

2024 REPORTS AND OPINIONS OF THE PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR

KNOX COUNTY

Good Life. Great Service.
April 5, 2024
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

Commissioner Hotz :

The Property Tax Administrator has compiled the 2024 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Knox County pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027. This Report and Opinion will inform the Tax Equalization and Review Commission of the level of value and quality of assessment for real property in Knox County.
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## Introduction

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 the Property Tax Administrator (PTA) shall annually prepare and deliver to each county assessor and to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (Commission) the Reports and Opinions (R\&O). The R\&O contains statistical and narrative reports informing the Commission of the certified opinion of the PTA regarding the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in each county. In addition, the PTA may make nonbinding recommendations for class or subclass adjustments to be considered by the Commission.

The statistical and narrative reports in the R\&O provide an analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The PTA's opinion of the level of value and quality of assessment in each county, is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and information gathered by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) regarding the assessment activities in the county during the preceding year.

The statistical reports are developed using the statewide sales file that contains all transactions as required by Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327. From this state sales file, a statistical analysis comparing assessments to sale prices for arm's-length sales (assessment sales ratio) is prepared. After analyzing all available information to determine that the sales represent the class or subclass of real property being measured, inferences are drawn regarding the level of assessment and quality of assessment of that class or subclass of real property. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed based on standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO).

The analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio studies and the overall quality of assessment in the county. The assessment practices are evaluated in the county to ensure generally accepted mass appraisal techniques are used and that those methods will generally produce uniform and proportionate valuations.

The PTA considers the statistical reports and the analysis of assessment practices when forming conclusions for both the level of value and quality of assessment. The consideration of both the statistical indicators and assessment processes used to develop valuations is necessary to accurately determine the level of value and quality of assessment. Assessment practices that produce a biased sales file will generally produce a biased statistical indicator, which, on its face, would otherwise appear to be valid. Likewise, statistics produced on small, unrepresentative, or otherwise unreliable samples, may indicate issues with assessment uniformity and assessment level; however, a detailed review of the practices and valuation models may suggest otherwise. For these reasons, the detail of the PTA's analysis is presented and contained within the Residential, Commercial, and Agricultural land correlations of the R\&O.

## Statistical Analysis:

Before relying upon any calculated statistical measures to evaluate the assessment performance of the county assessor, the Division teammates must evaluate whether the statistical sample is both representative of the population and statistically reliable.

A statistically sufficient reliable sample of sales is one in which the features of the sample contain information necessary to compute an estimate of the population. To determine whether the sample of sales is sufficient in size to evaluate the class of real property, measures of reliability are considered, such as the coefficient of dispersion (COD) or the width of the confidence interval. Generally, the broader the qualitative measures, the more sales will be needed to have reliability in the ratio study.

A representative sample is a group of sales from a larger population of parcels, such that statistical indicators calculated from the sample can be expected to reflect the characteristics of the sold and unsold population being studied. The accuracy of statistics as estimators of the population depends on the degree to which the sample represents the population.

Since multiple factors affect whether a sample is statistically sufficient, reliable, and representative, single test thresholds cannot be used to make determinations regarding sample reliability or representativeness.

For the analysis in determining a point estimate of the level of value, the PTA considers three measures as indicators of the central tendency of assessment: the median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. The use and reliability of each measure is based on inherent strengths and weaknesses which are the quantity and quality of the information from which it was calculated and the defined scope of the analysis.

The median ratio is considered the most appropriate statistical measure to determine a level of value for direct equalization, which is the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to an unacceptable required level of value. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, adjusting the class or subclass of properties based upon the median measure will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present in the class of property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers, which can skew the outcome in the other measures.

The weighted mean ratio best reflects a comparison of the fully assessable valuation of a jurisdiction, by measuring the total assessed values against the total of selling prices. The weighted mean ratio can be heavily influenced by sales of large-dollar property with extreme ratios.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the Price Related Differential (PRD) and Coefficient of Variation (COV). As a simple average of the ratios, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of the level of value because it assumes a normal
distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.
The quality of assessment relies in part on statistical indicators as well. If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the mean ratio, it may be an indication of disproportionate assessments. Assessments are disproportionate when properties within a class are assessed at noticeably different levels of market value. The coefficient produced by this calculation is referred to as the PRD and measures the assessment level of lower-priced properties relative to the assessment level of higher-priced properties. The PRD range stated in IAAO standards is $98 \%$ to $103 \%$. A perfect match in assessment level between the low-dollar properties and high-dollar properties indicates a PRD of $100 \%$. The reason for the extended range on the high end is the recognition by IAAO of the inherent bias in assessment. The IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies notes that the PRD is sensitive to sales with higher prices even if the ratio on higher priced sales do not appear unusual relative to other sales, and that small samples, samples with high dispersion, or extreme ratios may not provide an accurate indication of assessment regressivity or progressivity, appraisal biases that occur when high-value properties are appraised higher or lower than low-value properties in relation to market values.

The Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) is a measure also used in the evaluation of assessment quality. The COD measures the average absolute deviation calculated about the median and is expressed as a percentage of the median. A COD of $15 \%$ indicates that half of the assessment ratios are expected to fall within $15 \%$ of the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median the more equitable the property assessments tend to be.

Nebraska law does not provide for a range of acceptability for the COD or PRD; however, the IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies establishes the following range of acceptability for the COD:

| General Property Class | Jurisdiction Size/Profile/Market Activity | COD Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential improved (single family dwellings, condominiums, manuf. housing, 2-4 family units) | Very large jurisdictions/densely populated/newer properties/active markets | 5.0 to 10.0 |
|  | Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/older \& newer properties/less active markets | 5.0 to 15.0 |
|  | Rural or small jurisdictions/older properties/depressed market areas | 5.0 to 20.0 |
| Income-produding properties (commerdial, industrial, apartments,) | Very large jurisdictions/densely populated/newer properties/active markets | 5.0 to 15.0 |
|  | Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/older \& newer properties/less active markets | 5.0 to 20.0 |
|  | Rural or small jurisdictions/older properties/depressed market areas | 5.0 to 25.0 |
| Residential vacant land | Very large jurisdictions/rapid development/active markets | 5.0 to 15.0 |
|  | Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/slower development/less active markets | 5.0 to 20.0 |
|  | Rural or small jurisdictions//ittle development/depressed markets | 5.0 to 25.0 |
| Other (non-agricultural) vacant land | Very large jurisdictions/rapid development/active markets | 5.0 to 20.0 |
|  | Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/slower development/less active markets | 5.0 to 25.0 |
|  | Rural or small jurisdictions//ittle development/depressed markets | 5.0 to 30.0 |

A COD under $5 \%$ indicates that the properties in the sample are either unusually homogenous, or possibly indicative of a non-representative sample due to the selective reappraisal of sold parcels. The IAAO utilizes varying upper bounds for the COD range to recognize that sample size, property type, variation of property ages and market conditions directly impact the COD. This chart and the analyses of factors impacting the COD are considered to determine whether the calculated COD is within an acceptable range. The reliability of the COD can also be directly affected by extreme ratios.

The confidence interval is another measure used to evaluate the reliability of the statistical indicators. The PTA primarily relies upon the median confidence interval, although the mean and weighted mean confidence intervals are calculated as well. While there are no formal standards regarding the acceptable width of such measure, the range established is often useful in determining the range in which the true level of value is expected to exist. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023, the acceptable range is $69 \%$ to $75 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land, except for taxes levied to pay school bonds passed after January 12, 2022 for which the acceptable range is $44 \%$ to $50 \%$ of actual value. For all other classes of real property, the acceptable range is $92 \%$ to $100 \%$ of actual value.

## Analysis of Assessment Practices:

A review of the assessment practices that ultimately affect the valuation of real property in each county is completed. This review is done to ensure the reliability of the statistical analysis and to ensure generally accepted mass appraisal techniques are used to establish uniform and proportionate valuations. The review of assessment practices is based on information provided by the county assessors in Assessment Surveys and Assessed Value Updates (AVU), along with observed assessment practices in the county.

To ensure county assessors are submitting all Real Estate Transfer Statements, required for the development of the state sales file pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327, a random sample from the county registers of deeds' records is audited to confirm that the required sales have been submitted and reflect accurate information. The timeliness of the submission is also reviewed to ensure the sales file allows analysis of up-to-date information. The sales verification and qualification procedures used by the county assessors are reviewed to ensure that sales are properly considered arm's-length transactions unless determined to be otherwise through the verification process. Proper sales verification practices ensure the statistical analysis is based on an unbiased sample of sales.

Comparison of valuation changes on sold and unsold properties is conducted to ensure that there is no bias in the assessment of sold parcels and that the sales file adequately represents the population of parcels in the county.

Valuation groups and market areas are also examined to identify whether the groups and areas being measured truly represent economic areas within the county. The measurement of economic areas is the method by which the PTA ensures intra-county equalization exists. The progress of the county assessor's six-year inspection and review cycle is documented to ensure compliance with Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1311.03 and also to confirm that all property is being uniformly listed and described for valuation purposes.

Valuation methodologies developed by the county assessor are reviewed for both appraisal logic and to ensure compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. Methods and sales used to develop lot values, agricultural outbuildings, and agricultural site values are also reviewed to ensure the land component of the valuation process is based on the local market and economic area.

Compliance with statutory reporting requirements is also a component of the assessment practices review. Late, incomplete, or excessive errors in statutory reports can be problematic for property owners, county officials, the Division, the Commission, and others. The late, incomplete, or excessive errors in statutory reporting highlights potential issues in other areas of the assessment process. Public trust in the assessment process demands transparency, and assessment practices are reviewed to ensure taxpayers are served with such transparency.

Comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county is conducted throughout the year. When practical, if potential issues are identified, they are presented to the county assessor for clarification and correction, if necessary. The county assessor can then work to implement corrective measures prior to establishing assessed values. The PTA's conclusion that assessment quality either meets or does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal techniques is based on the totality of the assessment practices in the county.
*Further information may be found in Exhibit 94

## County Overview

With a total area of 1,108 square miles, Knox County has 8,336 residents, per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2024, a slight population increase from the 2023 U.S. Census. Reports indicate that $76 \%$ of county residents are homeowners and $88 \%$ of residents occupy the same residence as in the prior year (Census Quick
 Facts). The average home value is $\$ 92,638$ (2023
Average Residential Value, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-3506.02).
2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied $\quad$ NE Dept. of Revenue, Research Division 2023

|  | CITY POPULATION CHANGE |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | Change |
| BAZILE MILLS | 29 | 26 | $-10.3 \%$ |
| BLOOMFIELD | 1,028 | 986 | $-4.1 \%$ |
| CENTER | 94 | 79 | $-16.0 \%$ |
| CREIGHTON | 1,154 | 1,147 | $-0.6 \%$ |
| CROFTON | 726 | 756 | $4.1 \%$ |
| NIOBRARA | 370 | 365 | $-1.4 \%$ |
| SANTEE | 346 | 424 | $22.5 \%$ |
| VERDEL | 30 | 38 | $26.7 \%$ |
| VERDIGRE | 575 | 554 | $-3.7 \%$ |
| WAUSA | 634 | 592 | $-6.6 \%$ |
| WINNETOON | 68 | 54 | $-20.6 \%$ |

The majority of the commercial properties in Knox County are located in and around Bloomfield and Creighton. According to the latest information available from the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 257 employer establishments with total employment of 1,604 , a $2 \%$ decrease in employment, from 2019.

Agricultural land is the largest contributor to the county's valuation base. Knox County is included in the Lower Niobrara Natural Resources District (NRD). When compared against the top crops of the other counties in Nebraska, Knox County ranks first in corn for silage. In value of sales by commodity group, Knox County ranks first in

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Knox County

## Assessment Actions

Bloomfield, Center, Verdigre, Winnetoon, Bazile Mills and Creighton were reviewed for the 2024 assessment year. Updated costing and depreciation tables were implemented in the reviewed valuation groups. A lot study was conducted for all valuation groups. A 7\% increase to improvements was made to Niobrara. A $2 \%$ increase to improvements was made to Bloomfield.

A 5\% increase to improvements was implemented to rural properties in Market Area 1 and 3 and lowered $5 \%$ in Market Area 2. Rural site values were increased to $\$ 3500$ per acre.

The county assessor completed routine maintenance and pick-up work.

## Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

Sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's length sales are made available for measurement purposes. The sales usability rate for the residential class is near the statewide average. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified. The review revealed that no apparent bias exists in the qualification determination and that all arm's length transactions have been made available for measurement purposes.

Valuation groups are reviewed to ensure that economic differences are adequately identified and stratified. Knox county consists of twelve valuation groups primarily based on the assessor locations within the county. The valuation groups that have an insufficient number of sales are subject to the same appraisal techniques as the acceptable valuation groups.

The county assessor has a systematic review schedule, and a tracking file of the areas that are reviewed each year in order to remain in compliance with the six-year inspection and review cycle. Inspection dates range from 2018-2023. The land to building ratio indicate that lot values are low. Lot values are reviewed and updated within the six-year review cycle, dated 2024. Costing tables are dated 2021 except for Rural. Rural costing is dated 2017. Depreciation tables range from 20222024.

The county assessor has a written methodology on file.

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Knox County

## Description of Analysis

There are 12 valuation groups utilized in the residential class based on the county assessor locations.

| Valuation Group | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Bloomfield |
| 3 | Bazille Mills, Verdel and Winnetoon |
| 5 | Center |
| 10 | Creighton |
| 15 | Crofton |
| 20 | Lake |
| 26 | Devil's Nest |
| 30 | Niobrara |
| 35 | Rural |
| 37 | Santee |
| 45 | Verdigre |
| 50 | Wausa |

The statistical sample in the residential class consists of 202 sales, with the median within the acceptable range, the mean and weighted mean are low. The COD is within the range recommended by IAAO, and the PRD is high. Ten of the twelve valuation groups are represented and all with sufficient sales have a median within the acceptable range. Valuation Groups 3 and 5 have insufficient sample sizes for measurement purposes.

Review of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) indicates that the sales file changed at a higher rate than the abstract. This does support a sales bias; however, the abstract does contain changes that affect the unsold population and supports a level of value within the acceptable range.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

A review of the statistics with sufficient sales and the assessment practices suggests that the assessments within the county are valued within the acceptable range and are therefore equalized. Residential property is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Knox County

| VALUATION GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD |  |
| 1 | 30 | 94.48 | 87.75 | 79.55 | 15.44 | 110.31 |  |
| 3 | 2 | 61.49 | 61.49 | 46.27 | 37.11 | 132.89 |  |
| 5 | 1 | 95.86 | 95.86 | 95.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 |  |
| 10 | 40 | 95.10 | 92.97 | 84.41 | 14.64 | 110.14 |  |
| 15 | 27 | 92.04 | 91.26 | 90.00 | 10.00 | 101.40 |  |
| 20 | 32 | 91.64 | 86.94 | 87.32 | 15.02 | 99.56 |  |
| 30 | 10 | 92.60 | 91.05 | 90.64 | 10.30 | 100.45 |  |
| 35 | 18 | 92.68 | 89.97 | 86.65 | 13.52 | 103.83 |  |
| 45 | 14 | 95.22 | 96.09 | 91.67 | 08.73 | 104.82 |  |
| 50 | 28 | 93.03 | 88.53 | 84.29 | 11.96 | 105.03 |  |
|  |  | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 |

## Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the residential property in Knox County is $94 \%$.

## 2024 Commercial Correlation for Knox County

## Assessment Actions

An increase of $3 \%$ to improvements for Crofton was implemented for 2024 assessment year. Pick-up work and general maintenance were completed for the commercial class.

## Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales usability rate for the commercial class is near the statewide average. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified. The review revealed that no apparent bias exists in the qualification determination and that all arm's length transactions have been made available for measurement purposes. There are eleven commercial valuation groups in Knox County. All valuation groups lack a sufficient sample of sales. The Property Assessment Division's (Division's) analysis is limited to the overall class.

The county assessor is current and in compliance with the six-year inspection and review cycle. The county assessor has a systematic review schedule, a tracking file of the areas that are reviewed each year. The entire commercial class was inspected in 2018 and 2019. Lot values were reviewed and updated in 2021. Depreciation tables are dated 2021 and costing tables are dated 2020.

## Description of Analysis

There are 11 valuation groups utilized in the commercial class.

| Valuation Group | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Bloomfield |
| 3 | Bazille Mills, Center, Verdel, Winnetoon |
| 10 | Creighton |
| 15 | Crofton |
| 20 | Lake |
| 26 | Devil's Nest |
| 30 | Niobrara |
| 35 | Rural |
| 37 | Santee |
| 45 | Verdigre |
| 50 | Wausa |

## 2024 Commercial Correlation for Knox County

The statistical sample in the commercial class consists of 28 sales. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, the weighted mean is low. The COD is within the acceptable range recommended by IAAO, the PRD is high. Further analysis of the overall statistics shows the removal of the two most extreme outlier ratios will improve the qualitative measures, bringing the PRD within acceptable range.

