

# 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 Sherman County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	66	Median	94.33
Total Sales Price	\$4,030,700	Mean	113.19
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,030,700	Wgt. Mean	90.77
Total Assessed Value	\$3,658,520	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$50,578
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$61,071	Avg. Assessed Value	\$55,432

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	88.86 to 101.72
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.08 to 97.46
95% Mean C.I	99.01 to 127.37
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	9.57
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.10
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.50

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	72	96	95.51
2013	79	96	96.39
2012	65	99	98.54
2011	60	97	97

## 2015 Commission Summary for Sherman County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	97.43
Total Sales Price	\$187,500	Mean	104.46
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$187,500	Wgt. Mean	102.02
Total Assessed Value	\$191,280	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$70,963
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$20,833	Avg. Assessed Value	\$21,253

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.90 to 127.87
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.72 to 114.31
95% Mean C.I	90.26 to 118.66
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.80
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.19
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.25

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	9	100	97.43
2013	8		97.06
2012	8		98.90
2011	10		95



## 2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Sherman 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>94</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>72</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 Sherman County**

A physical inspection of rural residential properties in three townships was completed in 2014. The review work includes taking new pictures, checking listing information and establishing effective ages on all homes. A letter is also sent to taxpayers when the review work is conducted asking for the amount and type of basement finish, if applicable. Property record cards are updated as needed.

Within Loup City, the costing tables were updated to the Marshall & Swift June 2012 tables. A new depreciation study was conducted and a new depreciation table was implemented. All improved parcels within Loup City were revalued. A land analysis was also completed, which supported that lot values were already within the acceptable range.

A sales analysis was completed; the leasehold value was increased on the mobile homes and seasonal cabins at Sherman Reservoir; an adjustment to the economic depreciation within Rockville was made. The pickup work was also completed.

## 2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Sherman County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																
	The assessor and deputy assessor																
<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="text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>Loup City - largest community with a school system and some employment opportunities. The residential market is most active here.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02</td> <td>Ashton - small community with no school and limited services</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td>Hazard - bedroom community, less than 30 miles North of Kearney. Limited amenities and no school system.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td>Litchfield - small community with a school system, some business district</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">05</td> <td>Rockville - bedroom community, about 30 miles from Grand Island. Limited amenities and no school system.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Sherman Lake - Trail # 12, residential/recreational homes on leased land</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td>Acreage - rural residential parcels</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	01	Loup City - largest community with a school system and some employment opportunities. The residential market is most active here.	02	Ashton - small community with no school and limited services	03	Hazard - bedroom community, less than 30 miles North of Kearney. Limited amenities and no school system.	04	Litchfield - small community with a school system, some business district	05	Rockville - bedroom community, about 30 miles from Grand Island. Limited amenities and no school system.	10	Sherman Lake - Trail # 12, residential/recreational homes on leased land	15	Acreage - rural residential parcels
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																
01	Loup City - largest community with a school system and some employment opportunities. The residential market is most active here.																
02	Ashton - small community with no school and limited services																
03	Hazard - bedroom community, less than 30 miles North of Kearney. Limited amenities and no school system.																
04	Litchfield - small community with a school system, some business district																
05	Rockville - bedroom community, about 30 miles from Grand Island. Limited amenities and no school system.																
10	Sherman Lake - Trail # 12, residential/recreational homes on leased land																
15	Acreage - rural residential parcels																
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																
	Only the cost approach is used.																
<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>																
	Yes, depreciation tables are developed using local market information.																
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>																
	Yes																
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																
	Square foot method																
<b>7.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?</b>																
	Lots being held for sale or resale are valued the same as all other lots within the same neighborhood.																

8.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	01	2015	2012	2015	2013
	02	2013	2010	unknown	2012
	03	2013	2010	unknown	2012
	04	2013	2010	2008	2012
	05	2013	2010	unknown	2012
	10	2011	2010	2014	2012
	15	unknown	2010	2013	2002-2015

Although it is currently unknown when lot values studies were last completed in some of the smaller communities, the market has been relatively stable in these areas and the current sales analysis suggest that values are maintaining within the acceptable range. The current assessor began a cycle of reviewing all parcels in the county in 2012 and is scheduled to finish the rest of the rural residential and agricultural improved parcels in the 2015 calendar year.

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

---

### **County Overview**

The residential market in Sherman County is strongest in Loup City; the Village is the county seat, contains some local employment opportunities and a variety of services and amenities, and one of only two high schools located in the county. In recent years the market in Loup City has been stable. In the other four other small villages, only Litchfield contains a high school; both Litchfield and Ashton offer some basic services and amenities; there are very few services available in Hazard and Rockville. The market in these smaller communities is not organized.

In addition to the Villages there is housing at Sherman Reservoir which includes both permanent homes and seasonal cabins. The market for properties at the lake are recreational influenced and less restricted by the local economy.

### **Description of Analysis**

Review of the statistical profile reveals that only valuation grouping 01, Loup City; has a substantial number of sales; additionally neither valuation groups 03 or 15 have been represented at a portion similar to their presence in the overall county. For these reasons, only the calculated statistics for valuation group 01 will be relied upon.

Analysis of both the sales file and the abstract reflect the adjustments reported by the assessor. Review of the measures of central tendency show that only the median is within the acceptable range; however, the mean and weighted mean both improve when sales within valuation group one are segregated; suggesting that the overall measures are impacted by the more remote areas of the county where the market is unorganized. All evidence suggests that a level of value in the acceptable range has been achieved. Although there are insufficient sales in valuation groups 2-15, they are all believed to be in the acceptable range as they have been subjected to the same appraisal process that is employed in valuation group 01.

### **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties this year. The review involved an analysis of the sale utilization rate and screening the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. The review revealed that that the utilization rate in Sherman County is somewhat low; but is deflated by an unusually large number of family transactions with nominal or no consideration paid. All arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

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

---

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

The qualitative statistics are high; the sales price substrata reveals that approximately 11 low dollar sales are having a significant impact on the COD; however, the substrata also reveals a pattern of regressive assessments. Review of the individual valuation groupings reveals this pattern to be most prevalent outside of Loup City and Sherman Reservoir. While these measures should be examined before establishing future appraisal models, it is not unusual in rural areas for the qualitative statistics to be well above the range recommended by IAAO.

