

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 Grant County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	7	Median	166.86
Total Sales Price	\$123,100	Mean	173.08
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$123,100	Wgt. Mean	135.81
Total Assessed Value	\$167,180	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$26,058
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$17,586	Avg. Assessed Value	\$23,883

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	104.59 to 282.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.73 to 179.89
95% Mean C.I	115.58 to 230.58
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	4.70
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.20
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.02

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	9	100	130.43
2013	11		130.43
2012	9		123.37
2011	7	0	123

2015 Commission Summary for Grant County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	5	Median	109.75
Total Sales Price	\$308,000	Mean	134.41
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$308,000	Wgt. Mean	144.87
Total Assessed Value	\$446,196	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$24,177
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$61,600	Avg. Assessed Value	\$89,239

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	23.86 to 244.96
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.67
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	24.61

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	5	100	109.75
2013	7		114.50
2012	6		110.28
2011	1	0	98

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Grant 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	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	Does not meet 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 Grant County

There were no major changes in the Residential properties.

I will continue to review as needed.

There were a few sales but mostly because the seller no longer lives here and had the opportunity to sell the property.

I will start the 6-year review and physical inspection cycle again in 2018 for tax year 2019.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Grant County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:													
	Assessor, part time clerk and contracted appraiser.													
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%;"><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>Includes all Hyannis, villages, and rural residential</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Includes all Hyannis, villages, and rural residential						
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>													
1	Includes all Hyannis, villages, and rural residential													
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.													
	Primarily the cost approach and utilizing sales to establish depreciation. The sales comparison approach is not used since there are so few sales.													
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?													
	Depreciation is based on the market.													
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?													
	Not applicable.													
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?													
	Valued by square foot method.													
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?													
	Not applicable.													
8.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<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	2012	2012	2011	2012
<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	2012	2012	2011	2012										
	Lot values were reviewed in 2011 but were not changed.													

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Grant County

County Overview

The Grant County is prime ranch land; the grass vegetation makes it ideally suited to livestock grazing. The county has a total population of approximately 629 people (2012 census). Attempts were made at farming but, because the land was not conducive to farming and with the depression of the 1930's many people left. Those that remained bought up the land and many large ranches were established.

There are three towns in Grant County; Ashby (unincorporated), Whitman (unincorporated) and Hyannis. In the beginning, for a short period of time, Whitman was considered the county seat before it was re-located to Hyannis. Hyannis is most likely considered a minimum convenience center for employment and retail goods and services considering its distance from larger more populated areas. The residential market here seems to be flat to somewhat declining with a longer marketing time and fewer buyers.

Description of Analysis

Few residential sales ever occur during any two year study period; this reduces the reliability of any statistical analysis. The statistical sampling of 7 sales is not sufficient to have reliability in the measurement of the residential class.

In 2011-2012 Lore Appraisal Company assisted the County in completing the first six-year physical inspection and review cycle and appraising the residential class. Establishing meaningful depreciation tables was difficult. Since statistical analysis was not reliable with limited data the focus turned to ensuring equalization within the residential class.

Sales Qualification

Grant County has a consistent procedure that is utilized for residential sales verification. A Department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrated a sufficient explanation in the county notes section to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. 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. Grant County is scheduled for review again in 2015. The past review confirmed that the county was actively reviewing properties as required by statute with the assistance of Lore Appraisal. The assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently. It is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

2014 Residential Correlation Section for Grant County

The sales file consists of only 7 qualified residential sales and is considerate to be inadequate for statistical measurement and unrepresentative of the residential class as a whole.

Level of Value

Based on the consideration of all available information and the known assessment practices, the level of value is determined to be 100% of market value for the residential class of property in Grant County.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Grant County

There have been no major changes within the commercial class of real property for assessment year 2015.

I will continue to review the Commercial properties as needed.

There were a couple of sales but the owners were just wanting to get rid of the property as they no longer live here or had no use and had the opportunity to sell.

