

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 Colfax County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	151	Median	96.61
Total Sales Price	\$13,468,300	Mean	98.44
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,464,500	Wgt. Mean	94.25
Total Assessed Value	\$12,690,380	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$64,768
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$89,169	Avg. Assessed Value	\$84,042

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.90 to 98.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.65 to 97.85
95% Mean C.I	95.24 to 101.64
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	14.42
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.22
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.48

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	154	95	95.06
2013	124	96	96.38
2012	121	98	97.57
2011	157	95	95

2015 Commission Summary for Colfax County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	Median	96.32
Total Sales Price	\$1,495,062	Mean	102.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,495,062	Wgt. Mean	88.59
Total Assessed Value	\$1,324,480	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$148,151
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$87,945	Avg. Assessed Value	\$77,911

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	78.86 to 113.99
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	73.90 to 103.28
95% Mean C.I	78.94 to 125.10
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.23
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.00
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.58

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	24	100	99.60
2013	15		92.23
2012	16		94.09
2011	20		100

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Colfax 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
Residential Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Colfax County

For 2015, Colfax County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all residential pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

During 2014, the county inspected, reviewed and updated all of the residential parcels in Clarkson for use in 2015.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Colfax County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:												
	Assessor, Appraiser and Office Staff												
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; 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>All parcels in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh; these are the medium sized towns in the county. They have K-12 schools, some shopping and business.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>All recreational parcels; this valuation group is the countywide collection of recreational cabins, mobile homes and houses usually associated with river or lake locations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>All parcels in the villages of Richland and Rogers; these are the smallest towns in the county. There towns have less than 100 parcels, no schools and few commercial parcels.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>All rural parcels; typically, residences on agricultural parcels are associated with this valuation group.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>All parcels in the city limits of Schuyler and in the surrounding subdivisions; this is the county seat, and the principal town in the county. It has significantly more stores, businesses, employment and services than any other town in the county.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	All parcels in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh; these are the medium sized towns in the county. They have K-12 schools, some shopping and business.	2	All recreational parcels; this valuation group is the countywide collection of recreational cabins, mobile homes and houses usually associated with river or lake locations.	3	All parcels in the villages of Richland and Rogers; these are the smallest towns in the county. There towns have less than 100 parcels, no schools and few commercial parcels.	4	All rural parcels; typically, residences on agricultural parcels are associated with this valuation group.	5	All parcels in the city limits of Schuyler and in the surrounding subdivisions; this is the county seat, and the principal town in the county. It has significantly more stores, businesses, employment and services than any other town in the county.
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>												
1	All parcels in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh; these are the medium sized towns in the county. They have K-12 schools, some shopping and business.												
2	All recreational parcels; this valuation group is the countywide collection of recreational cabins, mobile homes and houses usually associated with river or lake locations.												
3	All parcels in the villages of Richland and Rogers; these are the smallest towns in the county. There towns have less than 100 parcels, no schools and few commercial parcels.												
4	All rural parcels; typically, residences on agricultural parcels are associated with this valuation group.												
5	All parcels in the city limits of Schuyler and in the surrounding subdivisions; this is the county seat, and the principal town in the county. It has significantly more stores, businesses, employment and services than any other town in the county.												
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.												
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate market value, with Marshall and Swift costing used as the cost estimator. Depreciation is used from the local market.												
4.	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?												
	Tables are developed by the county												
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?												
	Yes												
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?												
	The county conducts an analysis of vacant lot sales as the primary method of establishing residential lot values.												
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?												
	In the past, Colfax County has utilized a DCF methodology for developments of subdivisions. Those have been completed and there are no current subdivisions under development. There have been no individual applications for DCF valuation as provided for in LB 191.												

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	2011	2011	2011	2014;2009
	2	2012	2011	2012	2010
	3	2011	2011	2011	2009
	4	2012	2011	2012	2013
	5	2012	2011	2012	2011 & 2012

Depreciation Tables are as follows: Schuyler in 2012 Clarkson, Howells, Leigh in 2011 Rural in 2012.

All Residential costs are from June 2011.

All residential lots were reviewed and updated as follows: Schuyler in 2012 Clarkson, Howells, Leigh in 2011 Rural in 2012.

In V-group #1, Clarkson was inspected in 2014 and Howells and Leigh were last reviewed in 2009.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Colfax County

County Overview

Colfax County is an agriculturally based county with an array of six villages and towns. Five of them range in population from less than 100 to 658 and exist primarily to support agriculture. Schuyler, with a population of 6,213, is the largest town and county seat. It hosts additional nonagricultural employers including Cargill and has a more robust and diversified business climate. According to the 2010 Census data cited in the Departments CTL based municipality charts; the county population is 10,515, with 7,932 or 75.44% living within the villages and towns and 2,583 or 24.56% living outside of the municipal areas. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of residential property. The 2015 Abstract Form 45, reports 3,438 residential and 137 recreational parcels, for a class total of 3,575. There are an additional 668 residences located on agricultural parcels.

Description of Analysis:

Colfax County has divided their residential analysis and valuation work into 5 valuation groups. These groups are centered on individual towns, groups of similar towns or villages, recreational, and rural residential parcels. The characteristics of each Valuation Group are described in the Residential Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector.

For 2015, the median ratio for the 151 qualified residential sales is 97 % and is within the acceptable range; the COD at 13.89 is within the acceptable range and the PRD at 104.45 is above the acceptable range. In the analysis of residential sales the impact of small dollar sales needs to be examined. A review of the COD and PRD for the total sample can often lead to the conclusion that the quality of assessment is not good. It is useful to evaluate the COD and PRD of a slightly trimmed sample of the sales to evaluate the quality of assessment of the bulk of the parcels. The section of the statistical report that examines the "Sale Price" ranges offers the opportunity to do so. By reviewing the analysis of the 128 sales with prices greater than \$29,999, the assessment level and quality of about 83% of the sales is reported. That gives a statistical perspective of the quality of assessment of the majority of the parcels that is not impacted by the volatility of the selling prices of low price property. The median ratio for the trimmed sample is 96% and only had a fractional change since the median is not a volatile statistic. However, the trimmed COD is 11.17%, the PRD is 102.34. These statistics are both within the desired ranges. When the sales of parcels for less than \$30,000 are excluded it demonstrates how the county's predominant residential parcels are valued. It also shows that the more volatile low dollar sales are responsible for a disproportionate impact on the assessment statistics depicting quality of assessment, particularly the COD and the PRD. In this case all of

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Colfax County

the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median.