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices in which a portion of the counties are reviewed each year. This review was conducted in Sherman County during 2014. The reviewed confirmed that there was no bias in the assessment of sold and unsold parcels; changes to the properties were well documented and the process employed by the county was sufficiently transparent. However, the county is behind in completing the inspections of rural properties. To date approximately half of the rural parcels still need to be reviewed. The Department has been monitoring the county's progress with the review work and conversations with the county assessor indicate that the work should be completed in 2015.

Inspections have been completed for the majority of the county since 2012; and review of the appraisal tables shows that they have been kept current to achieve uniform assessments. Based on the verified assessment practices, the residential class of property is determined to be in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of the residential class of property in Sherman County is 94%.



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

Only routine maintenance was completed for 2015. Minor coding changes were made to improve uniformity in how commercial parcels were pricing in the CAMA system, resulting in small valuation changes to some parcels. A sales study was completed which supported that values were within the acceptable range. The pickup work was completed timely.

## 2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Sherman County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>			
	The assessor and the deputy assessor complete most of the work; however, an appraisal contract is maintained for the larger commercial properties.			
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>			
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>		
	01	There are no valuation groupings within the commercial class; there are too few sales to warrant stratifying them by location.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>			
	Only the cost approach is used. The sales comparison and income approaches may be developed by the contract appraiser when sufficient information is available.			
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>			
	The county contracts with a licensed appraiser for the appraisal of large, unique commercial properties.			
<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>			
	Depreciation studies are developed using local market information.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>			
	n/a			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>			
	All lots are valued by the square foot or by the acre, based on sales and similar properties.			
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
	01	2013	2007	2013

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

---

## **County Overview**

The majority of commercial parcels in Sherman County are in the county seat, Loup City. The community has an active business district for a town of its size and a variety of business and amenities are available locally. The larger employers include agriculturally based businesses and health and support services. Outside of Loup City, there are some basic services available in Ashton and Litchfield, but commercial properties in Hazard and Rockville are very limited with each town containing fewer than ten commercial parcels. The market for commercial real estate would not be considered organized in any of Villages, including Loup City. There are a few commercial parcels around Sherman Lake, these properties cater to visitors to the lake and are less dependent on the local economy.

## **Description of Analysis**

As there are few sales outside of Loup City annually, there are no valuation groupings in the commercial class of property. Commercial properties in the county are found in 33 different occupancy codes; however three-quarters of them are office buildings, retail stores, storage facilities (warehouse and material), bars/taverns, light commercial utility buildings and service garages. Most of these primary occupancy codes are present in the sales file; however, with only nine total sales the sample is too small to place any reliance on the calculated statistics.

The county reviewed and revalued all commercial properties last year. The changes in both the sales file and the abstract support the assessor's report that only routine maintenance was conducted this year.

## **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Department) for all counties this year. This involved a screening of the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. The review revealed that a relatively low number of commercial sales are being used. However, the nonqualified transactions contained a good number of substantially changed sales, with the remainder of the transactions mostly being partial interests and transfers of property for legal purposes. There was no bias in the qualification of sales and all available arm's length sales have been used in the commercial sample.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices in which a portion of the counties are reviewed each year. This review was conducted in Sherman County during 2014;

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

---

the review included all of the qualified commercial sales and comparable unsold properties in close proximity to the sales. The review supported that the 2014 reappraisal of commercial properties was equitably applied to sold and unsold properties; changes to properties were well documented and the process employed by the county was sufficiently transparent. The review also confirmed that the county was in compliance with the six year inspection requirement within the commercial class of property.

Based on the review of assessment practices, the quality of assessment of commercial property is in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on the analysis of all available information, Sherman County has met the statutory level of value of 100% in the commercial class.



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

A review of agricultural improvements in three rural townships was completed for 2015. The review work includes an onsite inspection, new pictures are taken, listing information is verified and corrected, and an effective age is established for all homes. A letter is also sent to taxpayers when the review work is conducted asking for the amount and type of basement finish, if applicable. The property record cards are updated as warranted. The pickup work was completed timely.

A sales analysis of agricultural land was conducted. The analysis indicated that increases to all land uses were necessary for 2015. Irrigated land increased 30%, dry land 20%, and grass land increased 38%.

## 2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Sherman County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>							
	The assessor and deputy assessor							
<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="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 65%; text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>No discernible differences have been determined for agricultural land in 2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2009</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	01	No discernible differences have been determined for agricultural land in 2014	2009
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
01	No discernible differences have been determined for agricultural land in 2014	2009						
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>							
	Annually sales are plotted, topography and geographic characteristics are reviewed.							
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>							
	Generally, any parcel less than 40 acres is classified as rural residential land. The only recreational parcels in the county are those with seasonal cabins at Sherman Reservoir.							
<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>							
	n/a							
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:</b>							
	Yes, one special value application has been filed in the county. At this time, there is no recognizable non-agricultural influence impacting the value of agricultural land.							
<b>7a.</b>	<b>What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist?</b>							
	Non-agricultural influences or are monitored through written sales verification and zoning permits. Sales analysis is also conducted annually to ensure that there are non-agricultural influences present in the county.							
<b>7b.</b>	<b>Describe the non-agricultural influences present within the county.</b>							
	n/a							
<b>7c.</b>	<b>How many parcels in the county are receiving special value?</b>							
	none							
<b>7d.</b>	<b>Where is the influenced area located within the county?</b>							
	n/a							
<b>7e.</b>	<b>Describe the valuation models and approaches used to establish the uninfluenced values.</b>							

