

**NEBRASKA**

Good Life. Great Service.

**DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE**

**2024 REPORTS AND OPINIONS  
OF THE PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR**

---

**COLFAX COUNTY**

April 5, 2024



Jim Pillen, Governor

Commissioner Hotz :

The Property Tax Administrator has compiled the 2024 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Colfax 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 Colfax 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

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sarah Scott".

Sincerely,  
Sarah Scott  
Property Tax Administrator  
402-471-5962

cc: Bill White, Colfax County Assessor

# Table of Contents

---

## **2024 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 412 square miles, Colfax County has 10,444 residents, per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2024, that's a slight decrease in population since the 2023 U.S. Census. Reports indicate that 78% of county residents are homeowners and 95% of residents occupy the same residence as in the prior year (Census Quick Facts). The average home value is \$152,214 (2023 Average Residential Value, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-3506.02).



The majority of the commercial properties in Colfax County are located in and around Schuyler, the county seat. According to information available from the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 250 employer establishments with total employment of 3,980, a slight increase of 1% from 2019.

Agricultural land is the main component of the valuation base in the county. Dryland makes up a majority of the land in the county. Colfax County is included in both the Lower Elkhorn and Lower Platte North Natural Resources Districts (NRD). In value

of sales by commodity group, Colfax County ranks fifth in hogs and pigs (USDA AgCensus).

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Colfax County

---

### *Assessment Actions*

The appraisal contractors completed a reappraisal for Valuation Group 1 for the 2024 assessment year. The assessor location of rural residential increased 10% in land and 5% to the improvements. The villages of Richland and Rogers both increased land 15% and the improvements 5%. The city of Schuyler and the suburban Schuyler area both had increases to the land of 15% and 5% to the improvements. All pick-up work was completed.

### *Assessment Practice Review*

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

The sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's length transactions are used. The county assessor and staff complete a verification of sales information by contacting the buyer or seller by telephone, if there is no response, they will further follow-up with contacting the realtor involved with the sale. The county assessor qualified sales near the statewide average. Further review of the disqualified sales support that all arm's-length transactions have been made available for the measurement of the residential class.

The lot values are studied during implementation of the reappraisal. The city of Schuyler lot values was completed in 2023. The reappraisal completed in 2024 included lot value changes for Clarkson, Howells, and Leigh. The remainder of the valuation groups were updated in 2019.

The costing date for all residential is 2022 and the depreciation analysis is also 2022 for Valuation Group 5. The depreciation for Valuation Group 1 is 2023 with the completion of the reappraisal. The rural residential costing date is 2022, but depreciation tables are 2019.

The Colfax County Assessor identifies five valuation groups. Valuation Group 1 includes three small towns with similar characteristics. Valuation Group 3 identifies two very small villages located between Schuyler and Columbus. Valuation Group 5 identifies the city of Schuyler. The rural residential parcels are identified as Valuation Group 4 and Valuation Group 2 identifies recreational parcels.

The six-year inspection and review cycle is current. The reappraisal of each area has been completed within the last six-year timeframe. During the reappraisal a new photo of the dwelling is taken, and changes are noted on the property record card.

The County Assessor has a written valuation methodology on file explaining the assessment practices.

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Colfax County

---

### *Description of Analysis*

The residential property class is analyzed using five valuation groups based on various assessor locations in the county.

Valuation Group	Description
1	Clarkson, Howells & Leigh
2	Recreational
3	Richland & Rogers
4	Rural residential homes
5	Schuyler and Schuyler Sub

The residential statistical profile represents four valuation groups. The overall measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range except for the weighted mean that is one percent below the acceptable range. The COD and PRD are both within the IAAO recommended range.

Most of the sales occur within Valuation Groups 1 and 5. All three measures of central tendency are within range for Valuation Group 1. The COD meets the standard, and the PRD is slightly high, impacted by three low dollar sales. Analysis of Valuation Group 1 shows the removal of the low dollar sales will bring the PRD within the recommended range.

The 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Form 45 Compared to the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) confirms the assessment actions as reported by the county assessor.

### *Equalization and Quality of Assessment*

A review of the statistics with sufficient sales along with the assessment practices suggest the assessments within the county are valued within the acceptable range, and therefore considered equalized. The quality of assessment of the residential class of property in Colfax County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

VALUATION GROUP						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
1	65	97.20	98.95	94.61	11.74	104.59
3	2	96.57	96.57	92.11	26.17	104.84
4	4	92.23	98.51	104.32	22.10	94.43
5	79	95.07	89.69	88.37	14.93	101.49
____ALL____	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08

## 2024 Residential Correlation for Colfax County

---

### *Level of Value*

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the residential property in Colfax County is 96%.

# 2024 Commercial Correlation for Colfax County

---

## *Assessment Actions*

The contract appraiser completed the reappraisal for Valuation Group 1. Valuation Group 2 received a 10% increase to the lot values and a 3% increase to the improvements. All pick-up work was added to the assessment roll.

## *Assessment Practice Review*

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

The sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's length transactions are used. The county assessor qualified a lower portion of sales in comparison to the statewide average. Further examination of the disqualified sales reveals sufficient explanation of why the sale is not arm's length and supports that all arm's-length transactions have been made available for the measurement of the commercial class.

The lot values are studied and updated during the reappraisal projects. Valuation Group 5 was updated in 2023. Valuation Group 1 has been updated for 2024. The remainder of the valuation groups are dated 2019 and 2021.

The appraisal tables for the costing are dated 2022 for all commercial parcels. The depreciation table for Valuation Group 1 corresponds with the results of the reappraisal for 2024. The remainder of the depreciation tables range from 2019 to 2022.

There are two commercial valuation groups in Colfax County. Schuyler is the main hub of the commercial class. The remainder of all commercial is dispersed amongst the assessor locations and grouped as one valuation group.

The six-year inspection and review cycle are up to date with a systematic plan in place to maintain compliance. For the commercial review an outside firm was hired to complete a reappraisal. The reappraisals have been completed between 2019 to 2024.

## *Description of Analysis*

The commercial class of property is analyzed utilizing the two valuation groups defined in the following table.

<b>Valuation Group</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	Schuyler
2	All parcels outside of Schuyler (Clarkson, Howells, Leigh, Richland, Rodgers and Rural)

## 2024 Commercial Correlation for Colfax County

---

Each valuation group is represented with the commercial sales and the Valuation Group 2 reappraisal was completed with the only measure of central tendency in range being the median at 100%. Both the mean and weighted mean are well above the acceptable range. Valuation Group 1 received percentage increases to the lots and improvements and has only the median measure of central tendency within range. The COD is significantly out of range in Valuation Group 1 and is distorted by a storage unit parcel that was sold twice in the same year. If those sales were removed the COD lowers to 20% and the median drops significantly below the range. The fluctuation of a small sample limits the usefulness of the statistics for purposes of determining a level of value.

The 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Form 45 Compared to the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) confirms the assessment actions as reported by the county assessor.

### *Equalization and Quality of Assessment*

A review of the statistics and the recent completion of the reappraisal along with the assessment practices suggest the assessments within the county are valued within the acceptable range, and therefore considered equalized. The quality of assessment of the commercial class of property in Colfax County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

VALUATION GROUP						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
1	7	96.50	123.67	115.85	55.09	106.75
2	12	100.15	118.53	113.88	23.22	104.08
____ALL____	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39

### *Level of Value*

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the commercial property in Colfax County is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value.

## 2024 Agricultural Correlation for Colfax County

---

### *Assessment Actions*

After reviewing the preliminary statistics and considering adjoining county values, the county assessor adjusted land values accordingly. The irrigated land was minimally adjusted resulting in an average change of 1%. The dryland was increased 15% and the grass was increased 2%. All pick-up work was completed and added to the assessment roll.

### *Assessment Practice Review*

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

The sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's-length transactions are used. The county assessor and staff complete a verification of sales information by contacting the buyer or seller by telephone, if there is no response, they will further follow-up with contacting the realtor involved with the sale. The usability rate for the agricultural class is near the statewide average. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified which includes many family transactions. Therefore, all arm's length agricultural sales were available for measurement purposes.

Agricultural homes and improvements are valued using the same practices as the rural residential homes. Reappraisal of agricultural homes was last done in 2019 and rural residential in 2018. Costing and depreciation tables utilized are dated 2022.

One market area is currently defined. The county assessor reviews the market to determine if additional market areas are needed. The aerial imagery was updated in April of 2023. The last full land use review was completed in 2017 and plans are to begin reviewing land use in 2024.

The required six-year inspection and review includes the dwellings and outbuildings last inspected in 2018 and 2019. This class will need to be focused on soon for compliance of the inspection and review requirements.

The county has identified a portion of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and the Wetland Reserve Program. Intensive land use has been identified to include parcels with chicken, hog and feedlots.

### *Description of Analysis*

There is one market area to analyze in Colfax County. With 35 qualified sales, the analysis shows all measures of central tendency are above the acceptable ranges. An analysis of the sales dispersed by study years indicates a significantly increasing market with a heavier distribution of sales towards the older two study-period years. The lack of new sales in the newest year impacts the reliance of the median.

