

NEBRASKA

Good Life. Great Service.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

**2025 REPORTS AND OPINIONS
OF THE PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR**

DAKOTA COUNTY



April 7, 2025

Jim Pillen, Governor

Commissioner Hotz :

The 2025 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been compiled for Dakota 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 Dakota County.

The information contained within the County Reports of the Appendices was provided by the county assessor pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1514](#).

For the Tax Commissioner

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sarah Scott".

Sarah Scott
Property Tax Administrator
402-471-5962

cc: Christy Abts, Dakota County Assessor

Table of Contents

2025 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator:

- Certification to the Commission
- Introduction
- County Overview
- Residential Correlation
- Commercial Correlation
- Agricultural Land Correlation
- Property Tax Administrator's Opinion

Appendices:

- Commission Summary

Statistical Reports and Displays:

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Chart of Net Sales Compared to Commercial Assessed Value
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Table-Average Value of Land Capability Groups
- Special Valuation Statistics (if applicable)

- Market Area Map
- Valuation History Charts

County Reports:

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared to the Prior Year
- Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- Assessor Survey
- Three-Year Plan of Assessment
- Special Value Methodology (if applicable)
- Ad Hoc Reports Submitted by County (if applicable)

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-producing properties (commercial, 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/little 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/little 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 264 square miles, Dakota County has 21,268 residents, per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2023, a 2% population decrease from the 2020 U.S. Census. Reports indicate that 65% of county residents are homeowners and 87% of residents occupy the same residence as in the prior year (Census Quick Facts). The average home value is \$174,083 (2024 Average Residential Value, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-3506.02).



The majority of the commercial properties in Dakota County are located in and around South Sioux City. According to the latest information available from the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 428 employer establishments with total employment of 11,376, a 2% decrease since 2019.

Dakota County is included in the Pappio-Missouri River Natural Resources District (NRD).

Dakota City is home to a large meat processing facility that is a major employer in the county.

The ethanol plant located in Jackson also contributes to the local agricultural economy.

2025 Residential Correlation for Dakota County

Assessment Practices & Actions

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) annually conducts a comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county. The review examines the integrity of the sales data provided to the Division for its ratio studies, as well as the more subjective aspects of the assessment process. The portions of the review that most significantly influence determinations of assessment quality are described herein, along with the assessment actions taken by the county assessor in the current assessment year.

The review of the sales qualification and verification are completed by sending a verification form to the buyer in a self-addressed stamped envelope. The sales qualification and verification processes has been evaluated to determine that the assessor is utilizing all arm's-length sales. A review of the sales verification and qualification concluded that the county's usability rate is below the statewide average.

There are eight valuation groups for residential property in Dakota County. The smaller towns are Valuation Groups 1, 5 and 10. Rural platted subdivisions comprise groups 15, 16 and 17. South Sioux City is the largest city in Valuation Group 20. Rural residential makes up the final valuation group.

The County's six-year inspection and review cycle complies with statute. All review work is done by a contract appraiser.

2025 Residential Assessment Details for Dakota County						
Valuation Group	Assessor Locations within Valuation Group	Depreciation Table Year	Costing Year	Lot Value Study Year	Last Inspection Year(s)	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
1	Dakota City	*2024	2022	2023	*2024	
5	Emerson and Hubbard	2022	2022	2023	2021	
10	Homer and Jackson	2022	2022	2023	2021	
15	Platted Rural sub-Lower Range	*2024	2022	2023	*2024	
16	Platted Rural Sub-Mid Range	*2024	2022	2023	*2024	
17	Platted Rural sub-High Range	*2024	2022	2023	*2024	
20	South Sioux City	*2024	2022	2021	*2024	
25	Rural Residential Unplatted	2022	2022	2021	2021	
Additional Comments:						
* = assessment action for current year						

Description of Analysis

All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range for the residential class. The COD and the PRD meet IAAO standards.

2025 Residential Correlation for Dakota County

When stratified by valuation group, all medians are within the acceptable range and most of the groups have all three measures of central tendency within the acceptable range, even though some of the valuation groups have few sales. The COD of each valuation group is lower than typical. The PRD for each valuation group is within IAAO standards.

Valuation Groups 1, 15, and 17 have a very low COD. Each of these areas was physically inspected this year by an appraisal company. The county assessor and staff updated depreciation tables for each of the areas that were inspected this year. The sample does not reflect typical disparity, and it is expected that the COD will increase over time.

The statistical sample and the 2025 County Abstract of Assessment, Form 45 Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) show similar valuation changes consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county assessor, in all locations, supporting that equalization has been achieved.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

The quality of assessment of residential property in Dakota County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. All residential property is considered equalized.

VALUATION GROUP						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
1	21	93.48	94.91	93.83	04.20	101.15
5	8	95.78	89.22	88.97	10.46	100.28
10	13	96.78	94.63	94.95	05.50	99.66
15	6	96.50	96.53	96.36	04.06	100.18
16	7	92.91	92.36	93.63	07.82	98.64
17	4	97.75	97.28	97.07	03.59	100.22
20	192	97.84	100.45	98.75	08.78	101.72
25	22	91.79	93.75	93.40	06.68	100.37
____ALL____	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the residential property in Dakota County is 97%.

2025 Commercial Correlation for Dakota County

Assessment Practices & Actions

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) annually conducts a comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county. The review examines the integrity of the sales data provided to the Division for its ratio studies, as well as the more subjective aspects of the assessment process. The portions of the review that most significantly influence determinations of assessment quality are described herein, along with the assessment actions taken by the county assessor in the current assessment year.

The review of the sales qualification and verification is reviewed. The county assessor sends a verification form to the buyer in a self-addressed stamped envelope. At times, the seller or realtor are contacted for sale terms, or a physical inspection of the property is completed to verify sales terms. A review of the sales verification and qualification process concluded that the county’s usability rate is below the statewide average.

There are two valuation groups for the commercial class. Valuation group 64 includes South Sioux City and rural South Sioux in the city limits. Valuation group 65 includes the small towns of Emerson, Hubbard, Homer, Jackson, Dakota City and rural commercial property.

The County Assessor’s six-year inspection and review cycle is current. The contract appraiser reviewed and inspected all commercial property for the 2024 assessment year.

2025 Commercial Assessment Details for Dakota County						
Valuation Group	Assessor Locations within Valuation Group	Depreciation Table Year	Costing Year	Lot Value Study Year	Last Inspection Year(s)	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
64	South Sioux City, Rural South Sioux in the city limits	2022	2022	2023/2024	2023/2024	
65	Emerson, Hubbard, Homer, Jackson, Dakota City, and Rural	2022	2022	2023/2024	2023/2024	
<u>Additional comments:</u> All pick-up work was completed and placed on the assessment roll. * = assessment action for current year						

Description of Analysis

For the commercial property class there was 41 qualified sales for measurement purposes All three measures of central tendency for the overall statistics are within the acceptable range. The COD is within the range while the PRD is low, but the sales price substratum does not support that assessments are progressive.

Both valuation groups are within the acceptable range, with medians that round to 97% and with qualitative statistics that support uniformity of assessment.

2025 Commercial Correlation for Dakota County

The statistical sample and the 2025 County Abstract of Assessment Form 45 Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report indicate changes to the population and sample reflect the stated assessment actions.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Based on the statistics and the assessment practices, the quality of assessment of commercial property complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

VALUATION GROUP						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
64	33	97.33	94.39	99.88	08.99	94.50
65	8	96.80	95.62	95.76	03.10	99.85
____ALL____	41	97.31	94.63	99.69	07.86	94.92

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the commercial property in Dakota County is 97%.

2025 Agricultural Correlation for Dakota County

Assessment Practices & Actions

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) annually conducts a comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county. The review examines the integrity of the sales data provided to the Division for its ratio studies, as well as the more subjective aspects of the assessment process. The portions of the review that most significantly influence determinations of assessment quality are described herein, along with the assessment actions taken by the county assessor in the current assessment year.

The sales qualification and verification processes were reviewed. The sales usability rate for the agricultural class is below the statewide average. Review of the non-qualified sales roster shows a majority of the disqualified sales in the comments are substantially changed, family and partial interest sales. After a thorough review of the roster, it appears that all arm’s-length sales were used for measurement.

The Dakota County Assessor has two separate market areas for agricultural land. Agricultural land within the county consists of flat bottom ground that can be influenced by the Missouri River. The west side of the county is bluffs and hill ground. The county assessor annually studies the market to monitor the need for market areas or other subclasses.

The county assessor is in compliance with the six-year inspection and review cycle. The county assessor’s staff reviews agricultural land use with aerial imagery, as well as information provided by taxpayers. Dakota County has 5,540 acres in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), but none have been identified. Intensive use has not been classified in the county.

There are 43 special valuation applications on file; nonagricultural influences are identified in the area surrounding Sioux City and the industrial area to the south of the city. The special values from the uninfluenced portion of Market Area 2 are used to determine the special value.

2025 Agricultural Assessment Details for Dakota County						
		Depreciation Tables Year	Costing Year	Lot Value Study Year	Last Inspection Year(s)	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
AG OB	Agricultural outbuildings	2022	2022	2021	2021	
AB DW	Agricultural dwellings	2022	2022	2021	2021	
<u>Additional comments:</u> All pick-up work was completed and placed on the assessment roll. * = assessment action for current year						

2025 Agricultural Correlation for Dakota County

Market Area	Description of Unique Characteristics	Land Use Reviewed Year	Description of Assessment Actions for Current Year
1	East portion of the county	2023	Irrigated land 10% increase Dryland 23% increase Grassland 20% increase
2	West portion of the county	2023	Irrigated land 24% increase Dryland 20% increase Grassland 20% increase
Additional comments:			
* = assessment action for current year			

Description of Analysis

The statistical sample for the agricultural class includes 22 qualified sales. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The COD supports the use of the median as an indicator of the level of value.

A review of the 80% Majority Land Use (MLU) by market areas reveals that the majority of sales are in Market Area 2; the sample of Market Area 1 is insufficiently small to be relied on for measurement, however the median is within acceptable range.

All 80% MLU samples with sufficient sales are within the acceptable range. Market Area 1 dryland has an insufficient sample; however, the median is in range. Market Area 1 dryland historically has few sales for analysis; however, the dryland values are at the high end of the value array of adjacent counties.

The Market Area 2 grassland median is below the acceptable range; however, grassland historically has few sales for analysis and study of surrounding county agricultural values shows that Dakota County's grassland values remain comparable to adjacent counties. Dakota County's grassland values are at the high end of the value array and the values are assessed within 5% of surrounding counties. The overall trend in the agricultural market and the comparison to surrounding counties supports that Dakota County is assessed within the acceptable range.

A review of the 2025 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) shows the value changed consistent with the reported actions of the county assessor.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Review of the statistical sample, comparable counties, and assessment practices indicates that the Dakota County Assessor has achieved value equalization. Agricultural improvements are equalized and assessed at the statutory level. The quality of assessment in the agricultural class of property in Dakota County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

2025 Agricultural Correlation for Dakota County

80%MLU By Market Area						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
<u> Dry </u>						
County	15	72.03	72.77	72.18	08.59	100.82
1	3	71.43	72.08	69.69	05.21	103.43
2	12	72.70	72.94	72.84	09.30	100.14
<u> Grass </u>						
County	1	33.67	33.67	33.67	00.00	100.00
2	1	33.67	33.67	33.67	00.00	100.00
<u> ALL </u>						
	22	69.46	69.14	67.53	15.23	102.38

Level of Value

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

Special Valuation Level of Value

A review of agricultural land values in Dakota County in areas that have non-agricultural influences indicates that the assessed values used are similar to the assessed values in the areas of the county that do not have non-agricultural influences. Therefore, it is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land is 69%.

2025 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Dakota 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 Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	69	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal 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 7th day of April, 2025.



