

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 Johnson County

Residential Real Property - Current

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Number of Sales | 76 | Median | 98.49 |
| Total Sales Price | \$4,089,600 | Mean | 112.21 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$4,089,600 | Wgt. Mean | 99.23 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$4,058,160 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$54,441 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$53,811 | Avg. Assessed Value | \$53,397 |

Confidence Interval - Current

| | |
|---|------------------|
| 95% Median C.I | 94.69 to 107.16 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 93.24 to 105.22 |
| 95% Mean C.I | 103.02 to 121.40 |
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the | 12.27 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period | 4.29 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period | 4.21 |

Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|------|-----------------|-----|--------|
| 2014 | 69 | 99 | 98.61 |
| 2013 | 72 | 97 | 96.77 |
| 2012 | 51 | 97 | 97.48 |
| 2011 | 60 | 97 | 97 |

2015 Commission Summary for Johnson County

Commercial Real Property - Current

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Number of Sales | 11 | Median | 109.24 |
| Total Sales Price | \$431,100 | Mean | 108.37 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$431,100 | Wgt. Mean | 96.40 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$415,560 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$75,147 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$39,191 | Avg. Assessed Value | \$37,778 |

Confidence Interval - Current

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| 95% Median C.I | 68.73 to 129.65 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 86.87 to 105.92 |
| 95% Mean C.I | 84.79 to 131.95 |
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 3.07 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period | 3.43 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period | 1.72 |

Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|------|-----------------|-----|--------|
| 2014 | 10 | 100 | 96.35 |
| 2013 | 7 | | 93.80 |
| 2012 | 9 | | 84.72 |
| 2011 | 8 | | 75 |

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Johnson 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 | 98 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |
| Commercial Real Property | 100 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |
| Agricultural Land | 70 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2015 Residential Assessment Actions for Johnson County

The County conducted a sales analysis in the residential class. This analysis revealed the need to decrease the values of older homes in both Tecumseh and Cook. In Cook this was a decrease of 15% and for Tecumseh the decrease was 25%.

The county reviewed and physically inspected all residential and agricultural improvements in Township six. New photos were taken and the condition of the properties were reviewed and updated. The county completed a depreciation study along with a new lot study for this location. New costs were implemented and the condition of the improvements was reviewed.

The county also completed permit and pickup work for the residential class.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Johnson County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|----|---|----|------------------------------|----|---|----|---|
| | Assessor and Deputy along with contracted lister | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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="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;">01</td> <td>Tecumseh-County seat and main trade center of the County. Stable population, K-12 school (Johnson County Central). State correctional facility just north of town.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Cook-situated between Tecumseh and Syracuse, limited retail, elementary and middle school</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Elk Creek-Located in southern part of County just off highway 50. Limited Commercial, Bank, Bar, Elevator, Service Station. No school</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">06</td> <td>Sterling-K-12 School, limited retail, on highway 41</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">09</td> <td>Rural residential- Acreagest</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Crab Orchard- Post Office only no retail limited number of commercial parcels</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">AG</td> <td>For the rural parcels the counties inspection cycle covers multiple years. Township 4 was inspected in 2010 Township 5 was inspected in 2009 Township 6 is currently being inspected with a majority of the parcels being inspected in 2014.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <u>Valuation Grouping</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> | 01 | Tecumseh-County seat and main trade center of the County. Stable population, K-12 school (Johnson County Central). State correctional facility just north of town. | 02 | Cook-situated between Tecumseh and Syracuse, limited retail, elementary and middle school | 04 | Elk Creek-Located in southern part of County just off highway 50. Limited Commercial, Bank, Bar, Elevator, Service Station. No school | 06 | Sterling-K-12 School, limited retail, on highway 41 | 09 | Rural residential- Acreagest | 15 | Crab Orchard- Post Office only no retail limited number of commercial parcels | AG | For the rural parcels the counties inspection cycle covers multiple years. Township 4 was inspected in 2010 Township 5 was inspected in 2009 Township 6 is currently being inspected with a majority of the parcels being inspected in 2014. |
| <u>Valuation Grouping</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01 | Tecumseh-County seat and main trade center of the County. Stable population, K-12 school (Johnson County Central). State correctional facility just north of town. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 02 | Cook-situated between Tecumseh and Syracuse, limited retail, elementary and middle school | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 04 | Elk Creek-Located in southern part of County just off highway 50. Limited Commercial, Bank, Bar, Elevator, Service Station. No school | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 06 | Sterling-K-12 School, limited retail, on highway 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 09 | Rural residential- Acreagest | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Crab Orchard- Post Office only no retail limited number of commercial parcels | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AG | For the rural parcels the counties inspection cycle covers multiple years. Township 4 was inspected in 2010 Township 5 was inspected in 2009 Township 6 is currently being inspected with a majority of the parcels being inspected in 2014. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The county relies on RCNLD (replacement cost new less depreciation) the county determines an economic depreciation based on sales for each valuation group. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 tables from the CAMA system are used with an economic adjustment for each valuation group. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Yes, they are developed at the same time as each valuation group is reviewed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The County uses a market based value on a per square foot basis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. | Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The county received one application to combine 39 lots into one parcel. Presently the county is looking at a discounted cash flow analysis on the combined parcels with the limited information that was provided with the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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> |
|----|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | 01 | 2011 | 2011 | 2011 | 2011 |
| | 02 | 2013 | 2013 | 2013 | 2013 |
| | 04 | 2008 | 2008 | 2008 | 2010 |
| | 06 | 2013 | 2013 | 2013 | 2013 |
| | 09 | 2008 | 2008 | 2008 | 2010-2014 |
| | 15 | 2008 | 2008 | 2008 | 2010 |
| | AG | 2008-14 | 2008-14 | 2008-14 | 2009-2014 |

The County maintains that the groupings are tied to amenities available in the communities and the appraisal cycle the county has. Each valuation group is analyzed separately and they tend to have their own unique markets.

The rural ag parcels in Township 6 were updated with Vanguard pricing.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Johnson County

County Overview

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Tecumseh which is centered in the County. Johnson is bordered to the south by Pawnee County with Gage County to the west. Otoe County is directly north with Nemaha to the east. Johnson County has seen a population increase since 2000 of over 700 people. The County has seen both a population and economic impact from the state correctional facility being located just north of Tecumseh.

Description of Analysis

The sales file consists of 76 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with the mean being above the range by twelve points. The quality statistic measurements of the PRD and the COD are both above the recommended range. Eighteen of the qualified sales display a sale price of under 15,000 with an average of just over 9,000 dollars. These low dollar sales impact the qualitative statistics. The valuation groups utilized in the county represent the assessor locations in the county. These groupings are influenced as much by the appraisal and inspection cycle the county uses than overall distinct markets. All valuation groups with a relevant sample of sales have calculated medians within the acceptable range.