## 2024 Agricultural Correlation for Colfax County

---

Despite the overall statistics, the primary land use, dryland land, is barely within the acceptable range at 69%, while the small sample of irrigated land is only slightly high and the only grass sale is significantly low. The Colfax County Assessor should have increased irrigated land the same as dryland but refrained from pushing the overall sample higher than the acceptable range, resulting in dryland values that are higher than irrigated values. A 5% adjustment to bring the small, irrigated subclass to the mid-point of the acceptable range, only brings the overall class to 76%. A substat reflecting this adjustment can be found in the appendix of this report. Further, Colfax County’s irrigated land value is already lower than every adjoining county, except Stanton County, a 5% reduction would bring the average irrigated land value to \$5,672, which is very close to Stanton County, but further dis-equalizes all other county values, and creates even more disparity between irrigated and dryland values within Colfax County.

Agricultural land values in Colfax County are generally aligned with those of adjoining counties, demonstrating equalization at uniform market values.

The 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Form 45 Compared to the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) confirms the assessment actions as reported by the county assessor.

### *Equalization and Quality of Assessment*

Agricultural homes and outbuildings have been valued using the same valuation process as rural residential improvements and are equalized at the statutorily required level. Agricultural land values are equalized at uniform portions of market value; all values have been determined to be acceptable and are reasonably comparable to adjoining counties. The quality of assessment of agricultural land in Colfax County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

80%MLU By Market Area						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
<u>    Irrigated    </u>						
County	8	75.57	81.34	77.48	21.85	104.98
1	8	75.57	81.34	77.48	21.85	104.98
<u>    Dry    </u>						
County	20	68.90	75.10	73.76	15.05	101.82
1	20	68.90	75.10	73.76	15.05	101.82
<u>    Grass    </u>						
County	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00
1	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00
<u>    ALL    </u>						
	35	77.24	77.35	76.19	15.64	101.52

### *Level of Value*

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Colfax County is determined to be at the statutory level of 75% of market value.



## 2024 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Colfax 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>96</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>75</b>	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 5th day of April, 2024.



Sarah Scott  
Property Tax Administrator

## APPENDICES

---

## 2024 Commission Summary for Colfax County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	150	Median	96.38
Total Sales Price	\$27,183,981	Mean	94.03
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$27,183,981	Wgt. Mean	91.22
Total Assessed Value	\$24,796,330	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$125,778
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$181,227	Avg. Assessed Value	\$165,309

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.97 to 97.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.15 to 94.29
95% Mean C.I	90.58 to 97.48
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	22.08
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.74
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.91

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2023	166	96	96.11
2022	153	94	94.38
2021	139	96	96.37
2020	158	96	96.41

## 2024 Commission Summary for Colfax County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	19	Median	97.90
Total Sales Price	\$2,172,850	Mean	120.42
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,172,850	Wgt. Mean	115.36
Total Assessed Value	\$2,506,665	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$234,392
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$114,361	Avg. Assessed Value	\$131,930

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.43 to 132.11
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	73.68 to 157.05
95% Mean C.I	93.59 to 147.25
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.09
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.19
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.80

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2023	21	95	95.35
2022	24	100	92.69
2021	19	100	95.08
2020	21	100	97.45

**19 Colfax  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 150  
 Total Sales Price : 27,183,981  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,183,981  
 Total Assessed Value : 24,796,330  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 181,227  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 165,309

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 94  
 COD : 13.88  
 PRD : 103.08

COV : 22.90  
 STD : 21.53  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.38  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 206.80  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.05

95% Median C.I. : 94.97 to 97.75  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.15 to 94.29  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.58 to 97.48

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:50AM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	23	99.55	104.63	99.32	13.66	105.35	60.17	181.76	96.06 to 101.15	153,630	152,589	
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	13	98.07	104.06	97.17	14.83	107.09	71.30	206.80	93.21 to 104.78	145,577	141,450	
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	21	97.21	98.68	97.43	06.31	101.28	82.21	121.83	95.62 to 100.42	151,147	147,264	
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	22	97.95	96.51	97.33	09.61	99.16	59.68	132.97	93.80 to 105.43	204,318	198,870	
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	17	94.62	87.17	88.00	10.57	99.06	60.07	100.75	71.69 to 97.92	181,824	160,002	
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	14	96.52	96.19	92.21	17.15	104.32	59.79	150.70	74.60 to 111.60	182,393	168,189	
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	18	73.48	78.96	79.14	22.13	99.77	41.05	111.11	66.07 to 98.30	234,156	185,301	
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	22	85.74	86.38	84.41	17.63	102.33	50.15	127.77	71.19 to 97.68	192,254	162,280	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	79	98.07	100.69	97.87	10.84	102.88	59.68	206.80	96.95 to 99.63	165,761	162,229	
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	71	91.31	86.62	85.03	17.04	101.87	41.05	150.70	78.66 to 95.74	198,435	168,736	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	73	96.95	96.30	95.05	10.04	101.32	59.68	206.80	95.62 to 98.19	173,323	164,747	
<u>ALL</u>	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08	41.05	206.80	94.97 to 97.75	181,227	165,309	

VALUATION GROUP											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
1	65	97.20	98.95	94.61	11.74	104.59	54.41	206.80	95.92 to 98.41	142,428	134,753	
3	2	96.57	96.57	92.11	26.17	104.84	71.30	121.83	N/A	68,000	62,633	
4	4	92.23	98.51	104.32	22.10	94.43	76.59	132.97	N/A	299,271	312,191	
5	79	95.07	89.69	88.37	14.93	101.49	41.05	174.60	89.92 to 97.21	210,039	185,612	
<u>ALL</u>	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08	41.05	206.80	94.97 to 97.75	181,227	165,309	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	149	96.51	94.26	91.29	13.71	103.25	41.05	206.80	95.07 to 97.75	182,040	166,176	
06	1	60.17	60.17	60.17	00.00	100.00	60.17	60.17	N/A	60,000	36,100	
07												
<u>ALL</u>	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08	41.05	206.80	94.97 to 97.75	181,227	165,309	

**19 Colfax  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 150  
 Total Sales Price : 27,183,981  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,183,981  
 Total Assessed Value : 24,796,330  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 181,227  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 165,309

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 94  
 COD : 13.88  
 PRD : 103.08

COV : 22.90  
 STD : 21.53  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.38  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 206.80  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.05

95% Median C.I. : 94.97 to 97.75  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.15 to 94.29  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.58 to 97.48

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:50AM

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	3	181.76	170.71	165.28	15.27	103.29	123.56	206.80	N/A	21,833	36,087
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>											
Greater Than 4,999	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08	41.05	206.80	94.97 to 97.75	181,227	165,309
Greater Than 14,999	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08	41.05	206.80	94.97 to 97.75	181,227	165,309
Greater Than 29,999	147	96.10	92.47	91.04	12.63	101.57	41.05	174.60	94.88 to 97.26	184,479	167,946
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	3	181.76	170.71	165.28	15.27	103.29	123.56	206.80	N/A	21,833	36,087
30,000 TO 59,999	11	98.23	106.87	109.24	16.44	97.83	70.20	174.60	89.48 to 127.77	42,818	46,773
60,000 TO 99,999	23	95.62	92.48	92.92	18.34	99.53	59.68	150.70	76.59 to 99.75	79,582	73,950
100,000 TO 149,999	24	96.42	95.07	95.06	06.94	100.01	73.03	115.43	94.62 to 98.88	126,458	120,211
150,000 TO 249,999	54	96.98	89.55	89.28	11.67	100.30	41.05	112.23	93.73 to 98.15	189,557	169,228
250,000 TO 499,999	34	95.35	91.19	91.32	12.19	99.86	61.81	132.97	87.15 to 98.30	324,882	296,669
500,000 TO 999,999	1	72.52	72.52	72.52	00.00	100.00	72.52	72.52	N/A	500,000	362,590
1,000,000 +											
<b>ALL</b>	150	96.38	94.03	91.22	13.88	103.08	41.05	206.80	94.97 to 97.75	181,227	165,309

**19 Colfax  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 2,172,850  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,172,850  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,506,665  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 114,361  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 131,930

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 115  
 MEAN : 120  
 COD : 35.26  
 PRD : 104.39

COV : 46.22  
 STD : 55.66  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.52  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 243.61  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.37

95% Median C.I. : 93.43 to 132.11  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.68 to 157.05  
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.59 to 147.25

