

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 Thomas County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	18	Median	97.95
Total Sales Price	\$580,250	Mean	96.05
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$580,250	Wgt. Mean	95.81
Total Assessed Value	\$555,923	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$32,964
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$32,236	Avg. Assessed Value	\$30,885

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.68 to 101.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.62 to 103.00
95% Mean C.I	85.97 to 106.13
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	8.22
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.35
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.07

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	24	98	98.09
2013	22	94	89.57
2012	17	98	97.99
2011	21	99	99

2015 Commission Summary for Thomas County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	4	Median	95.12
Total Sales Price	\$973,000	Mean	93.73
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$973,000	Wgt. Mean	94.74
Total Assessed Value	\$921,850	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$56,379
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$243,250	Avg. Assessed Value	\$230,463

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	76.55 to 110.91
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.27
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.97
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	24.40

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2014	6	100	93.57
2013	2		88.61
2012	3		94.68
2011	1	0	100

2015 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Thomas County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	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 Thomas County

The county created new depreciation tables for 2015 after the county assessor discovered errors to the depreciation following their CAMA conversion the prior year. The costing remains the same using the 2012 Marshall and Swift Costing tables.

The village of Seneca voted to become unincorporated this year. During the development of the new depreciation, market evidence was analyzed that indicated that parcels within Seneca were better suited with the rural parcels.

All pick-up work was completed timely by part-time listers.

Additional Residential Assessment Actions are as follows:

New homes were reviewed.

A review of sale properties was completed.

A study of lot values was also completed for all villages.

A sales file book is kept in the office for anyone to view properties that have sold.

Physical review of Villages will start in 2015.

2015 Residential Assessment Survey for Thomas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:																							
	part time listers																							
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:																							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Theford has four neighborhoods within it, is the central business area for the county and has access to highways 2 and 83.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Rural Residential and Seneca (has some business but no highway), and Halsey (abuts the forest, highway 2 and some business).</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">AG</td> <td>Outbuildings- structures on rural parcels throughout the county</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Theford has four neighborhoods within it, is the central business area for the county and has access to highways 2 and 83.	2	Rural Residential and Seneca (has some business but no highway), and Halsey (abuts the forest, highway 2 and some business).	AG	Outbuildings- structures on rural parcels throughout the county												
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																							
1	Theford has four neighborhoods within it, is the central business area for the county and has access to highways 2 and 83.																							
2	Rural Residential and Seneca (has some business but no highway), and Halsey (abuts the forest, highway 2 and some business).																							
AG	Outbuildings- structures on rural parcels throughout the county																							
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.																							
	The cost approach is the primary method with sales being utilized in the development of the depreciation. It is difficult to build models for the other two approaches with limited sales and income data.																							
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?																							
	The county develops depreciation based on local market information.																							
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?																							
	Yes																							
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?																							
	A per square foot cost has been developed.																							
7.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?																							
	N/A																							
8.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010-2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">AG</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">NA</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2013</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>	1	2015	2012	2015	2010	2	2015	2012	2015	2010-2011	AG	2012	NA	2013	2011
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>																				
1	2015	2012	2015	2010																				
2	2015	2012	2015	2010-2011																				
AG	2012	NA	2013	2011																				

Halsey was physically reviewed in 2010. Rural and Seneca was physically reviewed in 2011. Outbuildings are on a Flat value table that was developed in 2012. New depreciation models were created for 2015 after the assessor discovered there were conversion errors when switching her CAMA system from the MIPS 2.0 to MIPS 2.5 and the village of seneca was dissolved which was added to the rural residential depreciation this year.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Thomas County

County Overview

Thomas County is primarily rangeland with an economy that is largely agricultural, mainly cattle production. The county is sparsely populated with a total population of 647 (2010 census). The initial development of the county can be tied directly to the westward advancement of the railroad. The three remaining towns, Thedford (pop188), Seneca (unincorporated), and Halsey (76) were all built along the rail line.

The county seat, Thedford, is located at the crossroads of highway 83 and 2. Location helps Thedford maintain a somewhat stable economic market. As the civil and social hub of the county, Thedford has a school, bank, some services and retail trade that serve the need of the ranching population. The village of Halsey is located on the eastern boundary of the county next to the Halsey National forest, with a portion of the town falling in Blaine County. Seneca is no longer incorporated, the residents of the village voted to dissolve the village this year. Both Halsey and Seneca have an unorganized and erratic residential market.