Sales Qualification

Johnson County has a consistent procedure for sales verification. In reviewing the non-qualified sales the county has noted in the file the reason for all sale disqualifications. Approximately 57% of the improved residential sales were considered arm-length sales as determined by the county. It has been determined that the County utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median, and it has been confirmed that the assessment practices are acceptable. It is believed that residential property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Johnson County

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the LOV is determined to be 98% of market value for the residential class of property.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Johnson County

The county conducted an analysis of the commercial class, and no adjustments were warranted for the current year.

They completed all permit and pickup work for the class.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Johnson County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|
| | Assessor and deputy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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%;"><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>The entire County is considered as one valuation group.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | <u>Valuation Grouping</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> | 1 | The entire County is considered as one valuation group. | | | | | | |
| <u>Valuation Grouping</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | The entire County is considered as one valuation group. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | RCNLD | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3a. | Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The County relies on comparable properties in similar markets with local adjustments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 uses the tables from CAMA along with economic depreciation based on local market information. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping? | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Yes, There is only one grouping used for the entire County. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Market value based on square foot unit of measurement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. | <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;">2012</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 | 2012 | 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 | 2012 | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | For Johnson County there is not a lot of commercial market activity in the County and what does occur is not an organized or consistent market. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Johnson County

County Overview

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Tecumseh which is centered in the County. Johnson is bordered to the south by Pawnee County with Gage County to the west. Otoe County is directly north with Nemaha to the east. Johnson County has seen a population increase since 2000 of over 700 people. The County has seen both a population and economic impact from the state correctional facility being located just north of Tecumseh.

Description of Analysis

The commercial parcels in Johnson County are represented by 43 different occupancy codes. There have been only 11 qualified sales in the study period with eight different occupancies represented. The sample is not considered adequate for number of sales or representative of the commercial class of properties in the county.

The calculated median is above the statutory range and will not be relied on in the determination of a level of value.

Sales Qualification

The Department completed a sales verification review for all counties in 2014. 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. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and 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 or by subclass.

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 for Johnson County

Johnson continually verifies sales along with updating land use in the agricultural class of property. After a market analysis of the sales and a review of the statistics the county adjusted values within the LCG structure along with adjustments for various soil types in the county. The county utilizes physical inspections along with the GIS system to track changes for land use within the agricultural class. The county has been emphasizing the review of the CRP parcels within the county for the past several years.

The office completed the pickup and permit work for the year.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Johnson County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--|------|
| | Assessor and Deputy | | | | | | |
| 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="text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>The entire county is considered as one market area</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 | The entire county is considered as one market area | 2014 |
| <u>Market Area</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> | <u>Year Land Use Completed</u> | | | | | |
| 1 | The entire county is considered as one market area | 2014 | | | | | |
| 3. | Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas. | | | | | | |
| | The county reviews all ag sales to update land use and analyzes these sales to determine characteristics that impact the market. This review aids in determining if there are differing characteristics in different areas of the county that impact the agricultural market. The county also conducts a thorough sales verification. | | | | | | |
| 4. | Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land. | | | | | | |
| | Present use of the parcel is given the greatest consideration. Recreational land is land that is generally not used for residential, commercial or agricultural uses. WRP is one type of land that is considered as recreational land. The county also conducts sales verification as well as mailing out questionnaires to aid in determining present and intended uses for the property. | | | | | | |
| 5. | Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences? | | | | | | |
| | Yes | | | | | | |
| 6. | If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program. | | | | | | |
| | Presently with few available sales for analysis the county bases the value by placing a factor on the current grassland value. In the counties opinion this represents the market value of the parcel. | | | | | | |
| 7. | Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following: | | | | | | |
| | No | | | | | | |

Johnson County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

| County | Mkt Area | 1A1 | 1A | 2A1 | 2A | 3A1 | 3A | 4A1 | 4A | WEIGHTED AVG IRR |
|-----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| Johnson | 1 | 6,390 | 5,835 | 5,931 | 5,301 | 4,791 | n/a | 3,271 | 2,777 | 5,058 |
| Gage | 1 | 6,743 | 6,796 | 6,150 | 6,164 | 5,301 | 5,315 | 4,899 | 4,876 | 6,125 |
| Gage | 2 | 4,895 | 4,895 | 4,390 | 4,390 | 3,890 | n/a | 3,710 | 3,710 | 4,258 |
| Lancaster | 1 | 6,000 | 5,999 | 5,981 | 5,993 | 4,874 | 4,854 | 2,997 | 2,998 | 5,463 |
| Nemaha | 8300 | 5,600 | 5,400 | 5,100 | 5,000 | 4,900 | 4,800 | 4,000 | 3,900 | 4,980 |
| Otoe | 7000 | 4,900 | 4,900 | 4,500 | 4,300 | 4,200 | n/a | 4,100 | 4,100 | 4,364 |
| Otoe | 8000 | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,500 | 5,500 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 4,200 | 4,200 | 5,203 |
| Pawnee | 1 | 4,400 | 4,400 | n/a | 3,840 | 3,120 | n/a | 2,880 | 2,520 | 3,814 |

| County | Mkt Area | 1D1 | 1D | 2D1 | 2D | 3D1 | 3D | 4D1 | 4D | WEIGHTED AVG DRY |
|-----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| Johnson | 1 | 4,214 | 3,894 | 3,809 | 3,307 | 3,310 | 3,312 | 2,500 | 1,873 | 3,175 |
| Gage | 1 | 4,200 | 4,200 | 3,720 | 3,600 | 3,235 | 3,235 | 2,565 | 2,565 | 3,434 |
| Gage | 2 | 3,530 | 3,530 | 3,410 | 3,410 | 2,620 | n/a | 2,100 | 2,100 | 2,934 |
| Lancaster | 1 | 4,385 | 4,387 | 3,943 | 3,946 | 3,510 | 3,509 | 3,071 | 3,069 | 3,819 |
| Nemaha | 8300 | 4,734 | 4,600 | 4,299 | 4,100 | 3,800 | 3,600 | 2,850 | 2,600 | 3,827 |
| Otoe | 7000 | 4,100 | 4,100 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 3,700 | n/a | 3,500 | 3,100 | 3,781 |
| Otoe | 8000 | 4,600 | 4,600 | 4,350 | 4,200 | 4,150 | 3,900 | 3,500 | 3,000 | 4,108 |
| Pawnee | 1 | 3,700 | 3,700 | 3,275 | 3,200 | 2,600 | 2,540 | 2,400 | 2,100 | 2,951 |