I will start the 6-year review and physical inspection cycle again in 2017 for tax year 2018.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Grant County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:													
	Assessor, part time clerk and contracted appraiser.													
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in 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 commercial in the county.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	All commercial in the county.						
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>													
1	All commercial in the county.													
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.													
	Primarily the cost approach, there are few commercial sales in Grant County to utilize the sales comparison approach or enough income and expense information to make the income approach meaningful.													
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.													
	Would work with a contracted appraiser.													
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?													
	Due to limited sales, the depreciation tables used are a blend of local market and TerraScan tables. When there is a sale that can be used, an RCN is developed for the sale. By subtracting the land value from the sale price a bldg residual is calculated and divided by the RCN to determine remaining value or remaining life of bldg. This percentage good is then compared with TerraScan and adjusted accordingly.													
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?													
	Not applicable.													
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.													
	Square foot method.													
7.	<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>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<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	2011
<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	2011										

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Grant County

County Overview

Hyannis is a small town of approximately 182 people and the other two villages (Ashby and Whitman) have considerably smaller populations. All of the towns were built along the railroad line for providing services and the shipment of cattle. The communities of Grant County serve the basic needs of the area ranchers. Hyannis may be considered as a minimum convenience center for employment and retail goods and services considering its distance from larger more populated areas. But, a feasible commercial market does not exist.

Description of Analysis

The commercial properties comprise 36 different occupancy codes; for the most part 1 property per code. Only two occupancy codes have ten or more parcels, that being office buildings (344) and storage warehouses (406). There have been only five commercial sales during this study period.

In 2011 Lore Appraisal Company assisted the County in completing the first six-year physical inspection and review cycle and appraising the commercial class. There is not enough commercial sales data available to do an adequate statistical analysis. Therefore, attention was turned to ensuring equalization among the commercial properties based on like characteristics, age and condition.

Sales Qualification

The Department completed a sales verification review for all counties. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. 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. Grant County is scheduled for review again in 2015. The past review confirmed that the county was actively reviewing properties as required by statute with the assistance of Lore Appraisal. The assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

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

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Grant County

Level of Value

Based on the consideration of all available information and assessment practices, 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 Grant County

For 2015 I implemented GIS acres and added several soil codes that had been missing for several years. I now feel that my ag records are one step closer to being as accurate as possible.

I will continue to do pickup work and review properties as needed.

Grant County increased the Irrigated acres by 20% to \$1500/acre and Grass acres by 19% to \$315/acre.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Grant County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, part time clerk and contracted appraiser.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	0	Grant County is very homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grassland, with a small amount of irrigated acres.
		<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>
	Summer of 2014. Continue this every 6 years.	
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Not applicable.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Rural/Farm Residential – Less than 40 acres are classified as small acreages and or small farm sites – also known as a “non-working farm”. To the average consumer the “profits gained” are not considered actual income and are to be determined by the Internal Revenue Service and/or a qualified tax expert. Recreational land has not been identified as of yet in the market.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	No. Location and distance from Hyannis. The home sites, known as outlots, around Hyannis are \$3000 for the first acre, and \$500 up to ten acres, over ten acres \$250 up to twenty acres. It then becomes priced as agland. Ashby and Whitman (both unincorporated) are \$1000 for the first acre then \$500 up to ten acres and \$250 up to twenty acres.	
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	Not applicable.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:	
	No	

Grant County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Sheridan	1	n/a	1,690	1,625	1,500	1,495	1,480	1,470	1,440	1,556
Cherry	1	n/a	2,300	2,300	2,298	2,087	2,067	2,092	2,100	2,135
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Garden	1	n/a	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,963

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Grant	1	n/a	n/a							
Sheridan	1	n/a	635	605	575	565	535	525	520	573
Cherry	1	n/a	725	725	700	700	700	700	700	705
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a							
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	725	n/a	725	725	725	725
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a							
Garden	1	n/a	795	795	775	775	770	750	750	785

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	315	315	315	315
Sheridan	1	n/a	430	430	420	410	410	335	300	334
Cherry	1	n/a	590	560	540	499	445	295	295	324
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	320	320	310	310	310
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	330	330	n/a	330	330	330	330
Arthur	1	n/a	n/a	315	n/a	315	315	315	315	315
Garden	1	n/a	397	300	342	318	335	298	291	295

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

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Grant County

County Overview

Grant County is located in the center of the Nebraska Sand Hills; in this region the Valentine series soils are the most common. Grant County is included in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District; there are moratoriums and the NRD has indicated intentions of monitoring the wells. There are only a minimal amount of acres under irrigation due to the instability of the soils. In the Sand Hills the pivots are utilized to provide a supplemental feed source; which has been helpful in the mitigation of the effects of the drought and additional grazing land. The county consists of large ranches, and the economy of the area relies heavily on the grass and the production of livestock.

The Sand Hills is very homogeneous and the comparable area around the county is quite extensive. Counties immediately adjoining Grant County would be Cherry County to the north, Hooker County to the east, McPherson within a mile to the southeast, Arthur to the south, Garden to the west and Sheridan County to the northwest. The land use makeup of Grant County is approximately 98% grass, less than 1% irrigated and no dry land.