There have been two valuation groupings established to differentiate between varying market influences. Valuation grouping 01 consists of the village of Thedford, which has more demand for housing and is more organized than the rural areas and smaller villages that make up valuation grouping 02, where the market is considered very sporadic.

Description of Analysis

A comparison of the number of sold parcels in each valuation grouping compared to the number of parcels in the county show that the valuation grouping one and valuation group two, are being represented similarly in the sales file in accordance to the general makeup of the county. The sample contains only eighteen qualified sales, with ten sales in valuation grouping 01 and eight sales in valuation grouping 02. There are too few sales by individual valuation grouping for the statistics to be considered statistically reliable; the overall sample is being analyzed by the department.

The assessment actions state that new depreciation tables were developed for 2015 using market evidence. Although the statistics fall outside the acceptable range in valuation grouping 02, the sample is small and the market is erratic. The qualitative statistics of the overall sample fall within the acceptable range. The COD is low, especially in Thedford; however, the assessor relied on what few sales that occurred to build the depreciation tables. With so few sales, when this approach is used nearly every sale will have influence on the depreciation table. It is not likely that the COD will remain this low once sales after the study period occur. These assessment actions are substantiated by the sales file sample and the county's abstract of assessment.

2015 Residential Correlation Section for Thomas County

Sales Qualification

A Sales Qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties this year. The review involved analyzing the sale utilization rate and reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. There was no apparent bias in the qualification determination and all arm's length transactions were made available for measurement purposes.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices. This review was conducted in Thomas County in 2014; the review revealed that appraisal techniques were consistently and equitably applied within the residential class. Based on the review of assessment practices, the quality of assessment in the residential class is determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of the residential class in Thomas County is determined to be at 98% of market value.

2015 Commercial Assessment Actions for Thomas County

A complete reappraisal was conducted for the commercial class of real estate in 2015. The county hired Tax Valuation Inc. to physically inspect and revalue the commercial parcels within the county

The county completed all pick-up and permit work timely.

2015 Commercial Assessment Survey for Thomas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:				
	contracted appraiser				
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:				
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>			
	1	All commercial within Thomas County.			
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.				
	The cost approach is the primary method with sales being utilized in the development of the depreciation. It is difficult to build models for the other two approaches with limited sales and income data.				
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.				
	A credentialed appraiser is hired to assist in the valuation process.				
4.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?				
	Local market information is used in developing depreciation.				
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?				
	Not applicable.				
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.				
	From the market a square foot method has been developed.				
7.	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
	1	2015	2014	2014	2015

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Thomas County

County Overview

The economy of Thomas County is almost solely dependent upon the cattle production market. There are very few commercial parcels in Thomas County with the majority of them being within Thedford. The fact that Thedford sits at a crossroads of two major highways helps somewhat stabilize the economic market. Thedford has a school, bank, some services and retail trade that serve the needs of the ranching population. There are only a handful of commercial parcels in the other villages. A viable commercial market is almost non-existent within Thomas County.

Description of Analysis

There are forty-six commercial parcels in Thomas County that are represented by twenty-one occupancy codes. The majority of these codes contain only one parcel. The primary occupancy codes are 350 (restaurants) and 353 (retail stores). The statistical profile only contains four sales within the three year study period. With so few sales, the sample is not considered to be reliable for adequate measurement of the level of value.

The county contracted with Tax Valuation, Inc. for a complete reappraisal of the commercial class for 2015, including the physical inspection of commercial parcels to meet the six year inspection and review requirements. The costing was also updated to 2014 Marshall & Swift costing tables as part of the reappraisal.

The county assessor continues to complete and document the six year inspection and review cycle in a timely manner.

Sales Qualification

A Sales Qualification review was completed by the Department for all counties this year. The review involved analyzing the sale utilization rate and reviewing the non-qualified sales roster to ensure that the reasons for disqualifying sales were adequate and documented. There was no apparent bias in the qualification determination and all arm's length transactions were made available for measurement purposes.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The Department conducts a cyclical review of assessment practices. This review was conducted in Thomas County in 2014; the review revealed that appraisal techniques were consistently and equitably applied within the commercial class. Based on the review of assessment practices, the

2015 Commercial Correlation Section for Thomas County

quality of assessment in the commercial class is determined to be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards.

The sample of commercial sales is too small to be used in a meaningful analysis to determine the level of value of the commercial class.