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:51AM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-20 To 31-DEC-20	2	116.41	116.41	112.98	13.49	103.04	100.71	132.11	N/A	64,000	72,305
01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21	2	95.55	95.55	94.80	02.22	100.79	93.43	97.67	N/A	27,750	26,308
01-APR-21 To 30-JUN-21											
01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21	3	102.34	139.08	103.17	38.79	134.81	97.90	217.00	N/A	161,333	166,440
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	2	236.37	236.37	236.15	03.06	100.09	229.13	243.61	N/A	196,000	462,850
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22											
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	3	96.50	127.04	120.06	32.34	105.81	95.50	189.13	N/A	50,250	60,330
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	1	91.10	91.10	91.10	00.00	100.00	91.10	91.10	N/A	15,000	13,665
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	1	94.36	94.36	94.36	00.00	100.00	94.36	94.36	N/A	60,000	56,615
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	3	68.54	80.76	72.10	21.89	112.01	64.37	109.37	N/A	225,867	162,853
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23											
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	2	82.60	82.60	68.85	20.56	119.97	65.62	99.58	N/A	105,000	72,295
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-20 To 30-SEP-21	7	100.71	120.17	104.35	23.05	115.16	93.43	217.00	93.43 to 217.00	95,357	99,506
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	6	142.82	157.50	200.87	44.20	78.41	91.10	243.61	91.10 to 243.61	92,958	186,726
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	6	81.45	83.64	72.79	21.44	114.91	64.37	109.37	64.37 to 109.37	157,933	114,961
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21	7	102.34	154.44	158.63	55.94	97.36	93.43	243.61	93.43 to 243.61	133,071	211,091
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	5	95.50	113.32	111.30	20.97	101.81	91.10	189.13	N/A	45,150	50,254
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930

VALUATION GROUP										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
1	7	96.50	123.67	115.85	55.09	106.75	64.37	243.61	64.37 to 243.61	233,121	270,079
2	12	100.15	118.53	113.88	23.22	104.08	91.10	217.00	94.36 to 132.11	45,083	51,343
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930

**19 Colfax  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 2,172,850  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,172,850  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,506,665  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 114,361  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 131,930

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 115  
 MEAN : 120  
 COD : 35.26  
 PRD : 104.39

COV : 46.22  
 STD : 55.66  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.52  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 243.61  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.37

95% Median C.I. : 93.43 to 132.11  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.68 to 157.05  
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.59 to 147.25

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:51AM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930
04											
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930

**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	5	97.67	120.17	121.56	26.62	98.86	91.10	217.00	N/A	17,200	20,909
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930
Greater Than 14,999	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930
Greater Than 29,999	14	99.31	120.51	115.11	37.81	104.69	64.37	243.61	68.54 to 189.13	149,061	171,580
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	5	97.67	120.17	121.56	26.62	98.86	91.10	217.00	N/A	17,200	20,909
30,000 TO 59,999	3	132.11	138.22	138.02	24.15	100.14	93.43	189.13	N/A	42,000	57,968
60,000 TO 99,999	4	98.61	98.48	98.74	03.09	99.74	94.36	102.34	N/A	81,563	80,538
100,000 TO 149,999	1	109.37	109.37	109.37	00.00	100.00	109.37	109.37	N/A	100,000	109,365
150,000 TO 249,999	4	148.84	151.73	154.31	56.87	98.33	65.62	243.61	N/A	189,900	293,028
250,000 TO 499,999	2	81.14	81.14	80.59	20.67	100.68	64.37	97.90	N/A	387,500	312,295
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 TO 1,999,999											
2,000,000 TO 4,999,999											
5,000,000 TO 9,999,999											
10,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930



**19 Colfax  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 2,172,850  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,172,850  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,506,665  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 114,361  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 131,930

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 115  
 MEAN : 120  
 COD : 35.26  
 PRD : 104.39

COV : 46.22  
 STD : 55.66  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.52  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 243.61  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 64.37


95% Median C.I. : 93.43 to 132.11  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.68 to 157.05  
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.59 to 147.25

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:51AM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
336	1	68.54	68.54	68.54	00.00	100.00	68.54	68.54	N/A	177,600	121,735
344	3	132.11	148.54	120.40	30.41	123.37	96.50	217.00	N/A	55,083	66,322
350	1	93.43	93.43	93.43	00.00	100.00	93.43	93.43	N/A	37,500	35,035
353	3	97.67	97.02	97.80	00.82	99.20	95.50	97.90	N/A	136,000	133,012
386	4	209.13	190.65	211.81	21.87	90.01	100.71	243.61	N/A	127,125	269,268
406	1	99.58	99.58	99.58	00.00	100.00	99.58	99.58	N/A	20,000	19,915
426	1	102.34	102.34	102.34	00.00	100.00	102.34	102.34	N/A	91,000	93,130
434	2	78.36	78.36	67.48	16.26	116.12	65.62	91.10	N/A	102,500	69,170
470	1	64.37	64.37	64.37	00.00	100.00	64.37	64.37	N/A	400,000	257,460
528	2	101.87	101.87	103.74	07.37	98.20	94.36	109.37	N/A	80,000	82,990
<u>ALL</u>	<u>19</u>	97.90	120.42	115.36	35.26	104.39	64.37	243.61	93.43 to 132.11	114,361	131,930

### 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
2012	\$ 76,943,074	\$ 822,829	1.07%	\$ 76,120,245		\$ 50,562,981	
2013	\$ 78,948,086	\$ 2,164,757	2.74%	\$ 76,783,329	-0.21%	\$ 52,049,971	2.94%
2014	\$ 82,190,826	\$ 2,717,935	3.31%	\$ 79,472,891	0.66%	\$ 53,027,477	1.88%
2015	\$ 83,997,891	\$ 1,278,925	1.52%	\$ 82,718,966	0.64%	\$ 50,232,650	-5.27%
2016	\$ 82,204,356	\$ 983,445	1.20%	\$ 81,220,911	-3.31%	\$ 49,852,267	-0.76%
2017	\$ 86,775,046	\$ 4,202,040	4.84%	\$ 82,573,006	0.45%	\$ 50,738,160	1.78%
2018	\$ 94,723,836	\$ 2,510,020	2.65%	\$ 92,213,816	6.27%	\$ 50,183,014	-1.09%
2019	\$ 97,531,026	\$ 3,972,285	4.07%	\$ 93,558,741	-1.23%	\$ 50,750,174	1.13%
2020	\$ 107,044,961	\$ 5,773,710	5.39%	\$ 101,271,251	3.83%	\$ 53,955,362	6.32%
2021	\$ 106,685,335	\$ 569,095	0.53%	\$ 106,116,240	-0.87%	\$ 59,508,796	10.29%
2022	\$ 115,332,037	\$ 5,171,145	4.48%	\$ 110,160,892	3.26%	\$ 62,780,100	5.50%
2023	\$ 130,479,501	\$ 5,187,552	3.98%	\$ 125,291,949	8.64%	\$ 65,750,501	4.73%
<b>Ann %chg</b>	<b>5.15%</b>			<b>Average</b>	<b>1.65%</b>	2.36%	<b>2.49%</b>

Tax Year	Cumulative Change		
	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg Value	Cmltv%chg Net Sales
2012	-	-	-
2013	-0.21%	2.61%	2.94%
2014	3.29%	6.82%	4.87%
2015	7.51%	9.17%	-0.65%
2016	5.56%	6.84%	-1.41%
2017	7.32%	12.78%	0.35%
2018	19.85%	23.11%	-0.75%
2019	21.59%	26.76%	0.37%
2020	31.62%	39.12%	6.71%
2021	37.92%	38.65%	17.69%
2022	43.17%	49.89%	24.16%
2023	62.84%	69.58%	30.04%

County Number	19
County Name	Colfax

**19 Colfax**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 35  
Total Sales Price : 29,709,243  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,709,243  
Total Assessed Value : 22,635,800  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 848,836  
Avg. Assessed Value : 646,737

MEDIAN : 77  
WGT. MEAN : 76  
MEAN : 77  
COD : 15.64  
PRD : 101.52

COV : 18.82  
STD : 14.56  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.08  
MAX Sales Ratio : 106.64  
MIN Sales Ratio : 51.57

95% Median C.I. : 67.48 to 82.01  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.06 to 80.32  
95% Mean C.I. : 72.53 to 82.17

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:52AM

**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-20 To 31-DEC-20	2	88.34	88.34	81.71	12.57	108.11	77.24	99.43	N/A	1,192,000	973,978
01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21	5	98.15	97.87	97.48	06.80	100.40	82.21	106.64	N/A	494,995	482,510
01-APR-21 To 30-JUN-21	4	85.45	84.96	85.34	12.21	99.55	65.72	103.23	N/A	716,831	611,760
01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00	63.31	63.31	N/A	396,615	251,090
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	10	73.23	71.21	70.28	12.45	101.32	51.57	81.38	62.48 to 80.83	784,775	551,503
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	6	76.73	78.84	79.04	11.04	99.75	69.10	95.46	69.10 to 95.46	1,342,962	1,061,431
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	1	66.81	66.81	66.81	00.00	100.00	66.81	66.81	N/A	680,000	454,280
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	1	61.11	61.11	61.11	00.00	100.00	61.11	61.11	N/A	814,800	497,955
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	3	67.51	67.36	67.18	01.38	100.27	65.89	68.69	N/A	972,000	652,983
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	1	60.99	60.99	60.99	00.00	100.00	60.99	60.99	N/A	530,005	323,245
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23											
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	1	62.04	62.04	62.04	00.00	100.00	62.04	62.04	N/A	740,000	459,120
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-20 To 30-SEP-21	12	92.12	89.10	86.90	13.61	102.53	63.31	106.64	77.24 to 103.23	676,910	588,220
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	18	71.01	72.95	73.77	12.28	98.89	51.57	95.46	64.53 to 80.83	966,685	713,103
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	5	65.89	65.02	65.49	03.99	99.28	60.99	68.69	N/A	837,201	548,263
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21	20	80.79	80.23	78.21	15.27	102.58	51.57	106.64	65.72 to 87.54	679,333	531,286
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	11	69.10	73.01	74.43	09.73	98.09	61.11	95.46	65.89 to 84.46	1,133,507	843,615
<u>ALL</u>	35	77.24	77.35	76.19	15.64	101.52	51.57	106.64	67.48 to 82.01	848,836	646,737