Sales Qualification

During the past year, the Department reviewed the documentation of three years of the county's sale verification process posted in the comments in the sales file. The county has posted comments when required on nearly all of the sales reviewed. In most cases, the comments were complete enough to conclude why the sale was not used or adjusted for the ratio study. There was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process. The county qualified about 52% of all of the residential sales, so the Department believes that all available sales were used in the measurement process.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department is confident that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class partly because the assessment practices are good, partly because the sample is adequate and partly because the prepared statistics reasonably represent the class. That confidence that the statistics are meaningful does not necessarily extend to the subclasses. The confidence diminishes as the size of the subclasses diminishes. The values are equalized throughout the residential class and there are no subclasses of the residential class identified for individual adjustments.

Level of Value

The apparent level of value for the residential class is 97%, the quality of the assessment, based on the statistical indicators and the assessment actions is acceptable and there are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Colfax County

For 2015, Colfax County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all commercial pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

During 2014, the county did not inspect and review any of the commercial parcels since all commercial was inspected during 2013 for use in 2014.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Colfax County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:				
	Assessor, Appraiser and Office Staff				
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:				
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>			
	1	Valuation grouping 01 consists of all parcels located within the town of Schuyler. As the county seat, this commercial district is the commercial hub for the area.			
	2	Valuation group 02 consists of all commercial properties in Colfax County located outside the town of Schuyler.			
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.				
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate value in the commercial class, however, income information and comparable sales are considered when available.				
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.				
	The county hires specialized appraisers and searches for comparable sales in other counties.				
4.	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?				
	The county develops depreciation tables.				
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?				
	Yes; in some cases depreciation is developed for individual occupancy codes or groups.				
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.				
	Vacant commercial lots are valued primarily using market information from vacant lot sales.				
7.	<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	2008	2011	2008	2013
	2	2008	2011	2008	2013
	All commercial parcels were inspected during 2013 for use in 2014.				

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Colfax County

County Overview

Colfax County is an agriculturally based county with an array of five villages and towns. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. Schuyler, with a population of 6213, is the county seat and is the predominant location for much of the commercial and industrial property. All of the industrial valuation is in the non-municipal areas of the county, although Cargill, the main industrial employer is at the edge of Schuyler. In all, the commercial values are stable in most parts of the county. The 2015 Abstract Form 45, reports 564 commercial and 3 industrial parcels, for a class total of 567.

Description of Analysis

Colfax County has divided their commercial analysis and valuation work into two valuation groups. These groups are either in Schuyler or in the small towns and the rural areas of the county. The characteristics of each valuation group are described in in the Commercial Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector.

The key statistics that are prepared and considered for measurement are as follows: there are 17 qualified sales; the median ratio is 96%; the COD is 27.57; and the PRD is 115.16. Of the 17 qualified sales, 11 are in Schuyler and 6 are in the other valuation grouping. When the 9 different occupancy codes are reviewed, there are 4 sales in code 353 (retail store); 4 sales in code 344 (office building); 2 sales in code 352 (multi-family); and the remaining 6 codes have no more than 1 sales each. Even though there are 9 occupancy codes, there are still many property types with no representation in the statistical analysis. In short, barely 3% of the commercial parcels sold and there are not sufficient sales to represent or measure either the overall class or any subclass of the commercial property.

Sales Qualification

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process was done and concluded that there was no reason to believe that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process and that all available qualified sales were used in the measurement process.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department analyzes each county every other year to systematically review assessment practices. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Colfax County

reliable and applied consistently. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Level of Value

The statistical calculations alone are not representative of the commercial class and are not considered adequate to indicate the actual level of value. However all of the available information, particularly the assessment practices indicate that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value. The level of value is called at the statutory level of 100%.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Colfax County

For 2015, Colfax County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all pickup work of new improvements on agricultural parcels. They also update the land use on all parcels where changes have been reported or observed.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. Following that, they implemented new values for agricultural land throughout the county.

During 2013, the county inspected, reviewed and updated all of the farm buildings along with the inspection of the residences on agricultural parcels and the rural residences throughout the county for use in 2014. There was no inspection of improvements done for 2015. The county did review all of the agricultural land use throughout the county. This was done by comparing the 2010 aerial photos to the current 2014 photos from GIS to discover land use changes. Any land use observations that were not clear from the photos resulted in contact with the landowner or in some cases a drive by inspection to verify the current land use.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Colfax County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:							
	Assessor, Appraiser and Office Staff							
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.							
	<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="width: 65%; text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Area 1 is the only market area in the county so there are no unique characteristics that create a difference in value.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	1	Area 1 is the only market area in the county so there are no unique characteristics that create a difference in value.	2014
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
1	Area 1 is the only market area in the county so there are no unique characteristics that create a difference in value.	2014						
	The county reviewed all of their land use using the most recent GIS maps during 2014. This was done by comparing the base maps from 2010 to the current maps from 2014. If there were any questions that were not clearly shown on the maps, the land owner was called to verify the current land use.							
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.							
	The county plots and analyzes sales to annually monitor the potential for different markets.							
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.							
	The county sends questionnaires, verifies land use, and physically reviews parcels. They also call landowners if there are any questions from the review. If questions remain, the county will drive to the property for on-site review if the parcel is accessible.							
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?							
	Yes; both have a first acre valued at \$15,000; beginning in 2015.							
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.							
	The county relies on sales analysis and sales review to identify any potential influences. The county has used their own sales and also gathered and reviewed sales from nearby counties to analyze the market for WRP acres.							
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:							
	No							