Level of Value

Based on all available information and assessment practices, the level of value in Thomas County is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value for the commercial class of property.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Thomas County

A sales study of the agricultural market was conducted indicating that an adjustment was needed to the value of both irrigated and grass lands. Grass values were increased to \$335 and irrigated values increased to \$2,100. There is no dry land in Thomas County.

The assessor works with the Upper Loup NRD to keep all irrigated land listed correctly.

Land use was reviewed using GIS imagery for 2015.

Documented sales review questionnaires are being sent out and returned. A sales file book is kept in the office for anyone to review.

Pickup work was completed and new buildings were reviewed by part time employees. Sketches and photos are kept current after all pickup work is completed.

2015 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Thomas County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:							
	Two part-times listers.							
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; 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 style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Thomas County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grass land. The small remaining percentage is a mixture of irrigated and waste acres.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2015</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	0	Thomas County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grass land. The small remaining percentage is a mixture of irrigated and waste acres.	2015	
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
0	Thomas County is homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grass land. The small remaining percentage is a mixture of irrigated and waste acres.	2015						
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.							
	Not applicable.							
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.							
	This area is primarily ranch land. Small acreages that are not adjoining or part of a larger ranch holding, or would not substantiate an economically feasible ranching operation are considered rural residential. As of this interview non-agricultural influences have not been identified that would cause a parcel to be considered recreational.							
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?							
	Yes							
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.							
	Currently the market is not recognizing a non-agricultural influence.							
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If so, answer the following:							
	No							

Thomas County 2015 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Thomas	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Cherry	1	n/a	2,300	2,300	2,298	2,087	2,067	2,092	2,100	2,135
Blaine	1	n/a	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Custer	2	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Logan	1	n/a	3,630	3,495	3,360	2,870	2,870	2,600	2,485	3,048
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	2,100	2,100	n/a	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Thomas	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cherry	1	n/a	725	725	700	700	700	700	700	705
Blaine	1	n/a	515	n/a	n/a	n/a	515	515	515	515
Custer	2	n/a	540	530	530	515	515	505	505	517
Logan	1	n/a	1,625	1,560	1,560	1,440	1,440	1,210	1,210	1,441
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	725	n/a	725	725	725	725
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Thomas	1	n/a	n/a	335	335	n/a	335	335	335	335
Cherry	1	n/a	590	560	540	499	445	295	295	324
Blaine	1	n/a	515	n/a	515	515	515	390	390	393
Custer	2	n/a	395	395	395	395	398	400	396	396
Logan	1	n/a	415	415	415	415	415	415	415	415
McPherson	1	n/a	n/a	330	330	n/a	330	330	330	330
Hooker	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	320	320	310	310	310

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

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Thomas County

County Overview

Thomas County is part of the Nebraska Sand Hills; a region of grass-covered, stabilized sand dunes. Although there is some irrigation in the county with help of pivot irrigation, the fragile make-up of the soils is not ideal for cultivating crops. Therefore, 98% of the county is grass land that is suited for the production of cattle. The both Middle Loup River and the Dismal river run through Thomas County. Halsey National Forest lies on the eastern half of the county and is comprised of almost 90,000 acres.

Thomas County is in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District, which has moratoriums and restrictions. But the Upper Loup NRD also has a program for the expansion of irrigated acres, where annually they grant up to 2,500 additional acres to be irrigated if certain criteria are met.

Description of Analysis

The number of sales is very limited in Thomas County with only seven sales occurring within the three year study period. The analysis was expanded to bring in additional sales in an attempt to maximize the majority land use samples and balance the sample by study periods. The surrounding counties were also lacking in new year sales, leaving the analysis slightly unbalanced with fewer sales in the new year. An additional analysis was conducted including sales that were farther away to create a proportionate amount of sales in each study period. Including these sales had no effect on the analysis so the sample was left unbalanced using only the sales that were most comparable to Thomas County

An analysis of the agricultural market in the Sand Hills region indicates that both the grassland and irrigated land market values are increasing. Although there are no irrigated sales within Thomas County, the assessor attempted to recognize the market to stay uniform with other Sand Hills counties and took another substantial increase (42%) to the irrigated class. This increase generally demonstrates an acceptable portion of market value of the region has been attained. The county increased grass land values by 20%. This increase is typical for the region and the resulting values blend well with surrounding counties. Since the county is primarily grass land, the 95% MLU median of grassland is considered to be the best indicator of the level of value for the county.