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	35	77.24	77.35	76.19	15.64	101.52	51.57	106.64	67.48 to 82.01	848,836	646,737
<u>ALL</u>	35	77.24	77.35	76.19	15.64	101.52	51.57	106.64	67.48 to 82.01	848,836	646,737

**19 Colfax**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 35  
 Total Sales Price : 29,709,243  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,709,243  
 Total Assessed Value : 22,635,800  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 848,836  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 646,737

MEDIAN : 77  
 WGT. MEAN : 76  
 MEAN : 77  
 COD : 15.64  
 PRD : 101.52

COV : 18.82  
 STD : 14.56  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.08  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 106.64  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 51.57

95% Median C.I. : 67.48 to 82.01  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.06 to 80.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.53 to 82.17

Printed:3/21/2024 9:19:52AM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	5	71.45	78.96	73.20	24.86	107.87	51.57	106.64	N/A	724,090	530,001
1	5	71.45	78.96	73.20	24.86	107.87	51.57	106.64	N/A	724,090	530,001
<b>Dry</b>											
County	13	78.98	75.87	74.92	11.56	101.27	60.99	103.23	65.89 to 82.21	765,462	573,487
1	13	78.98	75.87	74.92	11.56	101.27	60.99	103.23	65.89 to 82.21	765,462	573,487
<b>Grass</b>											
County	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00	63.31	63.31	N/A	396,615	251,090
1	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00	63.31	63.31	N/A	396,615	251,090
<b>ALL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>77.24</b>	<b>77.35</b>	<b>76.19</b>	<b>15.64</b>	<b>101.52</b>	<b>51.57</b>	<b>106.64</b>	<b>67.48 to 82.01</b>	<b>848,836</b>	<b>646,737</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	8	75.57	81.34	77.48	21.85	104.98	51.57	106.64	51.57 to 106.64	813,556	630,310
1	8	75.57	81.34	77.48	21.85	104.98	51.57	106.64	51.57 to 106.64	813,556	630,310
<b>Dry</b>											
County	20	68.90	75.10	73.76	15.05	101.82	60.99	103.23	65.89 to 82.01	759,978	560,585
1	20	68.90	75.10	73.76	15.05	101.82	60.99	103.23	65.89 to 82.01	759,978	560,585
<b>Grass</b>											
County	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00	63.31	63.31	N/A	396,615	251,090
1	1	63.31	63.31	63.31	00.00	100.00	63.31	63.31	N/A	396,615	251,090
<b>ALL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>77.24</b>	<b>77.35</b>	<b>76.19</b>	<b>15.64</b>	<b>101.52</b>	<b>51.57</b>	<b>106.64</b>	<b>67.48 to 82.01</b>	<b>848,836</b>	<b>646,737</b>

## Colfax County 2024 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Colfax	1	6,404	6,304	6,304	6,051	5,740	5,526	5,100	4,818	<b>5,970</b>
Cuming	2	n/a	7,554	7,554	8,002	5,660	n/a	6,948	5,875	<b>7,537</b>
Cuming	4	7,929	7,610	7,610	7,954	5,351	n/a	6,896	5,591	<b>7,352</b>
Dodge	1	7,073	7,146	6,878	6,914	5,540	6,938	5,475	5,426	<b>6,859</b>
Dodge	2	7,337	7,319	7,191	7,192	7,150	6,935	7,050	6,987	<b>7,197</b>
Butler	1	6,422	6,286	6,286	6,101	5,761	5,484	5,068	4,977	<b>6,338</b>
Platte	6	9,520	8,585	8,585	8,381	7,590	7,190	6,900	6,479	<b>8,154</b>
Stanton	1	5,769	6,385	6,385	5,555	4,819	5,704	5,021	4,852	<b>5,624</b>

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Colfax	1	7,434	7,317	7,007	6,878	6,399	6,329	5,846	5,382	<b>6,651</b>
Cuming	2	7,374	7,374	6,919	n/a	6,345	6,345	5,280	5,280	<b>6,713</b>
Cuming	4	7,490	7,485	7,028	6,919	4,196	6,444	5,326	5,068	<b>6,936</b>
Dodge	1	5,328	5,494	5,180	-	4,825	5,092	4,854	5,093	<b>5,220</b>
Dodge	2	7,424	7,425	7,173	7,225	6,635	7,021	6,870	6,815	<b>7,224</b>
Butler	1	6,700	6,100	5,850	5,750	5,500	5,000	3,950	3,825	<b>5,398</b>
Platte	6	7,841	7,350	6,729	6,639	6,347	5,938	4,900	3,724	<b>6,461</b>
Stanton	1	6,392	6,394	6,393	4,463	3,267	5,411	5,043	5,116	<b>5,621</b>

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Colfax	1	2,129	2,128	1,928	1,928	n/a	1,821	n/a	1,714	<b>2,081</b>
Cuming	2	3,360	3,241	2,741	2,986	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>3,162</b>
Cuming	4	3,169	3,159	2,486	2,766	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>2,992</b>
Dodge	1	2,534	2,520	2,459	2,450	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,220	<b>2,509</b>
Dodge	2	2,341	2,260	2,205	2,151	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>2,288</b>
Butler	1	2,796	2,771	2,716	2,721	2,255	2,594	n/a	2,525	<b>2,764</b>
Platte	6	2,434	2,456	2,273	2,287	n/a	1,490	2,040	1,948	<b>2,389</b>
Stanton	1	2,244	2,372	1,860	2,325	1,605	n/a	n/a	1,878	<b>2,085</b>

County	Mkt Area	CRP	TIMBER	WASTE
Colfax	1	4,389	1,680	150
Cuming	2	5,923	1,438	129
Cuming	4	5,664	1,400	311
Dodge	1	3,210	n/a	293
Dodge	2	3,210	n/a	296
Butler	1	3,183	1,725	755

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

**SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE**

Mrkt Area	Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg1A1	6579	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg1A	6084	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg2A1	5989	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg2A	5748	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg3A1	5453	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg3A	5250	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg4A1	4845	Decrease	5%
1	Irrigated Land	Irrg4A	4577	Decrease	5%

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	35	Median :	76	COV :	18.02	95% Median C.I. :	67.56 to 81.87
Total Sales Price :	29,709,243	Wgt. Mean :	75	STD :	13.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	71.09 to 79.44
Total Adj. Sales Price :	29,709,243	Mean :	77	Avg. Abs. Dev :	11.57	95% Mean C.I. :	72.00 to 81.14
Total Assessed Value :	22,360,613						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	848,836	COD :	15.25	MAX Sales Ratio :	102.08		
Avg. Assessed Value :	638,875	PRD :	101.74	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.92		

Printed : 04/01/2024

DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
10/01/2020 To 12/31/2020	2	86.47	86.47	81.45	09.73	106.16	78.06	94.88	N/A	1,192,000	970,825
01/01/2021 To 03/31/2021	5	97.98	95.70	95.10	04.78	100.63	82.06	101.80	N/A	494,995	470,734
04/01/2021 To 06/30/2021	4	85.22	85.04	85.35	11.26	99.64	67.66	102.08	N/A	716,831	611,788
07/01/2021 To 09/30/2021	1	68.03	68.03	68.03		100.00	68.03	68.03	N/A	396,615	269,803
10/01/2021 To 12/31/2021	10	71.63	70.44	69.31	12.54	101.63	48.92	81.15	62.35 to 80.66	784,775	543,906
01/01/2022 To 03/31/2022	6	75.42	77.26	77.23	12.15	100.04	67.56	95.28	67.56 to 95.28	1,342,962	1,037,108
04/01/2022 To 06/30/2022	1	66.66	66.66	66.66		100.00	66.66	66.66	N/A	680,000	453,269
07/01/2022 To 09/30/2022	1	61.01	61.01	61.01		100.00	61.01	61.01	N/A	814,800	497,082
10/01/2022 To 12/31/2022	3	67.37	67.24	67.06	01.38	100.27	65.78	68.57	N/A	972,000	651,783
01/01/2023 To 03/31/2023	1	60.86	60.86	60.86		100.00	60.86	60.86	N/A	530,005	322,583
04/01/2023 To 06/30/2023											
07/01/2023 To 09/30/2023	1	61.94	61.94	61.94		100.00	61.94	61.94	N/A	740,000	458,345
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2021	12	91.05	88.30	86.33	11.64	102.28	67.66	102.08	78.06 to 100.16	676,910	584,356
10/01/2021 To 09/30/2022	18	68.37	71.98	72.48	12.59	99.31	48.92	95.28	64.39 to 80.66	966,685	700,670
10/01/2022 To 09/30/2023	5	65.78	64.90	65.37	04.00	99.28	60.86	68.57	N/A	837,201	547,255
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2021 To 12/31/2021	20	80.64	79.56	77.35	14.53	102.86	48.92	102.08	67.66 to 87.21	679,333	525,484
01/01/2022 To 12/31/2022	11	67.76	72.08	73.21	09.18	98.46	61.01	95.28	65.78 to 82.09	1,133,507	829,850

