

# 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 Sheridan County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	121	Median	97.52
Total Sales Price	\$6,894,151	Mean	111.51
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,881,151	Wgt. Mean	89.74
Total Assessed Value	\$6,175,011	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$85,985
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$56,869	Avg. Assessed Value	\$51,033

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.66 to 108.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	83.70 to 95.77
95% Mean C.I	102.68 to 120.34
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	21.12
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.32
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.16

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	106	95	95.44
2013	99	95	96.53
2012	95	96	96.25
2011	106	96	96

## 2015 Commission Summary for Sheridan County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	18	Median	118.27
Total Sales Price	\$1,331,417	Mean	114.37
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,325,417	Wgt. Mean	76.62
Total Assessed Value	\$1,015,509	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$81,918
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$73,634	Avg. Assessed Value	\$56,417

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.27 to 158.68
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	37.33 to 115.91
95% Mean C.I	89.45 to 139.29
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.91
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.07
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.80

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	15		97.66
2013	15		97.15
2012	9		98.89
2011	20	94	94



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>75</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

For assessment year 2015, the County completed the physical review of all residential property. A 2010 cost index was implemented. However, no market-derived depreciation was developed or implemented.

## 2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Sheridan County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																																	
	The previous Assessor, her staff and Haugen Appraisal.																																	
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																																	
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; 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;">10</td> <td>Gordon: all residential parcels within Gordon and those that could be considered suburban (since there is no separate suburban residential market).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td>Hay Springs: the residential parcels within Hay Springs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">30</td> <td>Rushville: all residential property in and around Rushville.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> <td>Small Towns: all residential property that exists within Antioch, Bingham, Ellsworth, Lakeside and Whiteclay.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td>Rural: all rural residential parcels.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	10	Gordon: all residential parcels within Gordon and those that could be considered suburban (since there is no separate suburban residential market).	20	Hay Springs: the residential parcels within Hay Springs.	30	Rushville: all residential property in and around Rushville.	40	Small Towns: all residential property that exists within Antioch, Bingham, Ellsworth, Lakeside and Whiteclay.	80	Rural: all rural residential parcels.																		
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																																	
10	Gordon: all residential parcels within Gordon and those that could be considered suburban (since there is no separate suburban residential market).																																	
20	Hay Springs: the residential parcels within Hay Springs.																																	
30	Rushville: all residential property in and around Rushville.																																	
40	Small Towns: all residential property that exists within Antioch, Bingham, Ellsworth, Lakeside and Whiteclay.																																	
80	Rural: all rural residential parcels.																																	
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																																	
	The cost approach: replacement cost new minus depreciation.																																	
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																																	
	The County relies upon the tables provided by the CAMA vendor.																																	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																																	
	No.																																	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																																	
	Any sales of residential lots are reviewed and then a value per front foot is calculated.																																	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?</b>																																	
	There are currently no vacant lots being held for sale or resale in the County.																																	
<b>8.</b>	<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="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">30</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</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>	10	2010	2010	2015	2015	20	2010	2010	2012	2012	30	2010	2010	2012	2012	40	2010	2010	2012	2012	80	2010	2010	2012	2014
<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>																														
10	2010	2010	2015	2015																														
20	2010	2010	2012	2012																														
30	2010	2010	2012	2012																														
40	2010	2010	2012	2012																														
80	2010	2010	2012	2014																														



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

---

## **County Overview**

Sheridan County is located in the very northeast segment of Nebraska's Panhandle. Sheridan shares its northern border with the State of South Dakota. Cherry County is Sheridan's eastern neighbor (with a small corner of Grant County bordering the southeast). Garden County is directly to the south, and a small portion of Morrill County touches the southwestern border of Sheridan County. Both Dawes and Box Butte Counties border Sheridan on the west. The U.S. Census Bureau projects a 2013 estimate of County population at 5,259. Major occupations in the County are found in agriculture, education, transportation and services. The city of Gordon has probably the only viable residential market within the County, with about 36% of total residential value. Rushville has 17% of residential value and the village of Hay Springs has approximately 12% of all residential value. Clinton consists of only 1% of value, and the remaining 34% is comprised of all rural residences. It appears that currently, the residential market within the County is static.

## **Description of Analysis**

The residential sample contains 121 sales, with each of the valuation groupings represented (and Gordon—valuation group 10 constitutes 42% of the sample). Only one of the three measures of central tendency are with range, and only three valuation groupings (10) Gordon, (40) small towns and (80) Rural have medians within range. Assessment actions taken by the newly-elected Assessor to address the commercial property class include the implementation of the required six-year physical review of all property within the County and the use of a 2010 cost index—however, without the inclusion of a market-derived depreciation (the contracted appraiser did not complete these for the residential and commercial property classes). Thus, all of the data for the residential property class is updated and correct. However, the use of a five year old depreciation schedule distorts the statistical profile. Although fourteen sales under \$10,000 are skewing the mean and the qualitative statistics, without a market-derived depreciation, the removal of these would not move the other statistical measures within range.

## **Sales Qualification**

The Department conducted a review of each county's sales qualification and verification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as Sheridan County's sales verification documentation. Review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Sheridan Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for the residential property class.

## **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. Sheridan County was selected for review in 2013. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently.

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

---

### **Level of Value**

There is no adequate information available to indicate that Sheridan County has not met an acceptable level of value. Based on the consideration of all information available and the County's assessment practices, the residential level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value.



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

For assessment year 2015, the County completed the six-year review of commercial property within the County. A 2010 cost index was implemented. However, a market-derived depreciation schedule was not developed.

## 2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Sheridan County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																																	
	The previous Assessor and her staff reviewed Hay Springs; Haugen Appraisal for other commercial valuation groupings.																																	
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																																	
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Gordon: all commercial parcels within and around Gordon.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td>Hay Springs: commercial property within and around Hay Springs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">30</td> <td>Rushville: the commercial parcels found within and around Rushville.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> <td>Small Towns: any commercial property in Antioch, Bingham, Ellsworth, Lakeside and Whiteclay.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td>Rural: all commercial parcels not within any of the other valuation groupings.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	10	Gordon: all commercial parcels within and around Gordon.	20	Hay Springs: commercial property within and around Hay Springs.	30	Rushville: the commercial parcels found within and around Rushville.	40	Small Towns: any commercial property in Antioch, Bingham, Ellsworth, Lakeside and Whiteclay.	80	Rural: all commercial parcels not within any of the other valuation groupings.																		
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																																	
10	Gordon: all commercial parcels within and around Gordon.																																	
20	Hay Springs: commercial property within and around Hay Springs.																																	
30	Rushville: the commercial parcels found within and around Rushville.																																	
40	Small Towns: any commercial property in Antioch, Bingham, Ellsworth, Lakeside and Whiteclay.																																	
80	Rural: all commercial parcels not within any of the other valuation groupings.																																	
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>																																	
	Cost approach—replacement cost new minus depreciation.																																	
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>																																	
	There are no unique commercial properties in Sheridan County.																																	
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																																	
	For assessment year 2015, the County is using the suggested depreciation from contracted appraiser Jeff Haugen.																																	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																																	
	No.																																	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>																																	
	Market value would be determined for lot sales and a value per front foot is established.																																	
<b>7.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th style="width: 25%;"><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">30</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2014</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>	10	2010	2010	2014	2014	20	2010	2010	2014	2014	30	2010	2010	2014	2014	40	2010	2010	2014	2014	80	2010	2010	2014	2014
<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>																														
10	2010	2010	2014	2014																														
20	2010	2010	2014	2014																														
30	2010	2010	2014	2014																														
40	2010	2010	2014	2014																														
80	2010	2010	2014	2014																														



# 2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Sheridan County

---

## County Overview

Sheridan County as of a U.S. Census Bureau estimate of 2013 projects a listed population of 5,259. The County seat is the City of Rushville and the other city in the county is Gordon. Villages include Clinton and Hay Springs. Whiteclay is noted as a "census-designated place," and Antioch is listed as a "ghost town." There is very limited commercial activity in Sheridan County and this consists mostly of retail and service entities. The city of Gordon comprises about 39% of the commercial sector; Hay Springs constitutes 8% of commercial property; Rushville contributes 23% of the commercial sector and Clinton is at 1%. Naturally agriculture is a contributing factor to any commercial activity within the County.

## Description of Analysis

Eighteen commercial sales were deemed qualified during the three-year timeframe of the sales study period. Of these, eight are in valuation group 10 (Gordon), six in group 20 (Hay Springs), three in group 30 (Rushville) and one in 40 (Small Towns). Valuation group 20 is over-represented by having 30% of the sales; valuation group 10 is also slightly over-represented, and valuation group 30 is under-represented compared to its place in the commercial base. Commercial valuation group 80 (Rural) is not represented in the sample at all. The sample therefore is not representative of the commercial base. Further, although the commercial data has been updated and corrected for any inconsistencies due to the completion of the six-year physical review, the lack of a current market-derived depreciation and suggested reliance on general percentages of economic depreciation by town (the Appraiser suggested a 50% economic to Gordon, a 65% to Rushville and a 75% to Hay Springs—but the Assessor will use the 2010 CAMA provided depreciation) renders the statistics meaningless for purposes of measurement.

## Sales Qualification

The Department conducted a review of Sheridan County's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as the County's sales verification documentation. A review of the qualification process used by the Sheridan County indicated that no bias exists in the qualification of sales and the Assessor is utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for the commercial property class.

## 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. Sheridan County was selected for review in assessment year 2013. Since taking office, the newly-elected Assessor has worked diligently to ensure that all data collected in the field for the completion of the six-year review has been accurately entered into the CAMA system.

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

---

### **Level of Value**

There is no adequate information available to indicate that Sheridan County has not met an acceptable level of value. Based on the consideration of all information available and the County's assessment practices, the commercial level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value.



