79%	19,548,918	17.22%	2,066.88
51. 4A1	24,683.64	46.42%	51,639,279	45.49%	2,092.04
52. 4A	2,308.62	4.34%	4,848,102	4.27%	2,100.00
53. Total	53,169.08	100.00%	113,514,073	100.00%	2,134.96
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	676.93	3.63%	490,775	3.73%	725.00
56. 2D1	3,294.31	17.64%	2,388,378	18.14%	725.00
57. 2D	7,981.52	42.75%	5,587,064	42.43%	700.00
58. 3D1	755.85	4.05%	529,095	4.02%	700.00
59. 3D	1,921.58	10.29%	1,345,106	10.21%	700.00
60. 4D1	3,658.00	19.59%	2,560,600	19.44%	700.00
61. 4D	382.72	2.05%	267,904	2.03%	700.00
62. Total	18,670.91	100.00%	13,168,922	100.00%	705.32
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,331.45	0.04%	785,556	0.07%	590.00
65. 2G1	8,000.30	0.23%	4,480,169	0.40%	560.00
66. 2G	102,581.12	2.97%	55,365,050	4.95%	539.72
67. 3G1	170,943.53	4.94%	85,383,765	7.63%	499.49
68. 3G	241,436.54	6.98%	107,407,677	9.60%	444.87
69. 4G1	979,209.76	28.31%	288,853,718	25.81%	294.99
70. 4G	1,955,758.95	56.54%	576,842,750	51.54%	294.95
71. Total	3,459,261.65	100.00%	1,119,118,685	100.00%	323.51
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	53,169.08	1.48%	113,514,073	9.09%	2,134.96
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	18,670.91	0.52%	13,168,922	1.05%	705.32
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	3,459,261.65	96.53%	1,119,118,685	89.61%	323.51
72. Waste	52,692.63	1.47%	3,083,927	0.25%	58.53
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	7,441.81	0.21%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	3,583,794.27	100.00%	1,248,885,607	100.00%	348.48

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	330.10	693,210	52,838.98	112,820,863	53,169.08	113,514,073
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	60.00	42,000	18,610.91	13,126,922	18,670.91	13,168,922
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	1,123.48	374,947	3,458,138.17	1,118,743,738	3,459,261.65	1,119,118,685
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	2.00	120	52,690.63	3,083,807	52,692.63	3,083,927
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	359.41	0	7,082.40	0	7,441.81	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,515.58</b>	<b>1,110,277</b>	<b>3,582,278.69</b>	<b>1,247,775,330</b>	<b>3,583,794.27</b>	<b>1,248,885,607</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	53,169.08	1.48%	113,514,073	9.09%	2,134.96
<b>Dry Land</b>	18,670.91	0.52%	13,168,922	1.05%	705.32
<b>Grass</b>	3,459,261.65	96.53%	1,119,118,685	89.61%	323.51
<b>Waste</b>	52,692.63	1.47%	3,083,927	0.25%	58.53
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	7,441.81	0.21%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,583,794.27</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,248,885,607</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>348.48</b>

## 2015 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2014 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

### 16 Cherry

	2014 CTL County Total	2015 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2015 form 45 - 2014 CTL)	Percent Change	2015 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	150,063,977	152,526,502	2,462,525	1.64%	2,572,357	-0.07%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	53,676,500	54,773,371	1,096,871	2.04%	1,802,793	-1.32%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>203,740,477</b>	<b>207,299,873</b>	<b>3,559,396</b>	<b>1.75%</b>	<b>4,375,150</b>	<b>-0.40%</b>
05. Commercial	59,534,324	72,574,414	13,040,090	21.90%	484,969	21.09%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	26,463,220	27,306,338	843,118	3.19%	0	3.19%
08. Minerals	6,405	6,405	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>86,003,949</b>	<b>99,887,157</b>	<b>13,883,208</b>	<b>16.14%</b>	<b>484,969</b>	<b>15.58%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>289,744,426</b>	<b>307,187,030</b>	<b>17,442,604</b>	<b>6.02%</b>	<b>4,860,119</b>	<b>4.34%</b>
11. Irrigated	79,135,535	113,514,073	34,378,538	43.44%		
12. Dryland	9,619,114	13,168,922	3,549,808	36.90%		
13. Grassland	948,224,326	1,119,118,685	170,894,359	18.02%		
14. Wasteland	2,569,951	3,083,927	513,976	20.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>1,039,548,926</b>	<b>1,248,885,607</b>	<b>209,336,681</b>	<b>20.14%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,329,293,352</b>	<b>1,556,072,637</b>	<b>226,779,285</b>	<b>17.06%</b>	<b>4,860,119</b>	<b>16.69%</b>