	n/a
--	-----

## Sherman County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Sherman	1	n/a	4,680	4,510	4,510	4,355	4,355	4,250	4,246	<b>4,406</b>
Custer	1	n/a	5,240	4,950	4,430	4,200	3,820	3,815	3,810	<b>4,577</b>
Valley	1	n/a	5,060	5,060	4,350	4,110	4,110	3,360	3,360	<b>4,412</b>
Greeley	2	n/a	5,050	4,870	4,400	4,300	4,160	4,120	3,790	<b>4,428</b>
Howard	7200	4,950	4,950	4,500	4,400	4,100	3,900	3,600	3,600	<b>4,459</b>
Howard	7100	4,950	4,950	4,500	4,400	4,100	3,900	3,600	3,600	<b>4,025</b>
Buffalo	1	5,450	5,413	5,200	5,047	4,632	4,796	4,394	4,392	<b>4,851</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Sherman	1	n/a	2,180	2,070	2,070	1,960	1,960	1,850	1,848	<b>1,946</b>
Custer	1	n/a	2,420	2,140	2,025	1,910	1,745	1,740	1,735	<b>2,009</b>
Valley	1	n/a	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,115	2,115	2,115	1,980	<b>2,096</b>
Greeley	2	n/a	2,600	2,500	2,500	2,400	2,300	2,150	2,000	<b>2,284</b>
Howard	7200	2,600	2,600	2,500	2,500	2,400	2,300	2,150	2,000	<b>2,273</b>
Howard	7100	2,600	2,600	2,500	2,500	2,400	2,300	2,150	2,000	<b>2,296</b>
Buffalo	1	2,700	2,700	2,500	2,500	2,350	2,250	2,150	2,150	<b>2,365</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Sherman	1	n/a	1,171	1,134	1,131	1,079	1,077	1,061	1,059	<b>1,066</b>
Custer	1	n/a	930	925	925	920	920	877	867	<b>874</b>
Valley	1	n/a	1,151	1,151	1,130	1,150	1,105	918	899	<b>931</b>
Greeley	2	n/a	1,055	1,003	1,018	990	1,000	968	948	<b>959</b>
Howard	7200	1,450	1,450	1,306	1,326	1,250	1,248	1,177	1,150	<b>1,195</b>
Howard	7100	1,450	1,450	1,300	1,300	1,250	1,200	1,175	1,150	<b>1,183</b>
Buffalo	1	1,278	1,370	1,231	1,176	1,083	906	1,038	1,008	<b>1,057</b>

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

## 2015 Methodology Report for Special Valuation Sherman County, Nebraska

Upon review of the properties and the sales within the current time period, there is no evidence for cause to implement special value for Sherman County. Sherman County has two filings from one property owner in 2004. There is no evidence to implement special value at this time. The parcels that have applications on file for special value are valued the same as other agricultural land within their own market area.

Dated this 6<sup>TH</sup> day of February, 2014.

  
Sherie Kuszak  
Sherman County Assessor

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

---

## **County Overview**

The majority of agricultural land in Sherman County is grassland. The farmland is primarily irrigated land and is generally clustered around stream beds; there is very little dry land in the county and it tends to include pivot corners or small parcels that are not suitable for irrigation. There are no market areas in the county at this time; all surrounding counties have similar land characteristics and have been considered comparable where they adjoin Sherman County.

## **Description of Analysis**

Analysis of sales within the county showed them to be proportionately distributed when stratified by sale date; however, the sample was heavily weighted with grassland sales and the cropland subclasses were unreliably small. The sample was expanded using comparable sales from all adjoining counties. There are few dry land sales in and around Sherman County and the subclass is still small.

The statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range; the majority land use samples of irrigated and grassland also suggest that those assessments are acceptable. While there are few dry sales, all the counties in this region of the state have made a significant effort in recent years to catch-up dry land assessments that had historically lagged. Comparison of Sherman County's value to the adjoining counties indicates that the values are reasonably comparable, supporting that dry land assessments are also acceptable.

## **Sales Qualification**

A sales qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties. This involved reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. No apparent bias existed in the qualification determinations and all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

Comparison of values for Sherman and the adjoining counties indicates that the values are very comparable to all surrounding counties. Sales analysis and review of past and current assessment practices confirms that the land use subclasses are at uniform portions of market value. Based on the analysis, values appear to be well equalized both within the county and with comparable areas outside of the county. The quality of assessment for agricultural land in Sherman County is determined to meet generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

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

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Sherman County is 72%.



**82 Sherman  
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 : 66  
 Total Sales Price : 4,030,700  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,030,700  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,658,520  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 61,071  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 55,432

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 113  
 COD : 34.99  
 PRD : 124.70

COV : 51.94  
 STD : 58.79  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.01  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 340.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 58.29

95% Median C.I. : 88.86 to 101.72  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.08 to 97.46  
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.01 to 127.37

Printed:3/30/2015 12:17:03PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	5	179.88	159.42	133.56	26.19	119.36	88.31	227.75	N/A	35,650	47,613
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	6	85.41	94.56	87.16	18.08	108.49	78.93	135.46	78.93 to 135.46	49,333	42,998
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	8	106.57	128.61	89.88	44.50	143.09	61.71	322.71	61.71 to 322.71	69,906	62,829
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	9	92.48	94.15	91.55	15.54	102.84	66.83	130.32	75.70 to 113.93	61,556	56,352
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	9	102.11	115.24	98.76	26.08	116.69	75.53	213.93	88.09 to 158.80	51,061	50,430
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	5	70.94	118.16	75.56	75.82	156.38	58.29	292.83	N/A	78,040	58,965
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	15	97.12	122.55	97.16	38.60	126.13	71.34	340.19	84.58 to 134.13	62,847	61,065
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	9	88.86	84.85	74.99	14.98	113.15	62.12	105.30	66.58 to 100.09	72,306	54,223
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	28	95.51	115.74	94.86	35.39	122.01	61.71	322.71	87.49 to 118.27	56,696	53,780
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	38	93.72	111.31	88.11	34.54	126.33	58.29	340.19	87.64 to 101.59	64,295	56,649
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	32	93.67	108.77	92.13	28.61	118.06	61.71	322.71	87.49 to 111.33	58,400	53,802
<u>ALL</u>	66	94.33	113.19	90.77	34.99	124.70	58.29	340.19	88.86 to 101.72	61,071	55,432