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

For the current assessment year the newly-elected Assessor addressed agricultural land by the following: overall, irrigated land was increased by 25%, while dry land was positively moved by 15%; the grass agricultural land class received an increase of 15% (15.48%).

## 2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Sheridan County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>							
	Haugen Appraisal, LLC and a contracted lister.							
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; width: 15%;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>The County has not determined significant differences either by location or market activity that would necessitate the establishment of unique market areas.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2013</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>		The County has not determined significant differences either by location or market activity that would necessitate the establishment of unique market areas.	2013	
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
	The County has not determined significant differences either by location or market activity that would necessitate the establishment of unique market areas.	2013						
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>							
	Sales are plotted and reviewed by the Assessor to determine if there is a unique difference that would justify establishing agricultural market areas.							
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>							
	Rural residential land is identified as not fitting the statutory definition of agricultural/horticultural land, and does not meet the definition of recreational land. Recreational land is marked by primary use for diversion, entertainment and relaxation.							
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>							
	Yes.							
<b>6.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>							
	The Assessor is not aware of any parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.							
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:</b>							
	No.							

## Sheridan County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Sheridan	1	n/a	1,690	1,625	1,500	1,495	1,480	1,470	1,440	<b>1,556</b>
Cherry	1	n/a	2,300	2,300	2,298	2,087	2,067	2,092	2,100	<b>2,135</b>
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	<b>1,500</b>
Garden	1	n/a	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,950	1,950	1,950	<b>1,963</b>
Box Butte	1	n/a	2,445	2,210	2,458	2,490	2,481	2,484	2,488	<b>2,473</b>
Box Butte	2	n/a	2,251	2,254	2,245	2,000	1,979	1,954	1,980	<b>2,204</b>
Box Butte	3	n/a	1,314	1,300	1,260	1,000	978	981	997	<b>1,268</b>
Dawes	4	n/a	1,800	n/a	1,600	1,400	1,400	1,200	1,200	<b>1,544</b>
Dawes	1	n/a	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,150	1,150	1,125	1,125	<b>1,167</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Sheridan	1	n/a	635	605	575	565	535	525	520	<b>573</b>
Cherry	1	n/a	725	725	700	700	700	700	700	<b>705</b>
Grant	1	n/a	<b>n/a</b>							
Garden	1	n/a	795	795	775	775	770	750	750	<b>785</b>
Box Butte	1	n/a	380	n/a	380	380	380	380	380	<b>380</b>
Box Butte	2	n/a	675	675	675	645	645	645	645	<b>670</b>
Box Butte	3	n/a	700	700	700	450	450	450	450	<b>666</b>
Dawes	4	n/a	660	n/a	620	575	575	525	525	<b>620</b>
Dawes	1	n/a	660	620	620	575	575	525	525	<b>602</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Sheridan	1	n/a	430	430	420	410	410	335	300	<b>334</b>
Cherry	1	n/a	590	560	540	499	445	295	295	<b>324</b>
Grant	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	315	315	315	<b>315</b>
Garden	1	n/a	397	300	342	318	335	298	291	<b>295</b>
Box Butte	1	n/a	297	285	292	293	287	286	285	<b>286</b>
Box Butte	2	n/a	386	383	378	377	367	367	365	<b>372</b>
Box Butte	3	n/a	413	405	378	369	384	354	355	<b>369</b>
Dawes	4	n/a	400	375	375	350	350	325	325	<b>340</b>
Dawes	1	n/a	400	375	375	350	350	325	325	<b>335</b>

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

# 2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Sheridan County

---

## County Overview

Sheridan County's total land area is 2,441 square miles. Agricultural land within the County is comprised of approximately 83% grass, 10% dry land and only 5% (rounded) irrigated. The remaining two percent is classified as waste. Its neighboring counties are Dawes and Box Butte to the west; the State of South Dakota borders Sheridan to the north; Cherry County borders Sheridan to the east and a small portion of the extreme southeast corner borders Grant County. Garden County borders Sheridan to the south. Sheridan County has not identified unique agricultural market areas.

Sheridan County lies within the Upper Niobrara White NRD. "In 2003, the UNWNRD established a stay on new high capacity wells to prevent the over-appropriation of the water supply. Working with Nebraska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the UNWNRD strives to maintain a balance of supply and demand for ground and surface water. Currently, DNR has determined that the majority of the UNWNRD is fully appropriated. Fully appropriated means the balance between the water supply and demand has been reached...no new high capacity wells or surface water rights are allowed in this area" (taken from the UNWNRD website).

However, in 2011 the Nebraska Supreme Court reversed the DNR "fully appropriated" designation for the Lower Niobrara River Basin that would permit landowners in that area (below the Dunlap Diversion and above the Spencer hydropower facility) "to add up to 20% of their currently certified irrigated acres once each year from 2011-2014 if they have an existing irrigation well" to service the acres (taken from the UNWNRD newsletter, Fall 2011).

## Description of Analysis

The sample used for assessment year 2015 has a total of thirty-one qualified sales—with comparable sales utilized from adjoining counties to stabilize time and Majority Land Use discrepancies. The resultant sample consisted of thirty-one qualified sales. The Sheridan County Assessor addressed the agricultural land class overall by the following: irrigated land was increased by 25%, dry land received a 15% increase and the grass classification of land received a 15% increase in value. It should be noted that while there are few sales of irrigated land in the County, the sales are consistently showing ratios below range. No non-binding recommendations will be made. It appears that grass land classification indicates medians that are outside of acceptable range at both the 95% and 80% MLU level. However, it must be noted that in the transfer of electronic certified values update, only partial data was transmitted for a number of multiple-parcel grass sales (thus the minimum sales ratio of 4.62).

A review of all of the sales included in the three-year sales study sample indicates that if the Assessor pursues corrections statutorily via the County Board at the next meeting on April 13 (and the Board has agreed to allow the corrections since it is a CAMA error) the overall level of value when measured by the largest land classification (grass) is 75% of market value. A new abstract will also be filed. This measurement is shown in the two tables below (both for 95% MLU and 80% MLU).

## 2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Sheridan County

---

### Majority Land Use

95%	Irrigated		Dry		Grass		CRP	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
County	0	N/A	0	N/A	13	74.92%	0	N/A
Area 1	0	N/A	0	N/A	13	74.92%	0	N/A

80%	Irrigated		Dry		Grass		CRP	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
County	1	55.03%	1	74.40%	19	74.92%	0	N/A
Area 1	4	52.35%	1	74.40%	19	74.92%	0	N/A

### Sales Qualification

The Department completed a sales verification review for Sheridan County in 2013. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. All qualified agricultural sales are available for analysis and review. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

### Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Based on a correlation of all available information the corrected level of value for Majority Land Use grass land is acceptable. Irrigated land, as shown by the average abstract value per LCG could be increased to closer match neighboring counties.

### Level of Value

Based on a correlation of all available information, the level of value for the Sheridan agricultural land class is determined to be at 75% of market value (based entirely on the grass values for both 80% and 95% MLU grass land). There are no non-binding recommendations made to address the overall or Majority Land Use uncorrected statistics.



**81 Sheridan  
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 : 121  
 Total Sales Price : 6,894,151  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,881,151  
 Total Assessed Value : 6,175,011  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,869  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 51,033

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 112  
 COD : 36.84  
 PRD : 124.26

COV : 44.43  
 STD : 49.54  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 35.93  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 275.24  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.11

95% Median C.I. : 91.66 to 108.19  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.70 to 95.77  
 95% Mean C.I. : 102.68 to 120.34

Printed:4/3/2015 11:24:58AM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	6	110.55	123.14	100.20	27.04	122.89	84.42	230.00	84.42 to 230.00	34,583	34,652
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	16	94.34	96.41	82.05	27.17	117.50	54.52	173.54	64.15 to 115.08	52,550	43,117
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	16	88.64	99.06	88.72	26.57	111.65	50.99	200.82	75.86 to 114.00	69,644	61,789
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	24	93.36	98.84	83.98	26.27	117.69	46.22	176.11	79.69 to 108.21	69,875	58,680
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	24	109.68	112.81	93.16	34.39	121.09	43.84	217.56	75.17 to 143.47	57,752	53,802
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	12	147.99	149.97	148.30	28.23	101.13	69.23	243.64	101.72 to 193.39	23,083	34,232
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	8	128.23	144.55	91.03	44.87	158.79	65.88	265.64	65.88 to 265.64	46,250	42,101
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	15	90.06	106.06	83.44	43.47	127.11	35.11	275.24	66.38 to 108.19	67,233	56,097
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	62	94.00	100.62	85.81	27.31	117.26	46.22	230.00	84.42 to 103.86	61,929	53,141
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	59	108.19	122.96	94.70	42.16	129.84	35.11	275.24	92.21 to 134.45	51,552	48,819
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	80	95.13	102.59	87.24	30.43	117.60	43.84	217.56	86.05 to 105.55	62,727	54,726
<u>ALL</u>	121	97.52	111.51	89.74	36.84	124.26	35.11	275.24	91.66 to 108.19	56,869	51,033

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
10	51	92.21	104.98	87.96	36.60	119.35	35.11	230.00	82.63 to 109.31	60,724	53,412
20	27	101.62	127.07	93.37	48.50	136.09	54.14	275.24	75.17 to 153.74	33,578	31,352
30	22	110.96	121.77	94.60	32.38	128.72	62.26	265.64	86.72 to 156.18	34,218	32,369
40	4	99.75	109.80	100.07	19.01	109.72	86.05	153.65	N/A	19,625	19,638
80	17	95.06	93.52	88.64	22.69	105.51	46.22	193.39	65.88 to 112.44	120,374	106,695
<u>ALL</u>	121	97.52	111.51	89.74	36.84	124.26	35.11	275.24	91.66 to 108.19	56,869	51,033