Review of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) supports the reported actions of the county assessor.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Based on the review of all available information and the statistical profile, commercial values within the class are uniformly applied. The quality of assessment complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

| VALUATION GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD |
| 1 | 6 | 94.05 | 90.56 | 100.52 | 11.00 | 90.09 |
| 3 | 1 | 99.59 | 99.59 | 99.59 | 00.00 | 100.00 |
| 10 | 9 | 92.34 | 102.70 | 87.78 | 22.66 | 117.00 |
| 15 | 5 | 93.23 | 88.60 | 84.97 | 11.24 | 104.27 |
| 35 | 2 | 87.05 | 87.05 | 77.53 | 18.22 | 112.28 |
| 45 | 3 | 97.30 | 88.52 | 90.77 | 14.29 | 97.52 |
| 50 | 2 | 93.98 | 93.98 | 97.32 | 12.09 | 96.57 |
| ALL | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 |

## Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the commercial property in Knox County is $94 \%$.

## 2024 Agricultural Correlation for Knox County

## Assessment Actions

Irrigated land was increased between $19 \%$ and $26 \%$ and dryland increased between $30 \%$ and $36 \%$ depending on Land Capability Group (LCG), and grassland was increased $50 \%$ in Market Area 1. Irrigated land was increased $6 \%$ to $9 \%$ and dryland was increased $16 \%$ to $18 \%$ depending on LCG, grassland was increased $23 \%$, CRP was increased $27 \%$ to $28 \%$, and timber was increased $8 \%$ in Market Area 2. Irrigated land was increased $10 \%$ to $12 \%$ depending on LCG, dryland was increased $30 \%$, grassland was increased $50 \%$, and timber was increased $8 \%$ in Market Area 3.

The county assessor completed routine maintenance and pick-up work.

## Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales usability rate for the agricultural class is below the statewide average. A review of the non-qualified sales revealed the majority are family and adjacent landowner sales. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified. The review revealed that no apparent bias exists in the qualification determination and that all arm's length transactions have been made available for measurement purposes.

Three agricultural market areas are used in Knox County for analyzing agricultural sales. Market areas were established by factors such as soil type, irrigation potential, land use and topography. Each year, the assessor plots all sales on the county map and monitor market areas in each established area.

The county assessor is current and in compliance with the six-year inspection and review cycle. The county assessor has a systematic review schedule, a tracking file of the areas that are reviewed each year. The depreciation for the agricultural dwellings and outbuildings is dated 2022. The costing is dated 2017. Feedlots have been identified by the county assessor as intensive use. Land use review ranges from 2017 to 2022. The county assessor is working on identifying enrolled acres in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). The county assessor sends a letter including a sales questionnaire to identify CRP and land use, however, receives little feedback.

No information exists that would meet the need to apply special value. All sales and surrounding areas are reviewed.

## Description of Analysis

The statistical sample for the agricultural class includes 69 qualified sales. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, the weighted mean is low. All

## 2024 Agricultural Correlation for Knox County

market areas have medians within the acceptable range. A review of each class by $80 \%$ Majority Land Use (MLU) indicates that most sales are grassland sales, and the median is within the acceptable range. There are few sales of dryland and irrigated for measurement purposes. Review of the irrigated land, dryland and grassland in all market areas compared to the surrounding counties indicates that the agricultural land values used in Knox County are comparable with surrounding counties.

Comparison of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) support that the values were uniformly applied to the agricultural class and accurately reflect the assessment actions reported by the County Assessor.

## Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Agricultural land values are equalized at uniform portions of market value; all values have been determined to be acceptable and are reasonably comparable to adjoining counties. The quality of assessment of agricultural land in Knox County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. Agricultural improvements are equalized and assessed at the statutory level.


## Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Knox County is $69 \%$.

## 2024 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Knox 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 (R.R.S. 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 <br> Property | 94 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal <br> techniques. | No recommendation. |
| Commercial Real <br> Property | 94 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal <br> techniques. | No recommendation. |
| Agricultural Land | 69 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal <br> techniques. | 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 5th day of April, 2024.


Sarah Scott
Property Tax Administrator

## APPENDICES

## 2024 Commission Summary

## for Knox County

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 202 | Median | 93.51 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 34,981,535$ | Mean | 89.95 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 34,981,535$ | Wgt. Mean | 85.78 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 30,007,490$ | Average Assessed Value of the Base | $\$ 87,131$ |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 173,176$ | Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 148,552$ |

Confidence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 89.45 to 95.00 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 82.93 to 88.63 |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 87.80 to 92.10 |
| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 16.69 |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 3.77 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 6.42 |

Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | 211 | 94 | 94.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 218 | 94 | 93.63 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 197 | 93 | 92.79 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 198 | 93 | 93.20 |

## 2024 Commission Summary

## for Knox County

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Commercial Real Property - Current |  | 94.23 |  |
| Number of Sales | 28 | Median | 94.21 |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 2,090,450$ | Mean | 89.59 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 2,090,450$ | Wgt. Mean | $\$ 142,337$ |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 1,872,880$ | Average Assessed Value of the Base | $\$ 66,889$ |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 74,659$ | Avg. Assessed Value |  |

## Confidence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 87.72 to 101.35 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 78.31 to 100.88 |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 85.92 to 102.50 |
| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 3.27 |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 4.35 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 2.04 |

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | 28 | 96 | 96.01 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | 23 | 97 | 96.95 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | 13 | 100 | 98.44 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 21 | 100 | 96.34 |

54 Knox RESIDENTIAL

| Number of Sales : 202 <br> Total Sales Price : 34,981,535 |  | MEDIAN : 94 |  |  | COV : 17.33 |  |  | 95\% Median C.I. : 89.45 to 95.00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WGT. MEAN : 86 |  |  | STD : 15.59 |  |  | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.93 to 88.63 |  |  |  |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,981,535 |  | MEAN : 90 |  |  | Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.46 |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. : 87.80 to 92.10 |  |  |  |
| Total Assessed Value : 30,007,490 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : |  | COD : 13.32 |  |  | MAX Sales Ratio : 140.05 |  |  | Printed:3/28/2024 |  |  |  |
| Avg. Assessed Value : |  | PRD : 104.86 |  |  | MIN Sales Ratio : 38.67 |  |  |  |  |  | 5:32PM |
| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-21 TO 31-DEC-21 | 22 | 95.77 | 95.15 | 94.44 | 09.07 | 100.75 | 68.16 | 114.20 | 89.34 to 102.49 | 181,341 | 171,252 |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22 | 12 | 94.43 | 94.82 | 94.55 | 08.23 | 100.29 | 72.07 | 110.26 | 88.76 to 105.18 | 157,360 | 148,788 |
| 01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22 | 31 | 98.27 | 94.42 | 89.11 | 13.44 | 105.96 | 62.41 | 140.05 | 85.63 to 105.12 | 202,600 | 180,530 |
| 01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22 | 28 | 94.11 | 91.51 | 88.60 | 08.45 | 103.28 | 69.00 | 115.61 | 84.58 to 95.86 | 162,774 | 144,216 |
| 01-OCT-22 TO 31-DEC-22 | 28 | 92.49 | 88.55 | 79.51 | 15.84 | 111.37 | 38.67 | 118.74 | 79.70 to 97.38 | 138,852 | 110,404 |
| 01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23 | 24 | 89.42 | 88.58 | 84.39 | 13.57 | 104.97 | 63.39 | 118.72 | 77.82 to 97.70 | 142,517 | 120,266 |
| 01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23 | 30 | 83.96 | 84.91 | 80.80 | 16.52 | 105.09 | 45.02 | 113.00 | 72.86 to 95.02 | 185,737 | 150,081 |
| 01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23 | 27 | 83.71 | 85.09 | 80.59 | 16.33 | 105.58 | 61.63 | 123.50 | 71.12 to 97.66 | 199,448 | 160,736 |
| $\ldots$ Study Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-21 TO 30-SEP-22 | 93 | 95.15 | 93.77 | 90.86 | 10.50 | 103.20 | 62.41 | 140.05 | 93.61 to 97.03 | 179,743 | 163,306 |
| 01-OCT-22 TO 30-SEP-23 | 109 | 86.79 | 86.70 | 81.14 | 15.88 | 106.85 | 38.67 | 123.50 | 80.69 to 93.42 | 167,573 | 135,963 |
| ___Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22 | 99 | 94.69 | 91.98 | 87.34 | 12.27 | 105.31 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 93.28 to 95.86 | 167,823 | 146,578 |
| ALL | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.00 | 173,176 | 148,552 |
| VALUATION GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 1 | 30 | 94.48 | 87.75 | 79.55 | 15.44 | 110.31 | 61.56 | 113.00 | 75.31 to 99.60 | 132,853 | 105,689 |
| 3 | 2 | 61.49 | 61.49 | 46.27 | 37.11 | 132.89 | 38.67 | 84.31 | N/A | 225,000 | 104,113 |
| 5 | 1 | 95.86 | 95.86 | 95.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 95.86 | 95.86 | N/A | 35,000 | 33,550 |
| 10 | 40 | 95.10 | 92.97 | 84.41 | 14.64 | 110.14 | 45.02 | 140.05 | 87.43 to 100.88 | 109,188 | 92,164 |
| 15 | 27 | 92.04 | 91.26 | 90.00 | 10.00 | 101.40 | 68.03 | 114.08 | 83.71 to 97.17 | 160,337 | 144,307 |
| 20 | 32 | 91.64 | 86.94 | 87.32 | 15.02 | 99.56 | 61.63 | 114.20 | 77.87 to 95.95 | 373,631 | 326,263 |
| 30 | 10 | 92.60 | 91.05 | 90.64 | 10.30 | 100.45 | 71.12 | 113.85 | 80.69 to 101.39 | 86,800 | 78,676 |
| 35 | 18 | 92.68 | 89.97 | 86.65 | 13.52 | 103.83 | 63.06 | 113.34 | 73.61 to 102.49 | 258,932 | 224,365 |
| 45 | 14 | 95.22 | 96.09 | 91.67 | 08.73 | 104.82 | 82.45 | 114.84 | 86.49 to 110.26 | 94,110 | 86,273 |
| 50 | 28 | 93.03 | 88.53 | 84.29 | 11.96 | 105.03 | 67.31 | 118.74 | 78.68 to 96.39 | 107,565 | 90,665 |
| _ ALL | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.00 | 173,176 | 148,552 |

54 Knox RESIDENTIAL

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | COV : 17.33 |  |  | 95\% Median C.I. : 89.45 to 95.00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sales Price : 34,981,535 |  |  |  | WGT. MEAN : 86 |  |  | STD : 15.59 |  |  | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.93 to 88.63 |  |  |  |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,981,535 |  |  |  | MEAN : 90 |  |  | Avg. Abs. Dev: 12.46 |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. : 87.80 to 92.10 |  |  |  |
| Total Assessed Value : 30,007,490 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 173,176 |  |  |  | COD : 13.32 |  |  | MAX Sales Ratio : 140.05 |  |  | Printed:3/28/2024 4:05:32PM |  |  |  |
| Avg. As | sessed | Value : 148, |  | PRD : 104.86 |  |  | MIN Sales Ratio : 38.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 01 |  |  | 170 | 93.66 | 90.52 | 84.98 | 13.02 | 106.52 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.18 | 135,443 | 115,100 |
| 06 |  |  | 32 | 91.64 | 86.94 | 87.32 | 15.02 | 99.56 | 61.63 | 114.20 | 77.87 to 95.95 | 373,631 | 326,263 |
| 07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.00 | 173,176 | 148,552 |
| SALE PRICE * <br> RANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|  |  |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| Low \$ Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less Than 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less Than |  | 15,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less Than |  | 30,000 | 8 | 108.24 | 103.62 | 103.25 | 08.92 | 100.36 | 71.12 | 114.84 | 71.12 to 114.84 | 21,706 | 22,411 |
| __Ranges Excl. Low \$_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Than |  | 4,999 | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.00 | 173,176 | 148,552 |
| Greater Than |  | 14,999 | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.00 | 173,176 | 148,552 |
| Greater Than |  | 29,999 | 194 | 92.96 | 89.39 | 85.69 | 13.25 | 104.32 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 88.31 to 94.73 | 179,422 | 153,754 |
| __Incremental Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | TO | 4,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000 | TO | 14,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15,000 | тO | 29,999 | 8 | 108.24 | 103.62 | 103.25 | 08.92 | 100.36 | 71.12 | 114.84 | 71.12 to 114.84 | 21,706 | 22,411 |
| 30,000 | TO | 59,999 | 22 | 100.21 | 101.38 | 100.46 | 08.61 | 100.92 | 67.08 | 123.50 | 95.86 to 106.25 | 45,661 | 45,873 |
| 60,000 |  | 99,999 | 51 | 97.42 | 96.45 | 96.24 | 09.21 | 100.22 | 68.03 | 140.05 | 93.71 to 99.60 | 76,727 | 73,838 |
| 100,000 | TO | 149,999 | 28 | 85.09 | 86.11 | 86.19 | 10.96 | 99.91 | 63.39 | 108.34 | 81.52 to 94.06 | 125,571 | 108,224 |
| 150,000 | TO | 249,999 | 48 | 83.92 | 84.99 | 84.90 | 14.92 | 100.11 | 60.54 | 113.34 | 75.93 to 93.42 | 182,377 | 154,846 |
| 250,000 | TO | 499,999 | 36 | 78.89 | 80.77 | 79.93 | 17.85 | 101.05 | 38.67 | 114.20 | 72.27 to 92.07 | 337,814 | 270,011 |
| 500,000 | TO | 999,999 | 9 | 91.59 | 88.22 | 89.21 | 12.27 | 98.89 | 66.08 | 108.18 | 78.07 to 99.02 | 606,544 | 541,104 |
| 1,000,000 + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  | 202 | 93.51 | 89.95 | 85.78 | 13.32 | 104.86 | 38.67 | 140.05 | 89.45 to 95.00 | 173,176 | 148,552 |

54 Knox
COMMERCIAL

Number of Sales : 28
Total Sales Price : 2,090,450
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,090,450
Total Assessed Value : 1,872,880
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 74,659
Avg. Assessed Value : 66,889

PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)
Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COV : } 22.69 \\
& \text { STD : } 21.38
\end{aligned}
$$

Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.65
95\% Median C.I. : 87.72 to 101.35
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 78.31 to 100.88
$95 \%$ Mean C.I. : 85.92 to 102.50

| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Avg. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 TO 31-DEC-20 | 1 | 98.59 | 98.59 | 98.59 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.59 | 98.59 | N/A | 150,000 | 147,880 |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21 | 3 | 84.22 | 87.38 | 86.49 | 12.68 | 101.03 | 72.94 | 104.97 | N/A | 92,000 | 79,572 |
| 01-APR-21 To 30-JUN-21 | 5 | 97.84 | 100.86 | 84.42 | 19.17 | 119.47 | 64.46 | 150.53 | N/A | 56,550 | 47,738 |
| 01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21 | 1 | 101.35 | 101.35 | 101.35 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 101.35 | 101.35 | N/A | 30,000 | 30,405 |
| 01-OCT-21 TO 31-DEC-21 | 4 | 105.38 | 104.70 | 93.27 | 23.17 | 112.25 | 57.66 | 150.37 | N/A | 36,050 | 33,624 |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22 | 2 | 70.25 | 70.25 | 70.74 | 01.34 | 99.31 | 69.31 | 71.19 | N/A | 197,500 | 139,703 |
| 01-APR-22 TO 30-JUN-22 | 4 | 99.89 | 100.67 | 106.47 | 05.42 | 94.55 | 93.23 | 109.67 | N/A | 121,125 | 128,964 |
| 01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-22 TO 31-DEC-22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23 | 1 | 92.34 | 92.34 | 92.34 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 92.34 | 92.34 | N/A | 32,000 | 29,550 |
| 01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23 | 3 | 90.10 | 92.69 | 94.33 | 08.40 | 98.26 | 82.62 | 105.34 | N/A | 48,333 | 45,593 |
| 01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23 | 4 | 90.30 | 84.78 | 80.20 | 10.28 | 105.71 | 63.28 | 95.22 | N/A | 37,750 | 30,276 |
| Study Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 To 30-SEP-21 | 10 | 98.22 | 96.64 | 88.76 | 14.63 | 108.88 | 64.46 | 150.53 | 72.94 to 104.97 | 73,875 | 65,569 |
| 01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22 | 10 | 99.89 | 96.20 | 90.82 | 18.48 | 105.92 | 57.66 | 150.37 | 69.31 to 109.67 | 102,370 | 92,976 |
| 01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23 | 8 | 91.22 | 88.69 | 87.63 | 08.51 | 101.21 | 63.28 | 105.34 | 63.28 to 105.34 | 41,000 | 35,929 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21 | 13 | 99.59 | 98.97 | 87.63 | 19.23 | 112.94 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 72.94 to 107.86 | 56,381 | 49,408 |
| 01-JAN-22 TO 31-DEC-22 | 6 | 95.27 | 90.53 | 90.42 | 13.25 | 100.12 | 69.31 | 109.67 | 69.31 to 109.67 | 146,583 | 132,543 |
| ALL | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 1 | 6 | 94.05 | 90.56 | 100.52 | 11.00 | 90.09 | 57.66 | 109.67 | 57.66 to 109.67 | 92,533 | 93,011 |
| 3 | 1 | 99.59 | 99.59 | 99.59 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 99.59 | 99.59 | N/A | 28,000 | 27,885 |
| 10 | 9 | 92.34 | 102.70 | 87.78 | 22.66 | 117.00 | 69.31 | 150.53 | 72.94 to 150.37 | 42,361 | 37,184 |
| 15 | 5 | 93.23 | 88.60 | 84.97 | 11.24 | 104.27 | 64.46 | 102.48 | N/A | 88,700 | 75,370 |
| 35 | 2 | 87.05 | 87.05 | 77.53 | 18.22 | 112.28 | 71.19 | 102.90 | N/A | 187,500 | 145,370 |
| 45 | 3 | 97.30 | 88.52 | 90.77 | 14.29 | 97.52 | 63.28 | 104.97 | N/A | 74,167 | 67,322 |
| 50 | 2 | 93.98 | 93.98 | 97.32 | 12.09 | 96.57 | 82.62 | 105.34 | N/A | 42,500 | 41,360 |
| $\ldots$ | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |