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	30	94.33	107.52	96.15	24.22	111.83	71.34	235.02	88.86 to 101.72	61,983	59,596
02	4	97.71	138.77	110.73	68.96	125.32	66.83	292.83	N/A	31,500	34,880
03	1	75.70	75.70	75.70	00.00	100.00	75.70	75.70	N/A	38,500	29,145
04	12	99.91	117.89	88.55	33.38	133.13	66.58	322.71	88.31 to 135.46	39,179	34,695
05	7	96.16	113.61	89.02	35.46	127.62	58.29	213.93	58.29 to 213.93	26,193	23,316
10	3	102.51	89.32	81.96	13.40	108.98	62.12	103.33	N/A	119,000	97,538
15	9	82.76	126.27	83.30	64.35	151.58	61.71	340.19	70.94 to 179.88	110,689	92,202
<u>ALL</u>	66	94.33	113.19	90.77	34.99	124.70	58.29	340.19	88.86 to 101.72	61,071	55,432

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	63	93.80	114.33	91.62	36.02	124.79	58.29	340.19	88.86 to 101.59	58,313	53,427
06	3	102.51	89.32	81.96	13.40	108.98	62.12	103.33	N/A	119,000	97,538
07											
<u>ALL</u>	66	94.33	113.19	90.77	34.99	124.70	58.29	340.19	88.86 to 101.72	61,071	55,432

**82 Sherman  
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 : 66  
 Total Sales Price : 4,030,700  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,030,700  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,658,520  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 61,071  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 55,432

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 113  
 COD : 34.99  
 PRD : 124.70

COV : 51.94  
 STD : 58.79  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.01  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 340.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 58.29

95% Median C.I. : 88.86 to 101.72  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.08 to 97.46  
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.01 to 127.37

Printed:3/30/2015 12:17:03PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	11	135.46	183.39	164.64	61.27	111.39	79.44	340.19	88.31 to 322.71	10,236	16,854	
Less Than 30,000	23	130.32	155.25	139.60	47.43	111.21	66.83	340.19	96.16 to 198.63	16,722	23,343	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	66	94.33	113.19	90.77	34.99	124.70	58.29	340.19	88.86 to 101.72	61,071	55,432	
Greater Than 14,999	55	92.25	99.15	88.64	22.64	111.86	58.29	235.02	87.49 to 98.82	71,238	63,148	
Greater Than 29,999	43	90.52	90.69	85.62	15.80	105.92	58.29	158.80	81.62 to 97.12	84,793	72,596	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	11	135.46	183.39	164.64	61.27	111.39	79.44	340.19	88.31 to 322.71	10,236	16,854	
15,000 TO 29,999	12	115.03	129.45	129.23	36.48	100.17	66.83	235.02	92.48 to 179.88	22,667	29,291	
30,000 TO 59,999	15	93.64	98.55	98.06	15.57	100.50	71.34	158.80	88.09 to 102.88	45,227	44,351	
60,000 TO 99,999	14	95.99	95.15	95.01	12.76	100.15	58.29	119.47	80.07 to 113.93	71,550	67,983	
100,000 TO 149,999	9	75.53	78.65	78.13	11.04	100.67	66.58	102.51	67.17 to 90.52	117,278	91,629	
150,000 TO 249,999	5	82.76	76.34	74.68	12.40	102.22	61.71	87.64	N/A	182,100	135,989	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	66	94.33	113.19	90.77	34.99	124.70	58.29	340.19	88.86 to 101.72	61,071	55,432	

**82 Sherman**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 187,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 187,500  
Total Assessed Value : 191,280  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 20,833  
Avg. Assessed Value : 21,253

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 102  
MEAN : 104  
COD : 14.03  
PRD : 102.39

COV : 17.68  
STD : 18.47  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.67  
MAX Sales Ratio : 134.42  
MIN Sales Ratio : 82.16

95% Median C.I. : 90.90 to 127.87  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.72 to 114.31  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.26 to 118.66

Printed:3/30/2015 12:17:04PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	134.42	134.42	134.42	00.00	100.00	134.42	134.42	N/A	18,000	24,195
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	109.32	109.32	115.04	10.88	95.03	97.43	121.20	N/A	6,750	7,765
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	127.87	127.87	127.87	00.00	100.00	127.87	127.87	N/A	15,000	19,180
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	3	94.32	95.39	96.93	02.45	98.41	92.47	99.39	N/A	35,333	34,248
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	1	82.16	82.16	82.16	00.00	100.00	82.16	82.16	N/A	25,000	20,540
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14											
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	1	90.90	90.90	90.90	00.00	100.00	90.90	90.90	N/A	10,000	9,090
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	3	121.20	117.68	126.11	10.17	93.32	97.43	134.42	N/A	10,500	13,242
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	4	96.86	103.51	100.76	10.45	102.73	92.47	127.87	N/A	30,250	30,481
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	2	86.53	86.53	84.66	05.05	102.21	82.16	90.90	N/A	17,500	14,815
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	3	121.20	117.68	126.11	10.17	93.32	97.43	134.42	N/A	10,500	13,242
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	5	94.32	99.24	97.58	11.16	101.70	82.16	127.87	N/A	29,200	28,493
<u>ALL</u>	9	97.43	104.46	102.02	14.03	102.39	82.16	134.42	90.90 to 127.87	20,833	21,253

<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.		
01	5	94.32	106.25	102.91	18.59	103.25	82.16	134.42	N/A	20,800	21,405
02	1	97.43	97.43	97.43	00.00	100.00	97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410
03	1	121.20	121.20	121.20	00.00	100.00	121.20	121.20	N/A	10,000	12,120
04	2	95.15	95.15	98.18	04.47	96.91	90.90	99.39	N/A	35,000	34,363
<u>ALL</u>	9	97.43	104.46	102.02	14.03	102.39	82.16	134.42	90.90 to 127.87	20,833	21,253

<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.		
02											
03	9	97.43	104.46	102.02	14.03	102.39	82.16	134.42	90.90 to 127.87	20,833	21,253
04											
<u>ALL</u>	9	97.43	104.46	102.02	14.03	102.39	82.16	134.42	90.90 to 127.87	20,833	21,253

**82 Sherman  
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 : 9  
 Total Sales Price : 187,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 187,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 191,280  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 20,833  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 21,253