Description of Analysis

For 2015, most grassland values increased in the Sand Hills within an approximate range of 18-25%, and the irrigated values moved upward by approximately 42%. Analysis of the grassland values indicated most assessment levels to be within the acceptable range and values were relatively similar across county lines. However, for the subclass of irrigated land, historical changes in assessed values do not appear to have increased parallel to the general market, based on sales analysis and economic indicators. Grant and Hooker counties are not equalized with surrounding Sand Hill Counties as a comparability analysis shows an approximate 40% difference for 2015.

Other sources of market information were analyzed from the *University of Nebraska Lincoln* publications, *Nebraska Farm Real Estate Market Developments 2013-2014* (new publication not be available until June of 2015) and *Cornhusker Economics*, both written by Jim Jansen and Roger Wilson. These resources indicate the trends and general patterns in the market by district. Most of the Sand Hill Region is considered to be in the Nebraska Agricultural Statistics District – North. These publications discuss the market holding steady for land that supports the cow-calf industry. The high cattle prices and the effects of the federal disaster relief Nebraska livestock growers got last year for forage losses caused by drought in 2012-14. In the North district the average reported value of Nebraska farmland for gravity irrigated cropland is reported at \$4215, for center pivot irrigated cropland it is reported as \$4985.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Grant County

Depending upon the type of land, the spread between the high grade and low grade land can be quite substantial in relation to the average value. This spread indicates that the underlying quality of land becomes an important factor in the market when considering how much value to place on a parcel. In the North district the average reported value per acre for different types of land and grades are:

Gravity Irrigated Cropland:	
Average	4,215
High Grade	5,250
Low Grade	3,075
Center Pivot Irrigated Cropland:	
Average	4,985
High Grade	7,230
Low Grade	4,635

A market analysis of all counties within the Sand Hill Region indicates irrigated land to be typically selling between \$2900-3200 per acre. For the last few years most of the Sand Hill counties have taken measures to recognize market trends in the irrigated land values. Grant County falls behind in this effort. Last year there was an 18% difference in inter-county equalization. This year that spread has increased significantly to 40%.

	<u>Grant County</u>	<u>Average of Other Sand Hill Counties</u>	<u>Equalization between Grant and other Sand Hill counties</u>
2013 value	1000	1000	most all counties were at this value
2014 value	1250	1475	18% difference in 2014 values
percent change 2013 to 2014	25% chg	47.5% chg	
2015 value	1500	2100	40% difference in 2015 values
percent change 2014 to 2015	20% chg	42% chg	

Since there are so few sales, and they are scattered among the Sand Hill Region, most of the assessors in this area have made a joint effort to establish a value that would not only recognize market indicators but, would also be at an acceptable level of value. For 2015 that value is \$2100 per acre.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Grant County

There is wide disparity in valuations across county lines for the irrigated subclass, despite the common market and economic indicators for the Sand Hills Region, assessment practices are not in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. Although there is insufficient evidence with which to establish a point estimate for irrigated land in Grant County, all available information suggests that an increase of 40% to irrigated land would be necessary to achieve equalized agricultural land values.

Sales Qualification

The Department completed a sales verification review. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. Measurement was done utilizing all available information. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Based on a correlation of all available information, the level of value for the grass land is acceptable but the level of value for the irrigated land is not. Since the tax burden is essentially shifted to the grass sectors as a result of the assessor's failure to increase irrigated land, assessment practices are not in compliance with accepted mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

To be consistent with all other Sand Hill counties, 69% will be used as the level of value for Grant County based on the subclass Majority Land Use > 95% Grass.

38 Grant
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 : 7
Total Sales Price : 123,100
Total Adj. Sales Price : 123,100
Total Assessed Value : 167,180
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 17,586
Avg. Assessed Value : 23,883

MEDIAN : 167
WGT. MEAN : 136
MEAN : 173
COD : 25.52
PRD : 127.44

COV : 35.92
STD : 62.17
Avg. Abs. Dev : 42.59
MAX Sales Ratio : 282.94
MIN Sales Ratio : 104.59

95% Median C.I. : 104.59 to 282.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.73 to 179.89
95% Mean C.I. : 115.58 to 230.58