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	35	75.87	76.57	75.26	15.25	101.74	48.92	102.08	67.56 to 81.87	848,836	638,875

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	35	Median :	76	COV :	18.02	95% Median C.I. :	67.56 to 81.87
Total Sales Price :	29,709,243	Wgt. Mean :	75	STD :	13.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	71.09 to 79.44
Total Adj. Sales Price :	29,709,243	Mean :	77	Avg. Abs. Dev :	11.57	95% Mean C.I. :	72.00 to 81.14
Total Assessed Value :	22,360,613						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	848,836	COD :	15.25	MAX Sales Ratio :	102.08		
Avg. Assessed Value :	638,875	PRD :	101.74	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.92		

Printed : 04/01/2024

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	5	67.76	76.20	70.41	23.64	108.22	48.92	101.80	N/A	724,090	509,832
1	5	67.76	76.20	70.41	23.64	108.22	48.92	101.80	N/A	724,090	509,832
<u>Dry</u>											
County	13	78.82	75.64	74.71	11.47	101.24	60.86	102.08	65.78 to 82.06	765,462	571,911
1	13	78.82	75.64	74.71	11.47	101.24	60.86	102.08	65.78 to 82.06	765,462	571,911
<u>Grass</u>											
County	1	68.03	68.03	68.03		100.00	68.03	68.03	N/A	396,615	269,803
1	1	68.03	68.03	68.03		100.00	68.03	68.03	N/A	396,615	269,803
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	35	75.87	76.57	75.26	15.25	101.74	48.92	102.08	67.56 to 81.87	848,836	638,875

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	8	71.82	78.08	74.18	21.02	105.26	48.92	101.80	48.92 to 101.80	813,556	603,467
1	8	71.82	78.08	74.18	21.02	105.26	48.92	101.80	48.92 to 101.80	813,556	603,467
<u>Dry</u>											
County	20	68.77	74.91	73.58	14.96	101.81	60.86	102.08	65.78 to 81.87	759,978	559,223
1	20	68.77	74.91	73.58	14.96	101.81	60.86	102.08	65.78 to 81.87	759,978	559,223
<u>Grass</u>											
County	1	68.03	68.03	68.03		100.00	68.03	68.03	N/A	396,615	269,803
1	1	68.03	68.03	68.03		100.00	68.03	68.03	N/A	396,615	269,803
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	35	75.87	76.57	75.26	15.25	101.74	48.92	102.08	67.56 to 81.87	848,836	638,875



**Colfax County 2024 Hypothetical Average Acre Value Comparison  
5% decrease to irrigated land**

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Colfax	1	6,084	5,989	5,989	5,748	5,453	5,250	4,845	4,577	5,672
Cuming	2	n/a	7,554	7,554	8,002	5,660	n/a	6,948	5,875	7,537
Cuming	4	7,929	7,610	7,610	7,954	5,351	n/a	6,896	5,591	7,352
Dodge	1	7,073	7,146	6,878	6,914	5,540	6,938	5,475	5,426	6,859
Dodge	2	7,337	7,319	7,191	7,192	7,150	6,935	7,050	6,987	7,197
Butler	1	6,422	6,286	6,286	6,101	5,761	5,484	5,068	4,977	6,338
Platte	6	9,520	8,585	8,585	8,381	7,590	7,190	6,900	6,479	8,154
Stanton	1	5,769	6,385	6,385	5,555	4,819	5,704	5,021	4,852	5,624


County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Colfax	1	7,434	7,317	7,007	6,878	6,399	6,329	5,846	5,382	6,651
Cuming	2	7,374	7,374	6,919	n/a	6,345	6,345	5,280	5,280	6,713
Cuming	4	7,490	7,485	7,028	6,919	4,196	6,444	5,326	5,068	6,936
Dodge	1	5,328	5,494	5,180	-	4,825	5,092	4,854	5,093	5,220
Dodge	2	7,424	7,425	7,173	7,225	6,635	7,021	6,870	6,815	7,224
Butler	1	6,700	6,100	5,850	5,750	5,500	5,000	3,950	3,825	5,398
Platte	6	7,841	7,350	6,729	6,639	6,347	5,938	4,900	3,724	6,461
Stanton	1	6,392	6,394	6,393	4,463	3,267	5,411	5,043	5,116	5,621

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Colfax	1	2,129	2,128	1,928	1,928	n/a	1,821	n/a	1,714	2,081
Cuming	2	3,360	3,241	2,741	2,986	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3,162
Cuming	4	3,169	3,159	2,486	2,766	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,992
Dodge	1	2,534	2,520	2,459	2,450	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,220	2,509
Dodge	2	2,341	2,260	2,205	2,151	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,288
Butler	1	2,796	2,771	2,716	2,721	2,255	2,594	n/a	2,525	2,764
Platte	6	2,434	2,456	2,273	2,287	n/a	1,490	2,040	1,948	2,389
Stanton	1	2,244	2,372	1,860	2,325	1,605	n/a	n/a	1,878	2,085

County	Mkt Area	CRP	TIMBER	WASTE
Colfax	1	4,389	1,680	150
Cuming	2	5,923	1,438	129
Cuming	4	5,664	1,400	311
Dodge	1	3,210	n/a	293
Dodge	2	3,210	n/a	296
Butler	1	3,183	1,725	755
Platte	6	2,443	2,064	200
Stanton	1	3,412	285	151

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

# COLFAX 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 2013 - 2023**



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational <sup>(1)</sup>				Commercial & Industrial <sup>(1)</sup>				Total Agricultural Land <sup>(1)</sup>			
	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg
2013	214,584,180	-	-	-	78,948,086	-	-	-	745,551,015	-	-	-
2014	220,078,955	5,494,775	2.56%	2.56%	82,190,826	3,242,740	4.11%	4.11%	1,035,922,325	290,371,310	38.95%	38.95%
2015	231,499,350	11,420,395	5.19%	7.88%	83,997,891	1,807,065	2.20%	6.40%	1,168,169,450	132,247,125	12.77%	56.69%
2016	236,565,970	5,066,620	2.19%	10.24%	82,204,356	-1,793,535	-2.14%	4.12%	1,216,844,785	48,675,335	4.17%	63.21%
2017	257,314,195	20,748,225	8.77%	19.91%	86,775,046	4,570,690	5.56%	9.91%	1,216,628,840	-215,945	-0.02%	63.19%
2018	267,181,015	9,866,820	3.83%	24.51%	94,723,836	7,948,790	9.16%	19.98%	1,221,238,525	4,609,685	0.38%	63.80%
2019	280,885,535	13,704,520	5.13%	30.90%	97,531,026	2,807,190	2.96%	23.54%	1,213,292,885	-7,945,640	-0.65%	62.74%
2020	319,724,655	38,839,120	13.83%	49.00%	107,044,961	9,513,935	9.75%	35.59%	1,159,721,740	-53,571,145	-4.42%	55.55%
2021	342,987,580	23,262,925	7.28%	59.84%	106,685,335	-359,626	-0.34%	35.13%	1,145,089,965	-14,631,775	-1.26%	53.59%
2022	379,802,660	36,815,080	10.73%	76.99%	115,397,632	8,712,297	8.17%	46.17%	1,143,849,535	-1,240,430	-0.11%	53.42%
2023	463,824,603	84,021,943	22.12%	116.15%	130,712,781	15,315,149	13.27%	65.57%	1,269,369,300	125,519,765	10.97%	70.26%


Rate Annual %chg: Residential & Recreational **8.01%** Commercial & Industrial **5.17%** Agricultural Land **5.47%**