Sarah Scott
Property Tax Administrator

APPENDICES

2025 Commission Summary for Dakota County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	273	Median	96.82
Total Sales Price	\$65,838,995	Mean	98.54
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$65,838,995	Wgt. Mean	97.19
Total Assessed Value	\$63,987,140	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$171,875
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$241,168	Avg. Assessed Value	\$234,385

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.66 to 97.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.04 to 98.34
95% Mean C.I	97.04 to 100.04
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	43.15
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.94
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.37

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2024	231	95	94.58
2023	209	94	94.33
2022	229	93	92.64
2021	240	94	93.90

2025 Commission Summary for Dakota County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	41	Median	97.31
Total Sales Price	\$34,757,050	Mean	94.63
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$34,757,050	Wgt. Mean	99.69
Total Assessed Value	\$34,650,145	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$579,034
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$847,733	Avg. Assessed Value	\$845,125

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.79 to 98.96
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.26 to 106.13
95% Mean C.I	90.83 to 98.43
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	19.97
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.30
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.28

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2024	50	98	97.84
2023	34	92	92.42
2022	33	94	94.25
2021	36	94	93.80

**22 Dakota
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2022 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 273
 Total Sales Price : 65,838,995
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 65,838,995
 Total Assessed Value : 63,987,140
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 241,168
 Avg. Assessed Value : 234,385

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 97
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 08.18
 PRD : 101.39

COV : 12.84
 STD : 12.65
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.92
 MAX Sales Ratio : 191.37
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.82

95% Median C.I. : 95.66 to 97.98
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.04 to 98.34
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.04 to 100.04

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:45PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	39	97.63	99.20	98.56	06.40	100.65	83.81	121.85	94.35 to 101.54	269,901	266,021	
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	31	100.75	107.14	102.39	13.28	104.64	73.16	191.37	96.78 to 106.33	253,805	259,864	
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	38	98.29	100.55	99.49	07.39	101.07	84.50	130.57	95.51 to 102.59	236,131	234,931	
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	41	96.00	98.89	97.58	07.59	101.34	73.74	142.41	94.26 to 99.75	197,123	192,345	
01-OCT-23 To 31-DEC-23	41	95.04	95.80	95.05	06.60	100.79	79.12	126.64	91.50 to 98.98	231,850	220,382	
01-JAN-24 To 31-MAR-24	21	97.67	97.23	97.11	06.87	100.12	75.72	110.83	91.39 to 103.24	224,190	217,700	
01-APR-24 To 30-JUN-24	36	93.47	94.42	93.40	07.72	101.09	72.07	124.42	90.40 to 97.14	258,415	241,361	
01-JUL-24 To 30-SEP-24	26	94.58	94.89	93.80	08.35	101.16	68.82	132.47	91.60 to 97.02	264,350	247,947	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	149	98.02	101.11	99.42	08.60	101.70	73.16	191.37	96.24 to 99.65	237,913	236,538	
01-OCT-23 To 30-SEP-24	124	94.65	95.45	94.58	07.44	100.92	68.82	132.47	93.36 to 96.96	245,080	231,799	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-23 To 31-DEC-23	151	97.67	100.16	98.48	08.68	101.71	73.16	191.37	95.89 to 99.51	228,005	224,536	
<u>ALL</u>	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385	

VALUATION GROUP											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
1	21	93.48	94.91	93.83	04.20	101.15	79.12	121.50	92.84 to 95.04	186,160	174,668	
5	8	95.78	89.22	88.97	10.46	100.28	68.82	100.97	68.82 to 100.97	235,719	209,708	
10	13	96.78	94.63	94.95	05.50	99.66	73.16	104.99	89.53 to 99.75	238,442	226,403	
15	6	96.50	96.53	96.36	04.06	100.18	88.27	103.02	88.27 to 103.02	201,000	193,689	
16	7	92.91	92.36	93.63	07.82	98.64	72.32	100.87	72.32 to 100.87	314,357	294,333	
17	4	97.75	97.28	97.07	03.59	100.22	90.87	102.76	N/A	465,975	452,315	
20	192	97.84	100.45	98.75	08.78	101.72	72.07	191.37	96.21 to 99.08	233,990	231,062	
25	22	91.79	93.75	93.40	06.68	100.37	74.08	111.30	88.82 to 98.40	306,716	286,479	
<u>ALL</u>	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385	

**22 Dakota
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2022 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 273	MEDIAN : 97	COV : 12.84	95% Median C.I. : 95.66 to 97.98
Total Sales Price : 65,838,995	WGT. MEAN : 97	STD : 12.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.04 to 98.34
Total Adj. Sales Price : 65,838,995	MEAN : 99	Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.92	95% Mean C.I. : 97.04 to 100.04
Total Assessed Value : 63,987,140			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 241,168	COD : 08.18	MAX Sales Ratio : 191.37	
Avg. Assessed Value : 234,385	PRD : 101.39	MIN Sales Ratio : 68.82	

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:45PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000											
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385
Greater Than 14,999	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385
Greater Than 29,999	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999	7	115.77	122.71	121.28	20.65	101.18	91.00	191.37	91.00 to 191.37	52,357	63,496
60,000 TO 99,999	13	104.76	105.28	105.14	13.05	100.13	73.74	130.57	93.20 to 124.42	79,919	84,025
100,000 TO 149,999	25	100.28	105.92	105.45	12.59	100.45	76.92	162.96	97.67 to 110.83	122,324	128,990
150,000 TO 249,999	119	96.86	97.37	97.29	06.01	100.08	68.82	126.64	95.51 to 98.57	201,746	196,275
250,000 TO 499,999	102	95.17	95.77	96.05	07.32	99.71	72.07	121.85	93.58 to 96.99	323,633	310,860
500,000 TO 999,999	7	96.22	95.74	95.50	02.49	100.25	91.86	100.39	91.86 to 100.39	622,428	594,446
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	273	96.82	98.54	97.19	08.18	101.39	68.82	191.37	95.66 to 97.98	241,168	234,385

22 Dakota
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 41
Total Sales Price : 34,757,050
Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,757,050
Total Assessed Value : 34,650,145
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 847,733
Avg. Assessed Value : 845,125

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 100
MEAN : 95
COD : 07.86
PRD : 94.92

COV : 13.12
STD : 12.42
Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.65
MAX Sales Ratio : 134.19
MIN Sales Ratio : 64.06

95% Median C.I. : 95.79 to 98.96
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.26 to 106.13
95% Mean C.I. : 90.83 to 98.43

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:47PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	4	100.97	101.82	100.60	01.81	101.21	99.62	105.72	N/A	2,043,500	2,055,684
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	1	97.05	97.05	97.05	00.00	100.00	97.05	97.05	N/A	215,000	208,655
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	6	99.43	105.13	107.81	07.91	97.51	96.83	134.19	96.83 to 134.19	1,798,500	1,938,932
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	3	98.20	97.69	98.37	01.11	99.31	95.79	99.07	N/A	571,867	562,573
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	6	97.66	98.95	98.27	02.79	100.69	95.33	104.97	95.33 to 104.97	396,242	389,401
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	6	97.36	98.10	99.82	02.66	98.28	92.71	106.77	92.71 to 106.77	565,333	564,306
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	3	96.66	96.15	98.14	02.12	97.97	92.82	98.96	N/A	410,000	402,365
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	3	91.55	87.56	89.98	11.49	97.31	69.78	101.34	N/A	454,333	408,812
01-OCT-23 To 31-DEC-23	3	88.73	86.38	92.07	12.43	93.82	68.67	101.75	N/A	963,333	886,907
01-JAN-24 To 31-MAR-24	1	82.85	82.85	82.85	00.00	100.00	82.85	82.85	N/A	1,075,000	890,610
01-APR-24 To 30-JUN-24	3	81.56	76.71	79.19	08.35	96.87	64.06	84.50	N/A	368,000	291,422
01-JUL-24 To 30-SEP-24	2	73.03	73.03	73.51	09.34	99.35	66.21	79.85	N/A	215,000	158,040
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	14	99.35	102.01	104.10	04.62	97.99	95.79	134.19	96.93 to 103.97	1,492,543	1,553,764
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	18	97.32	96.30	97.53	04.34	98.74	69.78	106.77	95.33 to 98.96	464,581	453,098
01-OCT-23 To 30-SEP-24	9	81.56	79.80	86.23	10.77	92.54	64.06	101.75	66.21 to 88.73	611,000	526,853
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	16	98.04	100.91	105.08	04.33	96.03	95.33	134.19	96.83 to 102.05	943,691	991,648
01-JAN-23 To 31-DEC-23	15	96.66	93.26	95.55	06.94	97.60	68.67	106.77	91.55 to 98.96	591,667	565,339
<u>ALL</u>	41	97.31	94.63	99.69	07.86	94.92	64.06	134.19	95.79 to 98.96	847,733	845,125

VALUATION GROUP

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
64	33	97.33	94.39	99.88	08.99	94.50	64.06	134.19	95.33 to 99.62	1,004,123	1,002,967
65	8	96.80	95.62	95.76	03.10	99.85	84.50	101.58	84.50 to 101.58	202,625	194,028
<u>ALL</u>	41	97.31	94.63	99.69	07.86	94.92	64.06	134.19	95.79 to 98.96	847,733	845,125

**22 Dakota
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 41
 Total Sales Price : 34,757,050
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,757,050
 Total Assessed Value : 34,650,145
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 847,733
 Avg. Assessed Value : 845,125

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 100
 MEAN : 95
 COD : 07.86
 PRD : 94.92

COV : 13.12
 STD : 12.42
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.65
 MAX Sales Ratio : 134.19
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.06

95% Median C.I. : 95.79 to 98.96
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.26 to 106.13
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.83 to 98.43

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:47PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	64.06	64.06	64.06	00.00	100.00	64.06	64.06	N/A	204,000	130,685
03	40	97.32	95.39	99.90	07.20	95.49	66.21	134.19	96.05 to 98.96	863,826	862,987
04											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>97.31</u>	<u>94.63</u>	<u>99.69</u>	<u>07.86</u>	<u>94.92</u>	<u>64.06</u>	<u>134.19</u>	<u>95.79 to 98.96</u>	<u>847,733</u>	<u>845,125</u>

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	1	96.50	96.50	96.50	00.00	100.00	96.50	96.50	N/A	5,000	4,825
Less Than 30,000	1	96.50	96.50	96.50	00.00	100.00	96.50	96.50	N/A	5,000	4,825
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	41	97.31	94.63	99.69	07.86	94.92	64.06	134.19	95.79 to 98.96	847,733	845,125
Greater Than 14,999	40	97.32	94.58	99.69	08.04	94.87	64.06	134.19	95.79 to 98.96	868,801	866,133
Greater Than 29,999	40	97.32	94.58	99.69	08.04	94.87	64.06	134.19	95.79 to 98.96	868,801	866,133
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	96.50	96.50	96.50	00.00	100.00	96.50	96.50	N/A	5,000	4,825
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999											
60,000 TO 99,999	2	94.88	94.88	95.25	02.17	99.61	92.82	96.93	N/A	79,500	75,725
100,000 TO 149,999	1	102.05	102.05	102.05	00.00	100.00	102.05	102.05	N/A	130,000	132,665
150,000 TO 249,999	6	88.45	83.76	83.30	15.51	100.55	64.06	98.06	64.06 to 98.06	201,500	167,844
250,000 TO 499,999	14	97.29	95.72	95.73	05.92	99.99	69.78	105.72	91.55 to 103.97	349,646	334,708
500,000 TO 999,999	8	95.01	91.26	91.88	08.78	99.33	68.67	101.34	68.67 to 101.34	645,625	593,229
1,000,000 TO 1,999,999	6	99.35	97.91	98.27	04.84	99.63	82.85	106.77	82.85 to 106.77	1,207,333	1,186,506
2,000,000 TO 4,999,999	1	134.19	134.19	134.19	00.00	100.00	134.19	134.19	N/A	3,050,000	4,092,825
5,000,000 TO 9,999,999	2	98.59	98.59	98.53	01.79	100.06	96.83	100.35	N/A	6,450,000	6,355,273
10,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>97.31</u>	<u>94.63</u>	<u>99.69</u>	<u>07.86</u>	<u>94.92</u>	<u>64.06</u>	<u>134.19</u>	<u>95.79 to 98.96</u>	<u>847,733</u>	<u>845,125</u>

**22 Dakota
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 41
 Total Sales Price : 34,757,050
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 34,757,050
 Total Assessed Value : 34,650,145
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 847,733
 Avg. Assessed Value : 845,125

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 100
 MEAN : 95
 COD : 07.86
 PRD : 94.92

COV : 13.12
 STD : 12.42
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 07.65
 MAX Sales Ratio : 134.19
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.06


95% Median C.I. : 95.79 to 98.96
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.26 to 106.13
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.83 to 98.43