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 102  
 MEAN : 104  
 COD : 14.03  
 PRD : 102.39

COV : 17.68  
 STD : 18.47  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.67  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 134.42  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 82.16

95% Median C.I. : 90.90 to 127.87  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.72 to 114.31  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.26 to 118.66

Printed:3/30/2015 12:17:04PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>												
Less Than 5,000	1	97.43	97.43	97.43	00.00	100.00	97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410	
Less Than 15,000	3	97.43	103.18	104.77	10.37	98.48	90.90	121.20	N/A	7,833	8,207	
Less Than 30,000	7	97.43	106.64	106.12	17.29	100.49	82.16	134.42	82.16 to 134.42	13,786	14,629	
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>												
Greater Than 4,999	8	96.86	105.34	102.10	15.88	103.17	82.16	134.42	82.16 to 134.42	23,000	23,484	
Greater Than 14,999	6	96.86	105.11	101.62	15.96	103.43	82.16	134.42	82.16 to 134.42	27,333	27,777	
Greater Than 29,999	2	96.86	96.86	97.66	02.62	99.18	94.32	99.39	N/A	45,500	44,438	
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>												
0 TO 4,999	1	97.43	97.43	97.43	00.00	100.00	97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410	
5,000 TO 14,999	2	106.05	106.05	106.05	14.29	100.00	90.90	121.20	N/A	10,000	10,605	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	110.17	109.23	106.55	19.90	102.52	82.16	134.42	N/A	18,250	19,446	
30,000 TO 59,999	1	94.32	94.32	94.32	00.00	100.00	94.32	94.32	N/A	31,000	29,240	
60,000 TO 99,999	1	99.39	99.39	99.39	00.00	100.00	99.39	99.39	N/A	60,000	59,635	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<b>ALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>97.43</b>	<b>104.46</b>	<b>102.02</b>	<b>14.03</b>	<b>102.39</b>	<b>82.16</b>	<b>134.42</b>	<b>90.90 to 127.87</b>	<b>20,833</b>	<b>21,253</b>	

<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
326	1	92.47	92.47	92.47	00.00	100.00	92.47	92.47	N/A	15,000	13,870	
344	1	82.16	82.16	82.16	00.00	100.00	82.16	82.16	N/A	25,000	20,540	
353	2	113.63	113.63	105.09	12.53	108.13	99.39	127.87	N/A	37,500	39,408	
384	1	97.43	97.43	97.43	00.00	100.00	97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410	
406	1	90.90	90.90	90.90	00.00	100.00	90.90	90.90	N/A	10,000	9,090	
442	1	94.32	94.32	94.32	00.00	100.00	94.32	94.32	N/A	31,000	29,240	
468	1	121.20	121.20	121.20	00.00	100.00	121.20	121.20	N/A	10,000	12,120	
471	1	134.42	134.42	134.42	00.00	100.00	134.42	134.42	N/A	18,000	24,195	
<b>ALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>97.43</b>	<b>104.46</b>	<b>102.02</b>	<b>14.03</b>	<b>102.39</b>	<b>82.16</b>	<b>134.42</b>	<b>90.90 to 127.87</b>	<b>20,833</b>	<b>21,253</b>	

**82 Sherman**  
**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 : 67  
Total Sales Price : 36,979,704  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 37,379,254  
Total Assessed Value : 26,954,396  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 557,899  
Avg. Assessed Value : 402,304

MEDIAN : 72  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 81  
COD : 30.29  
PRD : 112.05

COV : 52.60  
STD : 42.50  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.87  
MAX Sales Ratio : 350.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 00.00

95% Median C.I. : 66.77 to 81.20  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 76.92  
95% Mean C.I. : 70.62 to 90.98

Printed:3/30/2015 12:17:05PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	81.67	84.72	81.23	18.65	104.30	51.69	122.46	N/A	505,249	410,398	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	97.14	105.75	91.41	19.93	115.69	79.08	176.67	81.04 to 136.53	277,019	253,210	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	86.77	86.77	86.26	02.96	100.59	84.20	89.33	N/A	155,732	134,328	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	74.87	79.72	82.13	10.65	97.07	68.19	100.26	N/A	399,597	328,208	
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	14	65.28	75.08	78.28	29.96	95.91	42.45	161.70	53.36 to 92.29	424,387	332,208	
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	3	81.79	87.05	75.30	17.92	115.60	67.69	111.67	N/A	893,751	673,025	
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	4	68.80	70.92	71.89	06.96	98.65	65.84	80.22	N/A	976,904	702,326	
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	3	77.87	74.18	68.21	15.96	108.75	53.70	90.98	N/A	676,402	461,357	
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	6	60.47	52.07	54.65	26.79	95.28	00.00	74.74	00.00 to 74.74	586,967	320,774	
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	11	66.25	90.19	65.94	52.30	136.78	49.54	350.00	50.00 to 86.20	867,547	572,035	
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	3	59.82	61.39	58.07	07.15	105.72	55.76	68.60	N/A	487,860	283,315	
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	79.42	79.42	81.40	09.17	97.57	72.14	86.69	N/A	481,250	391,748	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	21	84.20	92.74	85.15	19.76	108.91	51.69	176.67	81.04 to 98.91	348,993	297,170	
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	24	67.86	75.77	74.61	24.74	101.55	42.45	161.70	63.69 to 81.79	606,646	452,640	
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	22	64.77	74.89	63.59	37.19	117.77	00.00	350.00	55.76 to 72.20	704,132	447,748	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	30	81.29	85.84	82.27	25.99	104.34	42.45	176.67	68.19 to 92.29	358,135	294,650	
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	16	67.23	67.49	67.03	21.61	100.69	00.00	111.67	57.65 to 80.22	758,742	508,568	
<u>ALL</u>	67	72.20	80.80	72.11	30.29	112.05	00.00	350.00	66.77 to 81.20	557,899	402,304	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
1	67	72.20	80.80	72.11	30.29	112.05	00.00	350.00	66.77 to 81.20	557,899	402,304	
<u>ALL</u>	67	72.20	80.80	72.11	30.29	112.05	00.00	350.00	66.77 to 81.20	557,899	402,304	