Cnty# **19**  
County **COLFAX**

**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 2013 - 2023



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational <sup>(1)</sup>						Commercial & Industrial <sup>(1)</sup>						
	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	
2013	214,584,180	2,839,265	1.32%	211,744,915	-	-1.32%	78,948,086	2,164,757	2.74%	76,783,329	-	-2.74%	
2014	220,078,955	3,147,148	1.43%	216,931,807	1.09%	1.09%	82,190,826	2,717,935	3.31%	79,472,891	0.66%	0.66%	
2015	231,499,350	3,213,290	1.39%	228,286,060	3.73%	6.39%	83,997,891	1,278,925	1.52%	82,718,966	0.64%	4.78%	
2016	236,565,970	2,082,080	0.88%	234,483,890	1.29%	9.27%	82,204,356	983,445	1.20%	81,220,911	-3.31%	2.88%	
2017	257,314,195	3,043,290	1.18%	254,270,905	7.48%	18.49%	86,775,046	4,202,040	4.84%	82,573,006	0.45%	4.59%	
2018	267,181,015	3,551,904	1.33%	263,629,111	2.45%	22.86%	94,723,836	2,510,020	2.65%	92,213,816	6.27%	16.80%	
2019	280,885,535	3,504,880	1.25%	277,380,655	3.82%	29.26%	97,531,026	3,972,285	4.07%	93,558,741	-1.23%	18.51%	
2020	319,724,655	3,414,695	1.07%	316,309,960	12.61%	47.41%	107,044,961	5,773,710	5.39%	101,271,251	3.83%	28.28%	
2021	342,987,580	3,107,693	0.91%	339,879,887	6.30%	58.39%	106,685,335	569,095	0.53%	106,116,240	-0.87%	34.41%	
2022	379,802,660	6,880,063	1.81%	372,922,597	8.73%	73.79%	115,397,632	5,171,145	4.48%	110,226,487	3.32%	39.62%	
2023	463,824,603	8,201,374	1.77%	455,623,229	19.96%	112.33%	130,712,781	5,187,552	3.97%	125,525,229	8.78%	59.00%	
Rate Ann%chg	8.01%			Resid & Recreat w/o growth			5.17%			C & I w/o growth			1.86%

Tax Year	Ag Improvements & Site Land <sup>(1)</sup>							
	Agric. Dwelling & Homesite Value	Ag Outblgd & Farmsite Value	Ag Imprv+Site Total Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth
2013	64,662,950	47,573,275	112,236,225	7,069,610	6.30%	105,166,615	-	-
2014	66,288,365	49,172,505	115,460,870	4,528,330	3.92%	110,932,540	-1.16%	-1.16%
2015	69,441,770	52,238,085	121,679,855	3,348,740	2.75%	118,331,115	2.49%	5.43%
2016	70,363,920	55,991,165	126,355,085	4,916,705	3.89%	121,438,380	-0.20%	8.20%
2017	71,918,980	58,782,570	130,701,550	4,588,330	3.51%	126,113,220	-0.19%	12.36%
2018	73,284,290	62,473,740	135,758,030	2,792,235	2.06%	132,965,795	1.73%	18.47%
2019	81,369,755	64,211,970	145,581,725	3,439,330	2.36%	142,142,395	4.70%	26.65%
2020	89,650,750	79,437,255	169,088,005	8,951,455	5.29%	160,136,550	10.00%	42.68%
2021	90,450,450	80,281,290	170,731,740	4,562,875	2.67%	166,168,865	-1.73%	48.05%
2022	112,376,985	83,312,440	195,689,425	5,144,189	2.63%	190,545,236	11.61%	69.77%
2023	140,457,680	83,976,460	224,434,140	1,624,820	0.72%	222,809,320	13.86%	98.52%
Rate Ann%chg	8.07%	5.85%	7.18%	Ag Imprv+Site w/o growth			4.11%	


(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; 2013 - 2023 CTL  
Growth Value; 2013 - 2023 Abstract of Asmnt Rpt.  
Prepared as of 12/29/2023

Cnty# 19  
County COLFAX

CHART 2

NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

CHART 3 - AGRICULTURAL LAND VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2013 - 2023



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
2013	291,600,990	-	-	-	420,177,510	-	-	-	32,355,770	-	-	-
2014	387,823,345	96,222,355	33.00%	33.00%	602,453,970	182,276,460	43.38%	43.38%	44,150,605	11,794,835	36.45%	36.45%
2015	437,160,715	49,337,370	12.72%	49.92%	677,992,995	75,539,025	12.54%	61.36%	51,502,350	7,351,745	16.65%	59.18%
2016	464,499,835	27,339,120	6.25%	59.29%	694,324,590	16,331,595	2.41%	65.25%	56,540,445	5,038,095	9.78%	74.75%
2017	463,097,500	-1,402,335	-0.30%	58.81%	692,979,100	-1,345,490	-0.19%	64.93%	59,114,625	2,574,180	4.55%	82.70%
2018	469,816,725	6,719,225	1.45%	61.12%	693,923,185	944,085	0.14%	65.15%	56,312,820	-2,801,805	-4.74%	74.04%
2019	462,630,615	-7,186,110	-1.53%	58.65%	687,297,015	-6,626,170	-0.95%	63.57%	60,908,085	4,595,265	8.16%	88.24%
2020	432,945,730	-29,684,885	-6.42%	48.47%	667,799,475	-19,497,540	-2.84%	58.93%	56,226,155	-4,681,930	-7.69%	73.77%
2021	421,437,825	-11,507,905	-2.66%	44.53%	667,030,060	-769,415	-0.12%	58.75%	54,583,080	-1,643,075	-2.92%	68.70%
2022	422,213,525	775,700	0.18%	44.79%	666,377,805	-652,255	-0.10%	58.59%	53,617,850	-965,230	-1.77%	65.71%
2023	465,354,915	43,141,390	10.22%	59.59%	745,398,150	79,020,345	11.86%	77.40%	56,622,165	3,004,315	5.60%	75.00%

Rate Ann.%chg: Irrigated **4.79%** Dryland **5.90%** Grassland **5.76%**

Tax Year	Waste Land <sup>(1)</sup>				Other Agland <sup>(1)</sup>				Total Agricultural			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2013	783,140	-	-	-	633,605	-	-	-	745,551,015	-	-	-
2014	789,565	6,425	0.82%	0.82%	704,840	71,235	11.24%	11.24%	1,035,922,325	290,371,310	38.95%	38.95%
2015	820,095	30,530	3.87%	4.72%	693,295	-11,545	-1.64%	9.42%	1,168,169,450	132,247,125	12.77%	56.69%
2016	1,226,625	406,530	49.57%	56.63%	253,290	-440,005	-63.47%	-60.02%	1,216,844,785	48,675,335	4.17%	63.21%
2017	1,184,275	-42,350	-3.45%	51.22%	253,340	50	0.02%	-60.02%	1,216,628,840	-215,945	-0.02%	63.19%
2018	1,185,795	1,520	0.13%	51.42%	0	-253,340	-100.00%	-100.00%	1,221,238,525	4,609,685	0.38%	63.80%
2019	1,188,850	3,055	0.26%	51.81%	1,268,320	1,268,320		100.18%	1,213,292,885	-7,945,640	-0.65%	62.74%
2020	1,045,140	-143,710	-12.09%	33.46%	1,705,240	436,920	34.45%	169.13%	1,159,721,740	-53,571,145	-4.42%	55.55%
2021	1,013,010	-32,130	-3.07%	29.35%	1,025,990	-679,250	-39.83%	61.93%	1,145,089,965	-14,631,775	-1.26%	53.59%
2022	987,335	-25,675	-2.53%	26.07%	653,020	-372,970	-36.35%	3.06%	1,143,849,535	-1,240,430	-0.11%	53.42%
2023	977,590	-9,745	-0.99%	24.83%	1,016,480	363,460	55.66%	60.43%	1,269,369,300	125,519,765	10.97%	70.26%

Cnty# **19**  
County **COLFAX**

Rate Ann.%chg: Total Agric Land **5.47%**

CHART 4 - AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative % Change 2013 - 2023 (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
2013	291,682,980	76,813	3,797			420,185,810	131,612	3,193			32,373,160	29,924	1,082		
2014	387,520,560	77,033	5,031	32.48%	32.48%	602,760,570	131,422	4,586	43.66%	43.66%	44,186,220	29,883	1,479	36.67%	36.67%
2015	437,235,070	77,461	5,645	12.21%	48.65%	678,294,330	132,170	5,132	11.89%	60.74%	51,413,125	28,522	1,803	21.91%	66.62%
2016	464,320,630	77,637	5,981	5.95%	57.50%	695,181,350	132,008	5,266	2.62%	64.95%	56,480,485	28,513	1,981	9.89%	83.10%
2017	463,079,995	77,393	5,983	0.05%	57.57%	693,296,250	131,654	5,266	0.00%	64.94%	59,348,315	29,204	2,032	2.59%	87.84%
2018	469,722,125	78,542	5,981	-0.05%	57.49%	694,233,725	131,830	5,266	0.00%	64.95%	56,154,935	27,567	2,037	0.24%	88.29%
2019	467,444,400	78,462	5,958	-0.38%	56.89%	687,821,500	130,708	5,262	-0.07%	64.83%	61,721,430	28,748	2,147	5.40%	98.45%
2020	433,023,925	77,671	5,575	-6.42%	46.82%	668,500,160	130,424	5,126	-2.60%	60.55%	55,950,195	26,114	2,143	-0.21%	98.04%
2021	421,820,975	78,490	5,374	-3.60%	41.53%	666,621,795	130,042	5,126	0.01%	60.56%	54,523,150	26,207	2,080	-2.90%	92.30%
2022	422,259,740	78,568	5,374	0.00%	41.53%	666,534,355	130,035	5,126	-0.01%	60.55%	53,612,010	25,720	2,084	0.19%	92.67%
2023	464,891,450	78,643	5,911	9.99%	55.67%	745,895,525	129,924	5,741	12.00%	79.82%	56,618,330	25,687	2,204	5.74%	103.74%