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	121	97.52	111.51	89.74	36.84	124.26	35.11	275.24	91.66 to 108.19	56,869	51,033
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	121	97.52	111.51	89.74	36.84	124.26	35.11	275.24	91.66 to 108.19	56,869	51,033

**81 Sheridan  
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 : 121  
 Total Sales Price : 6,894,151  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,881,151  
 Total Assessed Value : 6,175,011  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,869  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 51,033

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 112  
 COD : 36.84  
 PRD : 124.26

COV : 44.43  
 STD : 49.54  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 35.93  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 275.24  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.11

95% Median C.I. : 91.66 to 108.19  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.70 to 95.77  
 95% Mean C.I. : 102.68 to 120.34

Printed:4/3/2015 11:24:58AM

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	2	186.87	186.87	182.49	16.42	102.40	156.18	217.56	N/A	3,501	6,388	
Less Than 15,000	25	161.68	176.41	174.45	23.48	101.12	101.62	275.24	153.65 to 200.82	8,244	14,382	
Less Than 30,000	45	143.47	148.77	131.69	28.97	112.97	54.14	275.24	117.63 to 161.01	14,420	18,989	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	119	95.63	110.24	89.64	36.62	122.98	35.11	275.24	90.62 to 107.99	57,766	51,783	
Greater Than 14,999	96	90.59	94.61	87.12	26.26	108.60	35.11	202.39	82.70 to 95.57	69,532	60,578	
Greater Than 29,999	76	86.43	89.45	85.37	24.53	104.78	35.11	193.39	79.69 to 92.97	82,003	70,007	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	186.87	186.87	182.49	16.42	102.40	156.18	217.56	N/A	3,501	6,388	
5,000 TO 14,999	23	161.68	175.50	174.17	23.87	100.76	101.62	275.24	143.47 to 200.82	8,657	15,077	
15,000 TO 29,999	20	112.57	114.23	111.78	22.57	102.19	54.14	202.39	95.20 to 122.01	22,140	24,748	
30,000 TO 59,999	23	92.20	100.37	96.91	31.63	103.57	35.11	193.39	78.89 to 106.91	39,587	38,362	
60,000 TO 99,999	29	92.21	92.13	91.54	18.63	100.64	51.57	174.65	84.34 to 105.55	72,509	66,376	
100,000 TO 149,999	17	74.15	71.93	71.99	14.96	99.92	43.84	90.62	59.33 to 82.63	113,735	81,876	
150,000 TO 249,999	6	85.54	79.62	79.75	22.63	99.84	46.22	103.31	46.22 to 103.31	171,667	136,905	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	117.40	117.40	117.40	00.00	100.00	117.40	117.40	N/A	255,500	299,954	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	121	97.52	111.51	89.74	36.84	124.26	35.11	275.24	91.66 to 108.19	56,869	51,033	

**81 Sheridan  
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 : 18  
 Total Sales Price : 1,331,417  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,325,417  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,015,509  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 73,634  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 56,417

MEDIAN : 118  
 WGT. MEAN : 77  
 MEAN : 114  
 COD : 37.36  
 PRD : 149.27

COV : 43.81  
 STD : 50.10  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 44.18  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 184.06  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.83

95% Median C.I. : 67.27 to 158.68  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 37.33 to 115.91  
 95% Mean C.I. : 89.45 to 139.29

Printed:4/3/2015 11:24:59AM

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-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	184.06	184.06	184.06	00.00	100.00	184.06	184.06	N/A	50,000	92,031	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12												
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	94.22	94.22	102.12	66.22	92.26	31.83	156.60	N/A	35,500	36,254	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	82.67	82.67	72.34	35.24	114.28	53.54	111.80	N/A	15,500	11,212	
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12												
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13												
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	4	83.56	77.78	54.06	21.13	143.88	47.49	96.52	N/A	222,908	120,511	
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	67.27	67.27	67.27	00.00	100.00	67.27	67.27	N/A	15,000	10,090	
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	3	159.54	129.03	106.79	24.08	120.83	56.16	171.38	N/A	54,167	57,843	
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14												
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	3	158.68	159.02	157.55	02.44	100.93	153.39	164.99	N/A	32,595	51,352	
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	139.17	139.17	135.83	10.38	102.46	124.73	153.60	N/A	3,250	4,415	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	5	111.80	107.57	123.00	45.67	87.46	31.83	184.06	N/A	30,400	37,393	
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	5	72.75	75.68	54.28	20.92	139.43	47.49	96.52	N/A	181,327	98,426	
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	8	156.14	142.81	126.10	13.35	113.25	56.16	171.38	56.16 to 171.38	33,348	42,052	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	4	82.67	88.44	93.07	55.35	95.03	31.83	156.60	N/A	25,500	23,733	
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	8	83.56	95.68	62.26	41.61	153.68	47.49	171.38	47.49 to 171.38	133,642	83,208	
<u>ALL</u>	18	118.27	114.37	76.62	37.36	149.27	31.83	184.06	67.27 to 158.68	73,634	56,417	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
10	8	156.47	143.62	144.18	16.85	99.61	94.36	184.06	94.36 to 184.06	40,036	57,722	
20	6	113.18	110.41	100.20	40.55	110.19	53.54	158.68	53.54 to 158.68	21,250	21,293	
30	3	56.16	71.82	49.15	38.18	146.12	47.49	111.80	N/A	282,211	138,702	
40	1	31.83	31.83	31.83	00.00	100.00	31.83	31.83	N/A	31,000	9,868	
<u>ALL</u>	18	118.27	114.37	76.62	37.36	149.27	31.83	184.06	67.27 to 158.68	73,634	56,417	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
02	1	156.60	156.60	156.60	00.00	100.00	156.60	156.60	N/A	40,000	62,640	
03	17	111.80	111.89	74.13	39.48	150.94	31.83	184.06	56.16 to 159.54	75,613	56,051	
04												
<u>ALL</u>	18	118.27	114.37	76.62	37.36	149.27	31.83	184.06	67.27 to 158.68	73,634	56,417	

**81 Sheridan**  
**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 : 18  
Total Sales Price : 1,331,417  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,325,417  
Total Assessed Value : 1,015,509  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 73,634  
Avg. Assessed Value : 56,417

MEDIAN : 118  
WGT. MEAN : 77  
MEAN : 114  
COD : 37.36  
PRD : 149.27

COV : 43.81  
STD : 50.10  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 44.18  
MAX Sales Ratio : 184.06  
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.83

95% Median C.I. : 67.27 to 158.68  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 37.33 to 115.91  
95% Mean C.I. : 89.45 to 139.29

Printed:4/3/2015 11:24:59AM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	2	139.17	139.17	135.83	10.38	102.46	124.73	153.60	N/A	3,250	4,415
Less Than 15,000	4	139.17	137.20	129.97	13.61	105.56	111.80	158.68	N/A	5,375	6,986
Less Than 30,000	6	118.27	111.60	85.70	28.81	130.22	53.54	158.68	53.54 to 158.68	9,583	8,213
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	16	104.16	111.27	76.33	44.43	145.77	31.83	184.06	56.16 to 159.54	82,432	62,918
Greater Than 14,999	14	95.44	107.85	75.74	49.62	142.40	31.83	184.06	53.54 to 164.99	93,137	70,540
Greater Than 29,999	12	124.96	115.76	76.21	39.40	151.90	31.83	184.06	56.16 to 164.99	105,660	80,519
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	2	139.17	139.17	135.83	10.38	102.46	124.73	153.60	N/A	3,250	4,415
5,000 TO 14,999	2	135.24	135.24	127.43	17.33	106.13	111.80	158.68	N/A	7,500	9,557
15,000 TO 29,999	2	60.41	60.41	59.26	11.37	101.94	53.54	67.27	N/A	18,000	10,667
30,000 TO 59,999	8	158.07	129.44	132.15	25.65	97.95	31.83	184.06	31.83 to 184.06	38,911	51,420
60,000 TO 99,999	3	96.52	102.02	95.94	33.58	106.34	56.16	153.39	N/A	69,167	66,360
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999	1	47.49	47.49	47.49	00.00	100.00	47.49	47.49	N/A	749,133	355,789
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	18	118.27	114.37	76.62	37.36	149.27	31.83	184.06	67.27 to 158.68	73,634	56,417

<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	140.67	140.67	153.70	11.33	91.52	124.73	156.60	N/A	22,000	33,815
319	1	47.49	47.49	47.49	00.00	100.00	47.49	47.49	N/A	749,133	355,789
353	2	118.80	118.80	145.46	54.93	81.67	53.54	184.06	N/A	35,500	51,638
386	2	113.77	113.77	92.31	50.64	123.25	56.16	171.38	N/A	63,750	58,845
391	3	96.52	91.86	93.16	15.38	98.60	67.27	111.80	N/A	28,333	26,394
406	1	31.83	31.83	31.83	00.00	100.00	31.83	31.83	N/A	31,000	9,868
446	1	72.75	72.75	72.75	00.00	100.00	72.75	72.75	N/A	44,000	32,012
529	1	94.36	94.36	94.36	00.00	100.00	94.36	94.36	N/A	38,500	36,329
<u>ALL</u>	18	118.27	114.37	76.62	37.36	149.27	31.83	184.06	67.27 to 158.68	73,634	56,417

**81 Sheridan**  
**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 : 31  
Total Sales Price : 29,883,225  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 28,622,145  
Total Assessed Value : 13,529,707  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 923,295  
Avg. Assessed Value : 436,442

MEDIAN : 64  
WGT. MEAN : 47  
MEAN : 68  
COD : 30.98  
PRD : 142.99

COV : 43.19  
STD : 29.19  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.97  
MAX Sales Ratio : 130.61  
MIN Sales Ratio : 04.62

95% Median C.I. : 56.75 to 75.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 23.69 to 70.85  
95% Mean C.I. : 56.88 to 78.30