Printed:3/13/2015 2:32:28PM

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	2	159.91	159.91	141.74	34.10	112.82	105.38	214.44	N/A	14,250	20,198
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	282.94	282.94	282.94	00.00	100.00	282.94	282.94	N/A	1,600	4,527
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	1	174.02	174.02	174.02	00.00	100.00	174.02	174.02	N/A	10,000	17,402
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	163.33	144.93	126.33	12.71	114.72	104.59	166.86	N/A	27,667	34,952
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	2	159.91	159.91	141.74	34.10	112.82	105.38	214.44	N/A	14,250	20,198
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	5	166.86	178.35	134.02	22.66	133.08	104.59	282.94	N/A	18,920	25,357
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	282.94	282.94	282.94	00.00	100.00	282.94	282.94	N/A	1,600	4,527
<u>ALL</u>	7	166.86	173.08	135.81	25.52	127.44	104.59	282.94	104.59 to 282.94	17,586	23,883

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	7	166.86	173.08	135.81	25.52	127.44	104.59	282.94	104.59 to 282.94	17,586	23,883
<u>ALL</u>	7	166.86	173.08	135.81	25.52	127.44	104.59	282.94	104.59 to 282.94	17,586	23,883

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	6	165.10	166.19	129.23	25.29	128.60	104.59	282.94	104.59 to 282.94	18,933	24,468
06											
07	1	214.44	214.44	214.44	00.00	100.00	214.44	214.44	N/A	9,500	20,372
<u>ALL</u>	7	166.86	173.08	135.81	25.52	127.44	104.59	282.94	104.59 to 282.94	17,586	23,883

38 Grant
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 : 7
Total Sales Price : 123,100
Total Adj. Sales Price : 123,100
Total Assessed Value : 167,180
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 17,586
Avg. Assessed Value : 23,883

MEDIAN : 167
WGT. MEAN : 136
MEAN : 173
COD : 25.52
PRD : 127.44

COV : 35.92
STD : 62.17
Avg. Abs. Dev : 42.59
MAX Sales Ratio : 282.94
MIN Sales Ratio : 104.59

95% Median C.I. : 104.59 to 282.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.73 to 179.89
95% Mean C.I. : 115.58 to 230.58

Printed:3/13/2015 2:32:28PM

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	1	282.94	282.94	282.94	00.00	100.00	282.94	282.94	N/A	1,600	4,527	
Less Than 15,000	4	194.23	209.57	188.29	20.15	111.30	166.86	282.94	N/A	8,275	15,581	
Less Than 30,000	6	170.44	184.50	159.41	23.06	115.74	105.38	282.94	105.38 to 282.94	11,683	18,625	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	6	165.10	154.77	133.87	18.38	115.61	104.59	214.44	104.59 to 214.44	20,250	27,109	
Greater Than 14,999	3	105.38	124.43	116.51	18.58	106.80	104.59	163.33	N/A	30,000	34,952	
Greater Than 29,999	1	104.59	104.59	104.59	00.00	100.00	104.59	104.59	N/A	53,000	55,433	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	282.94	282.94	282.94	00.00	100.00	282.94	282.94	N/A	1,600	4,527	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	174.02	185.11	183.48	09.11	100.89	166.86	214.44	N/A	10,500	19,266	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	134.36	134.36	133.58	21.57	100.58	105.38	163.33	N/A	18,500	24,712	
30,000 TO 59,999	1	104.59	104.59	104.59	00.00	100.00	104.59	104.59	N/A	53,000	55,433	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	7	166.86	173.08	135.81	25.52	127.44	104.59	282.94	104.59 to 282.94	17,586	23,883	

38 Grant
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 : 5
Total Sales Price : 308,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 308,000
Total Assessed Value : 446,196
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 61,600
Avg. Assessed Value : 89,239

MEDIAN : 110
WGT. MEAN : 145
MEAN : 134
COD : 62.79
PRD : 92.78

COV : 66.25
STD : 89.05
Avg. Abs. Dev : 68.91
MAX Sales Ratio : 239.61
MIN Sales Ratio : 32.62

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 23.86 to 244.96

Printed:3/13/2015 2:32:29PM

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>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	213.81	213.81	213.81	00.00	100.00	213.81	213.81	N/A	60,000	128,285
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	1	32.62	32.62	32.62	00.00	100.00	32.62	32.62	N/A	30,000	9,786
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14											
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	157.94	157.94	188.92	51.72	83.60	76.26	239.61	N/A	43,500	82,179
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13											
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	4	145.04	140.58	170.86	59.39	82.28	32.62	239.61	N/A	44,250	75,607
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	213.81	213.81	213.81	00.00	100.00	213.81	213.81	N/A	60,000	128,285
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239
04											
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239

38 Grant
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 : 5
Total Sales Price : 308,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 308,000
Total Assessed Value : 446,196
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 61,600
Avg. Assessed Value : 89,239