**82 Sherman**  
**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 : 67  
 Total Sales Price : 36,979,704  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 37,379,254  
 Total Assessed Value : 26,954,396  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 557,899  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 402,304

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 72  
 MEAN : 81  
 COD : 30.29  
 PRD : 112.05

COV : 52.60  
 STD : 42.50  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.87  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 350.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 00.00

95% Median C.I. : 66.77 to 81.20  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 76.92  
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.62 to 90.98

Printed:3/30/2015 12:17:05PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	67.26	81.90	72.03	22.26	113.70	66.77	111.67	N/A	466,587	336,062
1	3	67.26	81.90	72.03	22.26	113.70	66.77	111.67	N/A	466,587	336,062
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	90.71	150.00	84.53	83.96	177.45	68.60	350.00	N/A	168,225	142,194
1	4	90.71	150.00	84.53	83.96	177.45	68.60	350.00	N/A	168,225	142,194
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	28	70.09	79.72	72.97	29.63	109.25	50.00	176.67	63.28 to 86.08	412,205	300,795
1	28	70.09	79.72	72.97	29.63	109.25	50.00	176.67	63.28 to 86.08	412,205	300,795
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>72.20</b>	<b>80.80</b>	<b>72.11</b>	<b>30.29</b>	<b>112.05</b>	<b>00.00</b>	<b>350.00</b>	<b>66.77 to 81.20</b>	<b>557,899</b>	<b>402,304</b>

**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	14	69.23	77.21	71.80	25.35	107.53	49.96	117.52	53.70 to 100.26	896,483	643,683
1	14	69.23	77.21	71.80	25.35	107.53	49.96	117.52	53.70 to 100.26	896,483	643,683
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	5	79.08	131.72	80.51	82.23	163.61	58.58	350.00	N/A	159,226	128,194
1	5	79.08	131.72	80.51	82.23	163.61	58.58	350.00	N/A	159,226	128,194
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	29	72.14	79.51	73.01	27.88	108.90	50.00	176.67	63.28 to 86.08	421,370	307,662
1	29	72.14	79.51	73.01	27.88	108.90	50.00	176.67	63.28 to 86.08	421,370	307,662
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>72.20</b>	<b>80.80</b>	<b>72.11</b>	<b>30.29</b>	<b>112.05</b>	<b>00.00</b>	<b>350.00</b>	<b>66.77 to 81.20</b>	<b>557,899</b>	<b>402,304</b>



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 3,751</b>	<b>Value : 849,772,430</b>	<b>Growth 2,032,282</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>	202	603,650	15	262,295	16	144,270	233	1,010,215	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	888	2,977,875	61	1,397,105	112	3,339,120	1,061	7,714,100	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	892	36,095,505	62	4,256,385	123	10,976,520	1,077	51,328,410	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,094	39,677,030	77	5,915,785	139	14,459,910	1,310	60,052,725	514,020
<b>% of Res Total</b>	83.51	66.07	5.88	9.85	10.61	24.08	34.92	7.07	25.29
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	46	118,180	2	2,455	0	0	48	120,635	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	148	601,720	6	95,135	5	93,970	159	790,825	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	152	12,669,770	6	471,135	8	1,026,275	166	14,167,180	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	198	13,389,670	8	568,725	8	1,120,245	214	15,078,640	731,317
<b>% of Com Total</b>	92.52	88.80	3.74	3.77	3.74	7.43	5.71	1.77	35.99
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	48,470	0	0	0	0	1	48,470	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	129,915	0	0	0	0	1	129,915	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	1	178,385	0	0	0	0	1	178,385	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	5	175,645	5	175,645	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	292	6,358,140	292	6,358,140	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	293	14,742,475	293	14,742,475	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	298	21,276,260	298	21,276,260	80,380
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	7.94	2.50	3.96
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,094	39,677,030	77	5,915,785	437	35,736,170	1,608	81,328,985	594,400
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	68.03	48.79	4.79	7.27	27.18	43.94	42.87	9.57	29.25
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	199	13,568,055	8	568,725	8	1,120,245	215	15,257,025	731,317
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	92.56	88.93	3.72	3.73	3.72	7.34	5.73	1.80	35.99
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,293	53,245,085	85	6,484,510	445	36,856,415	1,823	96,586,010	1,325,717
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	70.93	55.13	4.66	6.71	24.41	38.16	48.60	11.37	65.23

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	7	621,205	2,183,700	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	7	621,205	2,183,700
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				7	621,205	2,183,700

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	170	18	343	531

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	56,030	90	21,617,260	1,125	378,585,700	1,216	400,258,990
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	66	22,875,165	625	287,940,090	691	310,815,255
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	68	4,003,900	644	38,108,275	712	42,112,175
30. Ag Total							1,928	753,186,420