Printed:4/3/2015 11:25:00AM

**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	1	121.92	121.92	121.92	00.00	100.00	121.92	121.92	N/A	48,800	59,495
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	3	56.08	64.03	61.59	15.42	103.96	55.03	80.99	N/A	610,893	376,243
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	65.26	73.89	64.75	21.58	114.12	57.02	121.04	N/A	704,700	456,293
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	6	69.91	65.37	62.48	18.14	104.63	43.57	80.30	43.57 to 80.30	1,230,943	769,143
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	82.31	82.31	82.31	00.00	100.00	82.31	82.31	N/A	643,000	529,274
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2	65.14	65.14	59.75	19.97	109.02	52.13	78.14	N/A	164,000	97,985
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	1	35.00	35.00	35.00	00.00	100.00	35.00	35.00	N/A	1,325,000	463,763
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	2	65.72	65.72	70.34	13.19	93.43	57.05	74.39	N/A	411,000	289,091
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	5	56.75	60.31	32.31	47.79	186.66	04.62	129.73	N/A	198,100	63,998
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	4	69.85	69.27	24.65	48.17	281.01	06.77	130.61	N/A	2,616,180	644,785
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1	61.90	61.90	61.90	00.00	100.00	61.90	61.90	N/A	1,258,290	778,842
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	9	65.26	75.94	64.19	27.61	118.31	55.03	121.92	56.08 to 121.04	600,553	385,521
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	10	69.91	63.98	59.95	21.37	106.72	35.00	82.31	43.57 to 80.30	968,166	580,387
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	12	61.19	64.33	31.44	40.95	204.61	04.62	130.61	49.96 to 75.23	1,127,959	354,680
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	14	65.04	68.13	62.98	19.94	108.18	43.57	121.04	55.03 to 80.30	910,131	573,218
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	6	65.72	63.17	56.68	22.99	111.45	35.00	82.31	35.00 to 82.31	519,667	294,532
<u>ALL</u>	31	64.46	67.59	47.27	30.98	142.99	04.62	130.61	56.75 to 75.23	923,295	436,442

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	31	64.46	67.59	47.27	30.98	142.99	04.62	130.61	56.75 to 75.23	923,295	436,442
<u>ALL</u>	31	64.46	67.59	47.27	30.98	142.99	04.62	130.61	56.75 to 75.23	923,295	436,442

**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>Grass</u>											
County	13	65.26	78.58	66.72	33.40	117.78	49.96	130.61	56.08 to 121.92	384,717	256,675
1	13	65.26	78.58	66.72	33.40	117.78	49.96	130.61	56.08 to 121.92	384,717	256,675
<u>ALL</u>	31	64.46	67.59	47.27	30.98	142.99	04.62	130.61	56.75 to 75.23	923,295	436,442

**81 Sheridan**  
**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 : 31  
 Total Sales Price : 29,883,225  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 28,622,145  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,529,707  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 923,295  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 436,442

MEDIAN : 64  
 WGT. MEAN : 47  
 MEAN : 68  
 COD : 30.98  
 PRD : 142.99

COV : 43.19  
 STD : 29.19  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.97  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 130.61  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 04.62

95% Median C.I. : 56.75 to 75.23  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 23.69 to 70.85  
 95% Mean C.I. : 56.88 to 78.30

Printed:4/3/2015 11:25:00AM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	4	52.35	55.88	61.36	17.69	91.07	43.57	75.23	N/A	998,980	613,011
1	4	52.35	55.88	61.36	17.69	91.07	43.57	75.23	N/A	998,980	613,011
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	1	74.39	74.39	74.39	00.00	100.00	74.39	74.39	N/A	630,000	468,651
1	1	74.39	74.39	74.39	00.00	100.00	74.39	74.39	N/A	630,000	468,651
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	19	65.26	77.56	65.94	29.68	117.62	49.96	130.61	57.02 to 82.31	719,620	474,493
1	19	65.26	77.56	65.94	29.68	117.62	49.96	130.61	57.02 to 82.31	719,620	474,493
<b>_____ALL_____</b>											
	31	64.46	67.59	47.27	30.98	142.99	04.62	130.61	56.75 to 75.23	923,295	436,442



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 8,042</b>	<b>Value : 926,767,071</b>	<b>Growth 23,272</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	286	392,231	26	64,087	64	418,945	376	875,263	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,491	5,870,899	64	113,287,996	223	4,066,854	1,778	123,225,749	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,535	51,793,452	72	4,009,575	269	15,047,237	1,876	70,850,264	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,821	58,056,582	98	117,361,658	333	19,533,036	2,252	194,951,276	23,272
<b>% of Res Total</b>	80.86	29.78	4.35	60.20	14.79	10.02	28.00	21.04	100.00
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	63	275,956	7	27,626	12	45,889	82	349,471	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	297	2,576,767	18	78,173	33	166,135	348	2,821,075	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	302	24,594,371	18	2,224,405	40	6,218,452	360	33,037,228	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	365	27,447,094	25	2,330,204	52	6,430,476	442	36,207,774	0
<b>% of Com Total</b>	82.58	75.80	5.66	6.44	11.76	17.76	5.50	3.91	0.00
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	24	749,800	24	749,800	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	24	749,800	24	749,800	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.30	0.08	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,821	58,056,582	98	117,361,658	357	20,282,836	2,276	195,701,076	23,272
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	80.01	29.67	4.31	59.97	15.69	10.36	28.30	21.12	100.00
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	365	27,447,094	25	2,330,204	52	6,430,476	442	36,207,774	0
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	82.58	75.80	5.66	6.44	11.76	17.76	5.50	3.91	0.00
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,186	85,503,676	123	119,691,862	409	26,713,312	2,718	231,908,850	23,272
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	80.43	36.87	4.53	51.61	15.05	11.52	33.80	25.02	100.00

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	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	240	0	503	743

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	13	155,496	5	419,998	4,315	480,286,412	4,333	480,861,906
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	17,159	3	860	945	155,181,197	949	155,199,216
29. Ag Improvements	1	82,832	1	2,281	989	58,711,986	991	58,797,099
30. Ag Total							5,324	694,858,221

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	1	1.00	12,000	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	77,387	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.00	1,500	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	5,445	1	0.00	2,281	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	2	1.59	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	40	41.00	492,000	40	41.00	492,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	673	705.72	8,458,140	674	706.72	8,470,140	
33. HomeSite Improvements	751	0.00	34,173,000	752	0.00	34,250,387	0
34. HomeSite Total				<b>792</b>	<b>747.72</b>	<b>43,212,527</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	44	84.18	126,270	44	84.18	126,270	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	743	1,376.48	2,064,720	744	1,377.48	2,066,220	
37. FarmSite Improvements	933	0.00	24,538,986	935	0.00	24,546,712	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>979</b>	<b>1,461.66</b>	<b>26,739,202</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	1,609	6,307.16	0	1,611	6,308.75	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	2	15.15	23,075	2	15.15	23,075	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,771</b>	<b>8,533.28</b>	<b>69,974,804</b>	<b>0</b>

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	8	1,296.28	319,934	8	1,296.28	319,934

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	24,338.34	34.75%	41,131,814	37.74%	1,690.00
47. 2A1	732.78	1.05%	1,190,770	1.09%	1,625.00
48. 2A	16,824.44	24.02%	25,236,660	23.16%	1,500.00
49. 3A1	806.47	1.15%	1,205,672	1.11%	1,495.00
50. 3A	8,356.65	11.93%	12,367,848	11.35%	1,480.00
51. 4A1	17,181.59	24.53%	25,256,955	23.18%	1,470.00
52. 4A	1,801.27	2.57%	2,593,825	2.38%	1,440.00
53. Total	70,041.54	100.00%	108,983,544	100.00%	1,555.98
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	36,978.00	24.76%	23,481,065	27.43%	635.00
56. 2D1	2,619.78	1.75%	1,584,971	1.85%	605.00
57. 2D	57,299.21	38.37%	32,947,262	38.48%	575.00
58. 3D1	989.30	0.66%	558,962	0.65%	565.01
59. 3D	5,666.25	3.79%	3,031,448	3.54%	535.00
60. 4D1	39,003.61	26.12%	20,477,058	23.92%	525.00
61. 4D	6,790.38	4.55%	3,530,979	4.12%	520.00
62. Total	149,346.53	100.00%	85,611,745	100.00%	573.24
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	24,047.11	1.88%	10,340,042	2.41%	429.99
65. 2G1	3,832.08	0.30%	1,647,798	0.38%	430.00
66. 2G	70,840.45	5.53%	29,752,877	6.95%	420.00
67. 3G1	4,996.06	0.39%	2,048,388	0.48%	410.00
68. 3G	43,740.61	3.41%	17,933,264	4.19%	409.99
69. 4G1	756,160.85	59.01%	253,314,954	59.13%	335.00
70. 4G	377,800.17	29.48%	113,340,625	26.46%	300.00
71. Total	1,281,417.33	100.00%	428,377,948	100.00%	334.30
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	70,041.54	4.52%	108,983,544	17.44%	1,555.98
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	149,346.53	9.64%	85,611,745	13.70%	573.24
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	1,281,417.33	82.75%	428,377,948	68.55%	334.30
72. Waste	47,754.41	3.08%	1,910,180	0.31%	40.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	1,548,559.81	100.00%	624,883,417	100.00%	403.53

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	70,041.54	108,983,544	70,041.54	108,983,544
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	49.27	27,702	0.00	0	149,297.26	85,584,043	149,346.53	85,611,745
<b>78. Grass</b>	411.82	131,453	1,318.81	420,458	1,279,686.70	427,826,037	1,281,417.33	428,377,948
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	10.00	400	47,744.41	1,909,780	47,754.41	1,910,180
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>461.09</b>	<b>159,155</b>	<b>1,328.81</b>	<b>420,858</b>	<b>1,546,769.91</b>	<b>624,303,404</b>	<b>1,548,559.81</b>	<b>624,883,417</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	70,041.54	4.52%	108,983,544	17.44%	1,555.98
<b>Dry Land</b>	149,346.53	9.64%	85,611,745	13.70%	573.24
<b>Grass</b>	1,281,417.33	82.75%	428,377,948	68.55%	334.30
<b>Waste</b>	47,754.41	3.08%	1,910,180	0.31%	40.00
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,548,559.81</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>624,883,417</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>403.53</b>