MEDIAN : 110
WGT. MEAN : 145
MEAN : 134
COD : 62.79
PRD : 92.78

COV : 66.25
STD : 89.05
Avg. Abs. Dev : 68.91
MAX Sales Ratio : 239.61
MIN Sales Ratio : 32.62

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 23.86 to 244.96

Printed:3/13/2015 2:32:29PM

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												
Less Than 30,000	1	76.26	76.26	76.26	00.00	100.00	76.26	76.26	N/A	27,000	20,591	
Ranges Excl. Low \$												
Greater Than 4,999	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239	
Greater Than 14,999	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239	
Greater Than 29,999	4	161.78	148.95	151.46	48.07	98.34	32.62	239.61	N/A	70,250	106,401	
Incremental Ranges												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	1	76.26	76.26	76.26	00.00	100.00	76.26	76.26	N/A	27,000	20,591	
30,000 TO 59,999	1	32.62	32.62	32.62	00.00	100.00	32.62	32.62	N/A	30,000	9,786	
60,000 TO 99,999	2	226.71	226.71	226.71	05.69	100.00	213.81	239.61	N/A	60,000	136,026	
100,000 TO 149,999	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
ALL	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
304	1	213.81	213.81	213.81	00.00	100.00	213.81	213.81	N/A	60,000	128,285	
554	1	76.26	76.26	76.26	00.00	100.00	76.26	76.26	N/A	27,000	20,591	
594	2	174.68	174.68	150.54	37.17	116.04	109.75	239.61	N/A	95,500	143,767	
ALL	5	109.75	134.41	144.87	62.79	92.78	32.62	239.61	N/A	61,600	89,239	

38 Grant
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 : 27
Total Sales Price : 25,088,235
Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,086,735
Total Assessed Value : 16,552,400
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 929,138
Avg. Assessed Value : 613,052

MEDIAN : 68
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 68
COD : 19.84
PRD : 103.24

COV : 23.91
STD : 16.29
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.50
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.15
MIN Sales Ratio : 37.27

95% Median C.I. : 56.79 to 83.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
95% Mean C.I. : 61.67 to 74.57

Printed:3/13/2015 2:32:30PM

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	4	82.79	84.70	75.24	13.50	112.57	73.07	100.15	N/A	1,712,507	1,288,510
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	3	78.68	66.84	71.55	20.04	93.42	37.27	84.58	N/A	459,560	328,804
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	64.91	69.34	67.78	14.03	102.30	57.89	85.21	N/A	917,425	621,834
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	77.98	77.98	74.84	07.19	104.20	72.37	83.59	N/A	1,635,850	1,224,219
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	85.28	85.28	85.28	01.20	100.00	84.26	86.30	N/A	232,450	198,223
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	65.84	65.84	65.84	00.00	100.00	65.84	65.84	N/A	300,000	197,521
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	3	62.74	63.64	64.09	04.21	99.30	60.13	68.04	N/A	301,240	193,056
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	45.67	45.67	45.67	00.00	100.00	45.67	45.67	N/A	932,500	425,842
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	2	56.38	56.38	56.05	00.73	100.59	55.97	56.79	N/A	1,382,000	774,584
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	5	53.42	53.23	51.45	12.92	103.46	42.92	70.00	N/A	1,010,234	519,789
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1	84.00	84.00	84.00	00.00	100.00	84.00	84.00	N/A	417,761	350,919
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	10	76.33	74.73	72.91	17.44	102.50	37.27	100.15	57.89 to 91.61	1,098,098	800,595
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	8	70.21	72.91	73.31	12.42	99.45	60.13	86.30	60.13 to 86.30	617,540	452,697
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	9	53.61	56.51	53.73	16.28	105.17	42.92	84.00	45.67 to 70.00	1,018,381	547,208
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	8	75.53	70.56	71.60	16.48	98.55	37.27	85.21	37.27 to 85.21	925,332	662,544
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	7	65.84	67.57	61.47	15.20	109.92	45.67	86.30	45.67 to 86.30	371,589	228,425
<u>ALL</u>	27	68.04	68.12	65.98	19.84	103.24	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 83.59	929,138	613,052

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	27	68.04	68.12	65.98	19.84	103.24	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 83.59	929,138	613,052
<u>ALL</u>	27	68.04	68.12	65.98	19.84	103.24	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 83.59	929,138	613,052