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:47PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
342	1	106.77	106.77	106.77	00.00	100.00	106.77	106.77	N/A	1,140,000	1,217,170
344	8	97.26	92.73	94.38	10.73	98.25	64.06	105.72	64.06 to 105.72	327,931	309,507
349	1	97.39	97.39	97.39	00.00	100.00	97.39	97.39	N/A	1,247,000	1,214,465
352	11	96.83	93.17	101.87	13.03	91.46	66.21	134.19	68.67 to 101.75	1,422,364	1,448,956
353	4	97.13	94.46	96.19	04.30	98.20	84.50	99.07	N/A	530,150	509,971
386	3	91.55	87.56	89.98	11.49	97.31	69.78	101.34	N/A	454,333	408,812
405	1	97.31	97.31	97.31	00.00	100.00	97.31	97.31	N/A	700,000	681,140
406	1	95.79	95.79	95.79	00.00	100.00	95.79	95.79	N/A	260,000	249,045
442	2	95.44	95.44	96.61	02.75	98.79	92.82	98.06	N/A	117,500	113,523
446	1	100.35	100.35	100.35	00.00	100.00	100.35	100.35	N/A	6,250,000	6,271,595
470	4	97.00	97.19	95.47	02.58	101.80	92.71	102.05	N/A	283,750	270,909
471	2	97.48	97.48	97.52	00.44	99.96	97.05	97.91	N/A	237,500	231,605
494	1	100.80	100.80	100.80	00.00	100.00	100.80	100.80	N/A	500,000	504,000
851	1	99.62	99.62	99.62	00.00	100.00	99.62	99.62	N/A	1,062,000	1,057,945
<u>ALL</u>	41	97.31	94.63	99.69	07.86	94.92	64.06	134.19	95.79 to 98.96	847,733	845,125

Commercial & Industrial Value Change Vs. Net Taxable Sales Change



Tax Year	Value	Growth Value	% Growth of Value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Net Taxable Sales Value	% Chg Net Tax. Sales
2013	\$ 312,057,535	\$ 1,758,447	0.56%	\$ 310,299,088		\$ 148,909,165	
2014	\$ 313,465,455	\$ 3,054,755	0.97%	\$ 310,410,700	-0.53%	\$ 153,605,137	3.15%
2015	\$ 313,009,740	\$ 814,845	0.26%	\$ 312,194,895	-0.41%	\$ 161,911,051	5.41%
2016	\$ 312,064,410	\$ 7,371,555	2.36%	\$ 304,692,855	-2.66%	\$ 166,264,892	2.69%
2017	\$ 311,422,240	\$ 266,715	0.09%	\$ 311,155,525	-0.29%	\$ 164,469,955	-1.08%
2018	\$ 351,204,640	\$ 14,208,924	4.05%	\$ 336,995,716	8.21%	\$ 170,770,596	3.83%
2019	\$ 376,996,323	\$ 15,298,864	4.06%	\$ 361,697,459	2.99%	\$ 177,727,750	4.07%
2020	\$ 389,298,554	\$ 20,759,120	5.33%	\$ 368,539,434	-2.24%	\$ 176,119,216	-0.91%
2021	\$ 397,979,751	\$ 4,646,130	1.17%	\$ 393,333,621	1.04%	\$ 193,178,484	9.69%
2022	\$ 426,252,759	\$ 18,339,380	4.30%	\$ 407,913,379	2.50%	\$ 192,280,319	-0.46%
2023	\$ 452,037,470	\$ 27,137,800	6.00%	\$ 424,899,670	-0.32%	\$ 202,993,542	5.57%
2024	\$ 543,916,162	\$ 10,531,575	1.94%	\$ 533,384,587	18.00%	\$ 204,475,352	0.73%
Ann %chg	5.67%			Average	2.39%	2.90%	2.97%

Tax Year	Cumulative Change		
	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg Value	Cmltv%chg Net Sales
2013	-	-	-
2014	-0.53%	0.45%	3.15%
2015	0.04%	0.31%	8.73%
2016	-2.36%	0.00%	11.66%
2017	-0.29%	-0.20%	10.45%
2018	7.99%	12.54%	14.68%
2019	15.91%	20.81%	19.35%
2020	18.10%	24.75%	18.27%
2021	26.05%	27.53%	29.73%
2022	30.72%	36.59%	29.13%
2023	36.16%	44.86%	36.32%
2024	70.93%	74.30%	37.32%

County Number	22
County Name	Dakota

22 Dakota
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 22
 Total Sales Price : 20,505,970
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,505,970
 Total Assessed Value : 13,846,885
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 932,090
 Avg. Assessed Value : 629,404

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 15.23
 PRD : 102.38

COV : 20.67
 STD : 14.29
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.58
 MAX Sales Ratio : 100.58
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.67

95% Median C.I. : 61.53 to 77.98
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.56 to 74.49
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.80 to 75.48

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:48PM

DATE OF SALE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	1	76.68	76.68	76.68	00.00	100.00	76.68	76.68	N/A	1,307,952	1,002,875
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	1	67.48	67.48	67.48	00.00	100.00	67.48	67.48	N/A	631,275	425,955
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22											
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22											
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	1	77.98	77.98	77.98	00.00	100.00	77.98	77.98	N/A	420,000	327,535
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	1	72.03	72.03	72.03	00.00	100.00	72.03	72.03	N/A	800,000	576,220
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	2	57.87	57.87	62.34	16.36	92.83	48.40	67.34	N/A	1,171,250	730,215
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	5	75.23	76.50	76.29	04.71	100.28	71.43	83.28	N/A	685,933	523,319
01-OCT-23 To 31-DEC-23	3	82.29	66.93	64.53	20.72	103.72	33.67	84.83	N/A	1,352,960	873,088
01-JAN-24 To 31-MAR-24	4	64.19	72.62	67.03	17.28	108.34	61.53	100.58	N/A	1,025,674	687,529
01-APR-24 To 30-JUN-24	2	63.54	63.54	62.25	05.70	102.07	59.92	67.16	N/A	775,000	482,453
01-JUL-24 To 30-SEP-24	2	55.16	55.16	59.21	11.33	93.16	48.91	61.41	N/A	931,500	551,495
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	2	72.08	72.08	73.68	06.38	97.83	67.48	76.68	N/A	969,614	714,415
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	9	73.36	72.03	71.23	08.56	101.12	48.40	83.28	67.34 to 79.20	776,907	553,420
01-OCT-23 To 30-SEP-24	11	61.54	66.24	64.26	20.13	103.08	33.67	100.58	48.91 to 84.83	1,052,234	676,116
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	2	72.73	72.73	71.67	07.22	101.48	67.48	77.98	N/A	525,638	376,745
01-JAN-23 To 31-DEC-23	11	73.36	70.10	68.41	13.88	102.47	33.67	84.83	48.40 to 83.28	966,459	661,137
<u>ALL</u>	22	69.46	69.14	67.53	15.23	102.38	33.67	100.58	61.53 to 77.98	932,090	629,404

AREA (MARKET)											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	6	69.13	69.04	67.64	09.14	102.07	59.92	77.98	59.92 to 77.98	1,123,855	760,180
2	16	69.76	69.18	67.47	17.45	102.53	33.67	100.58	61.53 to 82.29	860,177	580,363
<u>ALL</u>	22	69.46	69.14	67.53	15.23	102.38	33.67	100.58	61.53 to 77.98	932,090	629,404

22 Dakota
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2025 R&O Statistics (Using 2025 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2024 Posted on: 1/31/2025

Number of Sales : 22	MEDIAN : 69	COV : 20.67	95% Median C.I. : 61.53 to 77.98
Total Sales Price : 20,505,970	WGT. MEAN : 68	STD : 14.29	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.56 to 74.49
Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,505,970	MEAN : 69	Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.58	95% Mean C.I. : 62.80 to 75.48
Total Assessed Value : 13,846,885			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 932,090	COD : 15.23	MAX Sales Ratio : 100.58	
Avg. Assessed Value : 629,404	PRD : 102.38	MIN Sales Ratio : 33.67	

Printed:3/17/2025 5:09:48PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Dry_____											
County	14	71.73	72.31	71.86	08.53	100.63	61.53	84.83	66.83 to 82.29	940,724	676,049
1	3	71.43	72.08	69.69	05.21	103.43	66.83	77.98	N/A	950,393	662,338
2	11	72.03	72.37	72.47	09.33	99.86	61.53	84.83	61.54 to 83.28	938,087	679,789
_____Grass_____											
County	1	33.67	33.67	33.67	00.00	100.00	33.67	33.67	N/A	1,546,880	520,850
2	1	33.67	33.67	33.67	00.00	100.00	33.67	33.67	N/A	1,546,880	520,850
_____ALL_____	22	69.46	69.14	67.53	15.23	102.38	33.67	100.58	61.53 to 77.98	932,090	629,404

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Dry_____											
County	15	72.03	72.77	72.18	08.59	100.82	61.53	84.83	67.16 to 79.20	918,009	662,660
1	3	71.43	72.08	69.69	05.21	103.43	66.83	77.98	N/A	950,393	662,338
2	12	72.70	72.94	72.84	09.30	100.14	61.53	84.83	67.16 to 82.29	909,913	662,741
_____Grass_____											
County	1	33.67	33.67	33.67	00.00	100.00	33.67	33.67	N/A	1,546,880	520,850
2	1	33.67	33.67	33.67	00.00	100.00	33.67	33.67	N/A	1,546,880	520,850
_____ALL_____	22	69.46	69.14	67.53	15.23	102.38	33.67	100.58	61.53 to 77.98	932,090	629,404

Dakota County 2025 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Dakota	1	8,390	n/a	8,255	8,255	n/a	7,190	7,185	7,010	8,260
Thurston	2	7,450	7,450	6,575	6,575	6,400	n/a	5,800	5,800	6,501
Dixon	2	8,400	8,240	7,825	7,570	7,040	6,530	6,395	6,140	7,124
Dakota	2	n/a	n/a	7,770	7,600	n/a	n/a	n/a	6,885	7,094
Dixon	1	8,960	8,650	8,210	7,945	7,935	7,450	6,710	6,440	7,742
Dixon	2	8,400	8,240	7,825	7,570	7,040	6,530	6,395	6,140	7,124
Thurston	1	7,050	7,050	6,500	6,500	6,300	6,300	5,600	5,600	6,375
Thurston	2	7,450	7,450	6,575	6,575	6,400	n/a	5,800	5,800	6,501


County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Dakota	1	8,292	8,270	8,155	n/a	7,465	6,275	6,025	5,915	8,008
Thurston	2	7,425	7,424	6,545	6,545	6,380	6,379	5,775	5,774	6,376
Dixon	2	7,345	6,725	6,725	6,710	6,250	6,060	5,530	5,400	6,074
Dakota	2	8,055	8,030	7,670	7,595	7,155	6,900	6,815	6,785	7,091
Dixon	1	8,810	8,490	7,950	7,830	7,790	7,730	6,665	6,110	7,653
Dixon	2	7,345	6,725	6,725	6,710	6,250	6,060	5,530	5,400	6,074
Thurston	1	6,665	6,664	6,149	6,149	5,794	5,800	4,474	4,375	5,820
Thurston	2	7,425	7,424	6,545	6,545	6,380	6,379	5,775	5,774	6,376

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Dakota	1	2,575	2,575	2,576	2,574	2,571	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,575
Thurston	2	2,125	2,125	1,925	1,825	1,625	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,048
Dixon	2	3,015	2,855	2,700	2,535	2,380	2,380	2,285	2,105	2,737
Dakota	2	2,950	2,950	2,950	2,950	2,950	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,950
Dixon	1	3,700	3,495	3,085	n/a	2,805	2,620	n/a	n/a	3,389
Dixon	2	3,015	2,855	2,700	2,535	2,380	2,380	2,285	2,105	2,737
Thurston	1	1,950	1,950	1,850	1,800	1,700	n/a	1,500	n/a	1,917
Thurston	2	2,125	2,125	1,925	1,825	1,625	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,048

County	Mkt Area	CRP	TIMBER	WASTE
Dakota	1	n/a	868	240
Thurston	2	n/a	550	100
Dixon	2	5,955	1,453	121
Dakota	2	n/a	731	215
Dixon	1	7,722	1,994	94
Dixon	2	5,955	1,453	121
Thurston	1	n/a	525	100
Thurston	2	n/a	550	100

Source: 2025 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.