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	45	46.00	345,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	45	45.00	2,543,770	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	61	194.27	194,020	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	67	0.00	1,460,130	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	318.62	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	7.64	3,020	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	6	6.00	45,000	6	6.00	45,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	376	389.09	2,925,000	421	435.09	3,270,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	383	384.09	21,806,135	428	429.09	24,349,905	706,565
34. HomeSite Total				<b>434</b>	<b>441.09</b>	<b>27,664,905</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	30	60.14	47,640	30	60.14	47,640	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	570	2,177.52	2,188,190	631	2,371.79	2,382,210	
37. FarmSite Improvements	620	0.00	16,302,140	687	0.00	17,762,270	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>717</b>	<b>2,431.93</b>	<b>20,192,120</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,953.94	0	0	5,272.56	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	2.04	805	0	9.68	3,825	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,151</b>	<b>8,155.26</b>	<b>47,860,850</b>	<b>706,565</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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	2	441.25	1,044,635	2	441.25	1,044,635
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	22,912.65	25.08%	107,231,245	26.64%	4,680.00
47. 2A1	6,554.03	7.17%	29,558,660	7.34%	4,510.00
48. 2A	7,167.57	7.85%	32,325,660	8.03%	4,509.99
49. 3A1	5,990.43	6.56%	26,088,235	6.48%	4,354.99
50. 3A	3,263.99	3.57%	14,214,175	3.53%	4,354.85
51. 4A1	21,847.41	23.91%	92,852,825	23.06%	4,250.06
52. 4A	23,628.17	25.86%	100,316,880	24.92%	4,245.65
53. Total	91,364.25	100.00%	402,587,680	100.00%	4,406.40
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	7,369.75	16.85%	16,066,135	18.88%	2,180.01
56. 2D1	3,233.16	7.39%	6,692,605	7.86%	2,069.99
57. 2D	2,486.28	5.68%	5,146,610	6.05%	2,070.00
58. 3D1	3,728.82	8.52%	7,308,490	8.59%	1,960.00
59. 3D	926.52	2.12%	1,815,960	2.13%	1,959.98
60. 4D1	13,330.22	30.47%	24,660,990	28.97%	1,850.01
61. 4D	12,673.58	28.97%	23,423,690	27.52%	1,848.23
62. Total	43,748.33	100.00%	85,114,480	100.00%	1,945.55
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,419.72	2.65%	6,344,295	2.92%	1,170.59
65. 2G1	2,827.37	1.38%	3,206,750	1.47%	1,134.18
66. 2G	3,620.57	1.77%	4,093,680	1.88%	1,130.67
67. 3G1	5,016.34	2.46%	5,413,650	2.49%	1,079.20
68. 3G	5,559.45	2.72%	5,988,975	2.75%	1,077.26
69. 4G1	49,239.02	24.12%	52,237,645	24.01%	1,060.90
70. 4G	132,477.28	64.89%	140,271,815	64.48%	1,058.84
71. Total	204,159.75	100.00%	217,556,810	100.00%	1,065.62
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	91,364.25	26.87%	402,587,680	57.08%	4,406.40
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	43,748.33	12.87%	85,114,480	12.07%	1,945.55
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	204,159.75	60.04%	217,556,810	30.84%	1,065.62
72. Waste	739.76	0.22%	66,600	0.01%	90.03
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	9,507.31	2.80%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	340,012.09	100.00%	705,325,570	100.00%	2,074.41

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<hr/>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry Total</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass Total</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	115.44	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	10.50	49,140	6,213.07	27,689,645	85,140.68	374,848,895	91,364.25	402,587,680
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	3,276.40	6,455,555	40,471.93	78,658,925	43,748.33	85,114,480
<b>78. Grass</b>	6.50	6,890	9,175.16	9,795,750	194,978.09	207,754,170	204,159.75	217,556,810
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	104.84	9,435	634.92	57,165	739.76	66,600
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	164.86	0	9,457.89	0	9,622.75	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>56,030</b>	<b>18,769.47</b>	<b>43,950,385</b>	<b>321,225.62</b>	<b>661,319,155</b>	<b>340,012.09</b>	<b>705,325,570</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	91,364.25	26.87%	402,587,680	57.08%	4,406.40
<b>Dry Land</b>	43,748.33	12.87%	85,114,480	12.07%	1,945.55
<b>Grass</b>	204,159.75	60.04%	217,556,810	30.84%	1,065.62
<b>Waste</b>	739.76	0.22%	66,600	0.01%	90.03
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	9,622.75	2.83%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>340,012.09</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>705,325,570</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,074.41</b>

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

82 Sherman

	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	61,437,235	60,052,725	-1,384,510	-2.25%	514,020	-3.09%
02. Recreational	20,345,160	21,276,260	931,100	4.58%	80,380	4.18%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	25,852,005	27,664,905	1,812,900	7.01%	706,565	4.28%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>107,634,400</b>	<b>108,993,890</b>	<b>1,359,490</b>	<b>1.26%</b>	<b>1,300,965</b>	<b>0.05%</b>
05. Commercial	14,051,845	15,078,640	1,026,795	7.31%	731,317	2.10%
06. Industrial	178,385	178,385	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,521,890	20,192,120	2,670,230	15.24%	0	15.24%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>31,752,120</b>	<b>35,449,145</b>	<b>3,697,025</b>	<b>11.64%</b>	<b>731,317</b>	<b>9.34%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>139,386,520</b>	<b>144,446,860</b>	<b>5,060,340</b>	<b>3.63%</b>	<b>2,032,282</b>	<b>2.17%</b>
11. Irrigated	309,054,770	402,587,680	93,532,910	30.26%		
12. Dryland	70,825,240	85,114,480	14,289,240	20.18%		
13. Grassland	157,923,125	217,556,810	59,633,685	37.76%		
14. Wasteland	36,820	66,600	29,780	80.88%		
15. Other Agland	583,355	0	-583,355	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>538,423,310</b>	<b>705,325,570</b>	<b>166,902,260</b>	<b>31.00%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>677,809,830</b>	<b>849,772,430</b>	<b>171,962,600</b>	<b>25.37%</b>	<b>2,032,282</b>	<b>25.07%</b>

**2014 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
SHERMAN COUNTY  
By Sherie Kuszak  
Sherman County Assessor**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2009).

General Description of Real Property in Sherman County:

Per the 2014 County Abstract, Sherman County consists of 3,748 parcels of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Residential	1322	35.27%	9.08%
Commercial	216	5.76 %	2.04%
Industrial	1	.03 %	.03%
Recreational	298	7.95 %	3.00%
Agricultural	1911	50.99 %	85.85%
Special Value	-	---	---

Agricultural land - taxable acres 339,877.68 with a value of 538,611,800

Other pertinent facts: County is predominantly agricultural with 60.14% grassland, 26.68% irrigated, and 12.93% dry-broke and .11 for other and waste.

Current Resources:

A. Staff: County Assessor, Deputy and Part time Clerk.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The Assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field.

The Deputy Assessor has taken and passed her Assessor's Exam.

B. Cadastral Maps 1969/soil maps/land use maps, aerial photos.

The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards

The property record cards in Sherman County were new in 1994 for Residential and Commercial and 1997 for Agricultural. The office went on-line in June of 2006 with the property record information.