# CHERRY COUNTY 2014 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature.

The standard for valuing certain classes of property for tax purposes is controversial in nature. Many feel a production basis would benefit our agricultural community. During the summer and fall of 2013 a "Tax Modernization Committee" was established. The purpose of this group was to listen to public input on the current property tax, sales tax, and income tax issues, and report these findings to the legislature &/or governor. Nothing to date concerning tax standards were changed by this committee probe. Although much time and service has been allotted to changing this standard, the standard remains:

**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."**

Our assessment levels are also defined by statute:

- 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land;
- 75% of special valuation for agricultural and horticultural land which meets qualifications for special valuation

The assessor's office consists of the assessor, deputy, one full-time clerk, and one part-time clerk. Currently, the assessor feels the office is at a sufficient level of staffing needed for completing basic operations. Ideally, more appraiser services would benefit the county, but realistically due to location, this is not a good possibility.

The importance of continuing education is recognized by this office. The assessor, and her deputy, will attend assessor workshops that are offered by Property Assessment Division and the Nebraska Assessor Association. The cost is not prohibitive, and much information is derived through speakers and networking with other assessors throughout the state. She would like to take some further IAAO courses in the near future.

As far as record management, records in the Cherry County Assessor's office are basically **public information**. There are a few exceptions, which are labeled confidential, and admission to these files is carefully screened.

Due to the size of Cherry County, various methods are utilized to access property information. Index cards give an alphabetical listing of all property owned under a particular name. Property record files are filed by legal description. Our computer system has the capability for CAMA services and administrative software. Now, due to the implementation of WebGIS services, the public has access

24/7 to property record information. This ability is frequently used by real estate agents, banks, appraisers, FSA office, and insurance companies. Cadastral maps continue to be kept current by office clerks. The maps are old, but property can readily be identified and located by using them.

The office uses Terra Scan assessment and appraisal system for electronic property record files and appraisal assistance. In the fall of 2008, we upgraded our server and other hardware. The office has installed wireless internet service to electronically file reports and to aid with e-mail. The Nebraska State Records Board awarded a grant to improve public access to records. This grant, along with county tax dollars, enabled the WebGIS service to be implemented. To defray some of the cost to our taxpayers, Cherry County offers an enhanced, sales-based subscription service available to the public upon request. This enhanced service includes scanned copies of deeds, Form 521's, surveys, site plans, all photos that are connected to the included sales.

Monthly, we submit new subdivisions, parcel splits, and other changes to GIS Workshop so our site can be updated for the public. We have excellent support and cooperation from GIS Workshop.

Sales review is an important factor in establishing fair market values. Statistics are only as reliable as the sample they are derived from. Cherry County adheres to the minimum standards of sales review from the International Association of Assessing Officers, Standard of Ratio Studies, 2007. These standards include, but are not limited to:

- Cherry County recognizes all sales over \$2.25 in Doc Stamps or \$100 consideration as arms-length transactions, unless verification proves otherwise
- Verification is made on all sales, usually with a knowledgeable third party
- During verifications, a standard form of questions is used. For residential and commercial sales, sales are verified and the response noted on supplemental sheets.
- Adjustments are made through the verification process if not noted on the Form 521.

Cherry County processed 355 real estate transfers in 2013. The real estate market has been active, making it a necessity to implement valuation changes within the residential and agricultural classes.