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
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	1	42.92	42.92	42.92	00.00	100.00	42.92	42.92	N/A	750,000	321,915
0	1	42.92	42.92	42.92	00.00	100.00	42.92	42.92	N/A	750,000	321,915
<u>Grass</u>											
County	22	69.02	69.73	66.27	19.72	105.22	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 84.26	897,038	594,438
0	22	69.02	69.73	66.27	19.72	105.22	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 84.26	897,038	594,438
<u>ALL</u>	27	68.04	68.12	65.98	19.84	103.24	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 83.59	929,138	613,052

38 Grant
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 : 27
 Total Sales Price : 25,088,235
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,086,735
 Total Assessed Value : 16,552,400
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 929,138
 Avg. Assessed Value : 613,052

MEDIAN : 68
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 68
 COD : 19.84
 PRD : 103.24

COV : 23.91
 STD : 16.29
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.50
 MAX Sales Ratio : 100.15
 MIN Sales Ratio : 37.27

95% Median C.I. : 56.79 to 83.59
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 61.67 to 74.57

Printed:3/13/2015 2:32:30PM

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	2	44.56	44.56	44.16	03.68	100.91	42.92	46.19	N/A	602,914	266,227
0	2	44.56	44.56	44.16	03.68	100.91	42.92	46.19	N/A	602,914	266,227
_____Grass_____											
County	25	70.00	70.00	67.08	18.03	104.35	37.27	100.15	60.13 to 83.59	955,236	640,798
0	25	70.00	70.00	67.08	18.03	104.35	37.27	100.15	60.13 to 83.59	955,236	640,798
_____ALL_____	27	68.04	68.12	65.98	19.84	103.24	37.27	100.15	56.79 to 83.59	929,138	613,052

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 1,695	Value : 176,431,036	Growth 753,189	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	28	65,891	8	19,043	46	72,202	82	157,136	
02. Res Improve Land	134	212,672	14	70,622	78	120,375	226	403,669	
03. Res Improvements	142	4,050,858	14	1,246,423	80	2,428,383	236	7,725,664	
04. Res Total	170	4,329,421	22	1,336,088	126	2,620,960	318	8,286,469	58,268
% of Res Total	53.46	52.25	6.92	16.12	39.62	31.63	18.76	4.70	7.74
05. Com UnImp Land	4	9,903	1	3,350	9	9,396	14	22,649	
06. Com Improve Land	27	25,665	7	35,651	22	22,305	56	83,621	
07. Com Improvements	27	1,086,973	7	272,334	27	347,688	61	1,706,995	
08. Com Total	31	1,122,541	8	311,335	36	379,389	75	1,813,265	0
% of Com Total	41.33	61.91	10.67	17.17	48.00	20.92	4.42	1.03	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	170	4,329,421	22	1,336,088	126	2,620,960	318	8,286,469	58,268
% of Res & Rec Total	53.46	52.25	6.92	16.12	39.62	31.63	18.76	4.70	7.74
Com & Ind Total	31	1,122,541	8	311,335	36	379,389	75	1,813,265	0
% of Com & Ind Total	41.33	61.91	10.67	17.17	48.00	20.92	4.42	1.03	0.00
17. Taxable Total	201	5,451,962	30	1,647,423	162	3,000,349	393	10,099,734	58,268
% of Taxable Total	51.15	53.98	7.63	16.31	41.22	29.71	23.19	5.72	7.74

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	0	0	0	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	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	40	1	86	127

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	12,042	1,163	136,852,559	1,164	136,864,601
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	13,498	132	18,827,228	133	18,840,726
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	38,639	137	10,587,336	138	10,625,975
30. Ag Total							1,302	166,331,302

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	1	3.00	390	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	38,639	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	104	160.00	320,000	104	160.00	320,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	106	154.00	8,092,439	106	154.00	8,092,439	694,921
34. HomeSite Total				106	160.00	8,412,439	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	3	4.00	2,390	3	4.00	2,390	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	115	433.42	76,016	116	436.42	76,406	
37. FarmSite Improvements	127	0.00	2,494,897	128	0.00	2,533,536	0
38. FarmSite Total				131	440.42	2,612,332	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,482.05	0	0	1,482.05	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				237	2,082.47	11,024,771	694,921

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	11	653.53	72,573	11	653.53	72,573

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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	652.03	33.52%	978,045	33.52%	1,500.00
51. 4A1	148.26	7.62%	222,390	7.62%	1,500.00
52. 4A	1,144.71	58.85%	1,717,069	58.85%	1,500.00
53. Total	1,945.00	100.00%	2,917,504	100.00%	1,500.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	22,151.58	4.58%	6,977,776	4.58%	315.00
69. 4G1	38,893.99	8.05%	12,251,644	8.05%	315.00
70. 4G	422,408.62	87.37%	133,058,844	87.37%	315.00
71. Total	483,454.19	100.00%	152,288,264	100.00%	315.00
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	1,945.00	0.39%	2,917,504	1.88%	1,500.00
Dry Total					
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total					
Grass Total	483,454.19	97.57%	152,288,264	98.06%	315.00
72. Waste	10,074.33	2.03%	100,763	0.06%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	950.43	0.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	495,473.52	100.00%	155,306,531	100.00%	313.45