54 Knox Page 23

Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

| Number of Sales : 28 |  |  |  | MEDIAN : 94 |  |  | COV : 22.69 |  |  | 95\% Median C.I. : 87.72 to 101.35 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sales Price : 2,090,450 |  |  |  | WGT. MEAN : 90 |  |  | STD : 21.38 |  |  | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 78.31 to 100.88 |  |  |  |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,090,450 |  |  |  | MEAN : 94 |  |  | Avg. Abs. Dev: 14.65 |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. : 85.92 to 102.50 |  |  |  |
| Total Assessed Value : 1,872,880 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 74,659 |  |  |  | COD : 15.55 |  |  | MAX Sales Ratio : 150.53 |  |  | Printed:3/28/2024 |  |  |  |
| Avg. As | ssesse | d Value : 66,8 |  | PRD : 105.16 |  |  | MIN Sales Ratio : 57.66 |  |  |  |  |  | 5:35PM |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03 |  |  | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |
| 04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |
| 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 | 1 | 107.86 | 107.86 | 107.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 107.86 | 107.86 | N/A | 7,000 | 7,550 |
| Less Than |  | 30,000 | 7 | 99.59 | 111.74 | 109.55 | 19.36 | 102.00 | 87.72 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 150.53 | 21,321 | 23,359 |
| __Ranges Excl. Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Than |  | 4,999 | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |
| Greater Than |  | 14,999 | 27 | 93.23 | 93.70 | 89.53 | 15.71 | 104.66 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 84.22 to 101.35 | 77,165 | 69,086 |
| Greater Than |  | 29,999 | 21 | 92.34 | 88.36 | 88.06 | 13.82 | 100.34 | 57.66 | 109.67 | 72.94 to 101.35 | 92,438 | 81,399 |
| __Incremental Ranges__ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | TO | 4,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000 | TO | 14,999 | 1 | 107.86 | 107.86 | 107.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 107.86 | 107.86 | N/A | 7,000 | 7,550 |
| 15,000 | TO | 29,999 | 6 | 96.41 | 112.39 | 109.64 | 21.90 | 102.51 | 87.72 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 150.53 | 23,708 | 25,993 |
| 30,000 | TO | 59,999 | 9 | 95.22 | 91.86 | 91.95 | 09.63 | 99.90 | 57.66 | 105.34 | 82.62 to 102.48 | 40,022 | 36,802 |
| 60,000 | TO | 99,999 | 7 | 90.10 | 87.44 | 87.61 | 14.01 | 99.81 | 63.28 | 104.97 | 63.28 to 104.97 | 75,500 | 66,149 |
| 100,000 | то | 149,999 | 2 | 68.70 | 68.70 | 68.08 | 06.17 | 100.91 | 64.46 | 72.94 | N/A | 128,750 | 87,658 |
| 150,000 | то | 249,999 | 1 | 98.59 | 98.59 | 98.59 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.59 | 98.59 | N/A | 150,000 | 147,880 |
| 250,000 | TO | 499,999 | 2 | 90.43 | 90.43 | 91.77 | 21.28 | 98.54 | 71.19 | 109.67 | N/A | 322,500 | 295,955 |
| 500,000 | то | 999,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,000,000 | TO | 1,999,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2,000,000 | TO | 4,999,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000,000 | T0 | 9,999,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10,000,000 + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |

54 Knox COMMERCIAL

| Number of Sales : 28 | MEDIAN : 94 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Total Sales Price : $2,090,450$ | WGT. MEAN : 90 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : $2,090,450$ | MEAN : 94 |
| Total Assessed Value : $1,872,880$ |  |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 74,659 | COD : 15.55 |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 66,889 | PRD : 105.16 |

PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)
Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COV : } 22.69 \\
& \text { STD : } 21.38
\end{aligned}
$$

Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.65
95\% Median C.I. : 87.72 to 101.35
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 78.31 to 100.88
$95 \%$ Mean C.I. : 85.92 to 102.50

MAX Sales Ratio : 150.53
MIN Sales Ratio : 57.66
Printed:3/28/2024 4:05:35PM

| OCCUPANCY CODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 326 | 1 | 84.22 | 84.22 | 84.22 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 84.22 | 84.22 | N/A | 76,000 | 64,005 |
| 344 | 1 | 150.53 | 150.53 | 150.53 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 150.53 | 150.53 | N/A | 25,250 | 38,010 |
| 349 | 1 | 72.94 | 72.94 | 72.94 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 72.94 | 72.94 | N/A | 110,000 | 80,235 |
| 352 | 1 | 98.59 | 98.59 | 98.59 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.59 | 98.59 | N/A | 150,000 | 147,880 |
| 353 | 5 | 97.84 | 90.42 | 90.76 | 11.09 | 99.63 | 57.66 | 102.90 | N/A | 44,840 | 40,696 |
| 381 | 1 | 102.48 | 102.48 | 102.48 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 102.48 | 102.48 | N/A | 50,000 | 51,240 |
| 384 | 2 | 129.12 | 129.12 | 136.84 | 16.47 | 94.36 | 107.86 | 150.37 | N/A | 11,000 | 15,053 |
| 406 | 2 | 99.11 | 99.11 | 101.04 | 06.29 | 98.09 | 92.88 | 105.34 | N/A | 42,000 | 42,435 |
| 434 | 1 | 90.10 | 90.10 | 90.10 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 90.10 | 90.10 | N/A | 60,000 | 54,060 |
| 442 | 5 | 91.86 | 88.46 | 89.17 | 12.77 | 99.20 | 63.28 | 104.97 | N/A | 50,600 | 45,118 |
| 447 | 1 | 69.31 | 69.31 | 69.31 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 69.31 | 69.31 | N/A | 95,000 | 65,840 |
| 494 | 1 | 71.19 | 71.19 | 71.19 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 71.19 | 71.19 | N/A | 300,000 | 213,565 |
| 528 | 2 | 78.85 | 78.85 | 67.90 | 18.25 | 116.13 | 64.46 | 93.23 | N/A | 83,750 | 56,863 |
| 530 | 1 | 95.22 | 95.22 | 95.22 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 95.22 | 95.22 | N/A | 34,000 | 32,375 |
| 532 | 1 | 87.72 | 87.72 | 87.72 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 87.72 | 87.72 | N/A | 25,000 | 21,930 |
| 542 | 1 | 109.67 | 109.67 | 109.67 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 109.67 | 109.67 | N/A | 345,000 | 378,345 |
| 594 | 1 | 97.30 | 97.30 | 97.30 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 97.30 | 97.30 | N/A | 69,500 | 67,625 |
| ALL | 28 | 94.23 | 94.21 | 89.59 | 15.55 | 105.16 | 57.66 | 150.53 | 87.72 to 101.35 | 74,659 | 66,889 |

Commercial \& Industrial Value Change Vs. Net Taxable Sales Change

Comm.\&Ind w/o Growth

Sources:
Value; 2012-2022 CTL Report
Growth Value; 2012-2022 Abstract Rpt
Net Taxable Sales; Dept. of Revenue website.

| Tax Year | Value |  | Growth Value |  | \% Growth of Value | Value Exclud. Growth |  | Ann. \%chg w/o grwth | Net Taxable Sales Value |  | \% Chg Net Tax. Sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | \$ | 44,388,395 | \$ | 972,515 | 2.19\% | \$ | 43,415,880 |  | \$ | 43,448,714 |  |
| 2013 | \$ | 53,740,720 | \$ | 1,368,855 | 2.55\% | \$ | 52,371,865 | 17.99\% | \$ | 43,848,568 | 0.92\% |
| 2014 | \$ | 52,956,510 | \$ | 129,876 | 0.25\% | \$ | 52,826,634 | -1.70\% | \$ | 45,338,248 | 3.40\% |
| 2015 | \$ | 55,107,420 | \$ | 2,828,564 | 5.13\% | \$ | 52,278,856 | -1.28\% | \$ | 41,060,322 | -9.44\% |
| 2016 | \$ | 58,002,725 | \$ | 1,988,820 | 3.43\% | \$ | 56,013,905 | 1.64\% | \$ | 40,634,890 | -1.04\% |
| 2017 | \$ | 59,828,965 | \$ | 1,085,665 | 1.81\% | \$ | 58,743,300 | 1.28\% | \$ | 41,330,647 | 1.71\% |
| 2018 | \$ | 68,079,140 | \$ | 8,851,400 | 13.00\% | \$ | 59,227,740 | -1.00\% | \$ | 44,381,900 | 7.38\% |
| 2019 | \$ | 74,196,570 | \$ | 727,285 | 0.98\% | \$ | 73,469,285 | 7.92\% | \$ | 44,721,444 | 0.77\% |
| 2020 | \$ | 87,323,230 | \$ | 11,987,435 | 13.73\% | \$ | 75,335,795 | 1.54\% | \$ | 47,374,970 | 5.93\% |
| 2021 | \$ | 86,325,945 | \$ | 1,949,690 | 2.26\% | \$ | 84,376,255 | -3.37\% | \$ | 52,764,552 | 11.38\% |
| 2022 | \$ | 88,963,740 | \$ | 2,202,170 | 2.48\% | \$ | 86,761,570 | 0.50\% | \$ | 56,057,387 | 6.24\% |
| 2023 | \$ | 89,824,120 | \$ | 537,005 | 0.60\% | \$ | 89,287,115 | 0.36\% | \$ | 57,463,199 | 2.51\% |
| Ann \%chg |  | 5.27\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2.17\% |  | 2.74\% | 2.71\% |


| Tax <br> Year | Cmltv\%chg <br> w/o grwth | Cumulative Change <br> Calue |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | - | - | Cmltv\%chg <br> Net Sales |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $17.99 \%$ | $21.07 \%$ | - |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $19.01 \%$ | $19.30 \%$ | $0.92 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $17.78 \%$ | $24.15 \%$ | $-5.50 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $26.19 \%$ | $30.67 \%$ | $-6.48 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $32.34 \%$ | $34.79 \%$ | $-4.87 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $33.43 \%$ | $53.37 \%$ | $2.15 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $65.51 \%$ | $67.15 \%$ | $2.93 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $69.72 \%$ | $96.73 \%$ | $9.04 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $90.09 \%$ | $94.48 \%$ | $21.44 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $95.46 \%$ | $100.42 \%$ | $29.02 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | $101.15 \%$ | $102.36 \%$ | $32.26 \%$ |


| County Number | 54 |
| ---: | :---: |
| County Name | Knox |
|  |  |

## 54 Knox

AGRICULTURAL LAND
Number of Sales : 69
Total Sales Price : $57,967,819$

Total Adj. Sales Price : 57,967,819 Total Assessed Value : 37,413,495 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 840,113 Avg. Assessed Value : 542,225

PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)
Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COV : } 33.89 \\
& \text { STD : } 23.35
\end{aligned}
$$

Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.83
95\% Median C.I. : 59.67 to 71.80
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.26 to 70.83
$95 \%$ Mean C.I. : 63.38 to 74.40
MAX Sales Ratio : 138.89
MIN Sales Ratio : 27.13

Printed:3/28/2024 4:05:38PM

| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 TO 31-DEC-20 | 9 | 75.68 | 80.37 | 86.26 | 19.45 | 93.17 | 54.00 | 131.87 | 62.43 to 91.77 | 468,932 | 404,521 |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21 | 2 | 81.01 | 81.01 | 84.60 | 08.16 | 95.76 | 74.40 | 87.61 | N/A | 639,300 | 540,828 |
| 01-APR-21 TO 30-JUN-21 | 3 | 90.08 | 81.70 | 84.54 | 10.41 | 96.64 | 63.44 | 91.57 | N/A | 548,384 | 463,613 |
| 01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-21 TO 31-DEC-21 | 10 | 87.76 | 89.41 | 81.08 | 18.40 | 110.27 | 68.41 | 138.89 | 69.25 to 102.21 | 748,577 | 606,935 |
| 01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22 | 8 | 75.49 | 79.21 | 76.74 | 18.70 | 103.22 | 56.09 | 110.44 | 56.09 to 110.44 | 1,108,866 | 850,899 |
| 01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22 | 1 | 61.82 | 61.82 | 61.82 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 61.82 | 61.82 | N/A | 250,000 | 154,540 |
| 01-JUL-22 TO 30-SEP-22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-22 TO 31-DEC-22 | 11 | 69.34 | 63.50 | 65.27 | 17.09 | 97.29 | 47.04 | 85.22 | 48.94 to 84.03 | 662,536 | 432,460 |
| 01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23 | 10 | 61.03 | 62.72 | 49.90 | 36.11 | 125.69 | 27.13 | 125.03 | 30.65 to 85.90 | 1,094,711 | 546,261 |
| 01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23 | 12 | 40.54 | 43.85 | 46.92 | 13.91 | 93.46 | 33.22 | 56.65 | 39.37 to 53.01 | 953,165 | 447,181 |
| 01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23 | 3 | 59.67 | 60.47 | 59.05 | 08.31 | 102.40 | 53.42 | 68.31 | N/A | 1,514,667 | 894,463 |
| Study Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-OCT-20 TO 30-SEP-21 | 14 | 79.29 | 80.74 | 85.57 | 16.95 | 94.36 | 54.00 | 131.87 | 63.44 to 91.57 | 510,296 | 436,656 |
| 01-OCT-21 TO 30-SEP-22 | 19 | 79.21 | 83.66 | 78.47 | 19.64 | 106.61 | 56.09 | 138.89 | 69.25 to 96.58 | 874,037 | 685,846 |
| 01-OCT-22 TO 30-SEP-23 | 36 | 52.64 | 56.48 | 53.39 | 26.88 | 105.79 | 27.13 | 125.03 | 47.04 to 67.97 | 950,472 | 507,479 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21 | 15 | 87.61 | 86.75 | 82.06 | 15.61 | 105.72 | 63.44 | 138.89 | 69.58 to 95.73 | 693,968 | 569,456 |
| 01-JAN-22 TO 31-DEC-22 | 20 | 69.51 | 69.70 | 71.42 | 18.39 | 97.59 | 47.04 | 110.44 | 56.09 to 79.21 | 820,441 | 585,940 |
| ALL | 69 | 69.34 | 68.89 | 64.54 | 25.71 | 106.74 | 27.13 | 138.89 | 59.67 to 71.80 | 840,113 | 542,225 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| 1 | 16 | 70.53 | 73.26 | 63.05 | 29.53 | 116.19 | 30.65 | 131.87 | 48.33 to 87.61 | 1,490,665 | 939,857 |
| 2 | 49 | 69.34 | 67.71 | 65.04 | 25.74 | 104.11 | 27.13 | 138.89 | 54.09 to 73.08 | 575,187 | 374,114 |
| 3 | 4 | 69.69 | 65.85 | 68.16 | 07.99 | 96.61 | 52.26 | 71.76 | N/A | 1,483,250 | 1,011,051 |
| ALL | 69 | 69.34 | 68.89 | 64.54 | 25.71 | 106.74 | 27.13 | 138.89 | 59.67 to 71.80 | 840,113 | 542,225 |

54 Knox AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2024 R\&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)
Qualified
Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

| Number of Sales : 69 | MEDIAN : 69 | COV : 33.89 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Sales Price : $57,967,819$ | WGT. MEAN : 65 | STD $: 23.35$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : $57,967,819$ | MEAN : 69 | Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.83 |

Total Adj. Sales Price : 57,967,819 Total Assessed Value : 37,413,495 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 840,113
Avg. Assessed Value : 542,225

COD : 25.71
PRD : 106.74

95\% Median C.I. : 59.67 to 71.80
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.26 to 70.83
95\% Mean C.I. : 63.38 to 74.40