| County | Mkt Area | 1G1 | 1G | 2G1 | 2G | 3G1 | 3G | 4G1 | 4G | WEIGHTED AVG GRASS |
|-----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Johnson | 1 | 1,833 | 2,292 | 1,755 | 1,848 | 1,862 | 1,650 | 1,516 | 1,125 | 1,589 |
| Gage | 1 | 1,401 | 2,037 | 1,680 | 1,992 | 1,617 | 1,342 | 1,437 | 1,003 | 1,484 |
| Gage | 2 | 1,485 | 2,025 | 1,766 | 2,165 | 1,630 | 2,490 | 1,396 | 1,081 | 1,562 |
| Lancaster | 1 | 2,358 | 2,540 | 2,094 | 2,162 | 1,817 | 1,826 | 1,430 | 1,369 | 1,809 |
| Nemaha | 8300 | 1,261 | 1,608 | 1,401 | 1,630 | 2,079 | 1,450 | 1,539 | 1,050 | 1,401 |
| Otoe | 7000 | 1,857 | 1,781 | 1,505 | 1,867 | 1,808 | n/a | 1,301 | 1,077 | 1,536 |
| Otoe | 8000 | 1,728 | 1,955 | 1,718 | 1,994 | 1,853 | 1,747 | 1,648 | 1,212 | 1,703 |
| Pawnee | 1 | 1,872 | 2,076 | 1,429 | 1,890 | 1,608 | 1,564 | 1,707 | 1,437 | 1,667 |

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

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Johnson County

County Overview

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The County is bordered by Pawnee County to the south, Gage to the west, Nemaha to the east with Otoe to the north. Johnson County is comprised of approximately 10% irrigated land, 47% dry crop land and 43% grass/pasture land. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. For 2015 the county continues to utilize one market area for the entire county. The county uses a schedule of values based generally on the LCG structure with some variations by soil type.

Description of Analysis

The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years. 46 qualified agricultural sales were used in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. The calculated median of the sample is rounded to 70. All three of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range providing strong support for each other.

The calculated medians for the majority land use of 80% dry and grass are within the acceptable range. In the comparison table of weighted averages the overall weighted average for grass is in the range when compared to neighboring counties with only Pawnee and Otoe area 8000 coming in higher. All increases for the county mirror the increases in the general area with a similar market.

Sales Qualification

A department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the assessor notes to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales. It has been determined that the county utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and utilizes all information available from the sales file and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for the calculated median, and it has been confirmed that the assessment practices are acceptable. It is believed that agricultural property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Johnson County

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the LOV is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural class of property.

49 Johnson
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 : 76
Total Sales Price : 4,089,600
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,089,600
Total Assessed Value : 4,058,160
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,811
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,397

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 112
COD : 28.00
PRD : 113.08

COV : 36.42
STD : 40.87
Avg. Abs. Dev : 27.58
MAX Sales Ratio : 239.87
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.80

95% Median C.I. : 94.69 to 107.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.24 to 105.22
95% Mean C.I. : 103.02 to 121.40

Printed:3/23/2015 1:34:46PM

| 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>Qtrts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12 | 8 | 88.91 | 102.82 | 90.44 | 26.63 | 113.69 | 75.58 | 177.16 | 75.58 to 177.16 | 46,638 | 42,178 |
| 01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13 | 3 | 87.00 | 121.21 | 168.68 | 40.29 | 71.86 | 85.74 | 190.89 | N/A | 27,500 | 46,387 |
| 01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13 | 11 | 110.05 | 122.30 | 115.56 | 23.84 | 105.83 | 78.00 | 219.85 | 94.25 to 168.10 | 28,318 | 32,725 |
| 01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13 | 11 | 90.35 | 90.78 | 86.20 | 26.50 | 105.31 | 40.80 | 186.20 | 47.25 to 110.60 | 70,818 | 61,042 |
| 01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13 | 12 | 95.86 | 116.45 | 99.56 | 34.21 | 116.96 | 71.15 | 239.87 | 80.60 to 122.83 | 47,083 | 46,878 |
| 01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14 | 2 | 138.27 | 138.27 | 102.61 | 31.07 | 134.75 | 95.31 | 181.23 | N/A | 176,500 | 181,105 |
| 01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14 | 13 | 104.67 | 115.89 | 101.34 | 22.52 | 114.36 | 70.97 | 175.66 | 93.94 to 161.40 | 65,915 | 66,798 |
| 01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14 | 16 | 97.58 | 113.59 | 98.49 | 24.32 | 115.33 | 80.80 | 194.29 | 91.14 to 154.00 | 48,038 | 47,314 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13 | 33 | 96.63 | 106.97 | 97.54 | 28.35 | 109.67 | 40.80 | 219.85 | 85.74 to 110.05 | 46,852 | 45,698 |
| 01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14 | 43 | 99.13 | 116.23 | 100.26 | 27.88 | 115.93 | 70.97 | 239.87 | 95.29 to 108.53 | 59,151 | 59,306 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13 | 37 | 97.03 | 110.94 | 99.72 | 30.83 | 111.25 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 90.35 to 107.33 | 46,973 | 46,841 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 76 | 98.49 | 112.21 | 99.23 | 28.00 | 113.08 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 94.69 to 107.16 | 53,811 | 53,397 |

| VALUATION GROUPING | | | | | | | | | | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|---------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 01 | 30 | 97.58 | 112.20 | 97.19 | 29.98 | 115.44 | 47.25 | 229.23 | 93.94 to 110.60 | 46,713 | 45,401 |
| 02 | 12 | 97.66 | 113.14 | 102.93 | 30.14 | 109.92 | 78.00 | 177.16 | 81.65 to 159.26 | 38,083 | 39,201 |
| 04 | 1 | 122.83 | 122.83 | 122.83 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 122.83 | 122.83 | N/A | 23,000 | 28,250 |
| 06 | 15 | 99.13 | 108.55 | 101.15 | 18.52 | 107.32 | 80.18 | 239.87 | 91.14 to 108.53 | 32,340 | 32,711 |
| 09 | 18 | 98.49 | 114.06 | 99.05 | 31.82 | 115.15 | 40.80 | 219.85 | 81.62 to 130.46 | 95,728 | 94,822 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 76 | 98.49 | 112.21 | 99.23 | 28.00 | 113.08 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 94.69 to 107.16 | 53,811 | 53,397 |

| PROPERTY TYPE * | | | | | | | | | | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 01 | 73 | 98.77 | 113.67 | 99.40 | 27.88 | 114.36 | 47.25 | 239.87 | 95.29 to 107.16 | 55,508 | 55,176 |
| 06 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 07 | 3 | 80.60 | 76.64 | 80.88 | 28.01 | 94.76 | 40.80 | 108.53 | N/A | 12,500 | 10,110 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 76 | 98.49 | 112.21 | 99.23 | 28.00 | 113.08 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 94.69 to 107.16 | 53,811 | 53,397 |