DAKOTA COUNTY




Legend

- Market_Area
- County
- Registered_WellsDNR
- geocode
- Federal Roads

**Soils
CLASS**

- Excessive 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 sandhills
- Moderately 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

CHART 1 - REAL PROPERTY VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational (1)				Commercial & Industrial (1)				Total Agricultural Land (1)			
	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg
2014	518,318,960	-	-	-	313,465,455	-	-	-	606,108,170	-	-	-
2015	553,789,005	35,470,045	6.84%	6.84%	313,009,740	-455,715	-0.15%	-0.15%	654,066,310	47,958,140	7.91%	7.91%
2016	567,882,380	14,093,375	2.54%	9.56%	312,064,410	-945,330	-0.30%	-0.45%	653,445,810	-620,500	-0.09%	7.81%
2017	612,304,985	44,422,605	7.82%	18.13%	311,422,240	-642,170	-0.21%	-0.65%	650,635,295	-2,810,515	-0.43%	7.35%
2018	687,202,300	74,897,315	12.23%	32.58%	351,204,640	39,782,400	12.77%	12.04%	601,414,935	-49,220,360	-7.56%	-0.77%
2019	709,944,440	22,742,140	3.31%	36.97%	376,996,323	25,791,683	7.34%	20.27%	556,725,815	-44,689,120	-7.43%	-8.15%
2020	736,616,190	26,671,750	3.76%	42.12%	389,298,554	12,302,231	3.26%	24.19%	554,594,585	-2,131,230	-0.38%	-8.50%
2021	787,175,840	50,559,650	6.86%	51.87%	397,979,751	8,681,197	2.23%	26.96%	553,910,440	-684,145	-0.12%	-8.61%
2022	844,226,530	57,050,690	7.25%	62.88%	442,786,499	44,806,748	11.26%	41.26%	580,718,870	26,808,430	4.84%	-4.19%
2023	977,724,095	133,497,565	15.81%	88.63%	452,979,384	10,192,885	2.30%	44.51%	622,225,320	41,506,450	7.15%	2.66%
2024	1,073,123,945	95,399,850	9.76%	107.04%	529,053,847	76,074,463	16.79%	68.78%	754,895,455	132,670,135	21.32%	24.55%


Rate Annual %chg: Residential & Recreational **7.55%** Commercial & Industrial **5.37%** Agricultural Land **2.22%**

Cnty# **22**
County **DAKOTA**

CHART 1

(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.

CHART 2 - REAL PROPERTY & GROWTH VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational (1)						Commercial & Industrial (1)					
	Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth
2014	518,318,960	6,316,100	1.22%	512,002,860	--	--	313,465,455	3,054,755	0.97%	310,410,700	--	--
2015	553,789,005	11,605,273	2.10%	542,183,732	4.60%	4.60%	313,009,740	814,845	0.26%	312,194,895	-0.41%	-0.41%
2016	567,882,380	12,201,020	2.15%	555,681,360	0.34%	7.21%	312,064,410	7,371,555	2.36%	304,692,855	-2.66%	-2.80%
2017	612,304,985	10,482,070	1.71%	601,822,915	5.98%	16.11%	311,422,240	266,715	0.09%	311,155,525	-0.29%	-0.74%
2018	687,202,300	13,247,700	1.93%	673,954,600	10.07%	30.03%	351,204,640	14,208,924	4.05%	336,995,716	8.21%	7.51%
2019	709,944,440	15,133,610	2.13%	694,810,830	1.11%	34.05%	376,996,323	15,298,864	4.06%	361,697,459	2.99%	15.39%
2020	736,616,190	2,462,350	0.33%	734,153,840	3.41%	41.64%	389,298,554	20,759,120	5.33%	368,539,434	-2.24%	17.57%
2021	787,175,840	704,190	0.09%	786,471,650	6.77%	51.74%	397,979,751	4,646,130	1.17%	393,333,621	1.04%	25.48%
2022	844,226,530	4,840,610	0.57%	839,385,920	6.63%	61.94%	442,786,499	18,339,380	4.14%	424,447,119	6.65%	35.40%
2023	977,724,095	9,953,811	1.02%	967,770,284	14.63%	86.71%	452,979,384	27,137,800	5.99%	425,841,584	-3.83%	35.85%
2024	1,073,123,945	9,412,505	0.88%	1,063,711,440	8.79%	105.22%	529,053,847	10,531,575	1.99%	518,522,272	14.47%	65.42%
Rate Ann%chg	7.55%	Resid & Recreat w/o growth				6.23%	C & I w/o growth				2.39%	

Tax Year	Ag Improvements & Site Land (1)						Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth
	Agric. Dwelling & Homesite Value	Ag Outbldg & Farmsite Value	Ag Imprv&Site Total Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth		
2014	28,442,895	9,467,670	37,910,565	94,245	0.25%	37,816,320	--	--
2015	27,877,595	10,969,555	38,847,150	1,723,480	4.44%	37,123,670	-2.08%	-2.08%
2016	27,548,110	11,173,700	38,721,810	555,845	1.44%	38,165,965	-1.75%	0.67%
2017	28,011,895	10,665,165	38,677,060	278,575	0.72%	38,398,485	-0.83%	1.29%
2018	27,448,390	10,967,355	38,415,745	207,840	0.54%	38,207,905	-1.21%	0.78%
2019	27,055,160	10,813,390	37,868,550	0	0.00%	37,868,550	-1.42%	-0.11%
2020	27,533,265	10,836,825	38,370,090	0	0.00%	38,370,090	1.32%	1.21%
2021	38,991,705	18,712,780	57,704,485	82,840	0.14%	57,621,645	50.17%	51.99%
2022	39,502,040	18,353,160	57,855,200	0	0.00%	57,855,200	0.26%	52.61%
2023	44,647,260	22,889,285	67,536,545	317,450	0.47%	67,219,095	16.19%	77.31%
2024	47,100,675	23,710,865	70,811,540	1,766,085	2.49%	69,045,455	2.23%	82.13%
Rate Ann%chg	5.17%	9.62%	6.45%	Ag Imprv+Site w/o growth		6.29%		


(1) Residential & Recreational excludes AgDwelling & farm home site land; Comm. & Indust. excludes minerals; Agric. land includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste & other agland, excludes farm site land. Real property growth is value attributable to new construction, additions to existing buildings, and any improvements to real property which increase the value of such property. Sources: Value; 2014 - 2024 CTL Growth Value; 2014 - 2024 Abstract of Asmnt Rpt. Prepared as of 02/11/2025

Cnty# 22
County DAKOTA

CHART 2

NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

CHART 3 - AGRICULTURAL LAND VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024



Tax Year	Irrigated Land				Dryland				Grassland			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2014	93,662,510	-	-	-	454,763,675	-	-	-	56,268,770	-	-	-
2015	103,092,690	9,430,180	10.07%	10.07%	502,647,085	47,883,410	10.53%	10.53%	46,895,545	-9,373,225	-16.66%	-16.66%
2016	103,276,295	183,605	0.18%	10.26%	501,723,420	-923,665	-0.18%	10.33%	47,034,510	138,965	0.30%	-16.41%
2017	103,190,920	-85,375	-0.08%	10.17%	498,908,185	-2,815,235	-0.56%	9.71%	47,115,285	80,775	0.17%	-16.27%
2018	99,357,615	-3,833,305	-3.71%	6.08%	455,224,465	-43,683,720	-8.76%	0.10%	45,481,395	-1,633,890	-3.47%	-19.17%
2019	91,048,755	-8,308,860	-8.36%	-2.79%	421,593,290	-33,631,175	-7.39%	-7.29%	42,662,400	-2,818,995	-6.20%	-24.18%
2020	91,646,030	597,275	0.66%	-2.15%	418,426,785	-3,166,505	-0.75%	-7.99%	43,195,000	532,600	1.25%	-23.23%
2021	92,092,635	446,605	0.49%	-1.68%	417,296,795	-1,129,990	-0.27%	-8.24%	43,124,490	-70,510	-0.16%	-23.36%
2022	96,215,240	4,122,605	4.48%	2.73%	439,834,985	22,538,190	5.40%	-3.28%	43,231,645	107,155	0.25%	-23.17%
2023	106,463,495	10,248,255	10.65%	13.67%	469,158,395	29,323,410	6.67%	3.17%	45,135,620	1,903,975	4.40%	-19.79%
2024	144,974,940	38,511,445	36.17%	54.78%	570,011,510	100,853,115	21.50%	25.34%	38,970,760	-6,164,860	-13.66%	-30.74%

Rate Ann.%chg: Irrigated **4.47%** Dryland **2.28%** Grassland **-3.61%**

Tax Year	Waste Land (1)				Other Agland (1)				Total Agricultural			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2014	1,412,635	-	-	-	580	-	-	-	606,108,170	-	-	-
2015	1,430,395	17,760	1.26%	1.26%	595	15	2.59%	2.59%	654,066,310	47,958,140	7.91%	7.91%
2016	1,410,990	-19,405	-1.36%	-0.12%	595	0	0.00%	2.59%	653,445,810	-620,500	-0.09%	7.81%
2017	1,399,980	-11,010	-0.78%	-0.90%	20,925	20,330	3416.81%	3507.76%	650,635,295	-2,810,515	-0.43%	7.35%
2018	1,350,880	-49,100	-3.51%	-4.37%	580	-20,345	-97.23%	0.00%	601,414,935	-49,220,360	-7.56%	-0.77%
2019	1,383,680	32,800	2.43%	-2.05%	37,690	37,110	6398.28%	6398.28%	556,725,815	-44,689,120	-7.43%	-8.15%
2020	1,388,730	5,050	0.36%	-1.69%	(61,960)	-99,650	-264.39%	-10782.76%	554,594,585	-2,131,230	-0.38%	-8.50%
2021	1,384,755	-3,975	-0.29%	-1.97%	11,765	73,725	627.85%	1928.45%	553,910,440	-684,145	-0.12%	-8.61%
2022	1,437,000	52,245	3.77%	1.72%	0	-11,765	-100.00%	-100.00%	580,718,870	26,808,430	4.84%	-4.19%
2023	1,467,810	30,810	2.14%	3.91%	0	0	-	-100.00%	622,225,320	41,506,450	7.15%	2.66%
2024	938,245	-529,565	-36.08%	-33.58%	0	0	-	-100.00%	754,895,455	132,670,135	21.32%	24.55%

Cnty# **22**
County **DAKOTA**

Rate Ann.%chg: Total Agric Land **2.22%**

CHART 4 - AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative % Change 2014 - 2024 (from County Abstract Reports)(1)

Tax Year	IRRIGATED LAND					DRYLAND					GRASSLAND				
	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg 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	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre
2014	92,980,020	16,749	5,551			456,164,085	96,627	4,721			55,642,745	28,717	1,938		
2015	103,198,255	16,827	6,133	10.47%	10.47%	503,253,555	96,312	5,225	10.68%	10.68%	46,615,355	28,870	1,615	-16.67%	-16.67%
2016	103,045,205	16,802	6,133	0.00%	10.47%	502,552,035	96,246	5,222	-0.07%	10.61%	46,834,665	29,198	1,604	-0.66%	-17.22%
2017	103,803,820	16,920	6,135	0.03%	10.51%	501,182,750	95,967	5,222	0.02%	10.63%	46,839,410	28,992	1,616	0.72%	-16.62%
2018	99,357,615	16,861	5,893	-3.95%	6.15%	454,456,325	95,673	4,750	-9.04%	0.62%	44,902,780	28,982	1,549	-4.10%	-20.04%
2019	91,048,755	16,896	5,389	-8.56%	-2.93%	420,832,290	95,909	4,388	-7.63%	-7.05%	42,647,580	29,549	1,443	-6.85%	-25.51%
2020	91,646,030	16,835	5,444	1.02%	-1.94%	418,220,845	96,363	4,340	-1.09%	-8.07%	46,143,150	29,289	1,575	9.16%	-18.69%
2021	92,092,635	16,917	5,444	0.00%	-1.94%	417,772,465	96,273	4,339	-0.01%	-8.08%	43,099,250	29,208	1,476	-6.34%	-23.85%
2022	96,215,240	16,886	5,698	4.67%	2.64%	439,834,985	96,146	4,575	5.42%	-3.10%	43,228,415	29,163	1,482	0.45%	-23.50%
2023	106,200,720	16,973	6,257	9.81%	12.71%	469,199,875	96,066	4,884	6.77%	3.46%	45,209,190	29,139	1,551	4.67%	-19.93%
2024	144,974,940	19,851	7,303	16.72%	31.56%	571,595,630	99,921	5,720	17.12%	21.17%	38,474,100	25,037	1,537	-0.95%	-20.69%