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre: 4.53%

6.04%

7.38%

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
2013	782,915	7,829	100			204,010	340	600			745,228,875	246,518	3,023		
2014	786,575	7,866	100	0.00%	0.00%	204,010	340	600	0.00%	0.00%	1,035,457,935	246,544	4,200	38.93%	38.93%
2015	817,230	8,172	100	0.00%	0.00%	217,095	362	600	-0.01%	-0.01%	1,167,976,850	246,688	4,735	12.73%	56.62%
2016	1,225,990	8,171	150	50.05%	50.05%	253,290	362	700	16.67%	16.67%	1,217,461,745	246,692	4,935	4.24%	63.25%
2017	1,154,980	7,698	150	-0.01%	50.03%	253,340	362	700	0.00%	16.67%	1,217,132,880	246,311	4,941	0.13%	63.46%
2018	1,188,940	7,924	150	0.00%	50.03%	0	0				1,221,299,725	245,863	4,967	0.53%	64.32%
2019	1,180,795	7,870	150	0.00%	50.04%	0	0				1,218,168,125	245,788	4,956	-0.23%	63.95%
2020	1,037,300	6,914	150	0.00%	50.04%	1,695,730	1,412	1,201		100.13%	1,160,207,310	242,534	4,784	-3.48%	58.24%
2021	1,017,955	6,784	150	0.00%	50.04%	1,025,990	666	1,542	28.38%	156.93%	1,145,009,865	242,190	4,728	-1.17%	56.39%
2022	988,150	6,586	150	0.00%	50.04%	653,020	574	1,137	-26.24%	89.52%	1,144,047,275	241,484	4,738	0.21%	56.72%
2023	978,205	6,519	150	0.00%	50.04%	961,810	601	1,599	40.65%	166.56%	1,269,345,320	241,374	5,259	11.00%	73.96%

19  
COLFAX

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre: 5.69%

(1) Valuations from County Abstracts vs Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports (CTL) will vary due to different reporting dates. Source: 2013 - 2023 County Abstract Reports  
Agland Assessment Level 1998 to 2006 = 80%; 2007 & forward = 75% NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 12/29/2023

CHART 4

CHART 5 - 2023 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
10,582	COLFAX	119,918,508	26,546,548	60,823,404	437,090,218	102,568,016	28,144,765	26,734,385	1,269,369,300	140,457,680	83,976,460	0	2,295,629,284
cnty sectorvalue % of total value:		5.22%	1.16%	2.65%	19.04%	4.47%	1.23%	1.16%	55.30%	6.12%	3.66%		100.00%
Pop.	Municipality:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsd Real	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
641	CLARKSON	2,974,575	83,792	11,631	26,138,980	7,626,771	0	0	209,365	0	0	0	37,045,114
6.06%	%sector of county sector	2.48%	0.32%	0.02%	5.98%	7.44%			0.02%				1.61%
	%sector of municipality	8.03%	0.23%	0.03%	70.56%	20.59%			0.57%				100.00%
561	HOWELLS	523,782	135,904	13,969	38,918,143	3,689,000	0	0	223,980	213,190	62,100	0	43,780,068
5.30%	%sector of county sector	0.44%	0.51%	0.02%	8.90%	3.60%			0.02%	0.15%	0.07%		1.91%
	%sector of municipality	1.20%	0.31%	0.03%	88.89%	8.43%			0.51%	0.49%	0.14%		100.00%
435	LEIGH	1,018,082	56,293	6,690	22,348,860	5,955,960	0	0	0	0	0	0	29,385,885
4.11%	%sector of county sector	0.85%	0.21%	0.01%	5.11%	5.81%							1.28%
	%sector of municipality	3.46%	0.19%	0.02%	76.05%	20.27%							100.00%
70	RICHLAND	43,057	117,424	1,043,997	2,469,085	1,466,900	0	0	622,060	0	0	0	5,762,523
0.66%	%sector of county sector	0.04%	0.44%	1.72%	0.56%	1.43%			0.05%				0.25%
	%sector of municipality	0.75%	2.04%	18.12%	42.85%	25.46%			10.79%				100.00%
82	ROGERS	13,295	200,057	1,798,998	1,988,175	473,820	0	0	129,295	0	0	0	4,603,640
0.77%	%sector of county sector	0.01%	0.75%	2.96%	0.45%	0.46%			0.01%				0.20%
	%sector of municipality	0.29%	4.35%	39.08%	43.19%	10.29%			2.81%				100.00%
6,547	SCHUYLER	9,596,547	2,810,824	5,591,665	218,108,670	56,585,545	13,860	5,180	828,535	0	0	0	293,540,826
61.87%	%sector of county sector	8.00%	10.59%	9.19%	49.90%	55.17%	0.05%	0.02%	0.07%				12.79%
	%sector of municipality	3.27%	0.96%	1.90%	74.30%	19.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%				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												
8,337	Total Municipalities	14,169,338	3,404,294	8,466,951	309,971,918	75,797,998	13,860	5,180	2,013,235	213,190	62,100	0	414,118,062
78.78%	%all municip.sectors of cnty	11.82%	12.82%	13.92%	70.92%	73.90%	0.05%	0.02%	0.16%	0.15%	0.07%		18.04%

19 COLFAX

Sources: 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied CTL, 2020 US Census; Dec. 2023 Municipality Population per Research Division NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 12/29/2023

CHART 5

<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 8,442</b>	<b>Value : 2,288,196,436</b>	<b>Growth 11,241,100</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	258	3,317,570	41	865,550	290	2,570,330	589	6,753,450	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,532	39,970,220	103	6,275,970	319	14,402,310	2,954	60,648,500	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,697	294,266,690	136	31,997,570	357	82,364,935	3,190	408,629,195	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,955	337,554,480	177	39,139,090	647	99,337,575	3,779	476,031,145	6,074,000
<b>% of Res Total</b>	78.20	70.91	4.68	8.22	17.12	20.87	44.76	20.80	54.03
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	80	1,450,290	5	286,260	3	149,290	88	1,885,840	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	443	8,981,870	25	1,166,790	23	1,361,925	491	11,510,585	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	449	71,856,496	29	12,966,975	25	13,096,670	503	97,920,141	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	529	82,288,656	34	14,420,025	28	14,607,885	591	111,316,566	762,920
<b>% of Com Total</b>	89.51	73.92	5.75	12.95	4.74	13.12	7.00	4.86	6.79
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	1	15,940	0	0	0	0	1	15,940	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	3	1,035,630	0	0	3	1,035,630	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	3	27,095,275	0	0	3	27,095,275	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	1	15,940	3	28,130,905	0	0	4	28,146,845	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	25.00	0.06	75.00	99.94	0.00	0.00	0.05	1.23	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	1	5,955	9	115,780	81	7,434,145	91	7,555,880	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	33	1,346,630	59	6,193,835	92	7,540,465	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	62	4,465,885	84	9,532,245	146	13,998,130	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	1	5,955	71	5,928,295	165	23,160,225	237	29,094,475	9,075
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.42	0.02	29.96	20.38	69.62	79.60	2.81	1.27	0.08
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,956	337,560,435	248	45,067,385	812	122,497,800	4,016	505,125,620	6,083,075
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	73.61	66.83	6.18	8.92	20.22	24.25	47.57	22.08	54.11
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	530	82,304,596	37	42,550,930	28	14,607,885	595	139,463,411	762,920
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	89.08	59.02	6.22	30.51	4.71	10.47	7.05	6.09	6.79
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,486	419,865,031	285	87,618,315	840	137,105,685	4,611	644,589,031	6,845,995
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	75.60	65.14	6.18	13.59	18.22	21.27	54.62	28.17	60.90



Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	139,715	5,673,205	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	2	139,715	5,673,205
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2	139,715	5,673,205

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	292	2	220	514

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	35	2,292,330	8	1,550,540	2,898	1,083,704,705	2,941	1,087,547,575
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	56,605	2	1,255,495	847	340,973,875	850	342,285,975
29. Ag Improvements	1	230,270	2	135,025	887	213,408,560	890	213,773,855

30. Ag Total				3,831	1,643,607,405
--------------	--	--	--	-------	---------------

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	30,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	30,000	1	1.00	30,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	121,585	1	0.00	86,450	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	3.08	15,400	2	4.41	22,050	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	108,685	2	0.00	48,575	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	3	1.22	0	2	4.72	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	2	0.42	0	1	4.66	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	48	45.23	1,301,150	49	46.23	1,331,150	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	561	573.02	17,196,350	563	575.02	17,256,350	
33. HomeSite Improvements	571	0.00	129,497,210	573	0.00	129,705,245	419,270
34. HomeSite Total				622	621.25	148,292,745	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	76	139.54	697,685	76	139.54	697,685	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	774	3,117.31	15,586,550	777	3,124.80	15,624,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	856	0.00	83,911,350	859	0.00	84,068,610	3,975,835
38. FarmSite Total				935	3,264.34	100,390,295	
39. Road & Ditches	3,122	5,260.45	0	3,127	5,266.39	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	52	987.48	1,902,575	55	992.56	1,902,575	
41. Total Section VI				1,557	10,144.54	250,585,615	4,395,105