Colfax County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Colfax	1	6,200	5,900	5,800	5,700	5,400	5,200	5,100	4,700	5,645
Butler	1	6,299	5,500	5,296	5,156	5,147	5,094	4,284	4,158	5,588
Cuming	1	6,221	6,221	5,830	5,842	5,386	5,404	4,556	4,483	5,823
Dodge	1	6,297	6,096	5,894	5,700	5,322	5,300	5,097	4,900	5,771
Platte	3	6,300	n/a	5,750	5,420	5,125	4,697	4,500	4,050	5,205
Platte	6	8,495	8,000	7,262	6,876	6,600	6,200	5,801	5,200	7,074
Saunders	1	6,160	5,942	5,727	5,229	5,060	4,730	3,768	3,520	4,849
Stanton	1	6,000	6,000	6,000	5,980	5,510	5,220	4,370	4,050	5,536

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Colfax	1	5,682	5,595	5,399	5,300	5,100	4,901	4,606	4,211	5,132
Butler	1	6,000	5,000	4,899	4,788	4,299	3,999	3,100	3,000	4,503
Cuming	1	5,896	5,899	5,550	5,517	5,070	5,070	4,216	4,158	5,389
Dodge	1	6,199	5,992	5,800	5,099	5,230	5,195	4,995	4,797	5,598
Platte	3	5,569	n/a	5,175	4,902	4,725	4,222	3,597	3,000	4,525
Platte	6	7,294	7,000	6,414	6,133	6,098	5,699	4,898	3,900	6,154
Saunders	1	5,408	5,176	4,947	4,441	4,257	3,797	3,109	2,764	3,870
Stanton	1	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,250	4,467	4,525	4,477	3,800	4,819

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Colfax	1	2,125	2,125	1,991	2,000	1,769	1,875	1,488	1,625	1,803
Butler	1	2,765	2,888	2,823	2,482	2,624	2,471	2,288	1,655	2,094
Cuming	1	3,147	2,781	2,733	2,491	2,071	2,184	2,164	1,283	2,379
Dodge	1	2,337	2,391	2,200	2,272	2,328	2,194	2,130	2,042	2,225
Platte	3	1,774	1,328	1,760	1,683	1,559	1,420	1,477	1,215	1,380
Platte	6	2,016	2,058	1,823	1,971	1,846	1,756	1,774	1,493	1,758
Saunders	1	2,053	2,050	2,417	1,668	2,299	1,992	1,683	925	1,686
Stanton	1	2,065	2,000	1,940	1,875	1,506	1,296	1,259	1,406	1,470

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

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Colfax County

County Overview

Colfax County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The primary crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. The county land use is approximately 31% irrigated land, 53% dry land, 12% grass land and 3% other uses. Colfax County is bordered on the north by Stanton and Cuming Counties, on the south by Butler County, on the east by Dodge County and on the west by Platte County. The agricultural land is valued using only one market area. The 2015 Abstract Form 45, reports 3,792 parcels of agricultural land. There are also 897 sets of farm site improvements located on agricultural parcels.

Description of Analysis

There was a total sample of 58 qualified sales; 43 Colfax County sales supplemented with 15 additional qualified sales used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in Colfax County. The sample after supplementation was deemed adequate, proportional among study years and representative for the irrigated and dry land uses.

In this study, the 80% Majority Land Use Tables demonstrate that the irrigated and dry values are both within the range. There are only 7 sales in the 80% MLU table for Grass that shows a median of 44.39%. In this case, the sample is small and a comparison of the grass values to the adjacent counties demonstrates that Colfax County is among the highest of the grass value range. Any comparable sales used were selected from a similar agricultural area within six miles of the subject county.

The calculated median ratio is 71%; the COD is 25.94 and the PRD is 103.84. Given the high appreciation in land value during the three years of this analysis, little weight is given to the COD and PRD. The 2015 abstract reports; overall agricultural land increased by 12.75%; irrigated land increased by nearly 13%, dry land increased by nearly 13%, and grass land increased by over 16%. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values.

Sales Qualification

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The findings, that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process applies to the agricultural sales too. The measurement was done with all available qualified sales.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Colfax County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales and analysis of agricultural values. Each year, the county verifies all of the new sales that take place. They update any changes to land use that are discovered or reported. They completely analyze and revalue all agricultural land within a classification system and monitor sales to affirm their use of one market area. The quality of assessment for agricultural land is acceptable.

Level of Value

For 2015, the apparent level of value of agricultural land is 71% and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. There are no strong indications of any major subclass outside the range. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

**19 Colfax
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 : 151
 Total Sales Price : 13,468,300
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,464,500
 Total Assessed Value : 12,690,380
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 89,169
 Avg. Assessed Value : 84,042

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 13.89
 PRD : 104.45

COV : 20.41
 STD : 20.09
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.42
 MAX Sales Ratio : 201.13
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.76

95% Median C.I. : 94.90 to 98.59
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.65 to 97.85
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.24 to 101.64

Printed:3/30/2015 3:57:00PM

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-12 To 31-DEC-12	24	98.53	100.61	100.71	10.56	99.90	70.33	133.79	95.04 to 108.44	75,673	76,210
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	23	97.11	97.47	90.29	09.47	107.95	63.12	127.07	93.63 to 103.87	102,300	92,362
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	21	93.20	92.04	89.07	11.86	103.33	48.76	124.04	84.13 to 98.77	92,490	82,378
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	20	103.03	105.76	105.03	14.44	100.70	75.51	141.37	94.11 to 115.40	84,020	88,245
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	20	98.99	99.78	97.94	16.24	101.88	64.36	147.20	87.86 to 112.46	78,355	76,741
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	6	98.06	100.22	95.62	10.66	104.81	82.91	127.79	82.91 to 127.79	75,083	71,798
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	17	90.94	95.59	90.21	15.96	105.96	69.70	201.13	78.81 to 98.70	68,356	61,664
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	20	91.77	96.88	89.38	18.30	108.39	59.63	193.55	87.07 to 99.08	124,655	111,414
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	88	97.45	98.91	95.59	11.86	103.47	48.76	141.37	95.98 to 100.39	88,543	84,639
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	63	94.27	97.77	92.41	16.68	105.80	59.63	201.13	89.60 to 97.74	90,044	83,209
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	84	97.06	98.64	94.85	13.34	104.00	48.76	147.20	94.27 to 101.05	89,794	85,166
<u>ALL</u>	151	96.61	98.44	94.25	13.89	104.45	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.59	89,169	84,042