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre: 4.54%

2.28%

-3.62%

Tax Year	WASTE LAND (2)					OTHER AGLAND (2)					TOTAL AGRICULTURAL LAND (1)				
	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg 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	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre
2014	1,411,170	6,697	211			244,130	348	702			606,442,150	149,138	4,066		
2015	1,427,045	6,606	216	2.52%	2.52%	244,145	348	702	0.01%	0.01%	654,738,355	148,963	4,395	8.09%	8.09%
2016	1,423,035	6,592	216	-0.07%	2.44%	595	3	215	-69.39%	-69.39%	653,855,535	148,842	4,393	-0.05%	8.03%
2017	1,402,790	6,533	215	-0.53%	1.90%	595	3	215	0.00%	-69.39%	653,229,365	148,415	4,401	0.19%	8.24%
2018	1,349,515	6,432	210	-2.29%	-0.43%	580	3	209	-2.52%	-70.16%	600,066,815	147,951	4,056	-7.85%	-0.26%
2019	1,382,675	6,437	215	2.38%	1.94%	595	3	215	2.59%	-69.39%	555,911,895	148,794	3,736	-7.88%	-8.12%
2020	1,386,040	6,447	215	0.08%	2.02%	39,740	185	215	0.08%	-69.36%	557,435,805	149,119	3,738	0.06%	-8.07%
2021	1,384,735	6,441	215	0.00%	2.02%	44,945	209	215	-0.01%	-69.37%	554,394,030	149,049	3,720	-0.50%	-8.53%
2022	1,388,625	6,459	215	0.00%	2.02%	44,945	209	215	0.00%	-69.37%	580,712,210	148,865	3,901	4.88%	-4.07%
2023	1,467,955	6,658	220	2.56%	4.64%	0	0				622,077,740	148,837	4,180	7.14%	2.79%
2024	930,690	4,203	221	0.42%	5.07%	0	0				755,975,360	149,013	5,073	21.38%	24.76%

22
DAKOTA

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre: 2.23%

(1) Valuations from County Abstracts vs Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports (CTL) will vary due to different reporting dates. Source: 2014 - 2024 County Abstract Reports
Agland Assessment Level 1998 to 2006 = 80%; 2007 & forward = 75% NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 02/11/2025

CHART 4

CHART 5 - 2024 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type

Pop.	County:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsdReal	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
21,582	DAKOTA	208,729,485	40,180,267	35,842,170	1,073,123,945	389,352,930	139,700,917	0	754,895,455	47,100,675	23,710,865	0	2,712,636,709
cnty sector		7.69%	1.48%	1.32%	39.56%	14.35%	5.15%		27.83%	1.74%	0.87%		100.00%
Pop.	Municipality:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsd Real	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
2,081	DAKOTA CITY	1,698,555	851,516	1,215,254	104,220,580	15,492,555	9,714,036	0	1,459,590	0	0	0	134,652,086
9.64%	%sector of county sector	0.81%	2.12%	3.39%	9.71%	3.98%	6.95%		0.19%				4.96%
	%sector of municipality	1.26%	0.63%	0.90%	77.40%	11.51%	7.21%		1.08%				100.00%
840	EMERSON	6,235	98,666	10,590	13,833,625	745,110	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,694,226
3.89%	%sector of county sector	0.00%	0.25%	0.03%	1.29%	0.19%							0.54%
	%sector of municipality	0.04%	0.67%	0.07%	94.14%	5.07%							100.00%
532	HOMER	1,038,445	342,889	728,608	30,568,895	2,588,740	0	0	77,780	331,505	670	0	35,677,532
2.47%	%sector of county sector	0.50%	0.85%	2.03%	2.85%	0.66%			0.01%	0.70%	0.00%		1.32%
	%sector of municipality	2.91%	0.96%	2.04%	85.68%	7.26%			0.22%	0.93%	0.00%		100.00%
153	HUBBARD	984,250	0	0	10,304,605	1,294,450	0	0	15,980	0	263,045	0	12,862,330
0.71%	%sector of county sector	0.47%			0.96%	0.33%			0.00%		1.11%		0.47%
	%sector of municipality	7.65%			80.11%	10.06%			0.12%		2.05%		100.00%
207	JACKSON	16,181,505	90,908	21,983	17,726,000	3,216,210	22,527,635	0	0	0	0	0	59,764,241
0.96%	%sector of county sector	7.75%	0.23%	0.06%	1.65%	0.83%	16.13%						2.20%
	%sector of municipality	27.08%	0.15%	0.04%	29.66%	5.38%	37.69%						100.00%
14,043	SOUTH SIOUX CITY	136,280,495	11,375,437	8,073,734	580,061,405	312,282,010	55,626,883	0	2,221,580	9,960	27,980	0	1,105,959,484
65.07%	%sector of county sector	65.29%	28.31%	22.53%	54.05%	80.21%	39.82%		0.29%	0.02%	0.12%		40.77%
	%sector of municipality	12.32%	1.03%	0.73%	52.45%	28.24%	5.03%		0.20%	0.00%	0.00%		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												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
17,857	Total Municipalities	156,189,486	12,759,416	10,050,169	756,715,115	335,619,077	87,868,555	0	3,774,930	341,465	291,695	0	1,363,609,906
82.74%	%all municip.sectors of cnty	74.83%	31.76%	28.04%	70.52%	86.20%	62.90%		0.50%	0.72%	1.23%		50.27%

22 DAKOTA

Sources: 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied CTL, 2020 US Census; Dec. 2024 Municipality Population per Research Division NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 02/11/2025

CHART 5

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 10,246	Value : 2,762,908,949	Growth 18,330,172	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	432	14,281,270	173	5,141,840	166	5,212,500	771	24,635,610	
02. Res Improve Land	4,362	88,748,065	653	19,011,805	548	23,821,420	5,563	131,581,290	
03. Res Improvements	4,611	766,133,765	992	152,170,505	563	117,772,575	6,166	1,036,076,845	
04. Res Total	5,043	869,163,100	1,165	176,324,150	729	146,806,495	6,937	1,192,293,745	9,465,963
% of Res Total	72.70	72.90	16.79	14.79	10.51	12.31	67.70	43.15	51.64
05. Com UnImp Land	137	6,702,475	32	1,684,740	14	1,346,375	183	9,733,590	
06. Com Improve Land	637	37,554,085	73	6,013,994	36	4,282,325	746	47,850,404	
07. Com Improvements	616	305,017,583	75	32,876,265	38	16,581,350	729	354,475,198	
08. Com Total	753	349,274,143	107	40,574,999	52	22,210,050	912	412,059,192	6,697,249
% of Com Total	82.57	84.76	11.73	9.85	5.70	5.39	8.90	14.91	36.54
09. Ind UnImp Land	7	405,045	8	668,920	0	0	15	1,073,965	
10. Ind Improve Land	17	5,719,020	10	3,911,230	0	0	27	9,630,250	
11. Ind Improvements	16	72,478,314	10	56,577,693	0	0	26	129,056,007	
12. Ind Total	23	78,602,379	18	61,157,843	0	0	41	139,760,222	0
% of Ind Total	56.10	56.24	43.90	43.76	0.00	0.00	0.40	5.06	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	5,043	869,163,100	1,165	176,324,150	729	146,806,495	6,937	1,192,293,745	9,465,963
% of Res & Rec Total	72.70	72.90	16.79	14.79	10.51	12.31	67.70	43.15	51.64
Com & Ind Total	776	427,876,522	125	101,732,842	52	22,210,050	953	551,819,414	6,697,249
% of Com & Ind Total	81.43	77.54	13.12	18.44	5.46	4.02	9.30	19.97	36.54
17. Taxable Total	5,819	1,297,039,622	1,290	278,056,992	781	169,016,545	7,890	1,744,113,159	16,163,212
% of Taxable Total	73.75	74.37	16.35	15.94	9.90	9.69	77.01	63.13	88.18

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	121	6,033,970	17,989,090	12	257,855	4,065,830
19. Commercial	99	26,029,083	75,493,927	2	219,614	27,891
20. Industrial	5	18,195,070	31,461,665	3	157,370	18,691,200
21. Other	1	183,230	46,815	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	133	6,291,825	22,054,920
19. Commercial	2	54,720	263,345	103	26,303,417	75,785,163
20. Industrial	0	0	0	8	18,352,440	50,152,865
21. Other	0	0	0	1	183,230	46,815
22. Total Sch II				245	51,130,912	148,039,763

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	308	90	124	522

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	14	1,674,375	273	76,194,410	1,658	683,630,225	1,945	761,499,010
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	57	13,755,535	343	175,395,195	400	189,150,730
29. Ag Improvements	1	25,700	59	9,780,185	351	58,340,165	411	68,146,050

30. Ag Total				2,356	1,018,795,790
--------------	--	--	--	-------	---------------

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	45,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	33	33.83	761,245	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	35	0.00	6,333,380	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	7	19.93	34,005	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	39	104.02	210,915	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	25,700	52	0.00	3,446,805	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	2	2.25	0	133	176.80	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	19	22.10	497,250	21	24.10	542,250	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	205	208.35	4,687,875	238	242.18	5,449,120	
33. HomeSite Improvements	227	0.00	35,238,370	262	0.00	41,571,750	0
34. HomeSite Total				283	266.28	47,563,120	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	53	84.90	184,105	60	104.83	218,110	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	245	858.06	1,566,020	284	962.08	1,776,935	
37. FarmSite Improvements	308	0.00	23,101,795	361	0.00	26,574,300	2,166,960
38. FarmSite Total				421	1,066.91	28,569,345	
39. Road & Ditches	1,254	2,098.31	0	1,389	2,277.36	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	4	60.25	416,635	4	60.25	416,635	
41. Total Section VI				704	3,670.80	76,549,100	2,166,960

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	1	40.00	27,400	1	40.00	27,400

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	43	1,383.86	10,081,375
44. Market Value	0	0.00	0	43	1,383.86	10,081,375
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	43	1,383.86	10,081,375
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	6,063.87	31.25%	50,875,755	31.74%	8,389.98
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	6,502.83	33.51%	53,680,430	33.49%	8,254.93
48. 2A	6,172.18	31.80%	50,951,130	31.78%	8,254.97
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	563.29	2.90%	4,050,085	2.53%	7,190.05
51. 4A1	35.77	0.18%	257,000	0.16%	7,184.79
52. 4A	69.22	0.36%	485,235	0.30%	7,010.04
53. Total	19,407.16	100.00%	160,299,635	100.00%	8,259.82
Dry					
54. 1D1	12,824.78	46.89%	106,343,330	48.55%	8,292.02
55. 1D	450.01	1.65%	3,721,525	1.70%	8,269.87
56. 2D1	6,641.38	24.28%	54,159,980	24.73%	8,154.93
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	6,948.98	25.41%	51,873,980	23.68%	7,464.98
59. 3D	31.19	0.11%	195,720	0.09%	6,275.09
60. 4D1	288.39	1.05%	1,737,495	0.79%	6,024.81
61. 4D	166.86	0.61%	987,020	0.45%	5,915.26
62. Total	27,351.59	100.00%	219,019,050	100.00%	8,007.54
Grass					
63. 1G1	920.59	31.07%	2,338,740	41.41%	2,540.48
64. 1G	961.40	32.45%	2,313,685	40.97%	2,406.58
65. 2G1	68.54	2.31%	89,545	1.59%	1,306.46
66. 2G	103.86	3.51%	105,985	1.88%	1,020.46
67. 3G1	51.39	1.73%	56,935	1.01%	1,107.90
68. 3G	120.86	4.08%	93,050	1.65%	769.90
69. 4G1	258.05	8.71%	281,280	4.98%	1,090.02
70. 4G	478.05	16.14%	368,100	6.52%	770.00
71. Total	2,962.74	100.00%	5,647,320	100.00%	1,906.11
Irrigated Total					
	19,407.16	38.18%	160,299,635	41.61%	8,259.82
Dry Total					
	27,351.59	53.81%	219,019,050	56.85%	8,007.54
Grass Total					
	2,962.74	5.83%	5,647,320	1.47%	1,906.11
72. Waste	1,105.57	2.18%	265,320	0.07%	239.98
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	318.89	0.63%	2,084,100	0.54%	6,535.48
75. Market Area Total	50,827.06	100.00%	385,231,325	100.00%	7,579.26