D. The County uses the CAMA and Assessment Administration system. Sherman County **does not** have GIS.

E. Web based – property record information access- June 2006. The County is now with GIS Workshop.

- F. Agri-data, Inc software implemented to re-measure all rural parcels to original plat with consideration to documented surveys and to aid conversion from old soil symbols to new numeric symbols.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property (*e.g. how you handle processes for Real Estate Transfers & ownership changes, Sales Review, building permits/information statements*).

The Assessor's staff processes sales transactions in the computer system and prints a copy of the 521 forms, property review sheet, which are given to the staff for review. Buyer/seller questionnaires are mailed at this time. The staff reviews the sales, takes new pictures, check accuracy of the data that we currently are using. Information confirmed is the land use for agricultural sales including verification with FSA records, the quality, condition and other data for any and all improvements. Properties are re-measured if something doesn't appear to be correct. Permits are provided to the Office by either the county zoning administrator or the city clerk which ever has the jurisdiction for the applicable property. The permits are all entered in the computer system to facilitate possible changes on parcels. In addition to the permits property information statements are utilized to track property alterations. The permits remain in the system for reference through the Property Record Card.

- B. Data Collection (*e.g. frequency & method of physical property inspections, listing, gather market and income data*)

In accordance with Neb. Statute §77-1311.03 the County is working to ensure that all parcels of real property are reviewed no less frequently than every six years. Further, properties are reviewed as deemed necessary from analysis of the market conditions within each Assessor Location.

The permit and sales review system offer opportunity for individual property reviews annually.

Working with ag-land property owners or tenants with land certification requirements between the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resource District provides updates for changes.

- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions (*e.g. how you perform A/S ratio studies internally or work with Field Liaison on analysis of A/S ratio studies*).

All statistics are reviewed annually to determine if adjustments are necessary to remain current with the market and building activity. For each assessor location and market area consideration is given to the number of sales in the study and the epoch of the parcel data.

The application of definitive market area boundaries within the agricultural sector is reviewed annually. This review attempts to ensure equality of sales distribution and types of classes and sub-classes moving in the market.

Analysis of this data is reviewed with the assigned Field Liaison and the plan of action for the year is developed.

D. Approaches to Value (*e.g. how you perform mass appraisal techniques or calibrate models, etc*);

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons,

Similar and like properties are studied to determine if action is necessary for adjustments for the upcoming year.

2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division CAMA system is utilized for costing and applying market depreciation. Marshall & Swift cost manual dates are updated when appropriate to revaluing and introducing updated depreciation tables.

Specific manual dates and depreciation studies may vary between assigned assessor locations. A preliminary and final chart depicting this information is completed each assessment year.

3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

Gather income information as available for commercial properties. Rental income has been requested for residential property. The income approach generally is not used since income/expense data is not readily available.

4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

Sales are plotted on a map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Analysis is completed for agricultural sales based on but not limited to the following components: number of sales; time frame of sales; number of acres selling; Further review is completed in attempt to make note of any difference in selling price paid per acre to be classed as special value.

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

The market is analyzed based on the standard approaches to valuation and the final valuation is determined based on the most appropriate method.

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.

Assessment ratios on current sale study periods are reviewed after final values are applied. The new costing and depreciation is then applied to the entire population of the class or sub-class being studied. Finally a unit of comparison analysis is completed to insure uniformity within the class or sub-class.

G. Notices and Public Relations

Notices of valuation change are mailed to property owners with assessed values different than the previous year on or before June 1<sup>st</sup>. These are mailed to the last known address of property owners. After notices have been mailed the appraisal staff is available to answer any questions or concerns of the taxpayers.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2014:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u># Sales</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	74	96.00		
Commercial	10	100.00		
Agricultural Land	76	70.00		
Special Value Agland	N/A			

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2011 Reports & Opinions.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:**

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

All other Residential parcels will be subject to in-house reviews with adjustments made as necessary to be compliant with market statistics.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion

of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

We will enter all the data from the reviews of the rural improvements and out buildings. New pictures will be added to the parcels.

Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriation in the valuation method, will be scrutinized for proportionality i.e. number of sales, timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties.

Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:**

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Property reviews with new photos will be in place at the Cabin area and the Marina. We will also do a review and new photos of the four small towns of Ashton, Rockville, Litchfield and Hazard.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

We will enter all the data from the reviews of the rural improvements and out buildings. New pictures will be added to the parcels.

Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriation in the valuation method, will be scrutinized for proportionality i.e. number of sales, timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties.

Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2017:**

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Property reviews with new photos will be in place for Loup City and the Acreages.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Completion of annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry-broke cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriation in the valuation method, will be scrutinized for proportionality i.e. number of sales, timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties.

Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

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

*(Optional Section as it may be relevant to achieving assessment actions planned - for example describe):*

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by statute/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report

- h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
- 3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 636 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
- 4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
- 5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
- 6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 212 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
- 7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
- 8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Tax Year 2013 finds 6 TIF's in Loup City City with a TIF Excess Value of 879,720.
- 9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
- 10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
- 11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
- 12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
- 13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
- 14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
- 15. Education: Assessor – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification Retention of the

assessor certification requires 60 hours of approved continuing education every four years.

Conclusion:

*Summarize current budget request & resources needed for the future to achieve assessment actions planned.*

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

SHERIE KUSZAK  
SHERMAN COUNTY ASSESSOR

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to County Board of Equalization.  
Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 of each year.



## 2015 Assessment Survey for Sherman County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	The part-time employee is sometimes shared with the county court office.
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$146,739
<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>
	\$20,000
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	n/a
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$30,000 for the CAMA system and the GIS
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$2,000
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	n/a
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$1,306.07

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The assessor and the deputy assessor
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, sherman.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	The maintenance of the GIS system is shared between the assessor, deputy assessor, and the vendor.
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

## 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>
	Loup City has its own zoning, and Ashton, Rockville, Litchfield & Hazard are governed by county zoning.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Robin Hendricksen
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop, Inc.
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	Agri-Data

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes, the county contract with Robin Hendricksen for the appraisal of large commercial properties.
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>
	The county does not specify requirements; however, the appraiser is a Certified General Appraiser
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes



# 2015 Certification for Sherman 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 Sherman County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2015.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