MAX Sales Ratio : 138.89
MIN Sales Ratio : 27.13

Printed:3/28/2024 4:05:38PM

| 95\%MLU By Market Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd. Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. |  |  |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 5 | 68.41 | 68.53 | 63.72 | 17.78 | 107.55 | 47.04 | 95.73 | N/A | 1,028,006 | 655,006 |
| 1 | 3 | 68.41 | 66.63 | 63.15 | 05.91 | 105.51 | 59.67 | 71.80 | N/A | 1,536,918 | 970,543 |
| 2 | 2 | 71.39 | 71.39 | 68.66 | 34.11 | 103.98 | 47.04 | 95.73 | N/A | 264,639 | 181,700 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 25 | 69.50 | 70.17 | 66.75 | 25.47 | 105.12 | 39.35 | 138.89 | 53.28 to 75.68 | 472,667 | 315,513 |
| 1 | 2 | 40.09 | 40.09 | 39.83 | 01.85 | 100.65 | 39.35 | 40.82 | N/A | 744,000 | 296,303 |
| 2 | 22 | 69.70 | 73.72 | 72.51 | 23.89 | 101.67 | 40.26 | 138.89 | 54.09 to 85.22 | 425,849 | 308,795 |
| 3 | 1 | 52.26 | 52.26 | 52.26 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 52.26 | 52.26 | N/A | 960,000 | 501,730 |
| ALL | 69 | 69.34 | 68.89 | 64.54 | 25.71 | 106.74 | 27.13 | 138.89 | 59.67 to 71.80 | 840,113 | 542,225 |
| 80\%MLU By Market Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| $\ldots$ _Irrigated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 7 | 82.96 | 82.68 | 79.34 | 19.79 | 104.21 | 49.11 | 131.87 | 49.11 to 131.87 | 1,458,536 | 1,157,157 |
| 1 | 3 | 87.61 | 100.81 | 93.08 | 18.61 | 108.30 | 82.96 | 131.87 | N/A | 1,362,317 | 1,268,043 |
| 2 | 3 | 69.58 | 68.20 | 68.62 | 17.62 | 99.39 | 49.11 | 85.90 | N/A | 1,037,600 | 711,998 |
| 3 | 1 | 71.76 | 71.76 | 71.76 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 71.76 | 71.76 | N/A | 3,010,000 | 2,159,975 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 9 | 71.07 | 69.19 | 64.05 | 23.01 | 108.02 | 27.13 | 100.70 | 47.04 to 95.73 | 1,031,431 | 660,663 |
| 1 | 4 | 70.11 | 70.26 | 65.12 | 08.87 | 107.89 | 59.67 | 81.14 | N/A | 1,294,689 | 843,126 |
| 2 | 4 | 71.39 | 67.65 | 57.86 | 42.82 | 116.92 | 27.13 | 100.70 | N/A | 650,032 | 376,128 |
| 3 | 1 | 71.07 | 71.07 | 71.07 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 71.07 | 71.07 | N/A | 1,504,000 | 1,068,950 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | 34 | 68.66 | 68.57 | 66.03 | 25.15 | 103.85 | 39.35 | 138.89 | 53.42 to 75.68 | 494,875 | 326,753 |
| 1 | 2 | 40.09 | 40.09 | 39.83 | 01.85 | 100.65 | 39.35 | 40.82 | N/A | 744,000 | 296,303 |
| 2 | 31 | 69.50 | 70.94 | 69.66 | 23.74 | 101.84 | 39.37 | 138.89 | 56.09 to 79.21 | 463,798 | 323,073 |
| 3 | 1 | 52.26 | 52.26 | 52.26 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 52.26 | 52.26 | N/A | 960,000 | 501,730 |
| ALL | 69 | 69.34 | 68.89 | 64.54 | 25.71 | 106.74 | 27.13 | 138.89 | 59.67 to 71.80 | 840,113 | 542,225 |

## Knox County 2024 Average Acre Value Comparison

| County | Mkt <br> Area | $\mathbf{1 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 A}$ | $\mathbf{2 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 A}$ | $\mathbf{3 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 A}$ | $\mathbf{4 A 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 A}$ | WEIGHTED <br> AVG IRR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knox | 1 | 6,785 | 6,785 | 6,670 | 6,380 | 6,345 | 6,345 | 6,251 | 6,248 | $\mathbf{6 , 3 7 7}$ |
| Cedar | 1 | 6,420 | 6,355 | 6,355 | 6,355 | 5,700 | 5,700 | 5,190 | 5,190 | $\mathbf{5 , 8 0 7}$ |
| Pierce | 1 | 7,806 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,188 | 7,059 | 6,684 | 5,436 | 5,160 | $\mathbf{6 , 8 8 5}$ |
| Knox | 3 | 6,065 | 6,065 | 6,022 | 6,020 | 5,687 | 5,400 | 4,735 | 4,524 | $\mathbf{5 , 3 3 9}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knox | 2 | 4,570 | 4,385 | 4,257 | 4,293 | 3,960 | 3,860 | 3,556 | 3,500 | $\mathbf{4 , 1 5 9}$ |
| Boyd | 1 | 3,875 | 3,675 | 3,675 | 3,675 | 3,425 | 3,425 | 3,250 | 3,250 | $\mathbf{3 , 5 5 6}$ |
| Holt | 3 | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,575 | 2,679 | 2,500 | 2,500 | $\mathbf{2 , 6 4 7}$ |
| Holt | 1 | 4,700 | 4,600 | 4,600 | 4,600 | 3,368 | 4,400 | 2,827 | 2,571 | $\mathbf{4 , 2 3 4}$ |
| Antelope | 1 | 5,400 | 5,200 | 5,200 | 5,075 | 4,600 | 4,400 | 4,400 | 4,200 | $\mathbf{4 , 8 9 8}$ |


| County | Mkt <br> Area | 1D1 | 1D | 2D1 | 2D | 3D1 | 3D | 4D1 | 4D | WEIGHTED <br> AVG DRY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knox | 1 | 6,785 | 6,785 | 6,670 | 6,680 | 5,985 | 5,610 | 5,500 | 5,500 | $\mathbf{6 , 1 6 8}$ |
| Cedar | 1 | 5,680 | 5,680 | 5,635 | 5,635 | 5,625 | 5,625 | 5,150 | 5,150 | $\mathbf{5 , 4 6 7}$ |
| Pierce | 1 | 5,635 | 5,460 | 5,145 | 4,905 | 4,260 | 4,130 | 2,875 | 2,510 | $\mathbf{4 , 5 7 6}$ |
| Knox | 3 | 5,960 | 5,825 | 5,570 | 5,505 | 5,305 | 5,025 | 4,510 | 3,770 | $\mathbf{5 , 0 8 5}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knox | $\mathbf{2}$ | 2,705 | 2,635 | 2,220 | 2,070 | 2,010 | 1,930 | 1,910 | 1,900 | $\mathbf{2 , 2 0 6}$ |
| Boyd | 1 | 2,350 | 2,350 | 2,200 | 2,200 | 2,100 | 2,100 | 1,975 | 1,975 | $\mathbf{2 , 2 2 0}$ |
| Holt | 3 | 2,700 | 2,700 | 2,600 | 2,600 | 2,340 | 2,350 | 2,100 | 2,100 | $\mathbf{2 , 4 5 5}$ |
| Holt | 1 | 2,700 | 2,700 | 2,600 | 2,600 | 2,350 | 2,350 | 2,100 | 2,101 | $\mathbf{2 , 5 3 4}$ |
| Antelope | 1 | 3,500 | 3,350 | 3,050 | 3,050 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,300 | 2,100 | $\mathbf{2 , 9 2 8}$ |


| County | Mkt <br> Area | 1G1 | 1G | 2G1 | 2G | 3G1 | 3G | 4G1 | 4G | WEIGHTED <br> AVG GRASS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knox | 1 | 2,546 | 2,548 | 2,546 | 2,546 | 2,522 | 2,520 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 2,520 | $\mathbf{2 , 5 4 5}$ |
| Cedar | 1 | 2,906 | 2,906 | 2,646 | 2,649 | 2,406 | 2,407 | 2,145 | 2,145 | $\mathbf{2 , 6 9 6}$ |
| Pierce | 1 | 2,280 | 2,165 | 1,980 | 1,705 | 1,625 | 1,440 | 1,260 | 1,200 | $\mathbf{2 , 0 1 3}$ |
| Knox | 3 | 2,295 | 2,299 | 2,298 | 2,297 | 2,280 | 2,282 | 2,280 | 2,280 | $\mathbf{2 , 2 9 3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knox | 2 | 1,901 | 1,901 | 1,901 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 1,909 | 1,900 | $\mathbf{1 , 9 0 1}$ |
| Boyd | 1 | 1,625 | 1,625 | 1,550 | 1,550 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,450 | 1,450 | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 9}$ |
| Holt | 3 | 1,513 | 1,698 | 1,360 | 1,447 | 1,208 | 1,206 | 1,201 | 1,203 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 0 1}$ |
| Holt | 1 | 1,358 | 1,518 | 1,486 | 1,347 | 1,202 | 1,132 | 1,110 | 1,147 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 1 4}$ |
| Antelope | 1 | 1,400 | 1,400 | 1,400 | 1,394 | 1,395 | 1,395 | 1,375 | 1,375 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 9 7}$ |


| County | Mkt <br> Area | CRP | TIMBER | WASTE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Knox | 1 | 1,695 | 600 | 250 |
| Cedar | 1 | 1,950 | 1,175 | 601 |
| Pierce | 1 | 4,100 | 976 | 150 |
| Knox | 3 | 1,990 | 600 | 250 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Knox | 2 | 1,990 | 600 | 250 |
| Boyd | 1 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 658 |
| Holt | 3 | 1,531 | 500 | 250 |
| Holt | 1 | 1,456 | 500 | 250 |
| Antelope | 1 | 1,800 | 500 | 182 |

Source: 2024 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX and Grass Detail from Schedule XIII.
CRP and TIMBER values are weighted averages from Schedule XIII, line 104 and 113.


Legend


LASS
Excesssive drained sandy soils formed in alluvium in valleys and eolian sand on uplands in sandhills Excessively drained sandy soils formed in eolian sands on uplands in sandhillsModerately well drained silty soils on uplands and in depressions formed in loess
Well drained silty soils formed in loess on uplands
Well drained silty soils formed in loess and alluvium on stream terraces
Well to somewhat excessively drained loamy soils formed in weathered sandstone and eolian material on uplands
Somewhat poorly drained soils formed in alluvium on bottom lands
Moderately well drained silty soils with clay subsoils on uplands
Lakes

(1) Residential \& Recreational excludes Agric. dwelling \& farm home site land. Commercial \& Industrial excludes minerals. Agricultural land includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste, \& other agland, excludes farm site land. Source: 2013-2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 12/29/2023



| Tax | Irrigated Land |  |  |  | Dryland |  |  |  | Grassland |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmltv\%chg |
| 2013 | 239,590,755 |  |  |  | 455,001,045 |  |  |  | 316,130,185 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 311,405,300 | 71,814,545 | 29.97\% | 29.97\% | 501,233,990 | 46,232,945 | 10.16\% | 10.16\% | 333,088,580 | 16,958,395 | 5.36\% | 5.36\% |
| 2015 | 373,268,040 | 61,862,740 | 19.87\% | 55.79\% | 625,633,865 | 124,399,875 | 24.82\% | 37.50\% | 380,667,895 | 47,579,315 | 14.28\% | 20.41\% |
| 2016 | 386,450,725 | 13,182,685 | 3.53\% | 61.30\% | 718,867,645 | 93,233,780 | 14.90\% | 57.99\% | 458,547,435 | 77,879,540 | 20.46\% | 45.05\% |
| 2017 | 401,205,060 | 14,754,335 | 3.82\% | 67.45\% | 719,905,340 | 1,037,695 | 0.14\% | 58.22\% | 469,900,440 | 11,353,005 | 2.48\% | 48.64\% |
| 2018 | 397,414,705 | -3,790,355 | -0.94\% | 65.87\% | 707,970,830 | -11,934,510 | -1.66\% | 55.60\% | 460,497,435 | -9,403,005 | -2.00\% | 45.67\% |
| 2019 | 397,734,630 | 319,925 | 0.08\% | 66.01\% | 704,349,650 | -3,621,180 | -0.51\% | 54.80\% | 458,681,230 | -1,816,205 | -0.39\% | 45.09\% |
| 2020 | 395,004,095 | -2,730,535 | -0.69\% | 64.87\% | 698,314,940 | -6,034,710 | -0.86\% | 53.48\% | 462,083,915 | 3,402,685 | 0.74\% | 46.17\% |
| 2021 | 388,112,625 | -6,891,470 | -1.74\% | 61.99\% | 679,861,170 | -18,453,770 | -2.64\% | 49.42\% | 456,120,770 | -5,963,145 | -1.29\% | 44.28\% |
| 2022 | 392,357,515 | 4,244,890 | 1.09\% | 63.76\% | 673,904,975 | -5,956,195 | -0.88\% | 48.11\% | 466,374,315 | 10,253,545 | 2.25\% | 47.53\% |
| 2023 | 417,172,290 | 24,814,775 | 6.32\% | 74.12\% | 706,044,071 | 32,139,096 | 4.77\% | 55.17\% | 486,915,785 | 20,541,470 | 4.40\% | 54.02\% |
| Rate Ann.\%chg: |  | Irrigated | 5.70\% |  |  | Dryland | 4.49\% |  |  | Grassland | 4.41\% |  |
| Tax | Waste Land ${ }^{(1)}$ |  |  |  | Other Agland ${ }^{(1)}$ |  |  |  | Total Agricultural |  |  |  |
| Year | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmltv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmltv\%chg |
| 2013 | 1,362,365 |  |  |  | 345,660 |  |  |  | 1,012,430,010 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 1,407,445 | 45,080 | 3.31\% | 3.31\% | 340,335 | -5,325 | -1.54\% | -1.54\% | 1,147,475,650 | 135,045,640 | 13.34\% | 13.34\% |
| 2015 | 1,460,630 | 53,185 | 3.78\% | 7.21\% | 348,510 | 8,175 | 2.40\% | 0.82\% | 1,381,378,940 | 233,903,290 | 20.38\% | 36.44\% |
| 2016 | 833,250 | -627,380 | -42.95\% | -38.84\% | 348,310 | -200 | -0.06\% | 0.77\% | 1,565,047,365 | 183,668,425 | 13.30\% | 54.58\% |
| 2017 | 647,020 | -186,230 | -22.35\% | -52.51\% | 2,808,895 | 2,460,585 | 706.44\% | 712.62\% | 1,594,466,755 | 29,419,390 | 1.88\% | 57.49\% |
| 2018 | 725,620 | 78,600 | 12.15\% | -46.74\% | 2,289,655 | -519,240 | -18.49\% | 562.40\% | 1,568,898,245 | -25,568,510 | -1.60\% | 54.96\% |
| 2019 | 737,995 | 12,375 | 1.71\% | -45.83\% | 2,301,300 | 11,645 | 0.51\% | 565.77\% | 1,563,804,805 | -5,093,440 | -0.32\% | 54.46\% |
| 2020 | 835,570 | 97,575 | 13.22\% | -38.67\% | 2,688,640 | 387,340 | 16.83\% | 677.83\% | 1,558,927,160 | -4,877,645 | -0.31\% | 53.98\% |
| 2021 | 833,320 | -2,250 | -0.27\% | -38.83\% | 2,781,840 | 93,200 | 3.47\% | 704.79\% | 1,527,709,725 | -31,217,435 | -2.00\% | 50.90\% |
| 2022 | 841,575 | 8,255 | 0.99\% | -38.23\% | 2,824,155 | 42,315 | 1.52\% | 717.03\% | 1,536,302,535 | 8,592,810 | 0.56\% | 51.74\% |
| 2023 | 3,197,970 | 2,356,395 | 280.00\% | 134.74\% | 3,289,710 | 465,555 | 16.48\% | 851.72\% | 1,616,619,826 | 80,317,291 | 5.23\% | 59.68\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cnty\# } \\ \text { County } \end{gathered}$ | 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rate Ann.\%chg: | Total Agric Land | 4.79\% |  |
|  | KNOX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: 2013-2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL |  |  | NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division |  |  | Prepared as of 12/29/2023 |  |  | CHART 3 |  |  |  |

CHART 4 - AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative \% Change 2013-2023 (from County Abstract Reports)(1)

|  | IRRIGATED LAND |  |  |  |  | DRYLAND |  |  | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmitv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | GRASSLAND |  |  | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmitv\%chg AvgVal/Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg <br> AvgVal/acre | Cmltv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre |  |  | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre |  |  |
| 2013 | 240,203,100 | 72,811 | 3,299 |  |  | 454,106,835 | 214,202 | 2,120 |  |  | 316,267,390 | 341,248 | 927 |  |  |
| 2014 | 310,199,265 | 77,851 | 3,985 | 20.78\% | 20.78\% | 500,843,935 | 211,030 | 2,373 | 11.95\% | 11.95\% | 333,018,285 | 337,893 | 986 | 6.34\% | 6.34\% |
| 2015 | 372,345,820 | 84,327 | 4,415 | 10.82\% | 33.84\% | 626,371,020 | 211,132 | 2,967 | 25.00\% | 39.94\% | 381,092,150 | 331,684 | 1,149 | 16.58\% | 23.97\% |
| 2016 | 386,396,950 | 86,703 | 4,457 | 0.93\% | 35.09\% | 718,648,080 | 208,820 | 3,441 | 16.00\% | 62.33\% | 458,307,820 | 330,939 | 1,385 | 20.53\% | 49.43\% |
| 2017 | 402,068,625 | 87,478 | 4,596 | 3.13\% | 39.32\% | 720,164,330 | 206,313 | 3,491 | 1.43\% | 64.65\% | 468,293,655 | 329,451 | 1,421 | 2.64\% | 53.37\% |
| 2018 | 396,324,330 | 86,991 | 4,556 | -0.88\% | 38.10\% | 707,921,130 | 206,069 | 3,435 | -1.58\% | 62.05\% | 460,963,385 | 329,815 | 1,398 | -1.67\% | 50.80\% |
| 2019 | 398,969,780 | 87,610 | 4,554 | -0.04\% | 38.04\% | 706,375,155 | 205,593 | 3,436 | 0.01\% | 62.07\% | 458,947,200 | 328,279 | 1,398 | 0.03\% | 50.85\% |
| 2020 | 394,719,600 | 87,350 | 4,519 | -0.77\% | 36.98\% | 699,654,190 | 204,796 | 3,416 | -0.57\% | 61.15\% | 462,103,275 | 328,896 | 1,405 | 0.50\% | 51.60\% |
| 2021 | 388,204,030 | 87,884 | 4,417 | -2.25\% | 33.90\% | 680,472,485 | 203,061 | 3,351 | -1.91\% | 58.07\% | 455,225,525 | 327,341 | 1,391 | -1.02\% | 50.05\% |
| 2022 | 392,491,310 | 88,545 | 4,433 | 0.35\% | 34.37\% | 675,826,815 | 202,795 | 3,333 | -0.55\% | 57.20\% | 464,379,550 | 325,440 | 1,427 | 2.61\% | 53.96\% |
| 2023 | 417,140,580 | 89,099 | 4,682 | 5.62\% | 41.92\% | 706,340,860 | 201,099 | 3,512 | 5.40\% | 65.68\% | 487,031,625 | 322,589 | 1,510 | 5.80\% | 62.90\% |