Cherry County mailed over 1200 personal property returns last January. The office refers to Regulations-Chapter 20 for guidance in the assessment of personal property.

Cherry County will process approximately 250 Homestead Exemption Applications. We make every effort to inform our taxpayers about homestead exemptions. This is one of the few forms of tax relief offered to our citizens, and this exemption loss is reimbursed to the county by the state. We personally visit the Valentine Senior Center, Northwest Community Action, Veteran's Service Office, and publish notice in the local newspaper for new filers. We mail previous filers new application forms annually. As a courtesy, we mail and phone reminders for former applicants to timely file their applications. As a benefit to our public, recent legislative changes have broadened the income tables for 2014, with more changes to come in 2015.

In the area of property discovery, the biggest obstacle for Cherry County is its size. Cherry County encompasses 6000 square miles and is dissected by a time zone. Because of the size of this county, our office utilizes building and zoning permits. We can pinpoint new building projects with little cost or time allocation. This office acquired a laptop during 2012, and one of the intents is to take it to the field with us, which will enable us to check property information as we come across it. In April 2009, we contracted with an aerial photography company to take pictures of all sites in rural Cherry County. The

pictures were excellent, and provided us with a tool for discovering new construction. Site plans were mailed to landowners to verify. With almost all appraisal maintenance, an external physical inspection is done at the time of listing.

As far as land usage, FSA maps were a great tool. However, these records have now been closed to public access. During the certification of irrigated acres, a requirement from the local natural resource district was that irrigators were responsible to furnish us with a map so we could locate the irrigated area. This worked out ideally, and again gave us the information we needed with minimal time and expense. We also mail questionnaires to known CRP participants to verify if they are still in the program, and to verify acre amounts. Now, with GIS, we have another tool to use to verify land usage.

Our office considers assessment/sale ratio studies supplied by the Property Assessment Division a tool in considering assessment actions. These studies work as a flag for detecting problems with our assessment practices. I also feel it necessary to express our appreciation to our field liaison, Pat Albro, for her tireless efforts in search of true equalization with her counties.

Information concerning statistical measures such as level of values, office compliance of state-defined reports, etc. is contained in the 2014 Reports and Opinions, issued by the Property Tax Administrator, April 2014. Also available on the Nebraska Department of Property Assessment's website is an annual calendar which depicts by date and by statute the annual responsibilities of the assessor's office.

## 2015 ASSESSMENT ACTIONS

**Residential-**In 2012, our residential market fell below the 92% median. Reviewing the sales and the statistics associated with these sales, this was anticipated. Our office gathered the data, performed a market review, performed physical drive-by reviews, and imported 2012 Marshall Swift costing and updated values proportionately. Depreciation was derived through the market. This review/revalue was the **entire** residential class which included Valentine City, villages, and rural residential acreages. We mailed preliminary notices of valuation change in February 2013, and followed with the formal notices by June 1, 2013. In examining the sales that have come through since the new values were set, it appears that the new values are more in tune with the current market. We have changed our hard copy files in the office to reflect these new changes. In August, we will start the 2015 appraisal maintenance ("pick-up") work. We reviewed our Improvement on Leased Land forms to check that they are property completed. The 2013 residential review/revalue completed the second cycle of the mandated six-year review.

**Commercial-** Our commercial market was active. A new "ShopKo" was completed last year. We examined our sales assessment ratios; it appears that a commercial review is needed. With this new review, we will import the 2012 Marshall Swift costing and use the three approaches to value. We will also do physical inspections on each property. A contract has been awarded to Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc. for this commercial review/revalue. This revalue is to be completed by January 1, 2015. As of January 1, 2015, the second cycle of the six-year review for our commercial class will be complete.