Sales Qualification

A Sales Qualification review is completed annually for all counties. This review included the analysis of the non-qualified sales roster to verify that the reason for the disqualification was adequate and documented. There appears to be no bias in the qualification determinations and all arm's length sales were made available for the measurement of real property in the county.

2015 Agricultural Correlation Section for Thomas County

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The increases to the separate classes of land are typical of the region and the resulting values set by the assessor relate well with comparable counties to maintain intra and inter county equalization. These factors, along with statistics that fall within the acceptable range, indicate that the assessment practices meet generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Level of Value

Based on all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Thomas County is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class.

86 Thomas
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 : 18
Total Sales Price : 580,250
Total Adj. Sales Price : 580,250
Total Assessed Value : 555,923
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,236
Avg. Assessed Value : 30,885

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 96
COD : 13.86
PRD : 100.25

COV : 21.10
STD : 20.27
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.58
MAX Sales Ratio : 158.17
MIN Sales Ratio : 68.94

95% Median C.I. : 83.68 to 101.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.62 to 103.00
95% Mean C.I. : 85.97 to 106.13

Printed:4/2/2015 4:36:39PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	102.47	102.47	102.71	00.89	99.77	101.56	103.38	N/A	43,500	44,681
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	100.33	100.33	100.33	00.00	100.00	100.33	100.33	N/A	16,000	16,052
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	2	90.14	90.14	90.98	07.17	99.08	83.68	96.60	N/A	51,750	47,085
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	3	99.29	95.35	98.72	04.40	96.59	86.82	99.94	N/A	48,167	47,549
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13	3	86.58	105.26	86.19	33.55	122.13	71.03	158.17	N/A	15,833	13,647
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	3	80.99	88.73	100.47	19.47	88.31	68.94	116.25	N/A	35,083	35,249
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14	1	99.38	99.38	99.38	00.00	100.00	99.38	99.38	N/A	19,500	19,380
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	3	93.91	91.97	83.56	12.33	110.06	73.62	108.37	N/A	19,000	15,876
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	8	99.62	96.45	97.50	04.87	98.92	83.68	103.38	83.68 to 103.38	43,875	42,779
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	10	90.25	95.72	93.21	21.60	102.69	68.94	158.17	71.03 to 116.25	22,925	21,370
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	9	96.60	98.05	94.32	14.91	103.95	71.03	158.17	83.68 to 100.33	34,611	32,645
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.95	96.05	95.81	13.86	100.25	68.94	158.17	83.68 to 101.56	32,236	30,885

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	10	99.34	96.77	99.20	06.76	97.55	83.68	116.25	86.58 to 101.56	36,400	36,107
02	8	88.80	95.14	90.10	24.20	105.59	68.94	158.17	68.94 to 158.17	27,031	24,356
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.95	96.05	95.81	13.86	100.25	68.94	158.17	83.68 to 101.56	32,236	30,885

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	18	97.95	96.05	95.81	13.86	100.25	68.94	158.17	83.68 to 101.56	32,236	30,885
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.95	96.05	95.81	13.86	100.25	68.94	158.17	83.68 to 101.56	32,236	30,885

86 Thomas
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 : 18
Total Sales Price : 580,250
Total Adj. Sales Price : 580,250
Total Assessed Value : 555,923
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,236
Avg. Assessed Value : 30,885

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 96
COD : 13.86
PRD : 100.25

COV : 21.10
STD : 20.27
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.58
MAX Sales Ratio : 158.17
MIN Sales Ratio : 68.94

95% Median C.I. : 83.68 to 101.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.62 to 103.00
95% Mean C.I. : 85.97 to 106.13