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	35	95.24	97.41	91.41	17.43	106.56	48.76	193.55	86.21 to 101.05	54,833	50,125
03	5	97.45	101.18	96.50	13.68	104.85	73.89	127.79	N/A	35,640	34,391
04	13	99.35	96.63	84.82	15.31	113.92	63.12	124.30	81.23 to 119.05	134,531	114,103
05	98	96.39	98.91	96.49	12.44	102.51	59.63	201.13	94.27 to 98.50	98,145	94,701
<u>ALL</u>	151	96.61	98.44	94.25	13.89	104.45	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.59	89,169	84,042

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	150	96.59	98.41	94.20	13.95	104.47	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.50	89,230	84,056
06	1	102.45	102.45	102.45	00.00	100.00	102.45	102.45	N/A	80,000	81,960
07											
<u>ALL</u>	151	96.61	98.44	94.25	13.89	104.45	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.59	89,169	84,042

**19 Colfax
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 : 151
 Total Sales Price : 13,468,300
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,464,500
 Total Assessed Value : 12,690,380
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 89,169
 Avg. Assessed Value : 84,042

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 13.89
 PRD : 104.45

COV : 20.41
 STD : 20.09
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.42
 MAX Sales Ratio : 201.13
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.76

95% Median C.I. : 94.90 to 98.59
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.65 to 97.85
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.24 to 101.64

Printed:3/30/2015 3:57:00PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	151.66	151.66	151.66	27.62	100.00	109.77	193.55	N/A	11,000	16,683	
Less Than 30,000	23	109.77	112.72	110.02	23.51	102.45	48.76	201.13	93.67 to 124.04	20,609	22,674	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	151	96.61	98.44	94.25	13.89	104.45	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.59	89,169	84,042	
Greater Than 14,999	149	96.56	97.72	94.16	13.32	103.78	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.38	90,218	84,946	
Greater Than 29,999	128	95.88	95.87	93.68	11.17	102.34	59.63	141.37	94.11 to 97.44	101,488	95,069	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	151.66	151.66	151.66	27.62	100.00	109.77	193.55	N/A	11,000	16,683	
15,000 TO 29,999	21	105.54	109.01	107.99	22.82	100.94	48.76	201.13	91.22 to 124.04	21,524	23,244	
30,000 TO 59,999	24	98.26	100.72	100.92	12.17	99.80	73.89	129.49	90.94 to 110.04	46,458	46,886	
60,000 TO 99,999	51	95.29	95.20	95.31	09.96	99.88	69.70	133.79	92.58 to 97.45	80,214	76,449	
100,000 TO 149,999	37	95.41	96.07	95.43	09.93	100.67	72.46	141.37	89.60 to 98.59	117,692	112,318	
150,000 TO 249,999	12	96.98	92.11	91.31	13.33	100.88	59.63	115.40	77.80 to 105.74	175,825	160,550	
250,000 TO 499,999	3	85.79	92.03	91.06	16.65	101.07	73.73	116.58	N/A	273,367	248,917	
500,000 TO 999,999	1	63.12	63.12	63.12	00.00	100.00	63.12	63.12	N/A	500,000	315,605	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	151	96.61	98.44	94.25	13.89	104.45	48.76	201.13	94.90 to 98.59	89,169	84,042	

19 Colfax
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 : 17
Total Sales Price : 1,495,062
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,495,062
Total Assessed Value : 1,324,480
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 87,945
Avg. Assessed Value : 77,911

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 102
COD : 27.57
PRD : 115.16

COV : 43.99
STD : 44.88
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.56
MAX Sales Ratio : 252.71
MIN Sales Ratio : 49.99

95% Median C.I. : 78.86 to 113.99
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.90 to 103.28
95% Mean C.I. : 78.94 to 125.10

Printed:3/30/2015 3:57:01PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	63.57	80.06	64.55	40.18	124.03	49.99	126.61	N/A	62,667	40,450
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	95.20	95.20	95.20	00.00	100.00	95.20	95.20	N/A	45,000	42,840
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	112.27	112.27	112.27	00.00	100.00	112.27	112.27	N/A	105,000	117,880
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	4	97.96	127.05	75.90	50.12	167.39	59.59	252.71	N/A	66,075	50,150
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	104.94	104.94	93.18	24.18	112.62	79.57	130.30	N/A	205,000	191,015
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2	110.56	110.56	113.59	03.10	97.33	107.13	113.99	N/A	102,500	116,428
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	83.26	83.26	85.86	04.14	96.97	79.81	86.71	N/A	31,381	26,943
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13											
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	2	90.53	90.53	80.48	12.89	112.49	78.86	102.20	N/A	107,500	86,520
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	5	95.20	89.53	83.45	26.32	107.29	49.99	126.61	N/A	67,600	56,414
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	10	97.96	110.57	92.28	30.80	119.82	59.59	252.71	79.57 to 130.30	94,206	86,937
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	2	90.53	90.53	80.48	12.89	112.49	78.86	102.20	N/A	107,500	86,520
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	6	97.96	119.28	87.21	36.32	136.77	59.59	252.71	59.59 to 252.71	69,050	60,220
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	6	96.92	99.59	98.67	18.12	100.93	79.57	130.30	79.57 to 130.30	112,960	111,462
<u>ALL</u>	17	96.32	102.02	88.59	27.57	115.16	49.99	252.71	78.86 to 113.99	87,945	77,911

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	11	96.32	95.83	93.98	19.60	101.97	49.99	130.30	63.57 to 126.61	99,027	93,066
02	6	91.01	113.38	74.12	44.64	152.97	59.59	252.71	59.59 to 252.71	67,627	50,126
<u>ALL</u>	17	96.32	102.02	88.59	27.57	115.16	49.99	252.71	78.86 to 113.99	87,945	77,911