Rate Annual \%chg Average Value/Acre:
$3.56 \%$

[^0]$5.00 \%$

|  | WASTE LAND (2) |  |  |  |  | OTHER AGLAND (2) |  |  |  |  | TOTAL AGRICULTURAL LAND (1) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg <br> AvgVal/acre | Cmltv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmltv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmilv\%chg AvgVal/Acre |
| 2013 | 1,355,365 | 15,739 | 86 |  |  | 1,033,660 | 9,658 | 107 |  |  | 1,012,966,350 | 653,658 | 1,550 |  |  |
| 2014 | 1,406,390 | 15,688 | 90 | 4.10\% | 4.10\% | 1,050,955 | 9,757 | 108 | 0.64\% | 0.64\% | 1,146,518,830 | 652,219 | 1,758 | 13.43\% | 13.43\% |
| 2015 | 1,457,300 | 15,589 | 93 | 4.28\% | 8.56\% | 1,143,830 | 10,114 | 113 | 4.99\% | 5.67\% | 1,382,410,120 | 652,847 | 2,118 | 20.46\% | 36.64\% |
| 2016 | 1,611,815 | 15,586 | 103 | 10.62\% | 20.08\% | 1,320,685 | 10,169 | 130 | 14.84\% | 21.35\% | 1,566,285,350 | 652,217 | 2,401 | 13.41\% | 54.97\% |
| 2017 | 631,370 | 4,321 | 146 | 41.29\% | 69.66\% | 3,912,505 | 13,313 | 294 | 126.29\% | 174.60\% | 1,595,070,485 | 640,876 | 2,489 | 3.64\% | 60.61\% |
| 2018 | 722,510 | 4,815 | 150 | 2.69\% | 74.23\% | 3,446,355 | 13,397 | 257 | -12.47\% | 140.35\% | 1,569,377,710 | 641,087 | 2,448 | -1.64\% | 57.97\% |
| 2019 | 739,525 | 4,929 | 150 | 0.00\% | 74.23\% | 3,449,085 | 13,350 | 258 | 0.44\% | 141.40\% | 1,568,480,745 | 639,761 | 2,452 | 0.15\% | 58.20\% |
| 2020 | 800,825 | 5,337 | 150 | 0.01\% | 74.24\% | 3,793,155 | 13,365 | 284 | 9.85\% | 165.18\% | 1,561,071,045 | 639,745 | 2,440 | -0.47\% | 57.46\% |
| 2021 | 835,755 | 5,570 | 150 | 0.00\% | 74.24\% | 3,827,960 | 14,120 | 271 | -4.48\% | 153.30\% | 1,528,565,755 | 637,976 | 2,396 | -1.81\% | 54.61\% |
| 2022 | 1,953,125 | 13,017 | 150 | 0.00\% | 74.23\% | 2,825,220 | 6,727 | 420 | 54.91\% | 292.39\% | 1,537,476,020 | 636,524 | 2,415 | 0.81\% | 55.87\% |
| 2023 | 1,396,575 | 5,581 | 250 | 66.77\% | 190.58\% | 5,105,265 | 13,975 | 365 | -13.01\% | 241.33\% | 1,617,014,905 | 632,343 | 2,557 | 5.87\% | 65.01\% |


| 54 |
| :---: |
| KNOX |

Rate Annual \%chg Average Value/Acre:

## CHART 5-2023 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type

| Pop. | County: | Personal Prop | StateAsd PP | StateAsdReal | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | Agdwell\& HS | Aglimprvas | Minerals | Total Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8,391 | KNOX | 102,624,400 | 17,064,920 | 2,656,077 | 234,252,733 | 89,834,150 | 0 | 185,296,115 | 1,616,619,826 | 118,913,470 | 77,586,540 | 0 | 2,444,848,231 |
| cnty sectorvalu | Iue \% of total value: | 4.20\% | 0.70\% | 0.11\% | 9.58\% | 3.67\% |  | 7.58\% | 66.12\% | 4.86\% | 3.17\% |  | 100.00\% |
| Pop. | Municipality: | Personal Prop | StateAsd PP | StateAsd Real | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | AgdwellaHS | Aglmprifes | Minerals | Total Value |
| 26 | BAZILE MILLS | 48,578 | 7,003 | 1,090 | 1,873,015 | 90,480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,020,166 |
| 0.31\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.05\% | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 0.80\% | 0.10\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 2.40\% | 0.35\% | 0.05\% | 92.72\% | 4.48\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 986 | BLOOMFIELD | 1,731,067 | 3,027,357 | 447,835 | 32,629,883 | 14,544,305 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52,380,447 |
| 11.75\% | \%sector of county sector | 1.69\% | 17.74\% | 16.86\% | 13.93\% | 16.19\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2.14 \%$ |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.30\% | 5.78\% | 0.85\% | 62.29\% | 27.77\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 79 | CENTER | 21,823 | 216,642 | 33,721 | 2,006,755 | 341,290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,620,231 |
| 0.94\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.02\% | 1.27\% | 1.27\% | 0.86\% | 0.38\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 0.83\% | 8.27\% | 1.29\% | 76.59\% | 13.03\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 1,147 | CREIGHTON | 1,405,720 | 903,124 | 122,103 | 43,450,285 | 6,501,975 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52,383,207 |
| 13.67\% | \%sector of county sector | 1.37\% | 5.29\% | 4.60\% | 18.55\% | 7.24\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.14\% |
|  | \%ssector of municipality | $2.68 \%$ | 1.72\% | 0.23\% | 82.95\% | 12.41\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 756 | CROFTON | 1,272,484 | 807,509 | 113,327 | 39,857,735 | 5,956,620 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48,007,675 |
| 9.01\% | \%sector of county sector | 1.24\% | 4.73\% | 4.27\% | 17.01\% | 6.63\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.96\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 2.65\% | 1.68\% | $0.24 \%$ | 83.02\% | 12.41\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 365 | NIOBRARA | 628,253 | 515,439 | 80,230 | 13,205,090 | 3,177,570 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,606,582 |
| 4.35\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.61\% | 3.02\% | 3.02\% | $5.64 \%$ | 3.54\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.72\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.57\% | 2.93\% | 0.46\% | 75.00\% | 18.05\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 424 | SANTEE | 19,077 | 29,660 | 4,583 | 299,265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352,585 |
| 5.05\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.02\% | $0.17 \%$ | 0.17\% | 0.13\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 5.41\% | 8.41\% | 1.30\% | 84.88\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 38 | VERDEL | 39,509 | 0 | 0 | 1,113,635 | 94,885 | 0 | 68,425 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,316,454 |
| 0.45\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.04\% |  |  | 0.48\% | 0.11\% |  | 0.04\% |  |  |  |  | 0.05\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.00\% |  |  | 84.59\% | 7.21\% |  | 5.20\% |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 554 | VERDIGRE | 2,559,215 | 509,100 | 79,243 | 16,896,955 | 3,091,460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23,135,973 |
| $6.60 \%$ | \%sector of county sector | 2.49\% | 2.98\% | 2.98\% | 7.21\% | 3.44\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.95\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 11.06\% | 2.20\% | $0.34 \%$ | 73.03\% | 13.36\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 592 | WAUSA | 1,855,926 | 1,066,126 | 154,907 | 21,471,345 | 3,275,270 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,823,574 |
| 7.06\% | \%sector of county sector | 1.81\% | 6.25\% | 5.83\% | 9.17\% | 3.65\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.14\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 6.67\% | 3.83\% | $0.56 \%$ | 77.17\% | 11.77\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| 54 | WINNETOON | 73,972 | 200,220 | 31,165 | 1,591,100 | 357,950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,254,407 |
| 0.64\% | \%sector of county sector | 0.07\% | 1.17\% | 1.17\% | 0.68\% | 0.40\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09\% |
|  | \%sector of municipality | 3.28\% | 8.88\% | 1.38\% | 70.58\% | 15.88\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of county sector |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of municipality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of county sector |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of municipality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of county sector |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of municipality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of county sector |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \%sector of municipality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,022 | Total Municipalities | 9,655,625 | 7,282,181 | 1,068,204 | 174,395,072 | 37,431,807 | 0 | 68,425 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229,901,312 |
| 59.85\% | \%all municip.sectors of coty | 9.41\% | 42.67\% | 40.22\% | 74.45\% | 41.67\% |  | 0.04\% |  |  |  |  | 9.40\% |


| Total Real Property <br> Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30 | Records : 11,600 | Value : 2,799,843,070 | Growth 12,644,475 | Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 41 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 369 | 3,817,470 | 103 | 1,579,305 | 247 | 5,535,455 | 719 | 10,932,230 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 2,196 | 24,765,180 | 87 | 1,750,000 | 250 | 4,735,850 | 2,533 | 31,251,030 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 2,249 | 163,467,880 | 101 | 15,085,890 | 296 | 37,905,250 | 2,646 | 216,459,020 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 2,618 | 192,050,530 | 204 | 18,415,195 | 543 | 48,176,555 | 3,365 | 258,642,280 | 1,886,035 |
| \% of Res Total | 77.80 | 74.25 | 6.06 | 7.12 | 16.14 | 18.63 | 29.01 | 9.24 | 14.92 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 63 | 183,580 | 6 | 66,720 | 12 | 327,275 | 81 | 577,575 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 468 | 2,097,000 | 30 | 483,990 | 40 | 5,852,570 | 538 | 8,433,560 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 471 | 36,634,810 | 34 | 3,422,350 | 58 | 42,597,040 | 563 | 82,654,200 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 534 | 38,915,390 | 40 | 3,973,060 | 70 | 48,776,885 | 644 | 91,665,335 | 1,164,415 |
| \% of Com Total | 82.92 | 42.45 | 6.21 | 4.33 | 10.87 | 53.21 | 5.55 | 3.27 | 9.21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 1 | 10,115 | 1,209 | 27,080,460 | 1,210 | 27,090,575 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 3 | 159,290 | 756 | 35,891,885 | 759 | 36,051,175 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 5 | 193,900 | 782 | 145,220,885 | 787 | 145,414,785 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 0 | 0 | 6 | 363,305 | 1,991 | 208,193,230 | 1,997 | 208,556,535 | 3,917,040 |
| \% of Rec Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 99.70 | 99.83 | 17.22 | 7.45 | 30.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Res \& Rec Total | 2,618 | 192,050,530 | 210 | 18,778,500 | 2,534 | 256,369,785 | 5,362 | 467,198,815 | 5,803,075 |
| \% of Res \& Rec Total | 48.83 | 41.11 | 3.92 | 4.02 | 47.26 | 54.87 | 46.22 | 16.69 | 45.89 |
| Com \& Ind Total | 534 | 38,915,390 | 40 | 3,973,060 | 70 | 48,776,885 | 644 | 91,665,335 | 1,164,415 |
| \% of Com \& Ind Total | 82.92 | 42.45 | 6.21 | 4.33 | 10.87 | 53.21 | 5.55 | 3.27 | 9.21 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 3,152 | 230,965,920 | 250 | 22,751,560 | 2,604 | 305,146,670 | 6,006 | 558,864,150 | 6,967,490 |
| \% of Taxable Total | 52.48 | 41.33 | 4.16 | 4.07 | 43.36 | 54.60 | 51.78 | 19.96 | 55.10 |



| 30. Ag Total |  |  |  |  |  | 5,594 | 2,240,978,920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Urban <br> Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 3 | 3.00 | 60,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 78 | 82.00 | 1,620,000 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 79 | 0.00 | 9,825,665 |  |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 44 | 117.80 | 410,800 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 79 | 312.65 | 1,094,275 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 86 | 0.00 | 2,883,000 |  |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 200 | 401.52 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 <br> Records | $0.00$ <br> Rural <br> Acres | 0 <br> Value | $12$ <br> Records | $358.86$ <br> Total <br> Acres | $140,680$ <br> Value | Growth |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 34 | 37.00 | 700,000 | 37 | 40.00 | 760,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 858 | 907.93 | 17,691,100 | 936 | 989.93 | 19,311,100 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 919 | 0.00 | 94,865,635 | 998 | 0.00 | 104,691,300 | 1,463,280 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,035 | 1,029.93 | 124,762,400 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 474 | 1,318.26 | 4,603,910 | 518 | 1,436.06 | 5,014,710 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 1,016 | 5,863.46 | 20,518,110 | 1,095 | 6,176.11 | 21,612,385 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 1,124 | 0.00 | 56,587,375 | 1,210 | 0.00 | 59,470,375 | 4,213,705 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,728 | 7,612.17 | 86,097,470 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 3,797 | 9,735.86 | 0 | 3,997 | 10,137.38 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 150 | 9,023.94 | 4,648,235 | 162 | 9,382.80 | 4,788,915 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 2,763 | 28,162.28 | 215,648,785 | 5,676,985 |



## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 1

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 1,929.13 | 4.58\% | 13,089,170 | 4.87\% | 6,785.01 |
| 46. 1A | 1,740.93 | 4.13\% | 11,812,210 | 4.40\% | 6,785.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 2,903.38 | 6.89\% | 19,365,530 | 7.21\% | 6,669.99 |
| 48. 2A | 16,353.31 | 38.83\% | 104,334,080 | 38.85\% | 6,380.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 410.20 | 0.97\% | 2,602,725 | 0.97\% | 6,345.01 |
| 50.3A | 77.46 | 0.18\% | 491,480 | 0.18\% | 6,344.95 |
| 51.4A1 | 15,192.99 | 36.08\% | 94,964,875 | 35.36\% | 6,250.57 |
| 52.4A | 3,507.04 | 8.33\% | 21,910,695 | 8.16\% | 6,247.63 |
| 53. Total | 42,114.44 | 100.00\% | 268,570,765 | 100.00\% | 6,377.17 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 2,874.39 | 3.56\% | 19,502,750 | 3.91\% | 6,785.00 |
| 55. 1D | 28,360.08 | 35.09\% | 192,423,200 | 38.60\% | 6,785.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 5,961.13 | 7.38\% | 39,760,760 | 7.98\% | 6,670.00 |
| 57. 2D | 7,552.44 | 9.34\% | 48,184,495 | 9.67\% | 6,379.99 |
| 58.3D1 | 168.31 | 0.21\% | 1,007,330 | 0.20\% | 5,984.97 |
| 59.3D | 1,611.79 | 1.99\% | 9,042,180 | 1.81\% | 5,610.02 |
| 60.4D1 | 28,854.26 | 35.70\% | 158,698,430 | 31.83\% | 5,500.00 |
| 61. 4D | 5,438.90 | 6.73\% | 29,913,950 | 6.00\% | 5,500.00 |
| 62. Total | 80,821.30 | 100.00\% | 498,533,095 | 100.00\% | 6,168.34 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 8,243.45 | 30.42\% | 20,925,880 | 30.53\% | 2,538.49 |
| 64. 1G | 5,901.61 | 21.78\% | 14,967,615 | 21.84\% | 2,536.19 |
| 65. 2G1 | 2,677.28 | 9.88\% | 6,756,685 | 9.86\% | 2,523.71 |
| 66. 2G | 9,003.26 | 33.22\% | 22,687,130 | 33.10\% | 2,519.88 |
| 67.3G1 | 1,051.67 | 3.88\% | 2,643,940 | 3.86\% | 2,514.04 |
| 68. 3G | 94.71 | 0.35\% | 238,670 | 0.35\% | 2,520.01 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 70. 4G | 125.99 | 0.46\% | 317,480 | 0.46\% | 2,519.88 |
| 71. Total | 27,097.97 | 100.00\% | 68,537,400 | 100.00\% | 2,529.24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 42,114.44 | 27.72\% | 268,570,765 | 32.09\% | 6,377.17 |
| Dry Total | 80,821.30 | 53.20\% | 498,533,095 | 59.56\% | 6,168.34 |
| Grass Total | 27,097.97 | 17.84\% | 68,537,400 | 8.19\% | 2,529.24 |
| 72. Waste | 539.60 | 0.36\% | 135,160 | 0.02\% | 250.48 |
| 73. Other | 1,344.86 | 0.89\% | 1,228,230 | 0.15\% | 913.28 |
| 74. Exempt | 137.85 | 0.09\% | 267,055 | 0.03\% | 1,937.29 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 151,918.17 | 100.00\% | 837,004,650 | 100.00\% | 5,509.58 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 2