Printed:4/2/2015 4:36:39PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	158.17	158.17	158.17	00.00	100.00	158.17	158.17	N/A	3,000	4,745	
Less Than 15,000	4	101.14	111.82	101.87	21.21	109.77	86.82	158.17	N/A	8,250	8,404	
Less Than 30,000	10	90.37	95.45	88.37	18.35	108.01	68.94	158.17	71.03 to 108.37	15,325	13,543	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	17	96.60	92.39	95.48	11.14	96.76	68.94	116.25	80.99 to 101.56	33,956	32,422	
Greater Than 14,999	14	97.95	91.54	95.44	11.58	95.91	68.94	116.25	73.62 to 101.56	39,089	37,308	
Greater Than 29,999	8	99.62	96.79	98.48	08.52	98.28	73.62	116.25	73.62 to 116.25	53,375	52,561	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	158.17	158.17	158.17	00.00	100.00	158.17	158.17	N/A	3,000	4,745	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	93.91	96.37	96.24	07.65	100.14	86.82	108.37	N/A	10,000	9,624	
15,000 TO 29,999	6	83.79	84.54	84.67	13.00	99.85	68.94	100.33	68.94 to 100.33	20,042	16,969	
30,000 TO 59,999	6	98.27	93.13	93.76	08.65	99.33	73.62	103.38	73.62 to 103.38	43,667	40,941	
60,000 TO 99,999	1	116.25	116.25	116.25	00.00	100.00	116.25	116.25	N/A	65,000	75,560	
100,000 TO 149,999	1	99.29	99.29	99.29	00.00	100.00	99.29	99.29	N/A	100,000	99,286	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.95	96.05	95.81	13.86	100.25	68.94	158.17	83.68 to 101.56	32,236	30,885	

86 Thomas
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 : 4
Total Sales Price : 973,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 973,000
Total Assessed Value : 921,850
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 243,250
Avg. Assessed Value : 230,463

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 94
COD : 09.41
PRD : 98.93

COV : 11.52
STD : 10.80
Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.95
MAX Sales Ratio : 103.64
MIN Sales Ratio : 81.03

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 76.55 to 110.91

Printed:4/2/2015 4:36:40PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	1	81.03	81.03	81.03	00.00	100.00	81.03	81.03	N/A	60,000	48,618
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13	1	101.70	101.70	101.70	00.00	100.00	101.70	101.70	N/A	23,000	23,392
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	96.09	96.09	95.49	07.87	100.63	88.53	103.64	N/A	445,000	424,920
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13											
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14											
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14											
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463
<u>ALL</u>	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463
<u>ALL</u>	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	3	101.70	95.46	100.80	07.41	94.70	81.03	103.64	N/A	164,333	165,643
04	1	88.53	88.53	88.53	00.00	100.00	88.53	88.53	N/A	480,000	424,920
<u>ALL</u>	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463

86 Thomas
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 : 4
Total Sales Price : 973,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 973,000
Total Assessed Value : 921,850
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 243,250
Avg. Assessed Value : 230,463

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 94
COD : 09.41
PRD : 98.93

COV : 11.52
STD : 10.80
Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.95
MAX Sales Ratio : 103.64
MIN Sales Ratio : 81.03

95% Median C.I. : N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
95% Mean C.I. : 76.55 to 110.91

Printed:4/2/2015 4:36:40PM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	1	101.70	101.70	101.70	00.00	100.00	101.70	101.70	N/A	23,000	23,392
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463
Greater Than 14,999	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463
Greater Than 29,999	3	88.53	91.07	94.57	08.52	96.30	81.03	103.64	N/A	316,667	299,486
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	1	101.70	101.70	101.70	00.00	100.00	101.70	101.70	N/A	23,000	23,392
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999	1	81.03	81.03	81.03	00.00	100.00	81.03	81.03	N/A	60,000	48,618
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	2	96.09	96.09	95.49	07.87	100.63	88.53	103.64	N/A	445,000	424,920
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
343	1	81.03	81.03	81.03	00.00	100.00	81.03	81.03	N/A	60,000	48,618
344	2	96.09	96.09	95.49	07.87	100.63	88.53	103.64	N/A	445,000	424,920
528	1	101.70	101.70	101.70	00.00	100.00	101.70	101.70	N/A	23,000	23,392
<u>ALL</u>	4	95.12	93.73	94.74	09.41	98.93	81.03	103.64	N/A	243,250	230,463

86 Thomas
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 : 15
Total Sales Price : 8,181,471
Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,181,471
Total Assessed Value : 5,829,979
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 545,431
Avg. Assessed Value : 388,665

MEDIAN : 69
WGT. MEAN : 71
MEAN : 74
COD : 20.76
PRD : 104.38

COV : 25.34
STD : 18.85
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.39
MAX Sales Ratio : 111.67
MIN Sales Ratio : 36.74

95% Median C.I. : 62.68 to 89.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.77 to 80.75
95% Mean C.I. : 63.94 to 84.82