49 Johnson
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 : 76
Total Sales Price : 4,089,600
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,089,600
Total Assessed Value : 4,058,160
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,811
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,397

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 112
COD : 28.00
PRD : 113.08

COV : 36.42
STD : 40.87
Avg. Abs. Dev : 27.58
MAX Sales Ratio : 239.87
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.80

95% Median C.I. : 94.69 to 107.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.24 to 105.22
95% Mean C.I. : 103.02 to 121.40

Printed:3/23/2015 1:34:46PM

| 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 | 18 | 108.31 | 125.33 | 128.79 | 32.30 | 97.31 | 40.80 | 229.23 | 94.25 to 154.74 | 9,367 | 12,063 | |
| Less Than 30,000 | 37 | 110.05 | 127.36 | 128.98 | 33.38 | 98.74 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 98.04 to 132.95 | 15,689 | 20,236 | |
| ___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greater Than 4,999 | 76 | 98.49 | 112.21 | 99.23 | 28.00 | 113.08 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 94.69 to 107.16 | 53,811 | 53,397 | |
| Greater Than 14,999 | 58 | 97.07 | 108.14 | 97.96 | 25.28 | 110.39 | 47.25 | 239.87 | 93.94 to 101.57 | 67,603 | 66,224 | |
| Greater Than 29,999 | 39 | 95.31 | 97.83 | 94.31 | 17.20 | 103.73 | 47.25 | 190.89 | 81.65 to 99.13 | 89,977 | 84,857 | |
| ___ Incremental Ranges ___ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 TO 4,999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5,000 TO 14,999 | 18 | 108.31 | 125.33 | 128.79 | 32.30 | 97.31 | 40.80 | 229.23 | 94.25 to 154.74 | 9,367 | 12,063 | |
| 15,000 TO 29,999 | 19 | 122.83 | 129.29 | 129.06 | 30.60 | 100.18 | 78.00 | 239.87 | 83.35 to 167.72 | 21,679 | 27,979 | |
| 30,000 TO 59,999 | 13 | 99.13 | 103.81 | 100.99 | 25.26 | 102.79 | 47.25 | 181.23 | 71.15 to 130.46 | 45,000 | 45,448 | |
| 60,000 TO 99,999 | 14 | 93.94 | 99.33 | 98.63 | 15.54 | 100.71 | 75.58 | 190.89 | 81.54 to 102.03 | 72,179 | 71,191 | |
| 100,000 TO 149,999 | 7 | 94.16 | 89.32 | 89.69 | 09.91 | 99.59 | 71.48 | 104.67 | 71.48 to 104.67 | 124,871 | 112,000 | |
| 150,000 TO 249,999 | 4 | 87.98 | 88.71 | 87.94 | 09.12 | 100.88 | 80.11 | 98.77 | N/A | 179,125 | 157,518 | |
| 250,000 TO 499,999 | 1 | 95.31 | 95.31 | 95.31 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 95.31 | 95.31 | N/A | 323,000 | 307,840 | |
| 500,000 TO 999,999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1,000,000 + | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ___ ALL ___ | 76 | 98.49 | 112.21 | 99.23 | 28.00 | 113.08 | 40.80 | 239.87 | 94.69 to 107.16 | 53,811 | 53,397 | |

49 Johnson
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 : 11
Total Sales Price : 431,100
Total Adj. Sales Price : 431,100
Total Assessed Value : 415,560
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 39,191
Avg. Assessed Value : 37,778

MEDIAN : 109
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 108
COD : 22.42
PRD : 112.42

COV : 32.39
STD : 35.10
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.49
MAX Sales Ratio : 191.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 63.04

95% Median C.I. : 68.73 to 129.65
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.87 to 105.92
95% Mean C.I. : 84.79 to 131.95

Printed:3/23/2015 1:34:49PM

| 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-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 1 | 113.00 | 113.00 | 113.00 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 113.00 | 113.00 | N/A | 1,000 | 1,130 |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12 | 1 | 93.18 | 93.18 | 93.18 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 93.18 | 93.18 | N/A | 135,000 | 125,790 |
| 01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12 | 1 | 63.04 | 63.04 | 63.04 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 63.04 | 63.04 | N/A | 2,300 | 1,450 |
| 01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12 | 1 | 81.94 | 81.94 | 81.94 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 81.94 | 81.94 | N/A | 50,000 | 40,970 |
| 01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13 | 1 | 124.33 | 124.33 | 124.33 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 124.33 | 124.33 | N/A | 9,000 | 11,190 |
| 01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13 | 1 | 129.65 | 129.65 | 129.65 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 129.65 | 129.65 | N/A | 20,000 | 25,930 |
| 01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13 | 1 | 109.24 | 109.24 | 109.24 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 109.24 | 109.24 | N/A | 25,000 | 27,310 |
| 01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14 | 1 | 191.25 | 191.25 | 191.25 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 191.25 | 191.25 | N/A | 800 | 1,530 |
| 01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14 | 1 | 117.86 | 117.86 | 117.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 117.86 | 117.86 | N/A | 28,000 | 33,000 |
| 01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14 | 2 | 84.27 | 84.27 | 92.04 | 18.44 | 91.56 | 68.73 | 99.81 | N/A | 80,000 | 73,630 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 | 3 | 93.18 | 89.74 | 92.82 | 17.87 | 96.68 | 63.04 | 113.00 | N/A | 46,100 | 42,790 |
| 01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13 | 3 | 124.33 | 111.97 | 98.85 | 12.79 | 113.27 | 81.94 | 129.65 | N/A | 26,333 | 26,030 |
| 01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14 | 5 | 109.24 | 117.38 | 97.80 | 25.73 | 120.02 | 68.73 | 191.25 | N/A | 42,760 | 41,820 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12 | 3 | 81.94 | 79.39 | 89.81 | 12.27 | 88.40 | 63.04 | 93.18 | N/A | 62,433 | 56,070 |
| 01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13 | 3 | 124.33 | 121.07 | 119.31 | 05.47 | 101.48 | 109.24 | 129.65 | N/A | 18,000 | 21,477 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |

| VALUATION GROUPING | | | | | | | | | | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|---------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | | |
| 01 | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |

| 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 | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |
| 04 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ALL</u> | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |

49 Johnson
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 : 11
Total Sales Price : 431,100
Total Adj. Sales Price : 431,100
Total Assessed Value : 415,560
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 39,191
Avg. Assessed Value : 37,778

MEDIAN : 109
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 108
COD : 22.42
PRD : 112.42

COV : 32.39
STD : 35.10
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.49
MAX Sales Ratio : 191.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 63.04

95% Median C.I. : 68.73 to 129.65
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.87 to 105.92
95% Mean C.I. : 84.79 to 131.95

Printed:3/23/2015 1:34:49PM

SALE PRICE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Low \$ Ranges | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Less Than 5,000 | 3 | 113.00 | 122.43 | 100.24 | 37.82 | 122.14 | 63.04 | 191.25 | N/A | 1,367 | 1,370 |
| Less Than 15,000 | 4 | 118.67 | 122.91 | 116.79 | 29.40 | 105.24 | 63.04 | 191.25 | N/A | 3,275 | 3,825 |
| Less Than 30,000 | 7 | 117.86 | 121.20 | 117.93 | 19.39 | 102.77 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 63.04 to 191.25 | 12,300 | 14,506 |
| Ranges Excl. Low \$ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greater Than 4,999 | 8 | 104.53 | 103.09 | 96.36 | 16.44 | 106.98 | 68.73 | 129.65 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 53,375 | 51,431 |
| Greater Than 14,999 | 7 | 99.81 | 100.06 | 95.76 | 16.16 | 104.49 | 68.73 | 129.65 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 59,714 | 57,180 |
| Greater Than 29,999 | 4 | 87.56 | 85.92 | 91.02 | 12.08 | 94.40 | 68.73 | 99.81 | N/A | 86,250 | 78,505 |
| Incremental Ranges | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 TO 4,999 | 3 | 113.00 | 122.43 | 100.24 | 37.82 | 122.14 | 63.04 | 191.25 | N/A | 1,367 | 1,370 |
| 5,000 TO 14,999 | 1 | 124.33 | 124.33 | 124.33 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 124.33 | 124.33 | N/A | 9,000 | 11,190 |
| 15,000 TO 29,999 | 3 | 117.86 | 118.92 | 118.14 | 05.77 | 100.66 | 109.24 | 129.65 | N/A | 24,333 | 28,747 |
| 30,000 TO 59,999 | 2 | 75.34 | 75.34 | 76.07 | 08.77 | 99.04 | 68.73 | 81.94 | N/A | 45,000 | 34,230 |
| 60,000 TO 99,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100,000 TO 149,999 | 2 | 96.50 | 96.50 | 96.30 | 03.44 | 100.21 | 93.18 | 99.81 | N/A | 127,500 | 122,780 |
| 150,000 TO 249,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 250,000 TO 499,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 500,000 TO 999,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1,000,000 + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ALL | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |

OCCUPANCY CODE

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Blank | 2 | 127.15 | 127.15 | 96.13 | 50.42 | 132.27 | 63.04 | 191.25 | N/A | 1,550 | 1,490 |
| 309 | 1 | 129.65 | 129.65 | 129.65 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 129.65 | 129.65 | N/A | 20,000 | 25,930 |
| 340 | 1 | 68.73 | 68.73 | 68.73 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 68.73 | 68.73 | N/A | 40,000 | 27,490 |
| 344 | 1 | 117.86 | 117.86 | 117.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 117.86 | 117.86 | N/A | 28,000 | 33,000 |
| 352 | 1 | 99.81 | 99.81 | 99.81 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 99.81 | 99.81 | N/A | 120,000 | 119,770 |
| 353 | 2 | 97.47 | 97.47 | 82.55 | 15.93 | 118.07 | 81.94 | 113.00 | N/A | 25,500 | 21,050 |
| 406 | 1 | 124.33 | 124.33 | 124.33 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 124.33 | 124.33 | N/A | 9,000 | 11,190 |
| 442 | 1 | 109.24 | 109.24 | 109.24 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 109.24 | 109.24 | N/A | 25,000 | 27,310 |
| 528 | 1 | 93.18 | 93.18 | 93.18 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 93.18 | 93.18 | N/A | 135,000 | 125,790 |
| ALL | 11 | 109.24 | 108.37 | 96.40 | 22.42 | 112.42 | 63.04 | 191.25 | 68.73 to 129.65 | 39,191 | 37,778 |

49 Johnson
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 : 46
Total Sales Price : 21,137,997
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,606,397
Total Assessed Value : 16,010,926
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 491,443
Avg. Assessed Value : 348,064

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 71
MEAN : 73
COD : 21.42
PRD : 102.43

COV : 26.59
STD : 19.29
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.05
MAX Sales Ratio : 129.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.28

95% Median C.I. : 62.39 to 76.54
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.28 to 78.37
95% Mean C.I. : 66.97 to 78.11

Printed:3/23/2015 1:34:51PM

DATE OF SALE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Qtrts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 5 | 87.46 | 90.34 | 89.69 | 15.31 | 100.72 | 71.17 | 110.44 | N/A | 499,000 | 447,559 |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12 | 4 | 92.28 | 88.41 | 84.52 | 06.87 | 104.60 | 73.70 | 95.40 | N/A | 284,559 | 240,495 |
| 01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12 | 5 | 74.48 | 76.98 | 75.26 | 10.30 | 102.29 | 66.98 | 95.34 | N/A | 347,156 | 261,262 |
| 01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12 | 9 | 57.56 | 67.22 | 64.66 | 23.02 | 103.96 | 46.87 | 94.89 | 54.88 to 89.64 | 515,843 | 333,550 |
| 01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13 | 1 | 129.25 | 129.25 | 129.25 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 129.25 | 129.25 | N/A | 1,085,000 | 1,402,400 |
| 01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13 | 2 | 67.80 | 67.80 | 66.95 | 05.77 | 101.27 | 63.89 | 71.70 | N/A | 214,550 | 143,640 |
| 01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13 | 2 | 47.13 | 47.13 | 46.92 | 10.29 | 100.45 | 42.28 | 51.98 | N/A | 536,945 | 251,935 |
| 01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13 | 7 | 73.68 | 68.20 | 64.52 | 20.87 | 105.70 | 45.22 | 103.27 | 45.22 to 103.27 | 422,864 | 272,824 |
| 01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14 | 5 | 64.28 | 60.76 | 61.67 | 09.47 | 98.52 | 51.98 | 69.36 | N/A | 783,178 | 482,964 |
| 01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14 | 3 | 66.69 | 73.64 | 68.45 | 19.72 | 107.58 | 57.38 | 96.84 | N/A | 331,757 | 227,083 |
| 01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14 | 3 | 61.47 | 60.15 | 61.04 | 03.14 | 98.54 | 56.60 | 62.39 | N/A | 711,867 | 434,500 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 | 14 | 83.26 | 85.02 | 83.93 | 14.28 | 101.30 | 66.98 | 110.44 | 71.17 to 95.40 | 383,501 | 321,863 |
| 01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13 | 14 | 60.73 | 68.86 | 71.85 | 27.32 | 95.84 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 51.98 to 89.64 | 516,470 | 371,107 |
| 01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14 | 18 | 63.34 | 65.70 | 63.05 | 17.70 | 104.20 | 45.22 | 103.27 | 52.57 to 73.68 | 555,934 | 350,519 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12 | 18 | 74.09 | 74.64 | 70.11 | 17.88 | 106.46 | 46.87 | 95.40 | 57.56 to 90.45 | 417,589 | 292,791 |
| 01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13 | 12 | 67.80 | 69.71 | 73.96 | 27.55 | 94.25 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 50.48 to 76.54 | 462,337 | 341,943 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 46 | 70.25 | 72.54 | 70.82 | 21.42 | 102.43 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 62.39 to 76.54 | 491,443 | 348,064 |