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

**81 Sheridan**

	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	78,916,561	194,951,276	116,034,715	147.03%	23,272	147.01%
02. Recreational	678,834	749,800	70,966	10.45%	0	10.45%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	45,529,211	43,212,527	-2,316,684	-5.09%	0	-5.09%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>125,124,606</b>	<b>238,913,603</b>	<b>113,788,997</b>	<b>90.94%</b>	<b>23,272</b>	<b>90.92%</b>
05. Commercial	24,958,202	36,207,774	11,249,572	45.07%	0	45.07%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	28,306,983	26,739,202	-1,567,781	-5.54%	0	-5.54%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>53,265,185</b>	<b>62,946,976</b>	<b>9,681,791</b>	<b>18.18%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18.18%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>178,389,791</b>	<b>301,883,654</b>	<b>123,493,863</b>	<b>69.23%</b>	<b>23,272</b>	<b>69.21%</b>
11. Irrigated	87,135,247	108,983,544	21,848,297	25.07%		
12. Dryland	74,366,573	85,611,745	11,245,172	15.12%		
13. Grassland	370,963,179	428,377,948	57,414,769	15.48%		
14. Wasteland	1,910,660	1,910,180	-480	-0.03%		
15. Other Agland	23,075	0	-23,075	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>534,398,734</b>	<b>624,883,417</b>	<b>90,484,683</b>	<b>16.93%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>712,788,525</b>	<b>926,767,071</b>	<b>213,978,546</b>	<b>30.02%</b>	<b>23,272</b>	<b>30.02%</b>

SHERIDAN COUNTY  
PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
2015, 2016 & 2017

INTRODUCTION

Sheridan County is 69 miles long and 36 miles wide, being the fourth largest county in area in Nebraska. It is located in the Nebraska Panhandle joining South Dakota on the north with only Dawes and Sioux Counties between it and Wyoming to the west and Cherry County to the east.

The north portion of the county is pine covered hills and canyons, perfect for hunting and raising cattle. Cropland, both dry and irrigated, fills the next portion of the county, with the south two-thirds being sandhills complete with lakes of all sizes and sub-irrigated meadowland, perfect for fishing and raising cattle.

The staff of the Sheridan County Assessor's office consists of the Assessor, one Part time Clerk & one full-time Clerk at this moment. Presently there is no deputy assessor. The County does currently have a contract with an appraiser. Jeff Haugen, doing business as Haugen Appraisal Services LLC from Scottsbluff will be doing the rural review as well as the review of the commercial properties and some residential properties in the town of Gordon for the county. Craig Stouffer, a local contractor, is no longer doing the physical inspections of all new construction and remodeling.

PURPOSE

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, and Directive 05-4 of the Property Assessment & Taxation, the Assessor shall submit a Plan of Assessment to the County Board of Commissioners on or before July 31. The Plan of Assessment shall describe the assessment actions the County Assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and the two years thereafter. The Assessor shall amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the County Board. On or before October 31 of each year, the County Assessor shall electronically send a copy of the plan and any amendments to the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation.

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Sheridan County Assessor's Office is to provide accurate, fair and equitable valuations for all property in the county and continually inform the property owners of said values in accordance with current state statutes and regulations.

## PLAN OF ASSESSMENT 2015

### STAFF

The staff of the Sheridan County Assessor's office is set forth in the introduction section of this Plan of Assessment.

### BUDGET

The Assessor will annually determine the funding necessary to operate the office for the coming fiscal year and submit her request to the County Board of Commissioners. Special attention will be given to insure that funding will be sufficient to cover all of the plans of assessment.

The County Assessor received \$100,600 for operating expenses (Fund 605) for the 2012-2013 fiscal year. There is also an Appraisal Update budget (Fund 702) in the amount of \$127,620. The cost of all computer hardware and software is paid from a fund other than those mentioned above. However, this does not apply to GIS as the support is paid out of the Appraisal budget. For 2013-2014 fiscal year the County Assessor requested \$117,136 for operating expenses (Fund 605). The Appraisal Update budget (Fund 702) the requested the amount was \$136,202 for 2013-2014 fiscal year. The computer hardware and software will come out of the budgets mentioned above. For 2013-2014 the County Assessor budget (605) was given the amount requested for operating expenses. And the Appraisal Update Budget (702) was also given the amount requested above to finish the review hopefully. For the 2014-2015 fiscal year the County Assessor requested \$139,380 for operating expenses (Fund 605). For the Appraisal Update budget (Fund 702) the Assessor requested \$143,716. The County Assessor received the requested amount of \$139,380 for operating expenses (Fund 605). For the Appraisal Update (Fund 702) the Assessor received a total of \$146,720.

### CONTINUING EDUCATION/TRAINING

The Assessor or Deputy will attend any courses or workshops necessary to secure the hours of continuing education required for the continuation of the Assessor's Certificate issued by the Property Tax Administrator or State Tax Commissioner.

The Panhandle County Assessors meet monthly to share problems, ideas and frustrations. These sessions provide uniformity of action, solutions to many problems and an invaluable support system.

### COMPUTERS

All computer software is contracted through the MIPS which includes CAMA, personal property and the administrative packages. We have contracted with GIS Workshop to implement GIS for this fiscal year. Currently we will be working to get the rest of the GIS information done as the new soil survey has been done. Once all the GIS information is done we will implement on line access then after a lot of cleanup work is done. At this time the land usage is complete for the entire county and the next step will be started then.

### PERSONAL PROPERTY

In 2014, 783 personal property returns were filed. Of those, 275 are commercial, with a total value of \$5,283,193 and 508 are agricultural, with a value of \$34,876,708. The total value of the personal property as of June 17, 2013, is \$40,159,901. However, an abstract did not have to be ran due to new legislation but the personal schedules will be checked before CTL time.

During 2013, the local newspapers were used for research to locate new businesses or liquidation of existing businesses or agricultural operations. This research, along with other information received during the year and the Returns filed in 2013, will form the basis for the Returns that will be provided to all personal property owners, who must file, in Sheridan County, for 2014. For the past several years, Personal Property Returns have been mailed to all persons filing a Return the previous year. However, for 2010 post cards were mailed as reminders to file the personal property returns as well as requesting that they submit the depreciation worksheets or asset listings when filing their Personal Property schedules for 2010. This will be office policy for 2011 too. However, for 2013 the schedules will be mailed once again due to the rise in gasoline prices. In 2014 postcards were mailed and personal property online was given a trial run. Due to complications with the online portion of personal property, schedules will be mailed in 2015.

All information will be verified by the property owners and income tax depreciation worksheets, also known as tax asset listings, will be reviewed before the Returns are signed and filed. Penalties for late filing will be added when applicable.

Shortly after June 1, a letter will be mailed to those who have not filed. The letter will state that no filing has been received and describe the penalties for late filings.

The County Abstract of Assessment Report for Personal Property no longer will be filed as required by 77-1514 of the Nebraska Statutes as Revised due to Legislative changes.

#### MOBILE HOME COURT REPORTS

In December, 2014, mobile home court reports will be mailed to all persons who own and operate a mobile home court in Sheridan County in accordance with 77-3706 of the Nebraska Statutes as Revised. Upon receipt of the completed reports, the Assessor and her staff will review the reports to determine whether or not the list is the same as the year before. Any additions or removal of mobile homes will be dealt with in an appropriate manner.

#### HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS

There were 249 homestead exemptions processed in 2013, with an exempted value of \$7,729,900 resulting in a tax loss of \$158,913.04. At this time, the roster shows that there are 248 homesteads that were approved and 24 that were disapproved for 2013. For 2014 there were 295 homesteads filed. It is too early to tell the number of approved and disapproved. The homestead roster for 2014 shows that there are 207 approved and 38 disapproved.

Applications for homestead exemptions, along with the appropriate information and income statements, will be mailed to persons receiving an Application last year. The Applications will be reviewed to determine if the property has been sold or the Applicant is now deceased, prior to mailing.

Information about the homestead exemptions will be printed in the local newspapers and sent to the radio station for those who are just becoming eligible for the exemptions and for others who may have applied in previous years. Reminders of the filing deadline will also be published in the newspaper and sent to the radio station. With new legislation introduced in 2007 notices will be mailed to applicants who have not responded by April 1<sup>st</sup> in accordance to Section 77-3508 under subdivision 1.

After the Applications and supporting forms are filed, they will be checked for accuracy,

ownership will be verified, valued will be added, the Applications will be approved or disapproved and the forms mailed to the Department of Revenue as required by statute. Homestead rejection letters will be mailed on or before July 31 in accordance with Section 77-3516 of the Nebraska Revised Statutes.

On or before September 1 of each year, the County Assessor shall determine the average single-family residential value in the county for the current year for purposes of Section 77-3507 to 77-3509, in accordance with Section 77-3506.02 of the Nebraska Revised Statutes. Value will be determined referring to Directive 95-4, issued by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, as the guideline. A certification of the value will be sent to the Department of Revenue on or before September 1, as required by said Section. The total number of residential reports, the total value of all residential properties and the exempt amounts will be included in the certification. Information will be obtained from the most current real estate abstract.

For the tax year 2014, it was determined from the Abstract of Assessment for Real Estate, Form 45, as certified March 19, 2014, that there were 2,683 single-family residential records in Sheridan County; that the total value of these residences is \$107,299,283. The average assessed value of single-family residential property is \$44,107 as of August 20, 2012. The exempt amount is \$40,000 pursuant to Section 77-3501.01(1) and \$50,000 pursuant to 77-3501.01(2).