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	22.41	6.01%	174,115	6.58%	7,769.52
48. 2A	81.45	21.83%	619,025	23.39%	7,600.06
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	269.27	72.17%	1,853,925	70.04%	6,885.00
53. Total	373.13	100.00%	2,647,065	100.00%	7,094.22
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,287.38	1.78%	10,369,865	2.02%	8,055.01
55. 1D	11,975.02	16.56%	96,163,075	18.76%	8,030.31
56. 2D1	4,423.07	6.12%	33,924,945	6.62%	7,670.00
57. 2D	403.09	0.56%	3,061,475	0.60%	7,595.02
58. 3D1	113.53	0.16%	812,270	0.16%	7,154.67
59. 3D	10,350.57	14.32%	71,418,810	13.93%	6,899.99
60. 4D1	2,953.59	4.09%	20,128,640	3.93%	6,814.97
61. 4D	40,786.42	56.42%	276,735,305	53.99%	6,784.99
62. Total	72,292.67	100.00%	512,614,385	100.00%	7,090.82
Grass					
63. 1G1	2,130.00	9.55%	5,792,240	14.10%	2,719.36
64. 1G	3,453.83	15.49%	8,593,465	20.92%	2,488.10
65. 2G1	2,229.18	10.00%	6,401,485	15.58%	2,871.68
66. 2G	4,447.80	19.95%	12,527,300	30.49%	2,816.52
67. 3G1	322.83	1.45%	728,725	1.77%	2,257.30
68. 3G	300.87	1.35%	206,135	0.50%	685.13
69. 4G1	1,374.27	6.16%	1,326,195	3.23%	965.02
70. 4G	8,039.96	36.06%	5,507,290	13.41%	684.99
71. Total	22,298.74	100.00%	41,082,835	100.00%	1,842.38
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	373.13	0.38%	2,647,065	0.48%	7,094.22
Dry Total					
Dry Total	72,292.67	73.70%	512,614,385	92.03%	7,090.82
Grass Total					
Grass Total	22,298.74	22.73%	41,082,835	7.38%	1,842.38
72. Waste	3,120.93	3.18%	671,080	0.12%	215.03
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	851.09	0.87%	4,753,020	0.85%	5,584.63
75. Market Area Total	98,085.47	100.00%	557,015,365	100.00%	5,678.88

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	1,707.43	14,054,175	18,072.86	148,892,525	19,780.29	162,946,700
77. Dry Land	205.49	1,646,315	9,093.07	69,699,005	90,345.70	660,288,115	99,644.26	731,633,435
78. Grass	15.42	14,180	2,710.55	5,024,415	22,535.51	41,691,560	25,261.48	46,730,155
79. Waste	57.82	13,880	531.93	121,185	3,636.75	801,335	4,226.50	936,400
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	620.00	3,965,775	549.98	2,871,345	1,169.98	6,837,120
82. Total	278.73	1,674,375	14,042.98	88,898,780	134,590.82	851,673,535	148,912.53	942,246,690

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	19,780.29	13.28%	162,946,700	17.29%	8,237.83
Dry Land	99,644.26	66.91%	731,633,435	77.65%	7,342.45
Grass	25,261.48	16.96%	46,730,155	4.96%	1,849.86
Waste	4,226.50	2.84%	936,400	0.10%	221.55
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	1,169.98	0.79%	6,837,120	0.73%	5,843.79
Total	148,912.53	100.00%	942,246,690	100.00%	6,327.52

Schedule XI : Residential Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line#</u> <u>Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
83.1 N/a Or Error	0	0	0	0	2	117,400	2	117,400	0
83.2 Dakcty Broyhill 14	5	114,255	27	744,585	30	6,478,035	35	7,336,875	23,055
83.3 Dakcty Original 15	48	1,246,635	543	12,595,980	547	86,821,325	595	100,663,940	285,790
83.4 Dakcty Rvrfrnt 17	1	31,195	24	1,175,710	28	8,145,550	29	9,352,455	5,410
83.5 Emerson 23	13	112,120	104	1,343,805	104	12,436,070	117	13,891,995	125,600
83.6 Harvest Meadows 1st Add	15	616,515	0	0	0	0	15	616,515	0
83.7 Homer 18	26	481,895	201	4,164,115	201	31,896,130	227	36,542,140	16,265
83.8 Hubbard 23	20	286,135	72	988,195	72	8,771,305	92	10,045,635	5,775
83.9 Jackson 20	40	493,525	73	1,465,315	73	10,103,805	113	12,062,645	606,275
83.10 Jackson 21	10	234,410	19	467,575	19	5,588,265	29	6,290,250	0
83.11 Mh In Courts	0	0	0	0	625	13,212,660	625	13,212,660	2,285
83.12 Rr Sbdv Blff View 56	2	60,650	5	178,235	5	1,812,695	7	2,051,580	0
83.13 Rr Sbdv Boals 64	0	0	4	88,500	4	637,040	4	725,540	0
83.14 Rr Sbdv Coopers 34	2	49,910	6	146,570	6	1,121,680	8	1,318,160	0
83.15 Rr Sbdv Dak Flats 60	3	106,700	19	709,450	19	8,921,115	22	9,737,265	0
83.16 Rr Sbdv Isl Hms 36	4	79,380	39	763,875	39	4,716,230	43	5,559,485	0
83.17 Rr Sbdv L&l Add 49	5	197,750	25	675,050	25	7,630,500	30	8,503,300	25,745
83.18 Rr Sbdv Lik U Wan 55	15	416,205	17	393,990	17	4,432,540	32	5,242,735	851,435
83.19 Rr Sbdv Orig Beh 33	28	407,415	95	1,876,320	95	12,043,605	123	14,327,340	188,660
83.20 Rr Sbdv Rott 1&2 61	7	391,540	29	919,350	29	10,184,940	36	11,495,830	47,185
83.21 Rr Sbdv Rott 3&4 62	3	117,000	20	783,000	20	8,498,205	23	9,398,205	0
83.22 Rr Sbdv Rott 5&6 63	10	199,535	14	402,405	14	5,602,660	24	6,204,600	198,435
83.23 Rr Sbdv Ssc Proj 50	3	111,995	32	1,211,500	32	7,295,540	35	8,619,035	238,090
83.24 Rr Sbdv Tompkins 42	3	45,910	119	2,629,590	119	28,454,490	122	31,129,990	104,980
83.25 Rural A1 Hubbard 25	18	761,105	162	7,479,435	164	31,958,785	182	40,199,325	553,790
83.26 Rural A2 Jackson 26	91	2,509,795	132	5,956,240	136	30,071,265	227	38,537,300	201,025
83.27 Rural A3 Homer 27	92	2,430,165	293	11,618,815	300	63,939,060	392	77,988,040	571,785
83.28 Rural A4 Ssc 28	27	1,006,145	155	5,297,355	156	29,804,960	183	36,108,460	233,150
83.29 Rural A5 Rvrfrnt 29	14	892,115	31	1,595,115	32	5,162,275	46	7,649,505	369,475
83.30 Rural Ag Land Only 2	1	50,010	0	0	0	0	1	50,010	0
83.31 Small Town Comm	2	27,775	0	0	1	25,760	3	53,535	0
83.32 South Sioux City Comm	2	692,615	1	41,290	0	0	2	733,905	0
83.33 Ssc 100	117	1,716,740	1,411	23,920,695	1,411	193,996,080	1,528	219,633,515	784,780
83.34 Ssc 104	12	1,385,600	27	1,148,375	27	8,476,315	39	11,010,290	660,955
83.35 Ssc 110	64	1,555,080	1,454	27,966,745	1,425	280,664,980	1,489	310,186,805	2,987,778
83.36 Ssc 115	7	1,560,480	387	11,977,310	386	106,040,170	393	119,577,960	80,195
83.37 Ssc 116	61	4,247,310	23	856,800	3	1,015,410	64	6,119,520	298,045

Schedule XI : Residential Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line#</u> <u>Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
84 Residential Total	771	24,635,610	5,563	131,581,290	6,166	1,036,076,845	6,937	1,192,293,745	9,465,963

Schedule XII : Commercial Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line# I</u>	<u>Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
		<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
85.1	Dakcty Broyhill 14	0	0	0	0	3	164,500	3	164,500	0
85.2	Dakcty Original 15	0	0	2	57,650	5	3,530,990	5	3,588,640	0
85.3	Dakcty Rvrfront 17	0	0	0	0	2	27,810	2	27,810	0
85.4	Homer 18	0	0	1	14,070	1	139,340	1	153,410	0
85.5	Rural A2 Jackson 26	0	0	1	45,565	1	416,245	1	461,810	126,015
85.6	Rural A3 Homer 27	0	0	0	0	1	28,105	1	28,105	0
85.7	Rural Ag Impvd Mkt1	0	0	2	366,310	2	278,825	2	645,135	0
85.8	Small Town Comm	57	2,029,130	159	4,807,810	160	63,332,945	217	70,169,885	2,760
85.9	South Sioux City Comm	140	8,699,130	607	52,144,339	579	415,144,490	719	475,987,959	6,568,474
85.10	Ssc 104	1	79,295	0	0	0	0	1	79,295	0
85.11	Ssc 110	0	0	1	44,910	1	467,955	1	512,865	0
86	Commercial Total	198	10,807,555	773	57,480,654	755	483,531,205	953	551,819,414	6,697,249

Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area

Market Area 1

Pure Grass	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
87. 1G1	899.18	49.90%	2,315,400	49.90%	2,575.01
88. 1G	877.77	48.71%	2,260,190	48.71%	2,574.92
89. 2G1	10.00	0.55%	25,760	0.56%	2,576.00
90. 2G	14.42	0.80%	37,110	0.80%	2,573.51
91. 3G1	0.63	0.03%	1,620	0.03%	2,571.43
92. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
93. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
94. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
95. Total	1,802.00	100.00%	4,640,080	100.00%	2,574.96
CRP					
96. 1C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
97. 1C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
98. 2C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
99. 2C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
100. 3C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
101. 3C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
102. 4C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
103. 4C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
104. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Timber					
105. 1T1	21.41	1.84%	23,340	2.32%	1,090.14
106. 1T	83.63	7.20%	53,495	5.31%	639.66
107. 2T1	58.54	5.04%	63,785	6.33%	1,089.60
108. 2T	89.44	7.71%	68,875	6.84%	770.07
109. 3T1	50.76	4.37%	55,315	5.49%	1,089.74
110. 3T	120.86	10.41%	93,050	9.24%	769.90
111. 4T1	258.05	22.23%	281,280	27.93%	1,090.02
112. 4T	478.05	41.18%	368,100	36.55%	770.00
113. Total	1,160.74	100.00%	1,007,240	100.00%	867.76
<hr/>					
Grass Total	1,802.00	60.82%	4,640,080	82.16%	2,574.96
CRP Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Timber Total	1,160.74	39.18%	1,007,240	17.84%	867.76
<hr/>					
114. Market Area Total	2,962.74	100.00%	5,647,320	100.00%	1,906.11

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	1,882.48	16.85%	5,553,375	16.85%	2,950.03
88. 1G	2,749.26	24.62%	8,110,500	24.62%	2,950.07
89. 2G1	2,141.14	19.17%	6,316,545	19.17%	2,950.09
90. 2G	4,185.73	37.48%	12,348,035	37.48%	2,950.03
91. 3G1	210.16	1.88%	620,010	1.88%	2,950.18
92. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
93. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
94. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
95. Total	11,168.77	100.00%	32,948,465	100.00%	2,950.05
CRP					
96. 1C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
97. 1C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
98. 2C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
99. 2C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
100. 3C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
101. 3C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
102. 4C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
103. 4C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
104. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Timber					
105. 1T1	247.52	2.22%	238,865	2.94%	965.03
106. 1T	704.57	6.33%	482,965	5.94%	685.47
107. 2T1	88.04	0.79%	84,940	1.04%	964.79
108. 2T	262.07	2.35%	179,265	2.20%	684.03
109. 3T1	112.67	1.01%	108,715	1.34%	964.90
110. 3T	300.87	2.70%	206,135	2.53%	685.13
111. 4T1	1,374.27	12.35%	1,326,195	16.30%	965.02
112. 4T	8,039.96	72.24%	5,507,290	67.70%	684.99
113. Total	11,129.97	100.00%	8,134,370	100.00%	730.85
<hr/>					
Grass Total	11,168.77	50.09%	32,948,465	80.20%	2,950.05
CRP Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Timber Total	11,129.97	49.91%	8,134,370	19.80%	730.85
<hr/>					
114. Market Area Total	22,298.74	100.00%	41,082,835	100.00%	1,842.38

**2025 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Compared with the 2024 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL)**

22 Dakota

	2024 CTL County Total	2025 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2025 form 45 - 2024 CTL)	Percent Change	2025 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	1,073,123,945	1,192,293,745	119,169,800	11.10%	9,465,963	10.22%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	47,100,675	47,563,120	462,445	0.98%	0	0.98%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	1,120,224,620	1,239,856,865	119,632,245	10.68%	9,465,963	9.83%
05. Commercial	389,352,930	412,059,192	22,706,262	5.83%	6,697,249	4.11%
06. Industrial	139,700,917	139,760,222	59,305	0.04%	0	0.04%
07. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-6)	529,053,847	551,819,414	22,765,567	4.30%	6,697,249	3.04%
08. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	23,710,865	28,569,345	4,858,480	20.49%	2,166,960	11.35%
09. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
10. Non Ag Use Land	0	416,635	416,635			
11. Total Non-Agland (sum lines 8-10)	23,710,865	28,985,980	5,275,115	22.25%	2,166,960	13.11%
12. Irrigated	144,974,940	162,946,700	17,971,760	12.40%		
13. Dryland	570,011,510	731,633,435	161,621,925	28.35%		
14. Grassland	38,970,760	46,730,155	7,759,395	19.91%		
15. Wasteland	938,245	936,400	-1,845	-0.20%		
16. Other Agland	0	0	0			
17. Total Agricultural Land	754,895,455	942,246,690	187,351,235	24.82%		
18. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	2,427,884,787	2,762,908,949	335,024,162	13.80%	18,330,172	13.04%

2025 Assessment Survey for Dakota County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	1 (part-time)
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	N/A
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$537,350
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$545,761
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$335,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	The \$335,000 is for appraisal work, CAMA system & computer system
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,000
12.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$89,043

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS
4.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes - sometimes for reference
5.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	They are not maintained
6.	Does the county have GIS software?
	gWorks
7.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, http://dakota.gworks.com
8.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	gWorks
9.	What type of aerial imagery is used in the cyclical review of properties?
	Eagleview
10.	When was the aerial imagery last updated?
	2022/ Going to be done again in the spring of 2025

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes, rural
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No, only parcels outside of the city/village jurisdiction.