AREA (MARKET)

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 46 | 70.25 | 72.54 | 70.82 | 21.42 | 102.43 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 62.39 to 76.54 | 491,443 | 348,064 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 46 | 70.25 | 72.54 | 70.82 | 21.42 | 102.43 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 62.39 to 76.54 | 491,443 | 348,064 |

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>Dry</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 9 | 73.70 | 73.48 | 64.42 | 19.13 | 114.06 | 50.48 | 96.84 | 52.57 to 95.34 | 612,598 | 394,654 |
| 1 | 9 | 73.70 | 73.48 | 64.42 | 19.13 | 114.06 | 50.48 | 96.84 | 52.57 to 95.34 | 612,598 | 394,654 |
| <u>Grass</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 12 | 70.38 | 71.00 | 65.73 | 23.87 | 108.02 | 42.28 | 105.14 | 54.88 to 90.45 | 261,245 | 171,716 |
| 1 | 12 | 70.38 | 71.00 | 65.73 | 23.87 | 108.02 | 42.28 | 105.14 | 54.88 to 90.45 | 261,245 | 171,716 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 46 | 70.25 | 72.54 | 70.82 | 21.42 | 102.43 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 62.39 to 76.54 | 491,443 | 348,064 |

49 Johnson
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 : 46
 Total Sales Price : 21,137,997
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,606,397
 Total Assessed Value : 16,010,926
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 491,443
 Avg. Assessed Value : 348,064

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 21.42
 PRD : 102.43

COV : 26.59
 STD : 19.29
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.05
 MAX Sales Ratio : 129.25
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.28

95% Median C.I. : 62.39 to 76.54
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.28 to 78.37
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.97 to 78.11

Printed:3/23/2015 1:34:51PM

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 |
|---------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| ____Dry____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 15 | 73.68 | 74.99 | 69.55 | 17.17 | 107.82 | 50.48 | 110.44 | 64.28 to 87.46 | 602,969 | 419,382 |
| 1 | 15 | 73.68 | 74.99 | 69.55 | 17.17 | 107.82 | 50.48 | 110.44 | 64.28 to 87.46 | 602,969 | 419,382 |
| ____Grass____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 12 | 70.38 | 71.00 | 65.73 | 23.87 | 108.02 | 42.28 | 105.14 | 54.88 to 90.45 | 261,245 | 171,716 |
| 1 | 12 | 70.38 | 71.00 | 65.73 | 23.87 | 108.02 | 42.28 | 105.14 | 54.88 to 90.45 | 261,245 | 171,716 |
| ____ALL____ | 46 | 70.25 | 72.54 | 70.82 | 21.42 | 102.43 | 42.28 | 129.25 | 62.39 to 76.54 | 491,443 | 348,064 |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30 | Records : 4,376 | Value : 785,616,916 | Growth 3,562,190 | 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 | 177 | 897,320 | 24 | 174,400 | 21 | 362,580 | 222 | 1,434,300 | |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 1,158 | 6,049,320 | 62 | 1,625,060 | 285 | 7,976,790 | 1,505 | 15,651,170 | |
| 03. Res Improvements | 1,188 | 49,139,850 | 62 | 5,028,100 | 296 | 24,925,290 | 1,546 | 79,093,240 | |
| 04. Res Total | 1,365 | 56,086,490 | 86 | 6,827,560 | 317 | 33,264,660 | 1,768 | 96,178,710 | 1,036,990 |
| % of Res Total | 77.21 | 58.31 | 4.86 | 7.10 | 17.93 | 34.59 | 40.40 | 12.24 | 29.11 |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 44 | 453,600 | 2 | 19,320 | 3 | 115,190 | 49 | 588,110 | |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 244 | 1,612,385 | 5 | 144,040 | 12 | 1,117,700 | 261 | 2,874,125 | |
| 07. Com Improvements | 248 | 11,790,300 | 6 | 239,120 | 15 | 6,186,050 | 269 | 18,215,470 | |
| 08. Com Total | 292 | 13,856,285 | 8 | 402,480 | 18 | 7,418,940 | 318 | 21,677,705 | 484,350 |
| % of Com Total | 91.82 | 63.92 | 2.52 | 1.86 | 5.66 | 34.22 | 7.27 | 2.76 | 13.60 |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 3 | 85,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 85,940 | |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 3 | 2,358,650 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2,358,650 | |
| 12. Ind Total | 3 | 2,444,590 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2,444,590 | 0 |
| % of Ind Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.31 | 0.00 |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 49,950 | 1 | 49,950 | |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 131,250 | 1 | 131,250 | |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1,340 | 1 | 1,340 | |
| 16. Rec Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 182,540 | 2 | 182,540 | 0 |
| % of Rec Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| Res & Rec Total | 1,365 | 56,086,490 | 86 | 6,827,560 | 319 | 33,447,200 | 1,770 | 96,361,250 | 1,036,990 |
| % of Res & Rec Total | 77.12 | 58.20 | 4.86 | 7.09 | 18.02 | 34.71 | 40.45 | 12.27 | 29.11 |
| Com & Ind Total | 295 | 16,300,875 | 8 | 402,480 | 18 | 7,418,940 | 321 | 24,122,295 | 484,350 |
| % of Com & Ind Total | 91.90 | 67.58 | 2.49 | 1.67 | 5.61 | 30.76 | 7.34 | 3.07 | 13.60 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 1,660 | 72,387,365 | 94 | 7,230,040 | 337 | 40,866,140 | 2,091 | 120,483,545 | 1,521,340 |
| % of Taxable Total | 79.39 | 60.08 | 4.50 | 6.00 | 16.12 | 33.92 | 47.78 | 15.34 | 42.71 |