At this time the average assessed value for single family residential property in Sheridan County for 2012 is 44,107 for the age 65 category and 52,928 for disabled individuals. The exempt amount is \$44,107 pursuant to Section 77-3501.01(1) and \$52,928 pursuant to 77-3501.01(2) from 2012. The average assessed value for single family residential property in Sheridan County for 2013 is 45,128 for the age of 65 category and 54,154 for disable individuals. Total amount of single-family residential value is at 122,928,527 as of August 19, 2013. The average assessed value for single family residential property in Sheridan County for 2014 is 45,982 for the age 65 and older category and 55,178 for disabled individuals and service veterans.

#### PERMISSIVE EXEMPTIONS

There are 47 organizations which filed for permission exemptions on real estate for the tax year 2013. Which total exemptions filed were 63 from these organizations.

In December 2014, Exemption Applications or Affidavits of Use for Continued Tax Exemption will be mailed. Upon receipt of the proper forms, ownership and other pertinent information will be reviewed, recommendations made and the forms filed with the Board of Equalization for their action as required by 7-202.91 of the Nebraska Revised Statutes.

Hearings may be required if questions arise concerning the continuing exempt status on any of the properties.

#### REAL ESTATE

Sheridan County is the fourth largest county in Nebraska by area. The south two-thirds of the county is grass covered sand hills dotted with lakes of various sizes bordered on the north by the Niobrara River. The north end of the county is pine covered canyons. There is a band of primarily dry cropland (151,440.22 acres) with some irrigation (70,081.69 acres) between the two areas. Grassland occupies about 1,279,705.43 acres with 47,006.96 acres of waste.

In the sand hills area, there are mostly trail roads to buildings and, generally, the trail road ends at a ranch home. This makes physical inspections challenging to say the least. In the north end of the county, roads are few, but generally graveled and can be traveled by a car.

According to the 2013 County Abstract of Assessment of Real Property, Form 45, there are 8,196 records in Sheridan County with a total value of \$717,714,024.

#### RESIDENTIAL

In 2014, there are 2,347 residential parcels in Sheridan County, 419 unimproved residential parcels and 1,928 improved residential parcels with a total value of \$81,123,593 as of March 19, 2014. 29% of the parcels in Sheridan County are residential accounting for 11% of the total value.

According to the 2014 Reports and Opinion statistics for the current study period, there were 106 qualified sales of residential property with a median of 95.0, a COD of 25.32 and a PRD of 112.69. The level of value, as determined by the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation, is 95% of actual value. The quality of assessment was determined to meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

The sales roster, sales verification, current year Reports & Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator and whatever other information is available will be used annually to determine whether or not residential values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Preliminary statistical reports indicated that the town of Gordon was at 89% and needed an increase of 3%. The market analysis showed that with the review the median was too low so an increase had to be made. Rushville was at 106.99% and needed a decrease of 25%. Hay Springs was at 84.87 and needed a decrease of 10% and rural residential were at 87.25% and were decreased 5% to be in compliance for the year of 2014. After the market analysis for Rushville, Hay Springs, and the rural residentials, the median was too high after the review so a decrease had to be made.

Special attention will be given to those residential properties selling well above or below the assessed value. Physical inspections will be made as needed as well as neighborhood reviews or inspections. Appropriate adjustments will be made as needed.

Due to new legislation it will become mandatory that over a six year period a portion of the county be reviewed each year. The review of Rural Residential properties and the residences in Hay Springs and Rushville are complete. Mr. Jeff Haugen is finishing up the Gordon review. The data entry of the Gordon information is all that the Assessor and staff have to finish for the Residential review to be complete.

#### COMMERCIAL

In 2014, there are 456 commercial parcels in Sheridan County, 82 unimproved parcels and 374 improved parcels with a total value of \$24,951,850. Commercial properties account for 6% of the total parcels and also 4% of the total value.

According to the Reports & Opinion statistics for the current study period, there were 15 qualified sales with a median of 98.0, a COD of 43.23 and a PRD of 144.83. The level of value, as determined by the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation, is 98% of actual value. The quality of assessment is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. There was no listed median however since there was not enough sales to determine a market for 2014 once again.

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinion of the Property Tax

Administrator and whatever other information is available will be used annually to determine whether or not commercial values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Percentage adjustments will be made, if necessary, to bring commercial values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given.

In addition to the information obtained from the above sources, all of the commercial parcels in Sheridan County were reviewed as by Mr. Haugen. The Assessor and staff need to enter the data and the Commercial review will be complete in 2015.

#### INDUSTRIAL

There are no industrial parcels in Sheridan County.

#### RECREATIONAL

In 2006, there are 23 recreational parcels, valued at \$690.00. For 2009, the recreational class was reviewed and an increase of 1,200 per Lot was implemented due to sales occurring here for 2009. So they are now at a value of 27,600. No adjustments were made for the year of 2010. However in 2010 two agricultural properties were included in the recreational count per the easement for the Wetlands Reserve Program for one owner's property which added some additional value. Presently, there are 24 recreational parcels with a total value of \$678,834 for 2014.

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Report & Opinion and whatever other information is available will be used annually to determine whether or not recreational values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Appropriate adjustments will be made.

#### AGRICULTURAL

In 2014, there are 70,081.69 acres of irrigation with a value of \$87,169,555; 151,440.22 acres of dry crop land with a value of \$72,298,934; 1,279,705.43 acres of grass with a value of \$370,509,354; 47,006.96 acres of waste with a value of \$1,880,282; 1,296.28 acres owned by Game & Parks, subject to an in lieu of tax, valued at \$278,728 and 370.95 acres exempt from taxation. Agricultural land values account for 85% of the total value.

According to the 2014, Reports & Opinion statistics for the current study period, there were 32 qualified sales of unimproved agricultural land with a median of 70%, a COD of 22.49 and a PRD of 115.26 Level of value is at 70% of actual value. To get the level required all classes of irrigated, dry crop and grass were increased for 2014. The subclass of waste was also increased from \$10 to \$40 per acre. Waste remained at \$40 per acre for 2014. The subclasses of dry crop and irrigated were increased some while only two subclasses of grass were increased for 2014. The quality of assessment is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator and whatever other information is available will be used annually to determine whether or not agricultural values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Values of the various classes will be adjusted, as necessary, to bring agricultural values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given. Physical inspections will continue.

The Assessor, staff and appraisal firm will continually monitor sales to determine if there is a need for market areas. At this time we will be reviewing the sales to see if implementing

market areas would be possible for 2015.

Due to new legislation it will become mandatory that over a six year period a portion of the county be reviewed each year. However no directive has been received from the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation to date. In March 2014 Mr. Haugen, the Assessor and staff completed the reappraisal of Rural properties.

Abandoned rural home sites and farm sites were identified and values adjusted in 2004. This will be an ongoing project and physical inspections of these sites will continue as part of the regular inspection process.

#### MINERAL INTEREST

We currently have no taxable mineral interests.

#### TIF

We currently have no parcels affected by tax increment financing.

#### SPECIAL VALUE

Two property owners have filed application for special value, which implements special value in Sheridan County. However, it was determined, from a comprehensive study of Ag sales, that there is insufficient non-agricultural and horticultural influence to establish a value different from the current value per our discussion with our appraiser. However this too, will be an ongoing process each year.

#### EXEMPT PROPERTIES

There are 744 parcels, which are exempt from taxation.

#### CENTRALLY ASSESSED PROPERTY

All centrally assessed values certified by the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation, including railroads and public utilities (both real and personal property) will be balanced before the information is entered into the computer. After the tax lists are run, a copy of the appropriate list will be mailed to each entity.

#### PICK UP WORK

#### (ALL CLASSES)

Pick up work began in August of 2013. Information accumulated during the year in the form of building permits, owner reports and physical inspections by the Assessor and her staff will be used. Recorded contracts between siding and window companies and property owners are also a very good source of information regarding improvements to homes. Depreciation worksheets, supplied for personal property returns, are another source of building information. Several previously unreported buildings have been discovered in this manner. As new construction is discovered, the property record card will be tagged and the property will be added to the list of work to be done. New construction will be physically inspected in order to determine value. All pick up work will be completed before the

statutory deadline for setting values.

Notices will be aired and published reminding property owners of their responsibility to report any improvements to their property in excess of \$2,500.00.

Approximately 149 parcels were inspected for new construction for the 2013 tax year. And, presently there are approximately 70 parcels or more that will be inspected for 2014. This number could change as we are constantly finding properties that need to be added to the list and inspected by our lister. There were 80 parcels total inspected for 2012 for pickup work. However, Mr. Haugen has found several buildings while doing the rural review and 34 more have been added as omitted property for 2012.

## LAND USE

(AG)

Copies of the Agland Inventory Report were sent to all owners of agricultural land in 2001 when it was discovered that some of the agricultural land use shown on the property record cards was incorrect. We had thought that we would repeat the process. However, the Natural Resources District is limiting the number of irrigated acres of each property owner to the number of acres reported to the County Assessor. It is expected that the number of irrigated acres will increase over the next few years as irrigated acres from the Assessor's records are compared to FSA maps and the acres actually irrigated, because property owners forget to report changes to the Assessor.

Agreements for electric service to irrigation pumps and stock wells, which have been recorded in the County Clerk's office, are used to help in the determination of new irrigated land. This is also a tool for discovering new irrigation systems to be added to the personal property returns and pumping equipment for stock wells. Follow up physical inspections are also used.

We did not keep a count of the number of land use changes that were made for 2014. However, for 2015 we hope to start a count of the land use changes that are made. We seem to forget to do this!!