3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	South Sioux City, Dakota City and Rural areas and all small towns
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1978

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Innovative Appraisal Service, Stanard Appraisal, and Cardinal Assessment Group
2.	GIS Services:
	gWorks
3.	Other services:
	N/A

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	List any outside appraisal or listing services employed by the county for the current assessment year
	Innovative Appraisal Service, Stanard Appraisal, Tom Kubert, and Cardinal Assessment Group
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes, there are contracts for all.
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Appraisers will be licensed and in good standing with the NRPAB. We prefer that all data listing providers have a construction or real estate background.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Yes
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	Data Listing Services do not in any capacity deal in value decisions. Appraisal services recommend values to the assessor however final values are decided by the assessor.

2025 Residential Assessment Survey for Dakota County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Assessor, Office Staff, Innovative Appraisal Service, Stanard Appraisal Service, and Cardinal Assessment Group
2.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.
	Sales Comparison, Cost Approach(new construction) and Income Approaches (rental properties) are used to estimate market value.
3.	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?
	Use tables and adjust based on market, if necessary.
4.	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, it is based on Neighborhoods.
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	Market sales. We start with vacant land sales and only use improved sales as a supporting indicator if insufficient vacant land sales are available.
6.	How are rural residential site values developed?
	The current sales market is analyzed. And we keep in line with our one-acre farm/home site.
7.	Are there form 191 applications on file?
	0
8.	Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?
	For lots covered by Form 191 Applications, the Assessor must use the income approach, including the use of a discounted cash-flow analysis.

2025 Commercial Assessment Survey for Dakota County


1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.
	The cost, sales and income approaches are all considered in the valuation process but the income approach is most used.
2a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.
	Sales and income approach with cost approach. Also search for similar properties across the state.
3.	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?
	Use the tables and adjust where needed.
4.	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.
	Yes, based on market analysis.
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	Vacant lot sales are reviewed and sales are compared.

2025 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Dakota County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Contract data listing service and Assessment Office Staff
2.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.
	Monitoring the market via sales, land use studies and keeping communication channels open with our local Agri-business owners.
3.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.
	Review market sales and conduct land use reviews. Generally 15 acres or more is ag if less than 15 acres it is rural residential unless it is contiguous with Ag.
4.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not what methodology is used to determine market value?
	<p>Ag sites and Home sites for Ag are the same, determined by the most recent land study.</p> <p>The county has two types of rural residential: 1) rural--outside of the city limits not located in a planned subdivision typically less than 20 acres; 2) rural sub--outside of the city limits located in a planned subdivision.</p> <p>The rural residential parcels are then broken down into five unique market areas for rural residential shown below to analyze the sales in the market to determine market value:</p> <p>Area 1 – Neighborhood 25--Southwest portion of the County (T28N R6 & 7E and that part of T27N R6 &7E)--value starts at \$5,000/acre.</p> <p>Area 2 -- Neighborhood 26--Northwest portion of the County (T29N R6 & 7E and that part of 8E)--value starts at \$10,000/acre.</p> <p>Area 3 -- Neighborhood 27--Bordered on the West by Area 1 & 2, the North and East by the Missouri River and to the South by Thurston County excluding the South Sioux City and Dakota City Rural Area 4 (T29N and that part of R8E, T28N R8 & that part of 9E and T27N R8 &9E)--value starts at \$12,000/acre.</p> <p>Area 4 -- Neighborhood 28--Northeast corner of the County consisting of South Sioux City and Dakota City surrounding rural areas (That part of T28N R9E and T29N R9E)--value starts at \$20,000/acre.</p> <p>Area 5 – Neighborhood 29--all Rural residential on the River not in a planned development (subdivision)--value starts at \$40,000/acre.</p> <p>Homesite raised in 2024 to \$22,500</p>
5.	What separate market analysis has been conducted where intensive use is identified in the county?
	Not current applicable. Sales are reviewed to determine if those parcels had a different selling price than the other parcels in the market.
6.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.

	The county uses current sales in the county for similar properties enrolled in the program and also analyzes sales from outside the county (TERC PRECEDENT) Cottonwood Flats vs. Dakota County
6a.	Are any other agricultural subclasses used? If yes, please explain.
	No
	<i>If your county has special value applications, please answer the following</i>
7a.	How many parcels have a special valuation application on file?
	43 applications, but they are valued as ag land.
7b.	What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist in the county?
	Market analysis and review of sales.
	<i>If your county recognizes a special value, please answer the following</i>
7c.	Describe the non-agricultural influences recognized within the county.
	There is housing with planned residential development along the Missouri River and anticipated commercial and industrial growth to areas surrounding the existing commercial/industrial complexes in Dakota County.
7d.	Where is the influenced area located within the county?
	Land one-two miles east and west of the commercial/industrial complex running north and south between South Sioux City and Dakota City. Land to the east extends to the Missouri River.
7e.	Describe in detail how the special values were arrived at in the influenced area(s).
	Qualified sales in Market Area 1 are analyzed. This Market Area includes all the unsubstantiated Greenbelt Areas. These values are established using Land Capability Groups to develop a value from qualified sales for each LCG. The values established should reflect 69% to 72% of Market Value.

DAKOTA COUNTY ASSESSMENT OFFICE



Plan of Assessment for Dakota County Assessment Years: 2025, 2026 and 2027

Amended: As Needed

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) **100%** of actual value for real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) **75%** of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) **75%** of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Sup 2009).

General Description of Real Property in Dakota County

Per the **2024** County Abstract, Dakota County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels
Residential	6901	67.66%
Commercial	903	08.85%
Industrial	41	0.0040%
Agricultural	2354	23.08%
Special Value	No New Applications	



Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2023

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	95	8.92	99.72
Commercial	98	4.20	98.28
Agricultural Land	72	23.16	97.84

Special Value Ag-land - Insufficient sales to calculate reliable statistics

***COD** = coefficient of dispersion:

The coefficient of dispersion (COD) is the most used measure of uniformity in ration studies. The COD is based on the average absolute deviation, but expresses it as a percentage. Thus, the COD provides a measure of appraisal uniformity that is independent of the level of appraisal and permits direct comparisons between property groups. Although the COD measures the average percentage deviation from the median, it does not measure the typical or median deviation. In normal distribution, 57 percent of the ratios will fall within one CD median. Low CODs (15.0 or less) tend to be associated with good appraisal uniformity. CODs of less than 5.0 are very rare except in (1) subdivisions in which lot prices are strictly controlled by the developer; (2) extremely homogeneous property groups, such as condominium units all located in the same complex; (3) appraisal ratio studies in which the assessor’s values and the independent appraisals reflect the same appraisal manuals and procedures; or (4) appraisals that have been adjusted to match the sales price.

***PRD** = price related differential:

Property appraisals sometimes result in unequal tax burdens between high and low value properties in the same property group. Appraisals are considered regressive if high-value properties are under appraised relative to low-value properties and progressive if high-value properties are relatively over appraised.

The price-related differential (PRD) is a statistic for measuring assessment progressivity or regressivity. It is calculated by dividing the mean by the weighted mean.

Recall that the unweighted mean weights the ratios equally, whereas the weighted mean weights them in proportion to their sales price. A PRD greater than 1.00 suggests that the high valued parcels are under appraised, thus pulling the weighted mean below the mean. On the other hand, if the PRD is less than 1.00, high-value parcels are relatively over appraised, pulling the weighted mean above the mean.

In practice, PRD’s have an upward bias. As an estimator of the population mean, the sample mean has a slight upward bias, but the weighted mean does not (except for very small samples). This upward bias reflected in the numerator of the calculation gives the PRD its slight upward bias. Assessment time lags can also contribute. In addition to measurement bias, one must leave a reasonable margin for sampling error in interpreting the PRD. As a general rule, except for small samples, PRDs should range between 0.98 and 1.03. Lower PRDs suggest significant assessment progressivity; higher ones suggest significant regressivity.

For more information regarding statistical measures see the **2024 Reports & Opinions**.

Current Resources

A. Staff

- a. We currently have an Assessor in the office and a Deputy Assessor in the office. The data listing will be contracted out for the coming year. We also have a part-time appraiser on staff. In addition, we contract



out our Commercial appraisal work to help mitigate our resource limitations. Training for our staff is conducted if and when time and our budget allow.

B. Cadastral Maps & Other Mapping Resources

- a. The Cadastral Maps are maintained via a 100% support contract with GWorks.
- b. We have Eagle View as well as an overlay and resource to locate field work. The new flyover was done in Spring of 2022 and will utilize the change finder for this program.

C. Software for CAMA

- a. Dakota County uses a CAMA system supplied by MIPS. In addition to the CAMA system we have a variety of software programs to enhance the office operation (Word, Excel, Outlook, GIS and others).

D. GIS

- a. Our GIS system is in place and hosted by GWorks.
- b. We have Eagle View (Pictometry) as a resource as well.

E. Website

- a. Our GIS website can be found at: [HTTP://Dakota.gworks.com](http://Dakota.gworks.com)

F. Department of Revenue

- a. The Department of Revenue has resources available to Assessors as well as a website found at: <http://www.revenue.nebraska.gov/PAD/index.html>



PROJECTS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OFFICE

1. FIELD INSPECTION MANUAL – **Still in process as resources have not available to complete.**
2. OFFICE PROCESS MANUALS – **ON HOLD (resources)**
3. TEMPLATES: TERC, PROTEST, DATA COLLECTION... - **IN PROCESS, some progress made in the area TERC**
4. SCAN AND STORE PAPER RECORDS INTO DATA SERVER – **NOT APPROVED, In process (CAMA)**
5. NEW CAMA SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION – **IMPLEMENTED AND USED AT THIS TIME**
6. CLEAN & ORGANIZE STORAGE (BSMNT) OLDER DATA – **In process will complete as resources become available.**

ACTIONS 2025, 2026 and 2027

2025-27 RESIDENTIAL ANTICIPATED VALUATION ACTIONS:

1. **2025** – Complete the review of South Sioux City Residential. Improvement review cycle. Complete the standard residential annual tasks, see below:
 - a. **Building Permit Final Reviews**
 - b. **Building Permit First Review for new permits**
 - c. **Building Permit Second Review for pending permits**