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 | 3 | 556,885 | 1,872,785 | 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 | 3 | 556,885 | 1,872,785 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II | | | | 3 | 556,885 | 1,872,785 |

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 | 188 | 71 | 254 | 513 |

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | |
|----------------------|---------|---------|----------|------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 38 | 258,544 | 153 | 29,543,088 | 1,281 | 339,683,695 | 1,472 | 369,485,327 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 2 | 110,084 | 59 | 15,827,735 | 730 | 231,419,340 | 791 | 247,357,159 |
| 29. Ag Improvements | 2 | 1,760 | 59 | 2,981,780 | 752 | 45,307,345 | 813 | 48,290,885 |
| 30. Ag Total | | | | | | | 2,285 | 665,133,371 |

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 | 24 | 25.00 | 337,600 | |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 24 | 0.00 | 2,053,260 | |
| 34. HomeSite Total | | | | | | | |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 2 | 1.16 | 4,060 | 33 | 41.69 | 301,915 | |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 1 | 1.00 | 3,500 | 55 | 126.65 | 555,975 | |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 1 | 0.00 | 1,760 | 57 | 0.00 | 928,520 | |
| 38. FarmSite Total | | | | | | | |
| 39. Road & Ditches | 0 | 0.86 | 0 | 0 | 262.90 | 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 | 2 | 2.00 | 26,600 | 2 | 2.00 | 26,600 | |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 434 | 439.79 | 5,765,244 | 458 | 464.79 | 6,102,844 | |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 429 | 0.00 | 31,837,185 | 453 | 0.00 | 33,890,445 | 987,960 |
| 34. HomeSite Total | | | | 455 | 466.79 | 40,019,889 | |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 243 | 302.44 | 2,316,990 | 278 | 345.29 | 2,622,965 | |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 665 | 1,932.93 | 7,734,045 | 721 | 2,060.58 | 8,293,520 | |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 722 | 0.00 | 13,470,160 | 780 | 0.00 | 14,400,440 | 1,052,890 |
| 38. FarmSite Total | | | | 1,058 | 2,405.87 | 25,316,925 | |
| 39. Road & Ditches | 0 | 4,382.82 | 0 | 0 | 4,646.58 | 0 | |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 41. Total Section VI | | | | 1,513 | 7,519.24 | 65,336,814 | 2,040,850 |

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 | 20 | 2,027.46 | 3,804,434 | 20 | 2,027.46 | 3,804,434 |

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 | 2,978.33 | 13.10% | 19,031,228 | 16.55% | 6,389.90 |
| 46. 1A | 2,952.50 | 12.99% | 17,229,208 | 14.98% | 5,835.46 |
| 47. 2A1 | 1,107.27 | 4.87% | 6,566,718 | 5.71% | 5,930.55 |
| 48. 2A | 6,991.76 | 30.75% | 37,061,620 | 32.23% | 5,300.76 |
| 49. 3A1 | 4,417.56 | 19.43% | 21,164,363 | 18.40% | 4,790.96 |
| 50. 3A | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 51. 4A1 | 4,133.00 | 18.18% | 13,520,008 | 11.76% | 3,271.23 |
| 52. 4A | 156.73 | 0.69% | 435,172 | 0.38% | 2,776.57 |
| 53. Total | 22,737.15 | 100.00% | 115,008,317 | 100.00% | 5,058.17 |
| Dry | | | | | |
| 54. 1D1 | 4,151.17 | 3.97% | 17,492,797 | 5.26% | 4,213.94 |
| 55. 1D | 9,345.21 | 8.93% | 36,386,430 | 10.95% | 3,893.59 |
| 56. 2D1 | 7,002.31 | 6.69% | 26,670,432 | 8.02% | 3,808.80 |
| 57. 2D | 21,130.89 | 20.19% | 69,878,081 | 21.03% | 3,306.92 |
| 58. 3D1 | 30,956.25 | 29.57% | 102,475,236 | 30.83% | 3,310.32 |
| 59. 3D | 0.26 | 0.00% | 861 | 0.00% | 3,311.54 |
| 60. 4D1 | 30,843.70 | 29.46% | 77,102,526 | 23.20% | 2,499.78 |
| 61. 4D | 1,254.00 | 1.20% | 2,348,267 | 0.71% | 1,872.62 |
| 62. Total | 104,683.79 | 100.00% | 332,354,630 | 100.00% | 3,174.84 |
| Grass | | | | | |
| 63. 1G1 | 1,339.63 | 1.40% | 2,454,952 | 1.61% | 1,832.56 |
| 64. 1G | 3,317.93 | 3.46% | 7,606,342 | 4.99% | 2,292.50 |
| 65. 2G1 | 6,590.22 | 6.87% | 11,568,478 | 7.60% | 1,755.40 |
| 66. 2G | 12,520.66 | 13.06% | 23,141,355 | 15.19% | 1,848.25 |
| 67. 3G1 | 10,128.98 | 10.57% | 18,865,137 | 12.39% | 1,862.49 |
| 68. 3G | 4.50 | 0.00% | 7,425 | 0.00% | 1,650.00 |
| 69. 4G1 | 48,464.37 | 50.56% | 73,480,146 | 48.25% | 1,516.17 |
| 70. 4G | 13,496.35 | 14.08% | 15,178,691 | 9.97% | 1,124.65 |
| 71. Total | 95,862.64 | 100.00% | 152,302,526 | 100.00% | 1,588.76 |
| Irrigated Total | | | | | |
| Irrigated Total | 22,737.15 | 10.14% | 115,008,317 | 19.17% | 5,058.17 |
| Dry Total | | | | | |
| Dry Total | 104,683.79 | 46.69% | 332,354,630 | 55.41% | 3,174.84 |
| Grass Total | | | | | |
| Grass Total | 95,862.64 | 42.75% | 152,302,526 | 25.39% | 1,588.76 |
| 72. Waste | 937.37 | 0.42% | 131,084 | 0.02% | 139.84 |
| 73. Other | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 74. Exempt | 426.05 | 0.19% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 224,220.95 | 100.00% | 599,796,557 | 100.00% | 2,675.02 |