Printed: 4/2/2015 4:36:41PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	91.07	95.55	90.31	10.16	105.80	83.92	111.67	N/A	477,168	430,953
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	74.44	74.44	74.44	00.00	100.00	74.44	74.44	N/A	1,030,005	766,782
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	98.03	98.03	98.03	00.00	100.00	98.03	98.03	N/A	200,000	196,063
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	65.27	65.27	65.27	00.00	100.00	65.27	65.27	N/A	1,775,000	1,158,558
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	72.66	72.66	71.31	13.74	101.89	62.68	82.63	N/A	584,600	416,850
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	4	68.29	66.58	66.08	03.79	100.76	60.39	69.33	N/A	297,000	196,245
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
01-OCT-13 To 31-DEC-13											
01-JAN-14 To 31-MAR-14	1	36.74	36.74	36.74	00.00	100.00	36.74	36.74	N/A	570,000	209,439
01-APR-14 To 30-JUN-14											
01-JUL-14 To 30-SEP-14	2	71.47	71.47	71.85	25.00	99.47	53.60	89.33	N/A	408,881	293,800
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	6	87.50	87.40	76.96	14.70	113.57	65.27	111.67	65.27 to 111.67	739,418	569,044
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	6	68.29	68.60	68.67	07.39	99.90	60.39	82.63	60.39 to 82.63	392,867	269,780
01-OCT-13 To 30-SEP-14	3	53.60	59.89	57.43	32.71	104.28	36.74	89.33	N/A	462,587	265,680
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	5	74.44	76.61	70.79	14.16	108.22	62.68	98.03	N/A	834,841	591,020
01-JAN-13 To 31-DEC-13	4	68.29	66.58	66.08	03.79	100.76	60.39	69.33	N/A	297,000	196,245
<u>ALL</u>	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665
<u>ALL</u>	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665

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	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665
1	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665
<u>ALL</u>	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665

86 Thomas
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 : 15	MEDIAN : 69	COV : 25.34	95% Median C.I. : 62.68 to 89.33
Total Sales Price : 8,181,471	WGT. MEAN : 71	STD : 18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.77 to 80.75
Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,181,471	MEAN : 74	Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.39	95% Mean C.I. : 63.94 to 84.82
Total Assessed Value : 5,829,979			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 545,431	COD : 20.76	MAX Sales Ratio : 111.67	
Avg. Assessed Value : 388,665	PRD : 104.38	MIN Sales Ratio : 36.74	

Printed:4/2/2015 4:36:41PM

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
____ Grass ____											
County	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665
1	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665
____ ALL ____	15	69.33	74.38	71.26	20.76	104.38	36.74	111.67	62.68 to 89.33	545,431	388,665

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 1,662	Value : 166,090,062	Growth 1,547,925	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	45	144,564	0	0	67	191,480	112	336,044	
02. Res Improve Land	171	476,412	0	0	118	887,679	289	1,364,091	
03. Res Improvements	175	5,988,790	0	0	127	5,958,280	302	11,947,070	
04. Res Total	220	6,609,766	0	0	194	7,037,439	414	13,647,205	51,260
% of Res Total	53.14	48.43	0.00	0.00	46.86	51.57	24.91	8.22	3.31
05. Com UnImp Land	2	3,898	0	0	13	55,072	15	58,970	
06. Com Improve Land	32	64,739	0	0	18	163,323	50	228,062	
07. Com Improvements	33	1,026,770	0	0	19	2,463,605	52	3,490,375	
08. Com Total	35	1,095,407	0	0	32	2,682,000	67	3,777,407	0
% of Com Total	52.24	29.00	0.00	0.00	47.76	71.00	4.03	2.27	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	220	6,609,766	0	0	194	7,037,439	414	13,647,205	51,260
% of Res & Rec Total	53.14	48.43	0.00	0.00	46.86	51.57	24.91	8.22	3.31
Com & Ind Total	35	1,095,407	0	0	32	2,682,000	67	3,777,407	0
% of Com & Ind Total	52.24	29.00	0.00	0.00	47.76	71.00	4.03	2.27	0.00
17. Taxable Total	255	7,705,173	0	0	226	9,719,439	481	17,424,612	51,260
% of Taxable Total	53.01	44.22	0.00	0.00	46.99	55.78	28.94	10.49	3.31

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	32	1,520	32	1,520	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	32	1,520	32	1,520	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	33	0	20	53

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,006	114,298,060	1,006	114,298,060
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	142	18,770,205	142	18,770,205
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	143	15,595,665	143	15,595,665
30. Ag Total							1,149	148,663,930