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	2	113.13	113.13	113.38	00.76	99.78	112.27	113.99	N/A	149,000	168,940
03	15	95.20	100.54	82.42	29.18	121.98	49.99	252.71	78.86 to 107.13	79,804	65,773
04											
<u>ALL</u>	17	96.32	102.02	88.59	27.57	115.16	49.99	252.71	78.86 to 113.99	87,945	77,911

19 Colfax
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 : 17
Total Sales Price : 1,495,062
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,495,062
Total Assessed Value : 1,324,480
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 87,945
Avg. Assessed Value : 77,911

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 89
MEAN : 102
COD : 27.57
PRD : 115.16

COV : 43.99
STD : 44.88
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.56
MAX Sales Ratio : 252.71
MIN Sales Ratio : 49.99

95% Median C.I. : 78.86 to 113.99
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.90 to 103.28
95% Mean C.I. : 78.94 to 125.10

Printed:3/30/2015 3:57:01PM

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	1	252.71	252.71	252.71	00.00	100.00	252.71	252.71	N/A	3,500	8,845	
Less Than 15,000	3	107.13	146.55	119.92	53.79	122.21	79.81	252.71	N/A	7,754	9,298	
Less Than 30,000	5	107.13	133.69	117.33	36.83	113.94	79.81	252.71	N/A	11,252	13,203	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	16	95.76	92.61	88.21	19.26	104.99	49.99	130.30	78.86 to 112.27	93,223	82,227	
Greater Than 14,999	14	95.76	92.48	88.10	19.98	104.97	49.99	130.30	63.57 to 113.99	105,129	92,613	
Greater Than 29,999	12	90.96	88.83	87.47	21.02	101.55	49.99	130.30	63.57 to 112.27	119,900	104,872	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999	1	252.71	252.71	252.71	00.00	100.00	252.71	252.71	N/A	3,500	8,845	
5,000 TO 14,999	2	93.47	93.47	96.40	14.61	96.96	79.81	107.13	N/A	9,881	9,525	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	114.41	114.41	115.52	10.67	99.04	102.20	126.61	N/A	16,500	19,060	
30,000 TO 59,999	3	95.20	92.74	91.87	03.36	100.95	86.71	96.32	N/A	43,333	39,808	
60,000 TO 99,999	2	74.79	74.79	73.54	33.16	101.70	49.99	99.59	N/A	66,650	49,018	
100,000 TO 149,999	3	112.27	102.05	103.10	19.81	98.98	63.57	130.30	N/A	105,000	108,257	
150,000 TO 249,999	3	78.86	84.15	85.20	22.99	98.77	59.59	113.99	N/A	186,833	159,177	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	79.57	79.57	79.57	00.00	100.00	79.57	79.57	N/A	300,000	238,705	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	17	96.32	102.02	88.59	27.57	115.16	49.99	252.71	78.86 to 113.99	87,945	77,911	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	78.86	78.86	78.86	00.00	100.00	78.86	78.86	N/A	200,000	157,710	
319	1	130.30	130.30	130.30	00.00	100.00	130.30	130.30	N/A	110,000	143,325	
341	1	107.13	107.13	107.13	00.00	100.00	107.13	107.13	N/A	12,000	12,855	
344	4	111.47	138.80	85.13	45.63	163.04	79.57	252.71	N/A	87,875	74,809	
352	2	113.13	113.13	113.38	00.76	99.78	112.27	113.99	N/A	149,000	168,940	
353	4	71.69	72.14	66.26	21.43	108.87	49.99	95.20	N/A	55,691	36,899	
384	1	99.59	99.59	99.59	00.00	100.00	99.59	99.59	N/A	63,300	63,040	
442	1	86.71	86.71	86.71	00.00	100.00	86.71	86.71	N/A	55,000	47,690	
471	1	102.20	102.20	102.20	00.00	100.00	102.20	102.20	N/A	15,000	15,330	
494	1	59.59	59.59	59.59	00.00	100.00	59.59	59.59	N/A	167,500	99,820	
___ ALL ___	17	96.32	102.02	88.59	27.57	115.16	49.99	252.71	78.86 to 113.99	87,945	77,911	

19 Colfax
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 : 58
Total Sales Price : 37,623,173
Total Adj. Sales Price : 37,623,173
Total Assessed Value : 26,878,832
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 648,675
Avg. Assessed Value : 463,428

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 71
MEAN : 74
COD : 25.94
PRD : 103.84

COV : 33.50
STD : 24.85
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.45
MAX Sales Ratio : 138.81
MIN Sales Ratio : 27.66

95% Median C.I. : 65.54 to 76.78
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.41 to 76.47
95% Mean C.I. : 67.78 to 80.58

Printed:3/30/2015 3:57:02PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	90.04	90.04	86.21	39.55	104.44	54.43	125.65	N/A	201,660	173,861
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	113.81	107.60	102.37	15.75	105.11	74.81	127.96	N/A	384,633	393,760
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	7	84.81	88.85	84.99	10.45	104.54	73.37	108.13	73.37 to 108.13	570,000	484,453
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	81.63	81.30	78.73	07.39	103.26	73.76	88.16	N/A	542,063	426,788
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	12	65.90	62.60	61.01	12.66	102.61	44.39	80.88	53.67 to 70.25	818,851	499,575
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	75.79	75.79	77.98	03.58	97.19	73.08	78.49	N/A	545,625	425,500
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	4	60.76	65.30	70.76	13.55	92.28	55.75	83.93	N/A	797,300	564,195
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	84.49	84.49	85.75	25.00	98.53	63.37	105.61	N/A	680,476	583,496
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	6	66.32	73.88	72.82	44.48	101.46	34.07	134.02	34.07 to 134.02	693,878	505,311
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	5	67.92	81.15	74.28	27.27	109.25	57.51	138.81	N/A	661,253	491,186
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	8	52.43	53.01	60.87	30.88	87.09	27.66	91.59	27.66 to 91.59	669,250	407,393
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	69.38	69.38	68.28	03.07	101.61	67.25	71.51	N/A	615,964	420,568
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	17	86.48	91.62	86.68	18.14	105.70	54.43	127.96	74.81 to 108.13	476,477	413,005
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	20	65.90	66.65	66.39	15.22	100.39	44.39	105.61	58.39 to 70.72	773,380	513,484
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	21	65.10	67.23	68.22	32.58	98.55	27.66	138.81	49.10 to 76.42	669,308	456,575
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	27	74.81	78.84	72.30	20.75	109.05	44.39	127.96	68.47 to 86.48	649,000	469,195
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	14	68.23	73.22	74.52	29.05	98.26	34.07	134.02	52.53 to 96.02	700,334	521,903
<u>ALL</u>	58	71.12	74.18	71.44	25.94	103.84	27.66	138.81	65.54 to 76.78	648,675	463,428