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,945.00	2,917,504	1,945.00	2,917,504
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	79.84	25,150	483,374.35	152,263,114	483,454.19	152,288,264
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	10,074.33	100,763	10,074.33	100,763
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	380.16	0	0.00	0	570.27	0	950.43	0
82. Total	0.00	0	79.84	25,150	495,393.68	155,281,381	495,473.52	155,306,531

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	1,945.00	0.39%	2,917,504	1.88%	1,500.00
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	483,454.19	97.57%	152,288,264	98.06%	315.00
Waste	10,074.33	2.03%	100,763	0.06%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	950.43	0.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	495,473.52	100.00%	155,306,531	100.00%	313.45

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

38 Grant

	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	8,205,071	8,286,469	81,398	0.99%	58,268	0.28%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	8,016,571	8,412,439	395,868	4.94%	694,921	-3.73%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	16,221,642	16,698,908	477,266	2.94%	753,189	-1.70%
05. Commercial	1,813,265	1,813,265	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	2,338,270	2,612,332	274,062	11.72%	0	11.72%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	4,151,535	4,425,597	274,062	6.60%	0	6.60%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	20,373,177	21,124,505	751,328	3.69%	753,189	-0.01%
11. Irrigated	3,352,750	2,917,504	-435,246	-12.98%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	126,199,216	152,288,264	26,089,048	20.67%		
14. Wasteland	93,753	100,763	7,010	7.48%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	129,645,719	155,306,531	25,660,812	19.79%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	150,018,896	176,431,036	26,412,140	17.61%	753,189	17.10%

GRANT COUNTY

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT 2015-2017

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15th of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31st of each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31st of each year.

REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

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 uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.”

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY IN GRANT COUNTY:

Per the 2014 County Abstract, Grant County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/Acre Count		Total Value		Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential	318		8,246,207		567,630	7,678,577
Commercial	75		1,813,265		106,270	1,706,995
Agricultural	1302		140,076,301		130,032,629	10,043,672
Game & Parks	11		57,945		57,945	0
Exempt	128		0		0	0
Total	1834		150,193,718		130,764,474	19,429,244

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Grant County, with the majority consisting of grassland (irrigated acres consisting of .54% of the total ag acres), primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Additional information is contained in the 2014 Reports & Opinions, issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2014.

CURRENT RESOURCES:

Staff/Budget/Training

The assessor and 1 part-time employee are the only employees in the office. The county hires an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the Assessor’s budget for FY 2014-2015 is \$24,450.00

I was elected to the office as Clerk Ex Officio in the General Election in November 2010. I plan on attending as many workshops and district meetings as the current budget will allow. I believe that knowledge is the key to maintaining this position.

Record Maintenance

In December of 2009 I, Christee Haney, appeared before the Nebraska State Records Board because I applied for a Grant to help defer the cost of a new mapping system for Grant County. I was awarded the grant and just recently the files were installed on our computer. I think this GIS software is going to be a very helpful tool for Grant County.

New property record cards were created for improved parcels of real property in 1999. Each property record card is filed by current owner alphabetically. If the owner has more than one

parcel they are all filed in one folder. I hope to change that so that the property record cards are filed by Township, Range and then by Section.

Grant County is using the TerraScan software. The GIS system is complete. As of February 2014 Grant County is teamed up with GIS Workshop and are now online to view the assessor's records.

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES:

Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor is also Register of Deeds which is helpful in the discovery process. Data collection will be done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA, NRCS, and NRD offices are also useful in tracking land usage.

Data Collection

Grant County has implemented procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

Ratio Studies

Ratio studies are a vital tool in considering any assessment actions taken. Ratio studies are conducted internally to determine whether any assessment action is required in a specific area or class of property. Consultation with the field liaison is an important part of this process.

Value Approaches

Market Approach: The market approach is used on all classes of property to obtain market value for each parcel of property. Sales comparison is the most common way to determine market value on similar properties.

Cost Approach: The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value.

Income Approach: The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties.

Land valuation studies will be performed on an annual basis. A three-year study of arms-length transactions will be used to obtain current market values.