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	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	22	23.00	253,000	22	23.00	253,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	91	101.99	1,121,890	91	101.99	1,121,890	
33. HomeSite Improvements	105	0.00	12,552,420	105	0.00	12,552,420	909,495
34. HomeSite Total				127	124.99	13,927,310	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	8	15.26	15,260	8	15.26	15,260	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	91	202.04	198,040	91	202.04	198,040	
37. FarmSite Improvements	140	0.00	3,043,245	140	0.00	3,043,245	587,170
38. FarmSite Total				148	217.30	3,256,545	
39. Road & Ditches	194	1,444.47	0	194	1,444.47	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	18	165.24	207,806	18	165.24	207,806	
41. Total Section VI				275	1,952.00	17,391,661	1,496,665

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

* LB 968 (2006) for tax year 2009 and forward there will be no Recapture value.

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	241.70	6.67%	507,570	6.67%	2,100.00
48. 2A	370.60	10.22%	778,260	10.22%	2,100.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	1,182.97	32.64%	2,484,237	32.64%	2,100.00
51. 4A1	31.91	0.88%	67,011	0.88%	2,100.00
52. 4A	1,797.29	49.59%	3,774,309	49.59%	2,100.00
53. Total	3,624.47	100.00%	7,611,387	100.00%	2,100.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	134.00	0.04%	44,890	0.04%	335.00
66. 2G	1,000.64	0.27%	335,215	0.27%	335.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	7,474.00	2.03%	2,503,793	2.03%	335.00
69. 4G1	1,763.51	0.48%	590,778	0.48%	335.00
70. 4G	357,823.00	97.18%	119,870,625	97.18%	335.00
71. Total	368,195.15	100.00%	123,345,301	100.00%	335.00
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	3,624.47	0.97%	7,611,387	5.80%	2,100.00
Dry Total					
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total					
Grass Total	368,195.15	98.47%	123,345,301	93.96%	335.00
72. Waste	2,103.86	0.56%	315,581	0.24%	150.00
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	373,923.48	100.00%	131,272,269	100.00%	351.07

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,624.47	7,611,387	3,624.47	7,611,387
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	368,195.15	123,345,301	368,195.15	123,345,301
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,103.86	315,581	2,103.86	315,581
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	373,923.48	131,272,269	373,923.48	131,272,269

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	3,624.47	0.97%	7,611,387	5.80%	2,100.00
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	368,195.15	98.47%	123,345,301	93.96%	335.00
Waste	2,103.86	0.56%	315,581	0.24%	150.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	373,923.48	100.00%	131,272,269	100.00%	351.07

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

86 Thomas

	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	13,110,899	13,647,205	536,306	4.09%	51,260	3.70%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,639,235	13,927,310	1,288,075	10.19%	909,495	3.00%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	25,750,134	27,574,515	1,824,381	7.08%	960,755	3.35%
05. Commercial	3,404,317	3,777,407	373,090	10.96%	0	10.96%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	3,003,480	3,256,545	253,065	8.43%	587,170	-11.12%
08. Minerals	1,520	1,520	0	0.00	0	0.00
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	6,409,317	7,035,472	626,155	9.77%	587,170	0.61%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	32,159,451	34,817,793	2,658,342	8.27%	1,547,925	3.45%
11. Irrigated	5,346,105	7,611,387	2,265,282	42.37%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	103,094,551	123,345,301	20,250,750	19.64%		
14. Wasteland	315,581	315,581	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	164,006	0	-164,006	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	108,920,243	131,272,269	22,352,026	20.52%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	141,079,694	166,090,062	25,010,368	17.73%	1,547,925	16.63%

THOMAS COUNTY, NEBRASKA

2014 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

June 15, 2014

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.
Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

General Description of Real Property in Thomas County:

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

	Parcel/Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential/Rec	420	25%	13,160,958	8%	1,752,805	11,408,153
Commercial/Ind	66	4%	3,375,154	2%	295,354	3,079,800
Agricultural	1193	71%	124,564,478	90%	110,509,953	14,054,525
Total	1664	100%	141,100,590	100%	112,558,112	28,542,478

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Thomas County, with the majority consisting of grassland, primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Agricultural Land – Taxable Acres

Irrigated	-	3,624.47
Grass	-	373,788.17
Waste	-	2,103.86

Agricultural Land – Forest Acres (Exempt-Not in Computer System)

US Forest	-	78,639
-----------	---	--------

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

Current Resources:

Staff/Budget/Training

Due to the population of the county, the Thomas County Clerk is required to be an ex-officio County official, who must also hold the office of Assessor, Register of Deeds, Clerk of District Court and Election Commissioner. A valid Nebraska Assessor's Certificate is required in order to file for or assume the position of County Clerk. A part time office assistant is also on staff in the Ex-Officio Clerk's office. The county contracts with an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance. Two additional part time staff has been hired for physical reviews of the real property in Thomas County.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the clerk's budget for FY 2014-2015 is \$31,250.