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	58	71.12	74.18	71.44	25.94	103.84	27.66	138.81	65.54 to 76.78	648,675	463,428
<u>ALL</u>	58	71.12	74.18	71.44	25.94	103.84	27.66	138.81	65.54 to 76.78	648,675	463,428

19 Colfax
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 : 58
 Total Sales Price : 37,623,173
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 37,623,173
 Total Assessed Value : 26,878,832
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 648,675
 Avg. Assessed Value : 463,428

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 25.94
 PRD : 103.84

COV : 33.50
 STD : 24.85
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.45
 MAX Sales Ratio : 138.81
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.66

95% Median C.I. : 65.54 to 76.78
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.41 to 76.47
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.78 to 80.58

Printed:3/30/2015 3:57:02PM

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
Irrigated											
County	7	58.39	73.93	63.49	34.61	116.44	46.12	125.65	46.12 to 125.65	526,850	334,494
1	7	58.39	73.93	63.49	34.61	116.44	46.12	125.65	46.12 to 125.65	526,850	334,494
Dry											
County	14	74.29	79.18	74.99	16.17	105.59	63.13	127.96	65.10 to 93.58	589,351	441,931
1	14	74.29	79.18	74.99	16.17	105.59	63.13	127.96	65.10 to 93.58	589,351	441,931
Grass											
County	7	44.39	45.60	42.84	25.23	106.44	27.66	73.08	27.66 to 73.08	222,224	95,207
1	7	44.39	45.60	42.84	25.23	106.44	27.66	73.08	27.66 to 73.08	222,224	95,207
ALL	58	71.12	74.18	71.44	25.94	103.84	27.66	138.81	65.54 to 76.78	648,675	463,428

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	21	73.37	76.70	70.77	23.93	108.38	46.12	125.65	56.95 to 88.16	703,996	498,205
1	21	73.37	76.70	70.77	23.93	108.38	46.12	125.65	56.95 to 88.16	703,996	498,205
Dry											
County	23	72.47	76.52	70.76	23.02	108.14	34.07	138.81	63.37 to 80.10	694,664	491,520
1	23	72.47	76.52	70.76	23.02	108.14	34.07	138.81	63.37 to 80.10	694,664	491,520
Grass											
County	7	44.39	45.60	42.84	25.23	106.44	27.66	73.08	27.66 to 73.08	222,224	95,207
1	7	44.39	45.60	42.84	25.23	106.44	27.66	73.08	27.66 to 73.08	222,224	95,207
ALL	58	71.12	74.18	71.44	25.94	103.84	27.66	138.81	65.54 to 76.78	648,675	463,428

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 7,934	Value : 1,605,827,921	Growth 7,840,955	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	319	1,495,835	53	678,305	2	16,925	374	2,191,065	
02. Res Improve Land	2,465	12,954,220	83	2,478,620	304	7,522,700	2,852	22,955,540	
03. Res Improvements	2,621	155,177,780	87	13,365,970	356	32,390,150	3,064	200,933,900	
04. Res Total	2,940	169,627,835	140	16,522,895	358	39,929,775	3,438	226,080,505	3,177,075
% of Res Total	85.51	75.03	4.07	7.31	10.41	17.66	43.33	14.08	40.52
05. Com UnImp Land	73	614,520	6	218,255	3	63,390	82	896,165	
06. Com Improve Land	428	4,328,880	24	730,810	18	381,890	470	5,441,580	
07. Com Improvements	435	37,379,231	28	6,954,870	19	3,401,025	482	47,735,126	
08. Com Total	508	42,322,631	34	7,903,935	22	3,846,305	564	54,072,871	1,278,925
% of Com Total	90.07	78.27	6.03	14.62	3.90	7.11	7.11	3.37	16.31
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	3	1,015,150	0	0	3	1,015,150	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	3	28,913,740	0	0	3	28,913,740	
12. Ind Total	0	0	3	29,928,890	0	0	3	29,928,890	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	1.86	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	1	5,180	3	8,890	29	595,375	33	609,445	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	20	157,500	30	1,249,515	50	1,407,015	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	62	1,097,880	42	2,352,065	104	3,449,945	
16. Rec Total	1	5,180	65	1,264,270	71	4,196,955	137	5,466,405	36,215
% of Rec Total	0.73	0.09	47.45	23.13	51.82	76.78	1.73	0.34	0.46
Res & Rec Total	2,941	169,633,015	205	17,787,165	429	44,126,730	3,575	231,546,910	3,213,290
% of Res & Rec Total	82.27	73.26	5.73	7.68	12.00	19.06	45.06	14.42	40.98
Com & Ind Total	508	42,322,631	37	37,832,825	22	3,846,305	567	84,001,761	1,278,925
% of Com & Ind Total	89.59	50.38	6.53	45.04	3.88	4.58	7.15	5.23	16.31
17. Taxable Total	3,449	211,955,646	242	55,619,990	451	47,973,035	4,142	315,548,671	4,492,215
% of Taxable Total	83.27	67.17	5.84	17.63	10.89	15.20	52.21	19.65	57.29

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	1	15,000	1,208,460	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	1	15,000	1,208,460
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	15,000	1,208,460