- d. **Sales Inspection**
 - e. **Protest Inspection**
 - f. **General Pickup work**
2. **2026** – Continue 6yr. Improvement cycle review in small towns, Homer, Jackson, Emerson, Hubbard, etc . Land study will be started on the small towns as well as a review of the small towns. Complete the standard residential annual tasks, see below:
- a. **Building Permit Final Reviews**
 - b. **Building Permit First Review for new permits**
 - c. **Building Permit Second Review for pending permits**
 - d. **Sales Inspection**
 - e. **Protest Inspection**
 - f. **General Pickup work**
3. **2027** – Initiate analysis on all work started and in progress from 2025-2026 to identify areas of opportunity or mark as complete if ready. Complete the 6yr. Improvement and Land Study for all small towns. Rural residential review will need to be started again. Complete the standard residential annual tasks, see below:
- a. **Building Permit Final Reviews**
 - b. **Building Permit First Review for new permits**
 - c. **Building Permit Second Review for pending permits**
 - d. **Sales Inspection**
 - e. **Protest Inspection**
 - f. **General Pickup work**
4. **2025-27** - ALL SALES WILL BE REVIEWED AND PROCESSED
- a. REVIEW 521 FOR DATA PROVIDED AND ACCURACY TO ENSURE ENOUGH INFORMATION EXISTS ON SALE.
 - b. REVIEW THE DEED FOR DATA PROVIDED AND ACCURACY TO ENSURE ENOUGH INFORMATION ON THE SALE IS PROVIDED
 - c. REVIEW ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DATA PROVIDED i.e. SURVEY TO VERIFY ACCURACY AND ENSURE ENOUGH DATA IS PROVIDED
 - d. REALTOR WEBSITE REVIEWED FOR ASKING \$ VS. SOLD \$
 - i. COMPARED WITH ASSESSED VALUE (RATIOS)
 - ii. ALTERNATE MARKET TRENDING ANALYSIS
 - e. MLS DATA SHEET PULLED TO VERIFY SALE AND PROPERTY INFORMATION
 - i. COMPARED WITH CAMA DATA FILE
 - f. FIELD INSPECTION COMPLETED
 - i. DISCUSS SALE DETAILS WITH OWNER/SELLER IF PRESENT
 - g. FINALIZE SALES QUALIFICATION CODING BASED ON THE REVIEW OF ALL STEPS TAKEN ABOVE.
5. BUILDING PERMITS AND PICK UP WORK WILL BE REVIEWED AND NEW DATA PROCESSED
- a. FIELD INSPECTION-A
 - i. GATHER FIRST AVAILABLE DATA FOR THE CAMA WORKING FILE
 - ii. COMPLETE DATA COLLECTION FORM
 - iii. COMPLETE QUALITY AND CONDITION FORM
 - iv. ESTIMATE THE DATE FOR THE FINAL FIELD INSPECTION AND SCHEDULE
 - b. FIELD INSPECTION-B
 - i. FINAL PICK-UP GATHER DATA TO COMPLETE CAMA WORKING FILE



- ii. COMPLETE DATA COLLECTION FORM
 - iii. COMPLETE QUALITY AND CONDITION FORM
 - iv. IF NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL NOT BE COMPLETED ESTIMATE THE % COMPLETE
 - 1. POPULATE THE % COMPLETE FORM AND PROVIDE TO THE ASSESSOR
 - 2. FLAG PARCEL FOR FINAL PICKUP IN NEXT YEAR.
 - 3. ASSESSOR TO REVIEW THE % COMPLETE FORM AND CALCULATE
 - a. NEW VALUE SET
 - b. NEW GROWTH SET
 - v. CLOSE BUILDING PERMIT
 - vi. LET THE ASSESSOR KNOW ALL DATA IS FINALIZED
 - vii. ASSESSOR CALCULATES FOR FINAL VALUATION
 - 1. SET THE NEW GROWTH
6. RATIO STUDIES AND ANALYSIS WILL BE COMPLETED ON ALL RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS AND VALUATION GROUPS
7. MARKET ADJUSTMENTS WILL BE MADE BY THE ASSESSOR IN THE EVENT IT IS DEEMED NECESSARY.

2025-27: ANTICIPATED COMMERCIAL VALUATION ACTIONS:

1. **2024-26** – PICK-UP WORK WILL BE COMPLETED. **2025-27** - ALL **SALES** WILL BE REVIEWED AND PROCESSED
 - a. REVIEW 521 FOR DATA PROVIDED AND ACCURACY TO ENSURE ALL ENOUGH INFORMATION EXISTS ON THE SALE.
 - b. REVIEW THE DEED FOR DATA PROVIDED AND ACCURACY TO ENSURE ENOUGH INFORMATION ON THE SALE IS PROVIDED
 - c. REVIEW ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DATA PROVIDED i.e. SURVEY TO VERIFY ACCURACY AND ENSURE ENOUGH DATA IS PROVIDED
 - d. REALTOR WEBSITE REVIEWED FOR ASKING \$ VS. SOLD \$
 - i. COMPARED WITH ASSESSED VALUE (RATIOS)
 - ii. ALTERNATE MARKET TRENDING ANALYSIS
 - e. MLS DATA SHEET PULLED TO VERIFY SALE AND PROPERTY INFORMATION
 - i. COMPARED WITH CAMA DATA FILE
 - f. FIELD INSPECTION COMPLETED
 - i. DISCUSS SALE DETAILS WITH OWNER/SELLER IF PRESENT
 - g. FINALIZE SALES QUALIFICATION CODING BASED ON THE REVIEW OF ALL STEPS TAKEN ABOVE.
2. **BUILDING PERMITS AND PICK UP WORK** WILL BE REVIEWED AND NEW DATA PROCESSED
 - a. FIELD INSPECTION-A
 - i. GATHER FIRST AVAILABLE DATA FOR THE CAMA WORKING FILE
 - ii. COMPLETE DATA COLLECTION FORM
 - iii. COMPLETE QUALITY AND CONDITION FORM
 - iv. ESTIMATE THE DATE FOR THE FINAL FIELD INSPECTION AND SCHEDULE
 - b. FIELD INSPECTION-B
 - i. FINAL PICK-UP GATHER DATA TO COMPLETE CAMA WORKING FILE
 - ii. COMPLETE DATA COLLECTION FORM
 - iii. COMPLETE QUALITY AND CONDITION FORM
 - iv. IF NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL NOT BE COMPLETED ESTIMATE THE % COMPLETE



1. POPULATE THE % COMPLETE FORM AND PROVIDE TO THE ASSESSOR
2. FLAG PARCEL FOR FINAL PICKUP IN NEXT YEAR.
3. ASSESSOR TO REVIEW THE % COMPLETE FORM AND CALCULATE
 - a. NEW VALUE SET
 - b. NEW GROWTH SET
- v. CLOSE BUILDING PERMIT
- vi. LET THE ASSESSOR KNOW ALL DATA IS FINALIZED
- vii. ASSESSOR CALCULATES FOR FINAL VALUATION
 1. SET THE NEW GROWTH
3. RATIO STUDIES AND ANALYSIS WILL BE COMPLETED ON ALL COMMERCIAL NEIGHBORHOODS AND VALUATION GROUPS
4. MARKET ADJUSTMENTS WILL BE MADE BY THE ASSESSOR IN THE EVENT IT IS DEEMED NECESSARY.
5. COMPLETE ANNUAL PARCEL PERCENTAGE FOR SIX-YEAR REVIEW CYCLE.
 - a. NEW PHOTOS
 - b. NEW DATA COLLECTED AND PROCESSED

2025-27: ANTICIPATED AGRICULTURAL VALUATION ACTIONS:

1. **2024-26** – WE ARE PLANNING ON CONDUCTING A STUDY TO VERIFY IF WE NOW CAN JUSTIFY THE NEED FOR A RECREATIONAL CLASS OF PROPERTY. The Department provided updated soil information that we updated in our CAMA System. We rolled updated soils for our new valuations. We will be using our Eagle View to assist with six year review and pickup process.
2. **2025-27** - ALL **SALES** WILL BE REVIEWED AND PROCESSED
 - a. REVIEW 521 FOR DATA PROVIDED AND ACCURACY TO ENSURE ALL ENOUGH INFORMATION EXISTS ON THE SALE.
 - b. REVIEW THE DEED FOR DATA PROVIDED AND ACCURACY TO ENSURE ENOUGH INFORMATION ON THE SALE IS PROVIDED
 - c. REVIEW ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DATA PROVIDED i.e. SURVEY TO VERIFY ACCURACY AND ENSURE ENOUGH DATA IS PROVIDED
 - d. REALTOR WEBSITE REVIEWED FOR ASKING \$ VS. SOLD \$
 - i. COMPARED WITH ASSESSED VALUE (RATIOS)
 - ii. ALTERNATE MARKET TRENDING ANALYSIS (SUPPORTIVE)
 - e. MLS DATA SHEET PULLED TO VERIFY SALE AND PROPERTY INFORMATION
 - i. COMPARED WITH CAMA DATA FILE
 - f. FIELD INSPECTION COMPLETED
 - i. DISCUSS SALE DETAILS WITH OWNER/SELLER IF PRESENT
 - ii. .
 - g. FINALIZE SALES QUALIFICATION CODING BASED ON THE REVIEW OF ALL STEPS TAKEN ABOVE.
3. **BUILDING PERMITS AND PICK UP WORK** WILL BE REVIEWED AND NEW DATA PROCESSED
 - a. FIELD INSPECTION-A
 - i. GATHER FIRST AVAILABLE DATA FOR THE CAMA WORKING FILE
 - ii. COMPLETE DATA COLLECTION FORM
 - iii. COMPLETE QUALITY AND CONDITION FORM



- iv. ESTIMATE THE DATE FOR THE FINAL FIELD INSPECTION AND SCHEDULE
- b. FIELD INSPECTION-B
 - i. FINAL PICK-UP GATHER DATA TO COMPLETE CAMA WORKING FILE
 - ii. COMPLETE DATA COLLECTION FORM
 - iii. COMPLETE QUALITY AND CONDITION FORM
 - iv. IF NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL NOT BE COMPLETED ESTIMATE THE % COMPLETE
 1. POPULATE THE % COMPLETE FORM AND PROVIDE TO THE ASSESSOR
 2. FLAG PARCEL FOR FINAL PICKUP IN NEXT YEAR.
 3. ASSESSOR TO REVIEW THE % COMPLETE FORM AND CALCULATE
 - a. NEW VALUE SET
 - b. NEW GROWTH SET
 - v. CLOSE BUILDING PERMIT
 - vi. LET THE ASSESSOR KNOW ALL DATA IS FINALIZED
 - vii. ASSESSOR CALCULATES FOR FINAL VALUATION
 1. SET THE NEW GROWTH
4. RATIO STUDIES AND ANALYSIS WILL BE COMPLETED ON ALL AGRICULTURAL NEIGHBORHOODS AND VALUATION GROUPS
5. MARKET ADJUSTMENTS WILL BE MADE BY THE ASSESSOR IN THE EVENT IT IS DEEMED NECESSARY.

Annual Assessor Administrative Reports Required by Law/Regulation:

- School District Taxable Value Report
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
- Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
- Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
- Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
- Annual Plan of Assessment Report

Personal Property; administer annual filing of schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.

Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

Homestead Exemptions; administer annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.

Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.



Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

County Board of Equalization - attends all county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests –assemble and provide information.

TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

Education: Assessor, Deputy Assessor and Appraiser Education – All will attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain the Assessor Certificate and the Appraiser License. The Assessor Certificate is issued by Property Assessment and Taxation and the Appraiser License is issued by Nebraska Real Estate Appraisal Board.


Respectfully submitted:

Assessor Signature: _____ Date: _____



DAKOTA COUNTY ASSESSOR OFFICE

Christy Abts
ASSESSOR
Assessor@dakotacountyne.org



Melissa Collins
DEPUTY ASSESSOR
Assessor@dakotacountyne.org

PHONE: 402.987.2101
FAX: 402.494.9201

Methodology for Special Valuation Area Values in Dakota County

INTRODUCTION

Special Valuation Areas, formally referred to as Greenbelt Areas, are intended to give tax relief to those Agricultural and Horticultural areas near **influenced** and **Developing** areas within a County. Normal practice would be to value this land at 69% to 75% of market value as estimated from the sales approach for that market area. In areas of development, either residential or commercial, this value can become much higher than the estimated value for agricultural and horticultural use. Relief can be obtained through the use of Special Value. To acquire this relief one must meet the qualifications of statute **§77-1344**, and file an application (**form 456**) pursuant to statute **§77-1345** in order to qualify for special valuation. All of the following criteria shall be met: (a) the land is located outside the corporate boundaries of any sanitary and improvement district, city, or village except as provided for in statute. (b) The land is agricultural or horticultural land. (c) The land is given an estimate of value based on other land in the county, for property tax purposes.

HISTORY

Dakota County Greenbelt areas were set up between **1992** and **1995** by a contracted appraiser. They consist of the following: areas surrounding South Sioux City and the industrial area to the south. The Greenbelt values were set up with the centers being the highest values and values declining as you moved away from the center. I have not been able to find any record of maps defining these areas or sales reflecting a need as most of these areas have since been annexed into city limits. Since there were no sales in the majority of the areas set up between 1992 and 1995, in 2002 the special value for all but a few of the designated areas was reduced to an amount equal to the taxable value as determined by comparable property qualified sales in the county.

CALCULATION OF VALUE

The Special Valuation is established by analysis of qualified sales in Market Area One of the county. This Market Area included all the unsubstantiated Greenbelt (Special Value) Areas. These values are established using Land Capability Groups to develop a value from qualified sales for each LCG. The values established should reflect 69% to 75% of the Market Value. Due to annexation and TIF, none qualify per (a) the land is located outside to corporate boundaries..city.

Dakota County Courthouse
1601 Broadway PO BOX 9
Dakota City, NE 68731