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 1.08 | 6,642 | 2,387.03 | 12,780,256 | 20,349.04 | 102,221,419 | 22,737.15 | 115,008,317 |
| 77. Dry Land | 77.57 | 293,510 | 6,533.41 | 21,963,213 | 98,072.81 | 310,097,907 | 104,683.79 | 332,354,630 |
| 78. Grass | 36.55 | 55,292 | 6,177.16 | 9,404,396 | 89,648.93 | 142,842,838 | 95,862.64 | 152,302,526 |
| 79. Waste | 4.37 | 5,624 | 200.82 | 27,468 | 732.18 | 97,992 | 937.37 | 131,084 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 426.05 | 0 | 426.05 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 119.57 | 361,068 | 15,298.42 | 44,175,333 | 208,802.96 | 555,260,156 | 224,220.95 | 599,796,557 |

| | Acres | % of Acres* | Value | % of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Irrigated | 22,737.15 | 10.14% | 115,008,317 | 19.17% | 5,058.17 |
| Dry Land | 104,683.79 | 46.69% | 332,354,630 | 55.41% | 3,174.84 |
| Grass | 95,862.64 | 42.75% | 152,302,526 | 25.39% | 1,588.76 |
| Waste | 937.37 | 0.42% | 131,084 | 0.02% | 139.84 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 426.05 | 0.19% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| Total | 224,220.95 | 100.00% | 599,796,557 | 100.00% | 2,675.02 |

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

49 Johnson

| | 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 | 95,646,620 | 96,178,710 | 532,090 | 0.56% | 1,036,990 | -0.53% |
| 02. Recreational | 188,300 | 182,540 | -5,760 | -3.06% | 0 | -3.06% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 37,060,860 | 40,019,889 | 2,959,029 | 7.98% | 987,960 | 5.32% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 132,895,780 | 136,381,139 | 3,485,359 | 2.62% | 2,024,950 | 1.10% |
| 05. Commercial | 21,201,305 | 21,677,705 | 476,400 | 2.25% | 484,350 | -0.04% |
| 06. Industrial | 2,444,590 | 2,444,590 | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 22,274,320 | 25,316,925 | 3,042,605 | 13.66% | 1,052,890 | 8.93% |
| 08. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 45,920,215 | 49,439,220 | 3,519,005 | 7.66% | 1,537,240 | 4.32% |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 178,815,995 | 185,820,359 | 7,004,364 | 3.92% | 3,562,190 | 1.92% |
| 11. Irrigated | 83,195,310 | 115,008,317 | 31,813,007 | 38.24% | | |
| 12. Dryland | 278,230,980 | 332,354,630 | 54,123,650 | 19.45% | | |
| 13. Grassland | 134,474,280 | 152,302,526 | 17,828,246 | 13.26% | | |
| 14. Wasteland | 2,025,490 | 131,084 | -1,894,406 | -93.53% | | |
| 15. Other Agland | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 497,926,060 | 599,796,557 | 101,870,497 | 20.46% | | |
| 17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed) | 676,742,055 | 785,616,916 | 108,874,861 | 16.09% | 3,562,190 | 15.56% |

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR JOHNSON COUNTY

To: Johnson County Board of Equalization
Nebr. Dept of Revenue--Property Assessment Division

As required by Sec. 77-1311.02, R.R.S. Nebr. as amended by 2007 Neb. Laws LB334, Section 64, the assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment on or before June 15 of each year, which shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter and submit such plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year, and may amend the plan, if necessary, after a budget is approved by the County Board, and submit a copy of the plan and any amendments to the Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year. 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.

The following is a plan of assessment for:

Tax Year 2015:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all rural residential property in Township 6, including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, take new photos of the property, implement new replacement cost, develop new market analysis and depreciation and establish new assessed value for 2015.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, adjusting by class/subclass to arrive at acceptable levels of value.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

BUDGET REQUEST FOR 2014-2015:

Requested budget of \$ ^(appraisal) 2 is needed to:

1. Complete pickup work for new improvements or improvement changes made throughout county in all classes;
2. In September 2014 begin drive-by reviews for rural Township 6 residential and related improvements—It will include new pictures, implement new replacement cost, and re-calculation of physical and economic depreciation. New values will be applied for the 2015 tax roll.
3. Analyze and possible adjustment to class/subclass of residential (includes mobile homes), commercial/industrial, and agricultural improvements.
4. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of agland.

Tax Year 2016:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all rural residential property in Township 5, including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, take new photos of the property, implement new replacement cost, develop new market analysis and depreciation and establish new assessed value for 2016.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

Tax Year 2017:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all rural residential property in Township 4, and urban residential property in the villages of Elk Creek and Crab Orchard including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, take new photos of the property, implement new replacement cost, develop new market analysis and depreciation, and establish new assessed value for 2017.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

Date: June 15, 2014

Karen A. Koehler

Karen A. Koehler
Johnson County Assessor



UPDATE FOLLOWING September 2014 ADOPTION OF 2014-2015 BUDGET

Date: Sept. 9, 2014

Karen A. Koehler

Karen A. Koehler
Johnson County Assessor



2015 Assessment Survey for Johnson County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|----------|--------|----------|------|----------|------|-------------|------|----------------------|-------|--------------|---------------|
| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Other full-time employees: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Other part-time employees: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Number of shared employees: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 118,767 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Vanguard</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15,060</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hardware</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GIS ESRI</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6910</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GIS Website</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hardware Maintenance</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">27,770</td> </tr> </table> | Vanguard | 15,060 | Hardware | 1500 | GIS ESRI | 6910 | GIS Website | 1900 | Hardware Maintenance | 2,400 | Total | 27,770 |
| Vanguard | 15,060 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hardware | 1500 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GIS ESRI | 6910 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GIS Website | 1900 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hardware Maintenance | 2,400 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 27,770 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|------------|--|
| 13. | Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used: |
| | 2,073 |

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Administrative software: |
| | VCS by Vanguard |
| 2. | CAMA software: |
| | Vanguard |
| 3. | Are cadastral maps currently being used? |
| | No |
| 4. | |
| | |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
| | Yes |
| 6. | Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address? |
| | Yes http://johnson.assessor.gisworkshop.com/ |
| 7. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| | Assessor and Deputy |
| 8. | Personal Property software: |
| | Vanguard |

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? |
| | Tecumseh, Cook, Elk Creek, Sterling, Crab Orchard |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
| | January 2006 |

D. Contracted Services

| | |
|-----------|----------------------------|
| 1. | Appraisal Services: |
| | None |
| 2. | GIS Services: |
| | GIS Workshop |
| 3. | |
| | |

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? |
| | NA |
| 3. | What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require? |
| | NA |
| 4. | Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA? |
| | There are currently no contracts. |
| 5. | Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county? |
| | NA |

2015 Certification for Johnson 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 Johnson 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