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	250	2	214	466

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	17	1,641,110	4	875,420	2,844	884,228,635	2,865	886,745,165
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,132	300,446,775	1,132	300,446,775
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	927	103,087,310	927	103,087,310
30. Ag Total							3,792	1,290,279,250

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	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	3	0.37	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	54	60.00	900,000	54	60.00	900,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	607	617.01	9,270,150	607	617.01	9,270,150	
33. HomeSite Improvements	614	0.00	59,463,140	614	0.00	59,463,140	0
34. HomeSite Total				668	677.01	69,633,290	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	83	153.65	384,125	83	153.65	384,125	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	808	3,257.45	8,143,625	808	3,257.45	8,143,625	
37. FarmSite Improvements	897	0.00	43,624,170	897	0.00	43,624,170	3,348,740
38. FarmSite Total				980	3,411.10	52,151,920	
39. Road & Ditches	3,306	5,433.01	0	3,309	5,433.38	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	13	292.10	517,190	13	292.10	517,190	
41. Total Section VI				1,648	9,813.59	122,302,400	3,348,740

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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

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	10,393.59	13.42%	64,440,255	14.74%	6,200.00
46. 1A	13,106.80	16.92%	77,330,065	17.69%	5,900.00
47. 2A1	15,607.25	20.15%	90,522,025	20.70%	5,800.00
48. 2A	9,472.52	12.23%	53,993,345	12.35%	5,700.00
49. 3A1	6,457.93	8.34%	34,872,875	7.98%	5,400.01
50. 3A	18,441.70	23.81%	95,896,810	21.93%	5,200.00
51. 4A1	3,666.25	4.73%	18,697,925	4.28%	5,100.01
52. 4A	315.27	0.41%	1,481,770	0.34%	4,700.00
53. Total	77,461.31	100.00%	437,235,070	100.00%	5,644.56
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,201.41	4.69%	35,235,915	5.19%	5,681.92
55. 1D	32,738.16	24.77%	183,155,835	27.00%	5,594.57
56. 2D1	7,874.21	5.96%	42,511,595	6.27%	5,398.84
57. 2D	6,513.29	4.93%	34,518,425	5.09%	5,299.69
58. 3D1	13,973.14	10.57%	71,263,015	10.51%	5,100.00
59. 3D	45,824.52	34.67%	224,576,375	33.11%	4,900.79
60. 4D1	17,296.71	13.09%	79,667,150	11.75%	4,605.91
61. 4D	1,749.03	1.32%	7,366,020	1.09%	4,211.49
62. Total	132,170.47	100.00%	678,294,330	100.00%	5,131.97
Grass					
63. 1G1	387.13	1.36%	822,640	1.60%	2,124.97
64. 1G	2,976.64	10.44%	6,323,875	12.30%	2,124.50
65. 2G1	1,994.58	6.99%	3,972,130	7.73%	1,991.46
66. 2G	2,966.40	10.40%	5,932,800	11.54%	2,000.00
67. 3G1	2,593.45	9.09%	4,586,555	8.92%	1,768.51
68. 3G	8,437.87	29.58%	15,821,870	30.77%	1,875.10
69. 4G1	6,894.33	24.17%	10,260,945	19.96%	1,488.32
70. 4G	2,272.03	7.97%	3,692,310	7.18%	1,625.11
71. Total	28,522.43	100.00%	51,413,125	100.00%	1,802.55
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	77,461.31	31.40%	437,235,070	37.44%	5,644.56
Dry Total					
Dry Total	132,170.47	53.58%	678,294,330	58.07%	5,131.97
Grass Total					
Grass Total	28,522.43	11.56%	51,413,125	4.40%	1,802.55
72. Waste	8,172.35	3.31%	817,230	0.07%	100.00
73. Other	361.85	0.15%	217,095	0.02%	599.96
74. Exempt	32.19	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	246,688.41	100.00%	1,167,976,850	100.00%	4,734.62

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	254.78	1,378,270	128.45	702,245	77,078.08	435,154,555	77,461.31	437,235,070
77. Dry Land	44.73	222,715	33.76	172,285	132,091.98	677,899,330	132,170.47	678,294,330
78. Grass	21.24	39,995	0.00	0	28,501.19	51,373,130	28,522.43	51,413,125
79. Waste	1.29	130	8.90	890	8,162.16	816,210	8,172.35	817,230
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	361.85	217,095	361.85	217,095
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	32.19	0	32.19	0
82. Total	322.04	1,641,110	171.11	875,420	246,195.26	1,165,460,320	246,688.41	1,167,976,850

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	77,461.31	31.40%	437,235,070	37.44%	5,644.56
Dry Land	132,170.47	53.58%	678,294,330	58.07%	5,131.97
Grass	28,522.43	11.56%	51,413,125	4.40%	1,802.55
Waste	8,172.35	3.31%	817,230	0.07%	100.00
Other	361.85	0.15%	217,095	0.02%	599.96
Exempt	32.19	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	246,688.41	100.00%	1,167,976,850	100.00%	4,734.62

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

19 Colfax

	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	215,255,900	226,080,505	10,824,605	5.03%	3,177,075	3.55%
02. Recreational	4,823,055	5,466,405	643,350	13.34%	36,215	12.59%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	66,288,365	69,633,290	3,344,925	5.05%	0	5.05%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	286,367,320	301,180,200	14,812,880	5.17%	3,213,290	4.05%
05. Commercial	52,608,536	54,072,871	1,464,335	2.78%	1,278,925	0.35%
06. Industrial	29,582,290	29,928,890	346,600	1.17%	0	1.17%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	49,172,505	52,151,920	2,979,415	6.06%	3,348,740	-0.75%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	131,363,331	136,153,681	4,790,350	3.65%	4,627,665	0.12%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	417,730,651	437,851,071	20,120,420	4.82%	7,840,955	2.94%
11. Irrigated	387,823,345	437,235,070	49,411,725	12.74%		
12. Dryland	602,453,970	678,294,330	75,840,360	12.59%		
13. Grassland	44,150,605	51,413,125	7,262,520	16.45%		
14. Wasteland	789,565	817,230	27,665	3.50%		
15. Other Agland	704,840	217,095	-487,745	-69.20%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	1,035,922,325	1,167,976,850	132,054,525	12.75%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,453,652,976	1,605,827,921	152,174,945	10.47%	7,840,955	9.93%

COLFAX COUNTY ASSESSOR
VIOLA M. BENDER
411 E. 11TH STREET
SCHUYLER, NE. 68661

June 1, 2014

I, Viola M. Bender, duly elected assessor of Colfax County, present this plan of assessment, pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, to the Colfax County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year and to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 of each year.