Reconciliation of Value

A reconciliation of the three approaches to value (if applicable) will be completed and documented.

Sales Ratio Review

Upon completion of assessment actions, sales ratio studies will be reviewed to determine if the statistics are within the guidelines set forth by the state.

Notices

Change of value notices are sent to the property owner of record no later than June 1st of each year as required by §77-1315. Prior to notices being sent, an article will be published in the paper to keep taxpayers informed of the process.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2014:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Ratio (Level of Value)</u>
Residential	n/a
Commercial	n/a
Agricultural	69.33

For more information regarding statistical measures, see 2014 Reports & Opinions issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2014.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

Residential: A physical inspection of all residential properties in the towns of Ashby, Hyannis, Whitman was completed by the end of 2012. Value changes were reflected on the 2013 County Abstract. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed as needed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: A Commercial Re-appraisal was completed in the fall of 2011 and implemented into the TerraScan program in January 2012. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed as needed. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessment.

Agricultural: A physical inspection of all ag-improved parcels within the county was completed in 2013 by the assessor, office staff and/or contract appraiser to be implemented into the TerraScan program in January 2014. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group was conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, needed to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from

the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Pickup work will be conducted as needed to all ag improvements.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Maintenance or pickup work will continue on commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2017:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: Commercial properties will be on the 6-year review cycle for this year. Changes will be made accordingly. The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Maintenance or pickup work will continue on commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical

measures. Grant County has also implemented GIS and it is in use. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review

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

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 18 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 35 applications annually.

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report: Compile tax loss due to Homestead Exemptions and report no later than November 30 annually.

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 125 personal property schedules annually.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Assessed Value Update: Compile all real property valuation information and report no later than March 19 annually.

Board of Educational Land and Funds Report: Compile all valuations for properties owned by BELF and report no later than March 31 annually.

Change of Value Notification: Notification sent no later than June 1 annually to all property owners whose value changed from the prior year.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Personal Property: Compile all personal property valuation information and file by June 15 annually.

Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list corrections documents for County Board of Equalization review.

Taxable Value and Growth Certifications: Total assessments for real, personal and centrally assessed properties are reported to all political subdivisions no later than August 20 annually.

School District Taxable Value Report: Final report of taxable value for all school districts located within the county to be filed no later than August 25 annually.

Annual Inventory Statement: Report of all personal property in possession of this office to be filed with the County Board by August 31 annually.

Average Residential Value Report: Certification of the average residential value for Homestead Exemption purposes filed no later than September 1 annually.

Three Year Plan of Assessment: Assessment plan detailing the next three years that must be prepared by June 15 annually, submitted to the County Board of Equalization no later than July 31 annually and filed no later than October 31 annually.

Tax List: Certification of the tax list, for both real and personal property within the county, which must be delivered to the treasurer no later than November 22 annually.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: Final report of the total taxes to be collected by the county to be filed no later than December 1 annually.

Government Owned Properties Report: Report of taxable and exempt state or governmental political subdivision owned properties to be filed for the year 2004 and every 4th year thereafter no later than December 1 annually.

Conclusion:

The Grant County Assessor makes every effort to comply with state statute and the rules and regulations of the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue in an attempt to assure uniform and proportionate assessments of all properties in Grant County.

Considering the broad range of duties this office is responsible for, it is anticipated that there will always be a need for the services of a contract appraiser. However, it is a goal of this office to ultimately complete the majority of the appraisal work by the assessor and office staff as budgetary concerns exist.

Lastly, it is a high priority that this office makes every effort to promote good public relations and keep the public apprised of the assessment practices required by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Christee L. Haney
Grant County Assessor

2015 Assessment Survey for Grant County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 80,400 - This budget includes all (5) offices managed by the Ex Officio Assessor.
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	None in the Ex Officio budget but, \$ 20,250 is a line item in the General Fund.
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	Not applicable.
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$ 2,000.00
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 1,000.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	Not applicable, budget includes all functions of being ex officio.
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	Not applicable, budget includes all functions of being ex officio.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters
2.	CAMA software:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Not applicable.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, www.grant.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop.
8.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	The village of Hyannis is the only area not zoned.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Susan Lore - DBA Lore Appraisal Company
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Yes – Lore Appraisal Company
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Experience and knowledge of mass appraisal (listing and appraisal work), Marshall Swift costing, computer skills, and customer relation skills.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Yes
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	The contracted appraiser will review all work with the assessor and may have some recommendations however, the final decisions on estimates of value will be made by the assessor.

2015 Certification for Grant 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 Grant 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