## SOIL SURVEY MAPS

(AG)

Soil survey maps will be updated as land use changes and existing tracts are split. The most recent soil survey maps from the Natural Resources Conservation Service are used in conjunction with the soil survey maps in the office. However with the implementation of GIS the maps will only be used as a reference once the conversion is complete.

## 521 FORMS

(ALL CLASSES)

There were 607 deeds and 521 forms processed in the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2011, and ending September 30, 2013.

A sale verification system was developed and implemented by the Sheridan County Assessor's office effective October 1, 2003, to replace the work done by the state sale reviewer, which position was terminated on September 5, 2003. Verification forms were developed by using a combination of forms obtained from Panhandle County Assessors and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. It is believed that more reliable statistics will be the result of the implementation of this system

521 forms will be reviewed periodically and the Assessor and staff shall use sales verifications and whatever other means they feel necessary to determine whether or not the sale was an arms length transaction and should be used in the determination of value for each of the real estate classifications. The forms and supporting documents will be forwarded to the Property Tax Administration in accordance with the statutes and rules and regulations.

#### SALES ROSTER (ALL CLASSES)

Special attention will be given to the sales roster to ascertain whether or not the correct data has been entered from the 521 forms and the supporting documents. The Assessor will supply any and all information required by statute, directives, rules and regulations to the Property Tax Administration at the times and in the manner prescribed to insure total accuracy in all data use. Accuracy is essential because so much emphasis is placed on market and errors can produce a skewed view of the market. For 2012, after reviewing the sales it has been decided to develop market areas for Sheridan County. This will be done prior to the first of the year 2012. After considerable study no market areas were done for 2013 however, the sales will be looked at again for 2014. No market areas were done for 2014 however, the sales will be looked at again for 2015.

#### PROPERTY RECORD CARDS (ALL CLASSES)

Property record cards and all supporting records, including all computer data, will be updated daily as the deeds are received from the County Clerk's office and change of addresses and other information is obtained.

Property record cards contain all the available information regarding the subject property. A simple map showing the location of the parcel within the section appears on each card. All building information appears on each improved parcel, as does a sketch of the house. Photos of the house and all main buildings are also contained in the file as well as the aerial photo of the farms, which were flown in 1985.

#### CADASTRAL MAPS (ALL CLASSES)

Our cadastral maps were originally drawn in 1974 on Mylar, by an excellent and meticulous draftsman and have been kept up very well over the years.

Cadastral maps will be updated at least monthly. This will include change of ownership, splits of tracts, platting of subdivisions or additions to towns and any other changes required. These may become a thing of the past once GIS is implemented on the computer system.

#### GIS

Currently, we are implementing the new soil survey on our computer system for the new soil survey conversion from the alpha system to the numerical system which has been completed by March 19<sup>th</sup> of 2010. GIS workshop has been hired to implement the new soil

survey conversion and it will be done sequentially by township to avoid total confusion. Hopefully, some of the other layers of the GIS software will be implemented for 2011. All parcel Id's have been entered and we are currently working on land classifications as of this date. Since July 31<sup>st</sup> the land usage has been completed so the next step will be done. GIS Work Shop is now doing the work for the office as there is not enough staff to do this duty too. GIS Work Shop continues to do all of the updating for us at this time.

## PROPERTY VALUATION PROTESTS (ALL CLASSES)

There were approximately 565 protests of value filed in June 2014 and heard by the Board of Equalization. There have been 78 protests of value filed during June of 2013 and heard by the Board of Equalization. Thirty two protests were heard by the Board in 2012. Properties upon which a valuation protest has been filed will be inspected as needed and time allows. These inspections will be made in conjunction with the continuing physical inspection of the County whenever possible. The County Assessor's Recommendation portion of the form will be completed prior to the Board of Equalization hearing whenever possible. The Assessor or Deputy shall attend all hearings since the Revenue's cleanup bill this past legislature.

Decisions of the Board will be implemented or appealed to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission as is appropriate.

The Assessor shall prepare a list of undervalued, overvalued and omitted real estate and submit it to the Board of Equalization as necessary. At this time there are thirty five parcels of omitted property that have been submitted to the County Board. For 2013 only one overvalued property has been submitted to the County Board of Equalization. In 2014 there was only one omitted property, one undervalued property, and five overvalued properties to report to the County Board.

Of the 49 protests filed in 2009, there was not any that appealed to the Tax Equalization & Review Commission. The one appeal in 2008, the Tax Equalization & Review Commission ruled in favor of the County Board's decision. Of the protests for 2010 one has filed an appeal to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. It was heard on July 11, 2011 and we have not received a decision on this as of this date. The decision received back was the order for dismissal with prejudice from the TERC board dated September 20, 2011. Final order on the 2010 appeal was received October 27, 2011. No appeals were filed to TERC for 2011 protests or the 2012 protests. As of this date July 31 2013 there may two that file to TERC from the 2013 protests. As of the August date to appeal to TERC there are two property owners that have appealed to the TERC board for 2013. One filed one appeal and the other has filed four appeals on his properties here in Sheridan County. There were two appeals to TERC for 2013 those were heard June 18, 2014 and June 23, 2014. The appeal that was heard on June 18, 2014 has not had a decision made as of August 5, 2014. The appeal heard on June 23, 2014 has had a decision made and that decision was in favor of the County.

The appeal to the Tax Equalization & Review Commission from the 2006 protest was settled before the hearing occurred.

The County Assessor shall prepare and submit any evidence necessary to defend the property values, which have been appealed to the Tax Equalization & Review Commission by a property owner, as well as attending any hearings.

## PHYSICAL INSPECTIONS

(ALL CLASSES)

The County Assessor and staff will continue the physical inspection of the real estate in Sheridan County as time and the budget allows. Maps will be maintained to show the progress of the inspections. All rural residential properties shall be inspected by the Assessor and staff for the year of 2013 and hopefully will be completed by the end of 2013.

Several unreported houses and other buildings have been discovered in the last several years as a direct result of physical inspections making it apparent that more time needs to be devoted to these inspections to insure that all taxable property is properly assessed.

## TRUST REPORT

(AG)

The Assessor shall submit the report of land held by trustees to the Secretary of State in compliance with 76-1517 Nebraska Statutes as Revised. However, due to legislative changes the Ag trust roster report was done away with in 2011.

## PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

(ALL CLASSES)

The Assessor shall submit a Plan of Assessment to the County Board of Equalization and the Department of Revenue Property assessment Division as provided by statute and rules and regulations.

## NOTICE OF VALUATION CHANGE

(ALL CLASSES)

All property owners will be sent notice of any change, either the increase or decrease of value of all real estate on or before June 1, in compliance with Section 77-1315 of the Revised Statutes of Nebraska. In addition, the Assessor will certify the completion of the real estate assessment roll and publish the certification in the newspaper.

In 2009, listings of appropriate sales information were mailed with the Notices. Property owners were able to see what had caused the changes in value. The number of questions decreased, as well as, fewer protests being filed. This practice will continue as long as results are positive. For 2010 a letter of explanation will be included. For 2010 a letter was drafted and sent with the list of sales in which the number of questions and protests decreased once again. For 2011 there was no letter or a list of sales sent out with the notices due to cost of postage. No letter was sent for 2012 or 2013 due to postage.

The Small Towns residences required no change for 2014. Gordon, Rushville, Hay Springs and the Rural Residences required changes for 2014. No changes were needed on commercial properties. Other statistics were not within the acceptable range as far as the median was concerned, so an increase some classes of all agricultural land was required for 2014. A raise of the sub class of waste from ten dollars an acre to forty dollars an acre was implemented in 2010. The raise of the sub classes of land for 2014 brought us in to an acceptable range of 70%.

NOTICE OF TAXABLE STATUS  
(ALL CLASSES)

Pursuant to Section 77-202.12 of the Nebraska Statutes, as Revised, Notices of Taxable Status will be mailed to governmental subdivisions owning taxable real estate, annually.

REPORTS AND OPINION OF THE PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR

The opinion of the Property Tax Administrator concerning the level of value of the residential, commercial and agricultural lands will be posted in the office of the County Assessor and mailed to the media as required by the various statutes and rules and regulations.

The Assessor shall prepare and submit any evidence necessary to defend the property values that were established as a result of the sale studies and reported in the Reports and Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator, if a show cause hearing is ordered by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. All such hearings will be attended by the County Assessor, if possible.

CERTIFICATION OF TAXABLE VALUE

The Appropriate Certification of Taxable Value and Value Attributable to Growth will be sent to all governmental subdivisions pursuant to Section 13-509 and 13-518.

The school district taxable value report will be mailed to the Property Tax Administrator on or before August 25 as required by 79-1016 of the Revised Statutes of Nebraska.

INVENTORY

The Assessor will maintain a list of all of the property within the office for which she is responsible along with the purchase price and date of purchase. An inventory of the property will be filed annually.

TAX DISTRICTS

Records will be updated as changes in tax districts occur.

In 2006, all Class I schools were dissolved, resulting in changes to about two-thirds to three-fourths of the property records in Sheridan County. Because of the controversy and general election issue, tax districts were not consolidated at this time, but will be next year, if the school reorganization stands. After checking the tax districts it has been determined that none could be consolidated due to the make up of the tax district. For example the hospital, fire district or school district. However, since the reorganization of schools was not reversed there will be changes or consolidation of tax districts done hopefully before the tax list is run for 2008. At the moment, there has been a change in the fire districts of Hay Springs and Rushville and a tax district has been eliminated and a new one added due to

this change for the 2008 tax year. No changes had to be done for the 2009 tax year. Once again, no changes had to be done for 2010. And for 2011 no changes were done to the tax districts. No changes were needed for 2012 again. No changes were needed for 2013. No changes were needed for 2014.

## TAX LIST

Personal property and real estate tax lists will be prepared and presented to the County Treasurer as required by Section 77-1613.01 of the Nebraska Revised Statutes. In addition to the daily changes of ownership and splitting current tracts, addresses will be updated and other adjustments made to make a more user friendly tax list.