The assessor believes continuing education is vital to maintaining proper assessment action. The assessor attends as many monthly district meetings as possible, as well as workshops offered by

the Nebraska Association of County Officials, the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue and the International Association of Assessing Officers.

Record Maintenance

Thomas County's cadastral maps have not been consistently maintained since the mid 1990's. The county board has recognized the need for consistent maintenance of the records and approved the development of a web based GIS system through GIS Workshop. Development began in June 2007 and was completed the spring of 2011. All maintenance to the GIS data for 2014/2015 and hosting of the GIS on the Internet will be handled by GIS Workshop. New property record cards were created for each parcel of real property in 2013. Each property record card is filed by legal description and contains up-to-date listings, photographs and sketches for those properties that have improvements. All rural parcels will have new soil data sheets added to the property record card.

Thomas County upgraded their software to PC Administration offered by MIPS for assessment and CAMA (computer assisted mass appraisal) administration. Upon completion of development of the GIS system, this office will have the ability to maintain all records electronically and make them available via the Internet at <http://thomas.assessor.gisworkshop.com>.

Assessment Procedures:

Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor also serves as register of deeds and zoning administrator, which is an aid in the process of property discovery. Data collection is done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA, NRCS, and NRD offices is also useful in tracking land usage.

Sales Review

The Assessor considers all sales to be arm's length, unless through the verification process, it is proven to be otherwise. Along with personal knowledge, the sales are verified with the buyer and seller. Most of the verification is done by personal contact or through a questionnaire mailed out to each the buyer and seller with a self-addressed stamped envelope for return to the Assessor's office.

Thomas County processes less than one-hundred Real Estate Transfer Form 521's annually. These are filed on a timely basis with the Department of Assessment & Taxation. Standards of sales review from the International Association of Assessing Officers, Standard of Ratio Studies, 1999, are adhered to.

Data Collection

Thomas County will implement procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

Ratio Studies

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

Value Approaches

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

Cost Approach: The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. Marshall/Swift costing dated December 2012 is used to arrive at Replacement Cost New (RCN). A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value. A depreciation study completed in 2013 by the county's assessor for residential, rural residential and commercial revaluation was used for the current year market values.

Income Approach: The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties. Collection and analysis of income and expense data was completed in 2006 by the county's contracted appraiser.

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

Reconciliation of Value

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

Sales Ratio Review

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

Notices

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

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

Property Class	Ratio (Level of Value)	*COD	*PRD
Residential	98.00	5.84	100.06
Commercial	100.00	28.53	158.47
Agricultural	69.00	27.02	97.31

(*Co-efficient of dispersion and price-related differential)

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review. New Marshall & Swift costing was applied in 2013.

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

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

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

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

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:

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

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

Agricultural: A physical inspection of the improved acreages and rural residential parcels will be conducted. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA

offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

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

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 20 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 40 applications annually.

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

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 100 personal property schedules annually.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ag Land Trust Report: Report of all property within the county owned by trusts to be filed with the Secretary of State no later than October 1 annually.

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

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

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

Conclusion:

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lorissa Hartman
Thomas County Assessor

2015 Assessment Survey for Thomas County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1
4.	Other part-time employees:
	2
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$30,750
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$ 10,000 (\$ 5,000 part-time help, \$ 5,000 contract)
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	Not applicable.
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$ 12,000
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 750
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	N/A
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$ 18,826.97

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Except for the villages.
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Tax Valuation, Inc
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	MIPS

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Currently there are only two part-time listers that are hired by the county, and Tax Valuation, Inc
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Qualified and credentialed individuals
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Yes, Tax Valuation Inc
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	the appraiser provides data and recommendations of value, but the assessor has the ultimate say in the determination of value.

2015 Certification for Thomas 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 Thomas 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