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 5,493.76 | 17.86\% | 25,108,475 | 19.62\% | 4,570.36 |
| 46. 1A | 2,794.44 | 9.08\% | 12,253,075 | 9.58\% | 4,384.81 |
| 47. 2A1 | 1,604.77 | 5.22\% | 6,831,250 | 5.34\% | 4,256.84 |
| 48. 2A | 11,557.87 | 37.57\% | 49,620,690 | 38.78\% | 4,293.24 |
| 49.3A1 | 2,603.37 | 8.46\% | 10,309,325 | 8.06\% | 3,959.99 |
| 50.3A | 261.18 | 0.85\% | 1,008,165 | 0.79\% | 3,860.04 |
| 51.4A1 | 4,350.72 | 14.14\% | 15,469,625 | 12.09\% | 3,555.65 |
| 52.4A | 2,101.37 | 6.83\% | 7,353,775 | 5.75\% | 3,499.51 |
| 53. Total | 30,767.48 | 100.00\% | 127,954,380 | 100.00\% | 4,158.75 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 7,240.84 | 10.05\% | 19,586,555 | 12.32\% | 2,705.01 |
| 55. 1D | 14,651.43 | 20.33\% | 38,606,570 | 24.28\% | 2,635.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 5,737.40 | 7.96\% | 12,737,030 | 8.01\% | 2,220.00 |
| 57.2D | 18,070.45 | 25.07\% | 37,405,860 | 23.52\% | 2,070.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 3,593.98 | 4.99\% | 7,223,860 | 4.54\% | 2,009.99 |
| 59.3D | 1,122.35 | 1.56\% | 2,166,175 | 1.36\% | 1,930.04 |
| 60.4D1 | 14,123.70 | 19.59\% | 26,976,410 | 16.96\% | 1,910.01 |
| 61. 4D | 7,539.20 | 10.46\% | 14,324,540 | 9.01\% | 1,900.01 |
| 62. Total | 72,079.35 | 100.00\% | 159,027,000 | 100.00\% | 2,206.28 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 20,437.87 | 9.01\% | 38,312,455 | 9.26\% | 1,874.58 |
| 64. 1G | 32,222.99 | 14.20\% | 59,512,605 | 14.39\% | 1,846.90 |
| 65. 2G1 | 61,717.26 | 27.20\% | 112,159,835 | 27.12\% | 1,817.32 |
| 66. 2G | 47,479.96 | 20.92\% | 86,934,575 | 21.02\% | 1,830.97 |
| 67.3G1 | 37,304.94 | 16.44\% | 67,224,335 | 16.26\% | 1,802.02 |
| 68.3G | 26,286.86 | 11.58\% | 46,663,755 | 11.28\% | 1,775.17 |
| 69.4G1 | 587.57 | 0.26\% | 1,099,895 | 0.27\% | 1,871.94 |
| 70. 4G | 871.40 | 0.38\% | 1,628,625 | 0.39\% | 1,868.98 |
| 71. Total | 226,908.85 | 100.00\% | 413,536,080 | 100.00\% | 1,822.48 |
| Irrigated Total | 30,767.48 | 8.96\% | 127,954,380 | 18.17\% | 4,158.75 |
| Dry Total | 72,079.35 | 20.99\% | 159,027,000 | 22.58\% | 2,206.28 |
| Grass Total | 226,908.85 | 66.07\% | 413,536,080 | 58.71\% | 1,822.48 |
| 72. Waste | 9,435.45 | 2.75\% | 2,360,780 | 0.34\% | 250.20 |
| 73. Other | 4,229.29 | 1.23\% | 1,499,835 | 0.21\% | 354.63 |
| 74. Exempt | 12,151.95 | 3.54\% | 19,738,010 | 2.80\% | 1,624.27 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 343,420.42 | 100.00\% | 704,378,075 | 100.00\% | 2,051.07 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 3

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 693.99 | 3.97\% | 4,208,820 | 4.51\% | 6,064.67 |
| 46. 1A | 403.36 | 2.31\% | 2,446,365 | 2.62\% | 6,064.97 |
| 47. 2A1 | 849.61 | 4.86\% | 5,116,310 | 5.49\% | 6,021.95 |
| 48. 2A | 6,311.64 | 36.13\% | 37,993,905 | 40.74\% | 6,019.66 |
| 49.3A1 | 430.82 | 2.47\% | 2,450,160 | 2.63\% | 5,687.20 |
| 50.3A | 2.86 | 0.02\% | 15,445 | 0.02\% | 5,400.35 |
| 51.4A1 | 6,263.96 | 35.86\% | 29,659,460 | 31.81\% | 4,734.94 |
| 52.4A | 2,510.73 | 14.37\% | 11,359,335 | 12.18\% | 4,524.32 |
| 53. Total | 17,466.97 | 100.00\% | 93,249,800 | 100.00\% | 5,338.64 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 3,486.21 | 7.32\% | 20,777,830 | 8.58\% | 5,960.01 |
| 55. 1D | 12,521.92 | 26.30\% | 72,940,325 | 30.13\% | 5,825.01 |
| 56. 2D1 | 3,803.58 | 7.99\% | 21,185,940 | 8.75\% | 5,570.00 |
| 57.2D | 6,574.48 | 13.81\% | 36,192,450 | 14.95\% | 5,504.99 |
| 58.3D1 | 172.78 | 0.36\% | 916,615 | 0.38\% | 5,305.10 |
| 59.3D | 401.13 | 0.84\% | 2,015,685 | 0.83\% | 5,025.02 |
| 60.4D1 | 13,785.57 | 28.96\% | 62,172,960 | 25.68\% | 4,510.00 |
| 61. 4D | 6,862.60 | 14.41\% | 25,872,100 | 10.69\% | 3,770.01 |
| 62. Total | 47,608.27 | 100.00\% | 242,073,905 | 100.00\% | 5,084.70 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 10,338.67 | 15.33\% | 23,334,590 | 15.87\% | 2,257.02 |
| 64. 1G | 8,902.83 | 13.20\% | 19,796,550 | 13.46\% | 2,223.62 |
| 65. 2G1 | 14,498.02 | 21.50\% | 30,606,120 | 20.81\% | 2,111.06 |
| 66. 2G | 16,266.69 | 24.12\% | 36,431,710 | 24.77\% | 2,239.65 |
| 67.3G1 | 13,836.41 | 20.51\% | 29,166,480 | 19.83\% | 2,107.95 |
| 68.3G | 3,240.94 | 4.81\% | 6,927,795 | 4.71\% | 2,137.59 |
| 69.4G1 | 36.21 | 0.05\% | 79,560 | 0.05\% | 2,197.18 |
| 70. 4G | 326.81 | 0.48\% | 733,110 | 0.50\% | 2,243.23 |
| 71. Total | 67,446.58 | 100.00\% | 147,075,915 | 100.00\% | 2,180.63 |
| Irrigated Total | 17,466.97 | 12.81\% | 93,249,800 | 19.27\% | 5,338.64 |
| Dry Total | 47,608.27 | 34.92\% | 242,073,905 | 50.02\% | 5,084.70 |
| Grass Total | 67,446.58 | 49.47\% | 147,075,915 | 30.39\% | 2,180.63 |
| 72. Waste | 2,691.84 | 1.97\% | 673,555 | 0.14\% | 250.22 |
| 73. Other | 1,127.96 | 0.83\% | 874,235 | 0.18\% | 775.06 |
| 74. Exempt | 13,583.10 | 9.96\% | 32,800,350 | 6.78\% | 2,414.79 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 136,341.62 | 100.00\% | 483,947,410 | 100.00\% | 3,549.52 |

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 0.00 | 0 | 4,091.85 | 22,469,710 | 86,257.04 | 467,305,235 | 90,348.89 | 489,774,945 |
| 77. Dry Land | 0.00 | 0 | 11,077.13 | 46,351,405 | 189,431.79 | 853,282,595 | 200,508.92 | 899,634,000 |
| 78. Grass | 0.00 | 0 | 10,128.09 | 19,556,090 | 311,325.31 | 609,593,305 | 321,453.40 | 629,149,395 |
| 79. Waste | 0.00 | 0 | 621.52 | 155,630 | 12,045.37 | 3,013,865 | 12,666.89 | 3,169,495 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 271.75 | 93,160 | 6,430.36 | 3,509,140 | 6,702.11 | 3,602,300 |
| 81. Exempt | 21.71 | 114,150 | 1,382.98 | 736,000 | 24,468.21 | 51,955,265 | 25,872.90 | 52,805,415 |
| 82. Total | 0.00 | 0 | 26,190.34 | 88,625,995 | 605,489.87 | 1,936,704,140 | 631,680.21 | 2,025,330,135 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 90,348.89 | 14.30\% | 489,774,945 | 24.18\% | 5,420.93 |
| Dry Land | 200,508.92 | 31.74\% | 899,634,000 | 44.42\% | 4,486.75 |
| Grass | 321,453.40 | 50.89\% | 629,149,395 | 31.06\% | 1,957.20 |
| Waste | 12,666.89 | 2.01\% | 3,169,495 | 0.16\% | 250.22 |
| Other | 6,702.11 | 1.06\% | 3,602,300 | 0.18\% | 537.49 |
| Exempt | 25,872.90 | 4.10\% | 52,805,415 | 2.61\% | 2,040.95 |
| Total | 631,680.21 | 100.00\% | 2,025,330,135 | 100.00\% | 3,206.26 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XI : Residential Records - Assessor Location Detail

| $\underline{\text { Line\# IAssessor Location }}$ | Unimproved Land |  | Improved Land |  | Improvements |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 83.1 N/a Or Error | 52 | 8,168,170 | 20 | 3,930,700 | 20 | 2,330,185 | 72 | 14,429,055 | 383,285 |
| 83.2 Bazile Mills | 29 | 542,720 | 16 | 139,965 | 21 | 1,452,455 | 50 | 2,135,140 | 0 |
| 83.3 Bloomfield | 63 | 614,230 | 451 | 4,757,440 | 457 | 32,777,290 | 520 | 38,148,960 | 64,365 |
| 83.4 Center | 16 | 61,245 | 50 | 289,320 | 52 | 1,975,765 | 68 | 2,326,330 | 615 |
| 83.5 Creighton | 73 | 665,840 | 560 | 7,689,920 | 568 | 41,516,510 | 641 | 49,872,270 | 373,975 |
| 83.6 Crofton | 44 | 513,075 | 331 | 5,596,320 | 339 | 34,058,405 | 383 | 40,167,800 | 349,330 |
| 83.7 Devils Nest | 714 | 3,661,840 | 31 | 390,105 | 31 | 3,904,040 | 745 | 7,955,985 | 185,140 |
| 83.8 Lake | 425 | 12,277,810 | 705 | 27,951,630 | 729 | 137,376,555 | 1,154 | 177,605,995 | 3,143,510 |
| 83.9 Niobrara | 21 | 210,220 | 180 | 1,881,955 | 197 | 12,542,520 | 218 | 14,634,695 | 96,770 |
| 83.10 Rural | 368 | 10,141,685 | 340 | 10,264,590 | 404 | 55,036,735 | 772 | 75,443,010 | 892,330 |
| 83.11 Santee | 1 | 1,220 | 7 | 10,565 | 7 | 305,980 | 8 | 317,765 | 0 |
| 83.12 Verdel | 34 | 114,220 | 30 | 110,645 | 30 | 940,730 | 64 | 1,165,595 | 0 |
| 83.13 Verdigre | 25 | 219,435 | 254 | 1,624,470 | 260 | 17,425,590 | 285 | 19,269,495 | 71,720 |
| 83.14 Wausa | 40 | 427,590 | 276 | 2,505,120 | 277 | 19,033,230 | 317 | 21,965,940 | 238,420 |
| 83.15 Winnetoon | 24 | 403,505 | 41 | 159,460 | 41 | 1,197,815 | 65 | 1,760,780 | 3,615 |
| 84 Residential Total | 1,929 | 38,022,805 | 3,292 | 67,302,205 | 3,433 | 361,873,805 | 5,362 | 467,198,815 | 5,803,075 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XII : Commercial Records - Assessor Location Detail

| $\underline{\text { Line\# I Assessor Location }}$ | Unimproved Land |  | Improved Land |  | Improvements |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 85.1 Bazile Mills | 0 | 0 | 1 | 900 | 2 | 84,445 | 2 | 85,345 | 0 |
| 85.2 Bloomfield | 9 | 33,035 | 103 | 541,285 | 105 | 15,059,640 | 114 | 15,633,960 | 446,755 |
| 85.3 Center | 2 | 1,230 | 11 | 12,085 | 11 | 322,500 | 13 | 335,815 | 0 |
| 85.4 Creighton | 15 | 54,120 | 104 | 545,720 | 104 | 6,093,035 | 119 | 6,692,875 | 152,870 |
| 85.5 Crofton | 10 | 43,170 | 65 | 253,465 | 65 | 5,956,160 | 75 | 6,252,795 | 0 |
| 85.6 Lake | 1 | 54,625 | 21 | 447,825 | 23 | 6,422,935 | 24 | 6,925,385 | 543,570 |
| 85.7 Niobrara | 7 | 36,080 | 43 | 416,145 | 43 | 2,702,380 | 50 | 3,154,605 | 0 |
| 85.8 Rural | 16 | 331,580 | 47 | 5,872,790 | 67 | 39,482,975 | 83 | 45,687,345 | 16,655 |
| 85.9 Verdel | 9 | 5,010 | 7 | 4,760 | 7 | 67,240 | 16 | 77,010 | 0 |
| 85.10 Verdigre | 5 | 7,510 | 60 | 101,020 | 60 | 2,948,305 | 65 | 3,056,835 | 4,565 |
| 85.11 Wausa | 6 | 11,170 | 62 | 222,355 | 62 | 3,200,645 | 68 | 3,434,170 | 0 |
| 85.12 Winnetoon | 1 | 45 | 14 | 15,210 | 14 | 313,940 | 15 | 329,195 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 86 Commercial Total | 81 | 577,575 | 538 | 8,433,560 | 563 | 82,654,200 | 644 | 91,665,335 | 1,164,415 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area $\quad$ Market Area 1

| Pure Grass | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87. 1G1 | 8,130.85 | 30.81\% | 20,704,855 | 30.82\% | 2,546.46 |
| 88. 1G | 5,796.79 | 21.97\% | 14,771,670 | 21.99\% | 2,548.25 |
| 89. 2G1 | 2,572.10 | 9.75\% | 6,549,490 | 9.75\% | 2,546.36 |
| 90. 2G | 8,624.48 | 32.68\% | 21,958,210 | 32.69\% | 2,546.03 |
| 91. 3G1 | 1,045.86 | 3.96\% | 2,637,180 | 3.93\% | 2,521.54 |
| 92. 3G | 94.71 | 0.36\% | 238,670 | 0.36\% | 2,520.01 |
| 93. 4G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 94. 4G | 125.99 | 0.48\% | 317,480 | 0.47\% | 2,519.88 |
| 95. Total | 26,390.78 | 100.00\% | 67,177,555 | 100.00\% | 2,545.49 |
| CRP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 96. 1C1 | 110.32 | 16.42\% | 219,540 | 16.42\% | 1,990.03 |
| 97. 1C | 95.38 | 14.20\% | 189,800 | 14.20\% | 1,989.93 |
| 98. 2 C 1 | 103.60 | 15.42\% | 206,165 | 15.42\% | 1,990.01 |
| 99. 2C | 360.23 | 53.62\% | 716,865 | 53.63\% | 1,990.02 |
| 100.3C1 | 2.23 | 0.33\% | 4,435 | 0.33\% | 1,988.79 |
| 101.3C | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 102. 4 C 1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 103. 4C | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 104. Total | 671.76 | 100.00\% | 1,336,805 | 100.00\% | 1,990.00 |
| Timber |  |  |  |  |  |
| 105. 1T1 | 2.28 | 6.44\% | 1,485 | 6.45\% | 651.32 |
| 106. 1T | 9.44 | 26.64\% | 6,145 | 26.67\% | 650.95 |
| 107.2 T1 | 1.58 | 4.46\% | 1,030 | 4.47\% | 651.90 |
| 108. 2T | 18.55 | 52.36\% | 12,055 | 52.32\% | 649.87 |
| 109.3T1 | 3.58 | 10.10\% | 2,325 | 10.09\% | 649.44 |
| 110.3T | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 111.4T1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 112.4T | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 113. Total | 35.43 | 100.00\% | 23,040 | 100.00\% | 650.30 |
| Grass Total | 26,390.78 | 97.39\% | 67,177,555 | 98.02\% | 2,545.49 |
| CRP Total | 671.76 | 2.48\% | 1,336,805 | 1.95\% | 1,990.00 |
| Timber Total | 35.43 | 0.13\% | 23,040 | 0.03\% | 650.30 |
| 114. Market Area Total | 27,097.97 | 100.00\% | 68,537,400 | 100.00\% | 2,529.24 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area
Market Area 2