The tax list shall be based on the levies certified by the Sheridan County Clerk from the budgets submitted by each governmental subdivision.

## TAX LIST CORRECTIONS

Corrections to the tax list will be made, as necessary, after approval by the County Board of Equalization.

## CERTIFICATE OF TAXES LEVIED

The Certificate of Taxes Levied, Form 49, will be filed in accordance with 77-1613.01 of the Nebraska Statutes, as Revised.

The County Assessor will balance the amounts levied, as shown on the Certificate of Taxes Levied, against the tax dollars budget whenever possible.

## REPORTS

All reports required by the statutes and by the rules and regulations, will be filed in a timely fashion, including the annual report of value of real estate owned by the Board of Educational Lands and Funds.

## REPORT IN ACCORDANCE WITH LB 644

The report required by LB 644 passed in the 2004 Legislative Session will be made on or before December 1 every four years.

## PROCEDURES MANUAL

The office procedures manual will be updated periodically to reflect changes in office procedures, values of agricultural land by class, statutory requirements and other applicable changes.

## RECORDS MANAGEMENT

All records and files will be retained in accordance with the records retention and disposition schedule recommended by the States Records Administrator.

## ADDENDUM

As of October 27, 2014, we still have the residential review of Gordon to complete and all of the commercial properties in the county. All we have left to do for the commercial is put the information into the CAMA system. Jeff Haugen has agreed to finish the review in Gordon for us. We are going to get the commercial and the rest of the residential finished and updated by March 2015.

## PLAN OF ASSESSMENT 2016

### REAL ESTATE

#### RESIDENTIAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator and whatever other information is available, will be used annually to determine whether or not residential values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Percentage adjustments will be made, if necessary, to bring residential values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given.

Special attention will be give to those residential properties selling well above or below the assessed value. Physical inspects will be made as needed as well as neighborhood reviews or inspections. Appropriate adjustments will be made as needed.

Due to new legislation it will become mandatory that over a six year period a portion of the county be reviewed each year. However, since the Assessor's Fall Workshop in September a portion of the agricultural land and improvements in Sheridan County will be reviewed by the office with Jerry Knoche's assistance. As mentioned before Mr. Knoche no longer works for Sheridan County. Mr. Haugen is currently doing the rural area. The rural area was the first to be reviewed previously. This will be ongoing process over the next six years. As mentioned in 2015 we are hoping to complete the residences in the towns by the end of 2015.

#### COMMERCIAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator and whatever other information is available will be used annually to determine whether or not commercial values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Percentage adjustments will be made, if necessary, to being commercial values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given.

In addition to the information obtained from the above sources, all of the commercial parcels in Sheridan County will be reviewed as funding allows, and determine whether or not adjustments should be made on an individual basis. The review will consist of physical inspections, drive by inspections and review of property records, as needed. It is also believed that the sales verification system, developed and implemented in October of 2003, will help to create more reliable statistics for future use.

#### INDUSTRIAL

There are no industrial parcels in Sheridan County. The commercial properties will be the last to be reviewed in the six year process.

#### RECREATIONAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Report & Opinion and whatever other information is available will be used annually to determine whether or not recreational values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Appropriate adjustments will be made.

#### AGRICULTURAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinion of the Property Tax Administrator and whatever other information is available, will be used annually to determine whether or not agricultural values are in compliance with the various statutes and regulations. Values of the various classes will be adjusted by percentage, if necessary, to bring agricultural values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given. Physical inspections will continue.

The Assessor, staff and appraisal firm will continue to monitor sales to determine if there is a need for market areas.

Due to new legislation it will become mandatory that over a six year period a portion of the county be reviewed each year. However, as to date no directive has been received from the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation so, no permanent plan is in place as of yet. However, since the Assessor's Fall Workshop a portion of the Agricultural will be the first to be reviewed since it was the first to be done in the last review. Jeff Haugen will assist the office in the review process. This will be ongoing process over the next six years. As mentioned from the year of 2015 we are trying to get this completed!!! In addition to the review the market areas will be reviewed each year too.

#### GIS

This will be updated daily once implemented in 2009 and will be ongoing process for our office.

#### SPECIAL VALUE

Plans for 2016 will depend on the outcome of the study to be conducted in the fall of 2015. In addition to the foregoing, the County Assessor shall perform all such other duties as the statutes and rules and regulations require and to promote a used friendly office environment for staff, property owners and researchers that come in to the office.

# **PLAN OF ASSESSMENT 2017**

## REAL ESTATE

### RESIDENTIAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator and other information available will be used annually to determine as to whether or not the residential values are in compliance with the statutes and regulations provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Percentage adjustments will be made, if necessary, to bring the residential values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given.

Those properties that are selling above the assessed value will be inspected as well as those selling below our assessed value. Physical inspections will be done by the assessor or the lister who works for the office part time as well as neighborhood reviews. Adjustments will be made per these inspections and reviews.

Due to new legislation in 2007 it will become mandatory that over a six year period a portion of the county be reviewed each year. Since the Assessor's Fall Workshop in September it has been decided to start reviewing a portion of the Agricultural land and improvements in the county since it was done first years ago in the review process. Jerry Knoche will assist the office on the review process. We as mentioned before now have Jeff Haugen to do this review process instead of Mr. Knoche. This will be an ongoing process over the next six years until the county has been reviewed. Once the county is complete for 2016 the review process will be started again.

### COMMERCIAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator and other information available will be used annually to determine as to whether or not the commercial values are in compliance with the statutes and regulations provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Percentage adjustments will be made, if necessary, to bring the commercial values within the acceptable range of the guidelines given.

In addition to the information above the commercial properties in Sheridan County will be reviewed as part of the six year portion of plan of assessment as mentioned above in the residential plan of assessment. The sales verification system developed in October of 2003 has helped to create a more reliable system of statistics for our future use. As mentioned before these will be the last to be reviewed.

## INDUSTRIAL

So far there are no industrial parcels in Sheridan County.

## RECREATIONAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current Reports & Opinions and other information will be used annually to determine whether or not recreational values are in compliance with the statutes and regulations. Appropriate adjustments will be made to the values as needed.

## GIS

The GIS system, once implemented in 2009 will be updated daily and will be an ongoing process for the office.

## AGRICULTURAL

The sales roster, sales verifications, current year Reports & Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator will be used annually to determine whether or not the agricultural values are in compliance with the statutes and regulations. Values will be adjusted accordingly to be within the acceptable range of the guidelines given. Physical inspections will continue. The Assessor, staff and appraisal firm will continue to monitor all sales to determine if there is a need for market areas in Sheridan County.

Per new legislation from 2007, it will be mandatory that over a six year period a portion of the county will be reviewed each year. Once a directive is received from the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation a plan will be implemented. No plan is in place as of this date.

Since the Assessor's Fall Workshop it has been decided that a portion of the Agricultural area in the county would be reviewed first with Jeff Haugen's assistance and the process would be ongoing over the next six years until the county has been reviewed. In addition the market areas will be reviewed each year too.

## SPECIAL VALUE

Plans for 2017 will depend on the outcome of the study to be conducted in the fall of 2016.

The County Assessor shall continue to perform all such other duties as the statutes and rules and regulations require of her. The office will be open and user friendly to all staff, property owners and others that need any of the information that the office has to offer.

## COMMENTS:

Annual valuation of all real estate to market is a large project, even with computers to do the mundane work for us.

The constant fluctuation of assessed values makes the budget process very difficult for

the various governmental subdivisions that are concerned with statutory levy limits and lid requirements. This is especially true of towns, which are affected by even small market fluctuations. The small towns such as those in Sheridan County do have quite a time just surviving as do others across the state of Nebraska.

Few sales and an erratic market made commercial valuations a special problem again this year. Although a complete reappraisal of the commercial properties was done recently, erratic purchase prices continue to be make valuation difficult to say the least. We are continuing to review all commercial properties hoping for better statistics and there is hope that a complete new review over the next six years will be of some help. However, as long as people pay a premium to own the only grocery store in 15 miles or the only New Holland machinery store in 45 miles, there will be problems. The franchise often goes with the building, but is never set out as such on the 521.

Unfortunately, most of what an Assessor can do is based on funding, over which we have no control. Commissioners continue to be reluctant to begin complete reappraisals and we can't override their decisions. New legislation passed in 2007 of which it becomes mandatory to review the county will hopefully let us do the reappraisal that we so desperately need. The longer that I work in the Assessor's office, it seems that there is less time for the Assessor to get all of the duties done as required by the regulations and statutes passed by the legislature each year. But I will keep trying each year. I have chosen to do the reappraisal even though the commissioners are reluctant and as much will be done as time permits as well as funding given to the office.

Respectfully submitted this 11<sup>th</sup> day of August 2014.

---

Amanda Lane  
Sheridan County Deputy Assessor

ATTACHMENT:  
See timeline on review process attached to this plan.

## 2015 Assessment Survey for Sheridan County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	None
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	None
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	Two.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	Two.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$139,380
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	None of the total budget.
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$146,720
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$1,800
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$2,200
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	For the Appraisal Budget, \$16,629.52 wasn't used. However, the Assessor Budget fund was over-spent by \$3,571.23. Net is \$13,058.29.

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No.
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	N/A
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes.
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes, and the web address is <a href="http://sheridan.gisworkshop.com">http://sheridan.gisworkshop.com</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Gordon, Hay Springs, Rushville and small towns.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1981

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Haugen Appraisal, LLC
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	MIPS for administrative, CAMA and personal property software.

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes, Haugen Appraisal, LLC.
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	Mr. Haugen is a General Certified Appraiser.
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Contract has been sent to the PTA.
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Both the Assessor and the contracted appraiser establish assessed values for the County.



# 2015 Certification for Sheridan 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 Sheridan County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