**Agriculture-** Cherry County has a single market area. Cherry County increased their agricultural land values again for the 2014 year. Looking at a quick sales review, sale prices for pasture ground are soaring and it appears values will be on the rise for the upcoming 2015 year. As our irrigated land stabilizes in market, pasture ground is climbing rapidly. This office not only utilizes sales/assessment

ratio studies, but “extended agland analysis” for agland property valuation. This methodology, utilized by the Department of Property Assessment termed “extended agland analysis”, was questioned and researched by Almy, Gloudemans, Jacobs & Denne, a property taxation consulting firm. The results of this study upheld the use of the extended agland analysis practice. The purpose of this extended analysis was to guarantee counties equalization by using comparable sales across county lines. It allowed counties that might not have had many sales to “borrow” sales, enabling their sales base to “extend” for valuation setting purposes. For Cherry County, this concept isn’t a bad idea, since we share huge school districts that cross county lines. Going forward into 2015, we will have to monitor if sales maintain their hectic pace. We will be examining these sales for further adjustments. Our first six-year cycle of review is complete. Appraisal maintenance will be completed.

## 2016 PLANNED ACTIONS

**Residential** - Complete appraisal maintenance. Monitor how the recent countywide residential review has fared.

**Commercial** -Complete 2015 appraisal review & revalue. Complete appraisal maintenance.

**Agricultural** –Investigate options to perform agricultural review on buildings to comply with LB334, the six-year review cycle. Utilize a more current costing for agriculture class residences and outbuildings. Concentrate on improving sales review. Monitor the market. Keep aware of legislative changes. Complete appraisal maintenance.

Continued GIS Workshop maintenance in all classes. Work on second six year review cycle for agricultural properties.

## 2017 PLANNED ACTIONS

**Residential** -Monitor sales in county and review for problem areas. Complete appraisal maintenance.

**Commercial** -Do all appraisal maintenance. Review all subclasses of commercial properties to detect problem areas. . If a commercial review has recently been completed, monitor to see how review fared.

**Agricultural** – Possibly import new costing and perform agricultural land class review for residences and outbuildings. Concentrate on sales review. Monitor the market. Continue with appraisal maintenance.

Continued GIS Workshop maintenance in all classes.

## CONCLUSION

It is a common business practice to prepare a budget and plan a course of action. It is no different with county business. We do owe it to our taxpayers for proportionate assessments at the most economical/efficient means possible. Planning saves time, money, and can assure our taxpayers that they are being well- served.

In our world of assessment practice, we can never let ourselves become satisfied that there is no room for improvement, that we are done researching alternate methods to accomplish accurate assessments, or our appraisal education is complete.

Our county board has been co-operative with allocating adequate funding requested for appraisal needs. Our board is a very informed, supportive board, and also answers to our taxpayers concerning assessment practices and expenditures of tax dollars. When county boards and county offices are able to work together for the public good, everyone gains from their efforts.

That being said, it will continue to be the goal of this office to comply with state statute and regulations to provide uniform and proportionate assessments on all properties in Cherry County.

And, as always, it is the utmost goal of this office to make every effort to promote good public relations and stay sensitive to the needs of its public.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty J. Daugherty  
Cherry County Assessor  
June 15, 2014

## 2015 Assessment Survey for Cherry County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$ 134,250
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	same
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$ 82,000
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	none
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	(\$ 37,500 is a line item in the general fund for GIS and appraisal computer needs)
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$3,200
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$ 49,050
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$ 5,520

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan (owned by Thomson Reuters)
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan (owned by Thomson Reuters)
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Office clerk
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes - GIS Workshop
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes, <a href="http://www.cherry.gisworkshop.com">www.cherry.gisworkshop.com</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Office staff and GIS Workshop
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan (owned by Thomson Reuters)

## 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>
	Valentine
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

### D. Contracted Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Company
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	TerraScan (owned by Thomson Reuters)

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ability to promote positive public relations.</li> <li>2) Experience in ad valorem tax appraisal.</li> <li>3) Familiarity with Nebraska Department of Revenue statutes and regulations.</li> <li>4) Familiarity and appreciation of the area (county).</li> </ul>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes



# 2015 Certification for Cherry County

---

This is to certify that the 2015 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 Cherry County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