| Pure Grass | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87. 1G1 | 18,792.02 | 9.18\% | 35,723,580 | 9.19\% | 1,901.00 |
| 88. 1G | 29,727.49 | 14.53\% | 56,519,930 | 14.53\% | 1,901.27 |
| 89. 2G1 | 53,950.40 | 26.37\% | 102,579,050 | 26.38\% | 1,901.36 |
| 90. 2G | 43,154.23 | 21.09\% | 82,001,630 | 21.08\% | 1,900.20 |
| 91. 3G1 | 34,092.32 | 16.66\% | 64,777,720 | 16.66\% | 1,900.07 |
| 92. 3G | 23,481.94 | 11.48\% | 44,624,945 | 11.47\% | 1,900.39 |
| 93. 4G1 | 565.93 | 0.28\% | 1,080,425 | 0.28\% | 1,909.11 |
| 94. 4G | 848.94 | 0.41\% | 1,612,970 | 0.41\% | 1,899.98 |
| 95. Total | 204,613.27 | 100.00\% | 388,920,250 | 100.00\% | 1,900.76 |
| CRP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 96. 1C1 | 1,133.52 | 15.01\% | 2,255,745 | 15.01\% | 1,990.04 |
| 97. 1C | 1,022.69 | 13.54\% | 2,035,175 | 13.54\% | 1,990.02 |
| 98. 2 C 1 | 3,382.04 | 44.77\% | 6,730,265 | 44.77\% | 1,990.00 |
| 99. 2C | 1,582.86 | 20.95\% | 3,149,915 | 20.95\% | 1,990.01 |
| 100. 3C1 | 267.34 | 3.54\% | 532,010 | 3.54\% | 1,990.01 |
| 101.3C | 160.78 | 2.13\% | 319,960 | 2.13\% | 1,990.05 |
| 102.4C1 | 4.03 | 0.05\% | 8,020 | 0.05\% | 1,990.07 |
| 103. 4C | 0.78 | 0.01\% | 1,555 | 0.01\% | 1,993.59 |
| 104. Total | 7,554.04 | 100.00\% | 15,032,645 | 100.00\% | 1,990.01 |
| Timber |  |  |  |  |  |
| 105. 1T1 | 512.33 | 3.48\% | 333,130 | 3.48\% | 650.23 |
| 106. 1T | 1,472.81 | 9.99\% | 957,500 | 9.99\% | 650.12 |
| 107. 2 T 1 | 4,384.82 | 29.74\% | 2,850,520 | 29.75\% | 650.09 |
| 108. 2T | 2,742.87 | 18.61\% | 1,783,030 | 18.61\% | 650.06 |
| 109.3T1 | 2,945.28 | 19.98\% | 1,914,605 | 19.98\% | 650.06 |
| 110.3T | 2,644.14 | 17.94\% | 1,718,850 | 17.94\% | 650.06 |
| 111.4T1 | 17.61 | 0.12\% | 11,450 | 0.12\% | 650.20 |
| 112.4T | 21.68 | 0.15\% | 14,100 | 0.15\% | 650.37 |
| 113. Total | 14,741.54 | 100.00\% | 9,583,185 | 100.00\% | 650.08 |
| Grass Total | 204,613.27 | 90.17\% | 388,920,250 | 94.05\% | 1,900.76 |
| CRP Total | 7,554.04 | 3.33\% | 15,032,645 | 3.64\% | 1,990.01 |
| Timber Total | 14,741.54 | 6.50\% | 9,583,185 | 2.32\% | 650.08 |
| 114. Market Area Total | 226,908.85 | 100.00\% | 413,536,080 | 100.00\% | 1,822.48 |

## County 54 Knox

2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area
Market Area 3


> 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
> Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL)

54 Knox

|  | 2023 CTL County Total | 2024 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2024 form 45-2023 CTL) | Percent <br> Change | 2024 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | Percent Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. Residential | 234,252,733 | 258,642,280 | 24,389,547 | 10.41\% | 1,886,035 | 9.61\% |
| 02. Recreational | 185,296,115 | 208,556,535 | 23,260,420 | 12.55\% | 3,917,040 | 10.44\% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 118,913,470 | 124,762,400 | 5,848,930 | 4.92\% | 1,463,280 | 3.69\% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 538,462,318 | 591,961,215 | 53,498,897 | 9.94\% | 7,266,355 | 8.59\% |
| 05. Commercial | 89,834,150 | 91,665,335 | 1,831,185 | 2.04\% | 1,164,415 | 0.74\% |
| 06. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 07. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-6) | 89,834,150 | 91,665,335 | 1,831,185 | 2.04\% | 1,164,415 | 0.74\% |
| 08. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 72,939,670 | 86,097,470 | 13,157,800 | 18.04\% | 4,213,705 | 12.26\% |
| 09. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 10. Non Ag Use Land | 4,646,870 | 4,788,915 | 142,045 | 3.06\% |  |  |
| 11. Total Non-Agland (sum lines 8-10) | 77,586,540 | 90,886,385 | 13,299,845 | 17.14\% | 4,213,705 | 11.71\% |
| 12. Irrigated | 417,172,290 | 489,774,945 | 72,602,655 | 17.40\% |  |  |
| 13. Dryland | 706,044,071 | 899,634,000 | 193,589,929 | 27.42\% |  |  |
| 14. Grassland | 486,915,785 | 629,149,395 | 142,233,610 | 29.21\% |  |  |
| 15. Wasteland | 3,197,970 | 3,169,495 | -28,475 | -0.89\% |  |  |
| 16. Other Agland | 3,289,710 | 3,602,300 | 312,590 | 9.50\% |  |  |
| 17. Total Agricultural Land | 1,616,619,826 | 2,025,330,135 | 408,710,309 | 25.28\% |  |  |
| 18. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed) | 2,322,502,834 | 2,799,843,070 | 477,340,236 | 20.55\% | 12,644,475 | 20.01\% |

## 2024 Assessment Survey for Knox County

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| $\mathbf{1 .}$ | Deputy(ies) on staff: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | One |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff: |
|  | None |
| 3. | Other full-time employees: |
|  | Four |
| 4. | Other part-time employees: |
|  | None |
| $\mathbf{5 .}$ | Number of shared employees: |
|  | None |
| $\mathbf{6 .}$ | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: |
|  | $\$ 335,550$ |
| 7. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: |
|  | same as above |
| $\mathbf{8 .}$ | Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work: |
|  | N/A |
| $\mathbf{9 .}$ | If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount: |
|  | $\$ 21,300$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0 .}$ | Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system: |
| $\mathbf{1 2 .}$ | Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops: |
| $\$ 35,610$ |  |
|  | $\$ 2,500$ |

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| $\mathbf{1 .}$ | Administrative software: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | MIPS |
| 2. | CAMA software: |
|  | MIPS |
| 3. | Personal Property software: |
|  | MIPS |
| 4. | Are cadastral maps currently being used? |
|  | We maintain them but use GIS as main go-to. |
| 5. | If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | Office staff |
| 6. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | gWorks |
| 7. | Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address? |
|  | Yes. Knox.gworks.com |
| $\mathbf{8 .}$ | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | Deputy Assessor/Appraisal Clerk |
| 9. | What type of aerial imagery is used in the cyclical review of properties? |
|  | gWorks, June 1,2019 the county had flood imagery flown of all creeks, rivers-mainly western |
| part of Knox County. Contract signed with pictometry to begin flying in March of 2024. |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0 .}$ | When was the aerial imagery last updated? |
|  | 2022 |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Yes |
| 2. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
|  | Yes |


| 3. | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | All towns and villages |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
|  | July 1995 |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | None |
| 2. | GIS Services: |
|  | gWorks |
| 3. | Other services: |
|  | None |

## E. Appraisal /Listing Services

| 1. | List any outside appraisal or listing services employed by the county for the current <br> assessment year |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | None |
| 2. | If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract? |
|  | N/A |
| 3. | What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require? |
|  | Standard appraisal qualifications are required by the county. |
| 4. | Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA? |
|  | N/A |
| 5. | Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county? |
|  | N/A |

## 2024 Residential Assessment Survey for Knox County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |
| 2. | List the valuation group recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each: |
|  | Valuation  <br> Group Description of unique characteristics |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Bloomfield, located in the eastern side of the county, K-12 school, active businesses, large } \\ \text { commercial chicken facility, and call center for employment, well maintained. Grain } \\ \text { elevator/fertilizer/care center/assisted living } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | Bazile Mills, small population, no gas or grocery store, no school, no curb and gutter. <br> Verdel, located in the northwestern part of the county and has nothing to offer in the way of business or schools. <br> Winnetoon, small community, not far from Center, has minimal business facilities, bank and café. No school and no curb and gutter. |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 5 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Center, county seat, small population, no gas or grocery, only a post office and Bar/Grill. } \\ \text { No curb and gutter } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | $10 \quad$Creighton, located in the central area of the county, has school, hospital, care center, <br> active business community, well maintained. |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 15 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Crofton, located in the northeast part of the county, closer to Yankton, SD community. } \\ \text { K-12 school and Parochial grade school, typical business community and well maintained. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 20 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Lake, residences located on the northern portion of the county along the Lewis and Clark } \\ \text { lake, occupied either full or part time. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | $26 ~$Devil's Nest, is a subdivided area that has been in existence for a long time. A new <br> developer is trying to revitalize and build the area. |
|  | 303Niobrara, located in the northwestern, central portion of the county. K-12 school, Medical <br> clinic and typical business community. |
|  | 35 Rural, residential property located outside the boundaries of the villages. |
|  | 37 等Santee, located northern middle part of county along the Missouri River. It is Santee Sioux <br> Indian Reservation with few taxpayers. College, school, grocery mainly for Native <br> Americans. |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 45 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Verdigre, located in the western portion of the county, K-12 school, medical clinic and } \\ \text { typical business activity. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | 50 $\begin{array}{l}\text { Wausa, located in the southeastern portion of the county, K-12 school, care center and } \\ \text { assisted living and typical small business community. }\end{array}$ |
|  | AG DW Agricultural Dwellings |
|  | AG OB $\quad$ Agricultural Outbuildings |
| 3 | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties. |
|  | The cost approach is used to determine market value of residential properties. |
|  |  |


| 4. | For the cost approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Local market information is used when developing depreciation studies. |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust depreciation tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are adjusted. |  |  |  |  |
|  | No, however each valuation groups economic is adjusted according to the market. |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values? |  |  |  |  |
|  | Residential lot values are developed by sales/market per square foot. The county uses the $15 \%-20 \%$ land to building range as well. |  |  |  |  |
| 7. | How are rural residential site values developed? |  |  |  |  |
|  | Market analysis, compare to surrounding counties. |  |  |  |  |
| 8. | Are there form 191 applications on file? |  |  |  |  |
|  | No |  |  |  |  |
| 9. | Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale? |  |  |  |  |
|  | All lots are treated the same, no applications to combine lots have been received. |  |  |  |  |
| 10. | Valuation <br> Group | Date of <br> Depreciation Tables | Date of Costing | Date of <br> Lot Value Study | Date of <br> Last Inspection |
|  | 1 | 2024 | 2021 | 2024 | 2023 |
|  | 3 | 2024 | 2021 | 2024 | 2023 |
|  | 5 | 2024 | 2021 | 2024 | 2023 |
|  | 10 | 2024 | 2021 | 2024 | 2023 |
|  | 15 | 2023 | 2021 | 2024 | 2022 |
|  | 20 | 2022 | 2021 | 2024 | 2020-2021 |
|  | 26 | 2022 | 2021 | 2024 | 2020-2021 |
|  | 30 | 2023 | 2021 | 2024 | 2022 |
|  | 35 | 2022 | 2017 | 2024 | 2018-2020 |
|  | 37 | 2023 | 2021 | 2024 | 2022 |
|  | 45 | 2024 | 2021 | 2024 | 2023 |
|  | 50 | 2023 | 2021 | 2024 | 2022 |
|  | AG DW | 2022 | 2017 | 2024 | 2018-2020 |
|  | AG OB | 2022 | 2017 | 2024 | 2018-2020 |
|  | Valuation Group 37 Santee only has 5 houses on the tax roll. Mainly not used for full time living, the rest is exempt. |  |  |  |  |

## 2024 Commercial Assessment Survey for Knox County

| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |  |
| 2. | List the valuation group recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each: |  |
|  | Valuation Group | Description of unique characteristics |
|  | 1 | Bloomfield, located in the eastern side of the county, K-12 school, active businesses, large commercial chicken facility, and call center for employment, well maintained. |
|  | 3 | Bazile Mills, small population, no gas or grocery store, no school and no curb and gutter. <br> Center, county seat, small population, no gas or grocery store, only post office and Bar/Grill. <br> Verdel, located in the northwestern part of the county and has nothing to offer in the way of business or schools. <br> Winnetoon, small community, not far from Center, has minimal business facilities, bank and café. No school or no curb and gutter. |
|  | 10 | Creighton, located in the central area of the county, has school, hospital, care center, active business community, well maintained. |
|  | 15 | Crofton, located in the northeast part of the county, closer to Yankton, SD community. K-12 school and Parochial grade school, typical business community and well maintained. |
|  | 20 | Lake, residences located on the northern portion of the county along the Lewis and Clark lake, occupied either full or part time. |
|  | 26 | Devil's Nest, is a subdivided area that has been in existence for a long time. A new developer is trying to revitalize and build the area. |
|  | 30 | Niobrara, located in the northwestern, central portion of the county. K-12 school, Medical clinic and typical business community. |
|  | 35 | Rural, residential property located outside the boundaries of the villages. |
|  | 37 | Santee, located northern middle part of county along the Missouri River. It is Santee Sioux Indian Reservation with few taxpayers. College, school, grocery mainly for Native Americans. |
|  | 45 | Verdigre, located in the western portion of the county, K-12 school, medical clinic and typical business activity. |
|  | 50 | Wausa, located in the southeastern portion of the county, K-12 school, care center and assisted living and typical small business community. |
| 3. | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties. |  |
|  | The cost approach is used to determine commercial property value. |  |
| 3a. | Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties. |  |
|  | The county would use Marshall \& Swift costing and tie in with local sales in determining unique property values. |  |
| 4. | For the cost approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? |  |


|  | Local market information as compared to CAMA depreciation was used to develop depreciation studies. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. | Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust depreciation tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are adjusted. |  |  |  |  |
|  | No, however each groupings economic deprecation is adjusted according to the market. |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Commercial lot values are determined by sales/market square foot. |  |  |  |  |
| 7. | Valuation Group | Date of Depreciation Tables | Date of Costing | Date of <br> Lot Value Study | Date of <br> Last Inspection |
|  | 1 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 |
|  | 3 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 |
|  | 10 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 |
|  | 15 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 |
|  | 20 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 |
|  | 26 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 |
|  | 30 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 |
|  | 35 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 |
|  | 37 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 |
|  | 45 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 |
|  | 50 | 2021 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |  |


| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |
| 2. | List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique. |
|  | Market Description of unique characteristics Year Land Use <br> Area  Completed |
|  | Area 1 is the south eastern portion of the county with borders of Cedar and Pierce Counties. This area has a substantial amount of uplands, silty soil, with abundant irrigation pivots scattered throughout the area. This area has some of the same characteristics as the bordering counties and does have more tillable acres. This area has significant rainfall. |
|  | Area 2 is the western portion of the county with borders of Holt and 2017-2022 Antelope Counties. This area is utilized more for the grassland characteristics. Sandy soils are abundant with silty, clay subsoils. Majority hilly, wooded, gullies, rough rangeland acres. Less cropland available. Extreme less rainfall. |
|  | Area 3 is the north eastern portion of the county with the north border as the Missouri River and the eastern border Cedar County with a portion dropping down into the central portion of the county. This area tends to have a mixture of dry and grass characteristics and minimal irrigation wells. This area becomes hilly with sandy soils and less rainfall as you gradually travel in northwesterly direction. Much rangeland. Geo 677 has the Bazile Creek winding through the southern portion with rough hilly areas to the south and west. Geo 463 has cropland with majority of grassland with waste and gullies becoming more prevalent as you travel North. |
|  | Contracted pictometry will be utilized for ongoing land use review for all market areas. |
| 3. | Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas. |
|  | Market areas were established in 2010 using factors such as soil type, irrigation potential, land use and topography. We totally revamped the county according to detailed soil and rainfall charts. Each year I plot all the sales on a county map and monitor the markets in each established area. |
| 4. | Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land. |
|  | The primary use of the parcel is looked at. Recreational land typically has lake influence. Some recreational land does also include agland that is no longer used to sustain agricultural purposes. This is determined through sales verification and review and inspection of properties. |
| 5. | Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not what methodology is used to determine market value? |
|  | Yes, they carry the same value. |


| 6. | What separate market analysis has been conducted where intensive use is identified in the <br> county? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 7. | If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the <br> Wetland Reserve Program. |
|  | We value WRP by maintaining the LVG codes, whether grass or waste. Currently there are sales of <br> WRP land so as a basis we value at one-half of the regular grass value. We maintain that there are at <br> least two types of WRP-the typical area along a creek bed that floods regularly and is not sustainable <br> for recreation and the second is the upland areas that are sustained for more specific activities with ideal <br> characteristics for recreation. |
| 7a. | Are any other agricultural subclasses used? If yes, please explain. |
|  | No |
|  | Ifvour county has special value applications, please answer the following identified as intensive use. |
| $\mathbf{8 a .}$ | How many parcels have a special valuation application on file? |
|  | 11 |
| $\mathbf{8 b .}$ | What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist in the county? |
|  | No information exists that would meet the need to apply special value. All sales and surrounding areas <br> reviewed. |
|  | Ifyour county recognizes a special value, please answer the following |
| $\mathbf{8 c .}$ | Describe the non-agricultural influences recognized within the county. |
|  | None |
| $\mathbf{8 d .}$ | Where is the influenced area located within the county? |
| $\mathbf{8 e .}$ | N/A |
|  | Nescribe in detail how the special values were arrived at in the influenced area(s). |

## 2023 Knox County 3 year Plan of Assessment



| Personal Property Schedules | Schedules Value | Exemptions | Value Exempted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 459 \$ 26,912,581 | 10 | \$ 0 |
| Agriculural | $\underline{935}$ \$ 75,000,502 | - 0 | \$0 |
| Total | 1394 \$101,913,083 | 0 | \$ 0 |

2023-2024 Proposed Budget
Assessor Budget-\$ 335,550.00
Re-Appraisal Budget-\$ 21,300.00
Total- $\$ 356,850.00$

2023 Form 425-Calamity- 1 application accepted/home destroyed by fire June 2023 2023 COV Notices Mailed by first class mail- 4,445
2023 Form 422 Protest- 20 protests filed

## Staff

1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
4 Full Time Clerk/Appraisers Sept' 22 II lost a 1 yr employee-November I hired new. December I hired new. January ' 23 retiree left after $20+$ year employment. The December hire left May 1 '23. Aug 1 '23 new employee hired.