Respectively Submitted

Viola M. Bender
Colfax County Assessor

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF COUNTY

Based on the counties abstract
Colfax County has a total parcel count of 8,396 parcels.

Residential-----	3,447
Industrial-----	3
Commercial-----	567
Agricultural-----	3,776
Rec land-----	131
Exempt-----	472

Colfax County also processes approximately 1,100 Personal Property filings and 400 Homestead Exemptions each year.

The Colfax County Assessor's Office consists of the Assessor, Deputy Assessor/Appraiser and two full time clerks.

Budget

2014 General Budget: 175,505

The general budget includes the salaries for the administrative personal, educational classes, office supplies, office equipment and the data processing costs.

Procedures Manual

Colfax County has a written policy manual, which is updated each year.

Responsibilities

Record maintenance: Cadastral Maps

The office staff maintains the maps by keeping the ownership and descriptions current (Reg 10-004.03).

Property Record Cards: The office staff maintains the property record cards by keeping current the required legal, ownership, classification codes and changes made to the assessment information of the property (Reg. 10-004).

Report Generation

County Abstract of Assessment Report for Real Property must be completed and certified by the county assessor on or before March 19, to the Property Tax Administrator (Reg.

60-004.03), (Statute 77-1514).

Certification of Values: Pursuant to section 13-509 and 13-518 the county assessor must certify taxable valuations to political subdivisions on or before August 20 of each year.

School District Taxable Value Report: Pursuant to Section 79-1016 the assessor on or before Aug. 25, shall provide the current values, by property class, for the county, school districts and supplement TIF information if applicable, to the Property Tax Administrator.
Tax List Corrections: Tax list corrections are generated to correct clerical error (77-128) and any overvalued, undervalued, and omitted real property.

Generate Tax Roll: The assessor's office will on or before November 22 completes and deliver to the county treasurer the Tax List.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: On or before December 1 of each year the assessor will certify to the Property Tax Administrator, the total taxable valuation and the Certificate of Taxes Levied.

MIPS/County Solutions LLC of 725 S. 14th Street Lincoln, NE. 68508 maintain all of our administrative programs.

Homestead Exemptions

The assessor's office on or before June 30 of each year, accepts applications for Homestead Exemption (77-3510 thru 77-3528). The assessor's office staff also helps the applicant complete the necessary forms.

Filing for Personal Property

The assessor's office on or before February 1 of each year sends a letter to all persons with personal property, explaining the procedure for filing Personal Property, the penalties for late filing and requesting they bring in or mail their depreciation worksheets to the assessor's office. We then complete the Personal Property Schedule and return a copy to the taxpayer.

Real Property

Residential: In 2014 we are reviewing and taking new photos of the properties in Clarkson, any changes that are made will be implemented for the 2015 tax year. For 2015 we plan on reviewing and taking new photos of the properties in Leigh and implement these changes for 2016. Plans for 2016 are to review and take new photos of the properties in Howells and implement the changes for 2017. We will also continue to do pick-up work, review sales and address any problem areas.

The 2014 level of value is Assessment Ratio: 95, COD 13.01 and the PRD: 104.99

Computerized

Colfax County has Implemented MIPS new PC Administrative system and CAMA V2 with 2011 Marshall and Swift pricing.

Commercial Property

In 2014 we are doing a drive-by review and taking new photos of the Commercial property in Clarkson, any changes we find will be implemented for the 2015 tax year. In 2015 we plan on doing a drive-by review and taking new photos of the Commercial property in Leigh, any changes we find will be implemented for the 2016 tax year. In 2016 we plan to do a drive-by review and take new photos of the commercial property in Howells, any changes we find will be implemented for 2017 tax year. We will continue to review sales, do pick-up work and address any problem areas.

The 2014 level of value is Assessment Ratio: 100, COD 23.99 and the PRD: 105.78

Agricultural

We are using our GIS to update our land use; this will be implemented for the 2015 tax year.

We have one market area in the county. When we verify our agland sales we also check with the buyer or seller on the land use. We are continuing to update our GIS system.

We are working with GIS Workshop, Inc from Lincoln, NE.

For 2014 the level of value was Assessment Ratio: 74, COD: 28.22 and the PRD: 110.21

The Assessor's office receives yearly updated well registration list, which also helps us track any changes in agland.

In the assessment years ahead we plan on continuing reviewing our agland sales, and keeping the land use and classifications as current as possible.

Pick-up Work

Pick-up work is usually started in August of each year and completed by February 1. We receive building permits monthly from the city clerk's. The county in 1999 implemented zoning, which requires a zoning permit before any construction can be stated, the zoning office will then submit a copy of this permit to the assessor's office, which helps us track new construction in the rural areas.

Sales Review

Real Estate Transfers (Form 521) are delivered to the assessor's office each month from the clerk's office. The assessor and the office staff complete the Real Estate Transfer Statements. The assessor or office staff does verification of sales information by contacting the buyer or seller by telephone or in person. If no response from buyer or seller we try to contact the abstractor or the realtor involved in the sales.

The assessor and/or appraiser complete drive by reviews checking for changes that are different than the current property record card. Things we look for are additional buildings, heating & cooling changes, also changes in square footage (additions to house).

2015 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	1
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$175,505
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$175,505; All of the cost of health care and benefits are paid from the county general budget, not the assessor's budget.
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	There is no separate fund. If a project is identified, the Board would have to fund it.
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$27,560: this includes \$17,000 for MIPS and \$10,560 for GIS
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	0

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor office staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor office staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All except Leigh
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	MIPS

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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

2015 Certification for Colfax 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 Colfax 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