All general staff functions are performed by everyone in the office. Clerks have their specific job they are in charge of but all general functions are shared. This makes all help accessible at all times to any customer. The Assessor prepares the reports. Deputy Assessor Christa has handed over the GIS mapping to Kylee and she has
mastered the program. Christa handles the residential valuations, MIPS and educating the clerks and helps with all other tasks .

## Contract Appraiser

No appraisers on contract.
EagleView Technologies has been ok'd by the Knox County Board of Supervisors and they will be flying Knox County early next spring 2024.

## Computer Vendor

March 2023 TerraScan moved out of Nebraska leaving us few choices for a vendor. MIIPS was chosen with promises of a convenient move over. Many concerns have been addressed and will continue to need attention as we go forward. This has taken a lot of time away from the normal daily activities of this office. Cleaning up the switch over is taking place and much time is still needed in the future to get all records checked.

## GIS

GIS Workshop

## Training

As the Assessor, I have attended all workshops and completed my educational hours needed to maintain my Assessor Certificate. The Deputy Assessor and the office clerks all attend school on a regular basis, whenever classes can be organized. We have utilized the GoToMeeting trainings. We need more of this for credit hours-it's worked wonderful! It is a good idea for education that is otherwise hard to acquire.

2023 R \& O Statistics

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Residential | $94.33 \%$ | 12.75 | 104.02 |
| Commercial | $96.01 \%$ | 16.18 | 107.46 |
| Agricultural | $70.52 \%$ | 16.42 | 102.33 |

# 3 Year Appraisal Plan 

## Current 2023

## Residential

Lake-Lake review was finalized and placed on the tax roles last year, 2022, with new pricings. Yearly maintenance will include sale reviews, building permits and pickup work going forward.
Towns- Towns will continue on the cyclical review. Moving to MIIPS, learning a new program, new employees and a hot humid summer has slowed down the outside work. We began first in June of 2022 and several towns were completed and implemented for 2023, Verdel, Niobrara, Crofton and Wausa. Towns remaining are Winnetoon, Creighton, Bazile Mills, Bloomfield and Verdigre. We mail out letters informing them that we are doing our review. Along with that, we send a work sheet with statistical questions for them to answer and return and/or call and visit. This way, when we review, we have the stat sheet with us and compare to what we see. We normally get good results with the returning of the questionnaires.

Yearly maintenance includes sale reviews, building permits and pickup work. Sale reviews, for towns, rural and lake, include questionnaires, telephone calls \&/or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer, the seller or the realtor. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. We continually review all files for accuracy and correct statistics.
Rural- Yearly maintenance will include sale review and pickup work. Sale review, for the rural homes (and buildings), includes questionnaires, telephone calls \&/or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer, the seller or the realtor. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed.

## Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be on the agenda for all commercial properties. Knox County generally has a lower number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires or telephone calls. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings was conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures.

As in the past, all sales are plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, using all information collected. My liaison is kept up to date. This year market area \#1 maintained their grass, dry increased $8 \%$ and irrigation increased $2 \%$. Area \#2 dry maintained, grass increased $6 \%$ and irrigation increased $5-10 \%$. Market area \#3 increased irrigation $10 \%-15 \%$, dry increased $4 \%$ and grass increased $4 \%$ in valuation. Sales review and pickup work will be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continual, using the 2022 aerials that were provided to us from the US Government. It appears the 2022 aerial is not as clear as one would think it would be, with the government providing. (For the portion of the county that flooded in 2019, we do have an aerial flight, by Cornerstone Mapping, which is very, very clear and is very useful).

## Other

Assessor, Deputy Assessor and personnel shall gather all information, transfer and value real estate and personal property pertinent to the valuations of Knox County. Duties include gathering all personal property by printing and mailing postcards to all individuals for the May 1 deadline; preparing each personal property with data entry; printing and mailing homestead exemptions to the individuals and working with the persons to help them file their returns; transferring all homestead information to PAD; generate an airport authority report; report exempt property being used by taxable entity; gather and handle all Form 521 sale information and work within preparing rosters and value within each market area, scan all 521's to the PAD; transfer all name changes and and get the required original information into the state department after the sale date; work with attorney's and realtor's on incorrect 521's because the register of deeds say they have to accept right right or wrong; set the yearly valuations to meet all state statistical ranges; change property names; handle the splits; maintain property record cards; generate yearly record sheets each year after PAD and TERC ok's our valuations; keep mapping up to date, generate valuation change notices, prepare omitted, over and undervalued notices and report to the clerk; hear protests, review and visit each protest sight; prepare copies of the evidence to CBOE ; prepare all evidence for the $\mathbb{C B O E}$ for TERC cases filed by property owners; keep track of growth and enter in each file; prepare centrally assessed values; generate and compile all valuations and distribute to each entity; certify school valuations; correct sales file roster; prepare charitable exemptions; combine and balance levies; accept and combine levies for the post card bill; generate the post card bill; combine and balance and enter levies; prepare all property for taxation; prepare Certified Tax List; prepare federal school aid reports for Niobrara and Santee; generate tax roles; prepare tax list corrections; on the cyclical reviews-organize full town and rural door to door reviews every 6 years for each one; prepare updates with FSA records brought in by the producer; work with the local NRD's; update CRP records that producers bring in; maintain the cadastral maps and the GIS.

## Residential

Lake-Yearly maintenance will be completed on the lake area. We have many very active lake areas which makes it difficult to constantly up to date. The lake seems to be very popular whether you can see the water or not. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.
Towns- Plans are for implementation for the remaining towns that were physically reviewed in 2023. Two new employees will learn the review and valuation process, as well as all employees will become familiar with MIIPS. It will take some time to become familiar with the new program, which is different than TerraScan. Yearly appraisal maintenance will continue. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.
Rural- Organization for the rural review shall begin. Rural farm review will be organized by market areas and plans set forth for a major review, normally taking 3 years to complete. The rural review is so difficult to undertake because of the miles and miles of roads that do not go through. Last reviews included hiring outside of the office because of not enough employees to maintain the office work and also to be available every day to go out and review. Now with the new program, new employees etc. time will take longer to review and enter. The old process of hiring outside help, appears very slim in happening now for the next review, according to our board of supervisors. We are not a county of through roads in the western and middle sections of the county. We also plan on using the aerial flights of Eagle View to our advantage. Rural questionnaires will be mailed as we did for the residential lake and towns. Yearly maintenance will include sale review and pickup work. Sale review, for the rural homes (and buildings), includes questionnaires, telephone calls \&/or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer, the seller or the realtor. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Commercial

Maintenance will continue or all commercial property. Generally, we have a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. It is very difficult to compare all because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires or telephone calls. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, using all information collected. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIIS updates will continue using the new 2022 aerials that were provided to us by the US Government.

## Other

Assessor, Deputy Assessor and personnel shall gather all information, transfer and value real estate and personal property pertinent to the valuations of Knox County. Duties include gathering all personal property by printing and mailing postcards to all individuals for the May 1 deadline; preparing each personal property with data entry; printing and mailing homestead exemptions to the individuals and working with the persons to help them file their returns; transferring all homestead information to PAD; generate an airport authority report; report exempt property being used by taxable entity; gather and handle all Form 521 sale information and work within preparing rosters and value within each market area, scan all 521's to the PAD; transfer all name changes and and get the required original information into the state department after the sale date; work with attorney's and realtor's on incorrect 521's because the register of deeds say they have to accept right right or wrong; set the yearly valuations to meet all state statistical ranges; change property names; handle the splits; maintain property record cards; generate yearly record sheets each year after PAD and TERC ok's our valuations; keep mapping up to date, generate valuation change notices, prepare omitted, over and undervalued notices and report to the clerk; hear protests, review and visit each protest sight; prepare copies of the evidence to CBOE ; prepare all evidence for the CBOE for TERC cases filed by property owners; keep track of growth and enter in each file; prepare centrally assessed values; generate and compile all valuations and distribute to each entity; certify school valuations; correct sales file roster; prepare charitable
exemptions; combine and balance levies; accept and combine levies for the post card bill; generate the post card bill; combine and balance and enter levies; prepare all property for taxation; prepare Certified Tax List; prepare federal school aid reports for Niobrara and Santee; generate tax roles; prepare tax list corrections; on the cyclical reviews-organize full town and rural door to door reviews every 6 years for each one; prepare updates with FSA records brought in by the producer; work with the local NRD's; update CRP records that producers bring in; maintain the cadastral maps and the GIS.
$\underline{2025}$

## Residential

Lake/Towns- Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the residential lake and city, which includes sale reviews and pickup work. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

Rural- Rural home and farm building review shall have begun, a major undertaking of the rural areas. As always, this task will take two or three years plus to complete. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

Commercial - Commercial properties will be identified and prepared for the cyclical review. Somehow, the commercial and rural reviews have landed in the same cyclical review pattern. This did happen after hiring an outside individual to review the rural. At that same time, we reviewed partial commercial on our own, while a company worked on their own time to review the bigger complicated commercials. They did not return with some of our information until 1.5 years later._Maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial properties. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires or telephone calls. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis in conducted in house, using all information collected. Sale review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing.

## Other

Assessor, Deputy Assessor and personnel shall gather all information, transfer and value real estate and personal property pertinent to the valuations of Knox County. Duties include gathering all personal property by printing and mailing postcards to all individuals for the May 1 deadline; preparing each personal property with data entry; printing and mailing homestead exemptions to the individuals and working with the persons to help them file their returns; transferring all homestead information to PAD; generate an airport authority report; report exempt property being used by taxable entity; gather and handle all Form 521 sale information and work within preparing rosters and value within each market area, scan all 521's to the PAD; transfer all name changes and and get the required original information into the state department after the sale date; work with attorney's and realtor's on incorrect 521's because the register of deeds say they have to accept right right or wrong; set the yearly valuations to meet all state statistical ranges; change property names; handle the splits; maintain property record cards; generate yearly record sheets each year after PAD and TERC ok's our valuations; keep mapping up to date, generate valuation change notices, prepare omitted, over and undervalued notices and report to the clerk; hear protests, review and visit each protest sight; prepare copies of the evidence to CBOE ; prepare all evidence for the CBOE for TERC cases filed by property owners; keep track of growth and enter in each file; prepare centrally assessed values; generate and compile all valuations and distribute to each entity; certify school valuations; correct sales file roster; prepare charitable exemptions; combine and balance levies; accept and combine levies for the post card bill; generate the post card bill; combine and balance and enter levies; prepare all property for taxation; prepare Certified Tax List; prepare federal school aid reports for Niobrara and Santee; generate tax roles; prepare tax list corrections; on the cyclical reviews-organize full town and rural door to door reviews every 6 years for each one; prepare updates with FSA records brought in by the producer; work with the local NRD's; update CRP records that producers bring in; maintain the cadastral maps and the GIS.

## Residential

Lake/Towns- Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the residential lake and city, which includes sale reviews and pickup work. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

Rural- Rural residential review will continue. As always, this task will take two or three years plus to complete. Yearly maintenance will include sale review and pickup work. Sale reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls \&/or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer, the seller or the realtor. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. We continually review all files for accuracy and correct statistics.

Commercial- Commercial review shall have gotten started. Appraisal maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial property. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires or telephone calls. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis in conducted in house, by myself, using all information collected. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing.

## Other

Assessor, Deputy Assessor and personnel shall gather all information, transfer and value real estate and personal property pertinent to the valuations of Knox County.

Duties include gathering all personal property by printing and mailing postcards to all individuals for the May 1 deadline; preparing each personal property with data entry; printing and mailing homestead exemptions to the individuals and working with the persons to help them file their returns; transferring all homestead information to PAD; generate an airport authority report; report exempt property being used by taxable entity; gather and handle all Form 521 sale information and work within preparing rosters and value within each market area, scan all 521's to the PAD; transfer all name changes and and get the required original information into the state department after the sale date; work with attorney's and realtor's on incorrect 521's because the register of deeds say they have to accept right right or wrong; set the yearly valuations to meet all state statistical ranges; change property names; handle the splits; maintain property record cards; generate yearly record sheets each year after PAD and TERC ok's our valuations; keep mapping up to date, generate valuation change notices, prepare omitted, over and undervalued notices and report to the clerk; hear protests, review and visit each protest sight; prepare copies of the evidence to CBOE ; prepare all evidence for the CBOE for TERC cases filed by property owners; keep track of growth and enter in each file; prepare centrally assessed values; generate and compile all valuations and distribute to each entity; certify school valuations; correct sales file roster; prepare charitable exemptions; combine and balance levies; accept and combine levies for the post card bill; generate the post card bill; combine and balance and enter levies; prepare all property for taxation; prepare Certified Tax List; prepare federal school aid reports for Niobrara and Santee; generate tax roles; prepare tax list corrections; on the cyclical reviews-organize full town and rural door to door reviews every 6 years for each one; prepare updates with FSA records brought in by the producer; work with the local NRD's; update CRP records that producers bring in; maintain the cadastral maps and the GIS.

## Residential

Lake/Towns- Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the residential lake and city, which includes sale reviews and pickup work. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.
Rural- Residential review shall begin to finalize and implemented by market areas as they are completed, working market area by market area. Yearly maintenance will be done for the lake and town parcels, which include building permits, sale review
and pickup work. Yearly maintenance will include sale review and pickup work. Sale reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls \&/or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer, the seller or the realtor. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. We continually review all files for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Commercial

Commercial review shall be finalized and implemented. Appraisal maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial property. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires or telephone calls. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis in conducted in house, by myself, using all information collected. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing.

## Other

Assessor, Deputy Assessor and personnel shall gather all information, transfer and value real estate and personal property pertinent to the valuations of Knox County. Duties include gathering all personal property by printing and mailing postcards to all individuals for the May 1 deadline; preparing each personal property with data entry; printing and mailing homestead exemptions to the individuals and working with the persons to help them file their returns; transferring all homestead information to PAD; generate an airport authority report; report exempt property being used by taxable entity; gather and handle all Form 521 sale information and work within preparing rosters and value within each market area, scan all 521's to the PAD; transfer all name changes and and get the required original information into the state department after the sale date; work with attorney's and realtor's on incorrect 521's because the register of deeds say they have to accept right right or wrong; set the yearly valuations to meet all state statistical ranges; change property names; handle the splits; maintain property record cards; generate yearly record sheets each year after PAD and TERC ok's our valuations; keep mapping up to date,
generate valuation change notices, prepare omitted, over and undervalued notices and report to the clerk; hear protests, review and visit each protest sight; prepare copies of the evidence to CBOE ; prepare all evidence for the $\mathbb{C B O E}$ for TERC cases filed by property owners; keep track of growth and enter in each file; prepare centrally assessed values; generate and compile all valuations and distribute to each entity; certify school valuations; correct sales file roster; prepare charitable exemptions; combine and balance levies; accept and combine levies for the post card bill; generate the post card bill; combine and balance and enter levies; prepare all property for taxation; prepare Certified Tax List; prepare federal school aid reports for Niobrara and Santee; generate tax roles; prepare tax list corrections; on the cyclical reviews-organize full town and rural door to door reviews every 6 years for each one; prepare updates with FSA records brought in by the producer; work with the local NRD's; update CRP records that producers bring in; maintain the cadastral maps and the GIS.

|  | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | Continue town review Market Analysis | Finalize Town <br> Implement town Market Analysis | Market analysis $\square$ | Market Analysis $\square$ | Market Analysis |
| Commercial | Market Analysis | Market Analysis | Market Analysis Organize commercial | Market Analysis <br> Contimue commercia | Market Analysis <br> Implement Conmercial |
| Agricultural | GIS Updates Aerial Updates Market Analysis | GIS Updates <br> Aerial Updates <br> Drganize Ranal <br> Market Analysis | GIS Updates Acrial Updates <br> Market Analysis | GIS Updates <br> Aerial Updates <br> Market Analysis | GIS Updates <br> Aerial Updates <br> Market Analysis |

Monica J. McManigal Assessor

During an intensive market study in Knox County, all sales were examined thoroughly and through this process, I have concluded that there is no difference in the market to show a reason to value by special valuation. There were no market factors shown other than that of purely agricultural purposes. Knox County consists mostly of rolling grasslands to the West and North and heavier cropped soils to the South and East, all conducive to our grazing/farming industry.


Knox County accepted applications in March of 2012.
\#1) Jerry Hanefeldt-8 applications all in either 13-30-5 or 24-30-5 Valley Township \#2) Foner Farms-3 applications all in either 7-32-5 or 8-32-5 Niobrara Township


[^0]:    5.18\%