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	4,237.97	5.38%	29,347,915	6.24%	6,924.99
46. 1A	11,490.95	14.60%	73,590,525	15.66%	6,404.22
47. 2A1	19,645.13	24.96%	123,839,760	26.35%	6,303.84
48. 2A	19,533.27	24.81%	118,196,370	25.15%	6,051.03
49. 3A1	575.70	0.73%	3,304,515	0.70%	5,739.99
50. 3A	9,345.98	11.87%	51,642,475	10.99%	5,525.64
51. 4A1	11,170.93	14.19%	56,971,780	12.12%	5,100.00
52. 4A	2,721.32	3.46%	13,110,975	2.79%	4,817.87
53. Total	78,721.25	100.00%	470,004,315	100.00%	5,970.49
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	3,785.85	2.92%	28,145,050	3.26%	7,434.27
55. 1D	44,180.57	34.03%	323,286,595	37.44%	7,317.39
56. 2D1	13,623.69	10.49%	95,464,955	11.06%	7,007.28
57. 2D	1,259.58	0.97%	8,663,545	1.00%	6,878.12
58. 3D1	1,761.14	1.36%	11,268,850	1.31%	6,398.61
59. 3D	47,033.64	36.23%	297,657,860	34.47%	6,328.62
60. 4D1	2,324.70	1.79%	13,589,250	1.57%	5,845.59
61. 4D	15,860.53	12.22%	85,368,920	9.89%	5,382.48
62. Total	129,829.70	100.00%	863,445,025	100.00%	6,650.60
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	11,255.80	43.83%	25,117,615	43.63%	2,231.53
64. 1G	8,322.43	32.41%	19,168,805	33.30%	2,303.27
65. 2G1	4,175.46	16.26%	8,870,350	15.41%	2,124.40
66. 2G	1,832.93	7.14%	4,140,220	7.19%	2,258.80
67. 3G1	15.68	0.06%	61,935	0.11%	3,949.94
68. 3G	67.75	0.26%	194,215	0.34%	2,866.64
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	9.53	0.04%	16,330	0.03%	1,713.54
71. Total	25,679.58	100.00%	57,569,470	100.00%	2,241.84
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	78,721.25	32.62%	470,004,315	33.74%	5,970.49
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	129,829.70	53.79%	863,445,025	61.98%	6,650.60
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	25,679.58	10.64%	57,569,470	4.13%	2,241.84
72. Waste	6,513.16	2.70%	977,255	0.07%	150.04
73. Other	607.53	0.25%	1,025,725	0.07%	1,688.35
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	241,351.22	100.00%	1,393,021,790	100.00%	5,771.76

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	228.74	1,547,960	298.41	1,953,705	78,194.10	466,502,650	78,721.25	470,004,315
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	84.58	570,140	93.44	630,990	129,651.68	862,243,895	129,829.70	863,445,025
<b>78. Grass</b>	57.50	185,065	63.89	136,380	25,558.19	57,248,025	25,679.58	57,569,470
<b>79. Waste</b>	2.48	370	19.40	2,910	6,491.28	973,975	6,513.16	977,255
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	607.53	1,025,725	607.53	1,025,725
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>373.30</b>	<b>2,303,535</b>	<b>475.14</b>	<b>2,723,985</b>	<b>240,502.78</b>	<b>1,387,994,270</b>	<b>241,351.22</b>	<b>1,393,021,790</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	78,721.25	32.62%	470,004,315	33.74%	5,970.49
<b>Dry Land</b>	129,829.70	53.79%	863,445,025	61.98%	6,650.60
<b>Grass</b>	25,679.58	10.64%	57,569,470	4.13%	2,241.84
<b>Waste</b>	6,513.16	2.70%	977,255	0.07%	150.04
<b>Other</b>	607.53	0.25%	1,025,725	0.07%	1,688.35
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>241,351.22</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,393,021,790</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5,771.76</b>

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 Clarkson	3	35,615	316	2,180,315	316	29,580,310	319	31,796,240	487,950
83.2 Clarkson Mh	0	0	9	76,850	10	520,760	10	597,610	0
83.3 Clarkson V	41	251,945	0	0	0	0	41	251,945	0
83.4 Howells	0	0	297	1,740,960	297	39,619,240	297	41,360,200	1,671,535
83.5 Howells Mh	0	0	2	11,750	2	37,695	2	49,445	0
83.6 Howells V	44	192,815	1	5,040	1	1,040	45	198,895	0
83.7 Leigh	0	0	217	1,527,970	217	23,406,625	217	24,934,595	1,553,300
83.8 Leigh V	35	228,515	4	13,025	4	180,820	39	422,360	155,140
83.9 Richland	0	0	46	155,325	46	2,432,250	46	2,587,575	0
83.10 Richland V	3	11,670	0	0	0	0	3	11,670	0
83.11 Rogers	0	0	35	132,880	36	1,942,680	36	2,075,560	1,100
83.12 Rogers Mh	0	0	3	6,810	3	56,715	3	63,525	0
83.13 Rogers V	6	22,955	0	0	0	0	6	22,955	0
83.14 Rural	277	2,571,100	368	20,126,950	396	88,661,765	673	111,359,815	199,245
83.15 Rural Mh	3	0	7	301,030	42	2,507,385	45	2,808,415	9,075
83.16 Rural V	91	7,394,000	2	60,000	2	354,365	93	7,808,365	5,000
83.17 Schuyler	6	159,485	1,592	33,841,420	1,593	193,532,040	1,599	227,532,945	1,931,035
83.18 Schuyler Mh	0	0	3	50,195	166	4,555,355	166	4,605,550	7,915
83.19 Schuyler Sub	10	148,950	125	7,513,595	132	33,084,055	142	40,746,600	21,780
83.20 Schuyler Sub Mh	0	0	6	138,000	60	1,166,020	60	1,304,020	0
83.21 Schuyler Sub V	41	889,595	0	0	0	0	41	889,595	0
83.22 Schuyler V	120	2,402,685	13	306,850	13	988,205	133	3,697,740	40,000
84 Residential Total	680	14,309,330	3,046	68,188,965	3,336	422,627,325	4,016	505,125,620	6,083,075

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	Clarkson	0	0	69	377,680	70	7,298,126	70	7,675,806	4,950
85.2	Clarkson V	14	67,355	0	0	0	0	14	67,355	0
85.3	Howells	0	0	55	148,685	55	3,868,495	55	4,017,180	0
85.4	Howells V	13	23,980	0	0	0	0	13	23,980	0
85.5	Leigh	0	0	56	230,040	57	5,965,945	57	6,195,985	0
85.6	Leigh Mh	0	0	1	3,190	1	129,475	1	132,665	0
85.7	Leigh V	10	35,955	0	0	0	0	10	35,955	0
85.8	Richland	0	0	9	53,910	9	1,030,825	9	1,084,735	0
85.9	Richland Mh	0	0	0	0	2	651,905	2	651,905	0
85.10	Richland V	7	20,970	0	0	0	0	7	20,970	0
85.11	Rogers	0	0	5	40,335	7	663,740	7	704,075	0
85.12	Rogers V	1	8,900	0	0	0	0	1	8,900	0
85.13	Rural	1	72,740	50	3,499,770	56	52,879,620	57	56,452,130	0
85.14	Rural Mh	0	0	0	0	1	9,580	1	9,580	0
85.15	Rural V	8	389,485	0	0	0	0	8	389,485	0
85.16	Schuyler	4	119,235	244	7,987,415	243	52,000,940	247	60,107,590	757,970
85.17	Schuyler Sub	0	0	1	64,575	1	279,300	1	343,875	0
85.18	Schuyler V	31	1,163,160	4	140,615	4	237,465	35	1,541,240	0
86	Commercial Total	89	1,901,780	494	12,546,215	506	125,015,416	595	139,463,411	762,920

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	9,898.91	43.38%	21,071,055	44.38%	2,128.62
88. 1G	7,502.95	32.88%	15,966,045	33.63%	2,127.97
89. 2G1	3,819.28	16.74%	7,363,670	15.51%	1,928.03
90. 2G	1,560.06	6.84%	3,007,795	6.33%	1,928.00
91. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
92. 3G	30.62	0.13%	55,755	0.12%	1,820.87
93. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
94. 4G	9.53	0.04%	16,330	0.03%	1,713.54
95. Total	22,821.35	100.00%	47,480,650	100.00%	2,080.54
<b>CRP</b>					
96. 1C1	619.46	31.74%	2,807,675	32.78%	4,532.46
97. 1C	652.89	33.45%	2,922,880	34.12%	4,476.83
98. 2C1	353.55	18.12%	1,502,705	17.54%	4,250.33
99. 2C	272.87	13.98%	1,132,425	13.22%	4,150.05
100. 3C1	15.68	0.80%	61,935	0.72%	3,949.94
101. 3C	37.13	1.90%	138,460	1.62%	3,729.06
102. 4C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
103. 4C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
104. Total	1,951.58	100.00%	8,566,080	100.00%	4,389.31
<b>Timber</b>					
105. 1T1	737.43	81.34%	1,238,885	81.36%	1,680.00
106. 1T	166.59	18.37%	279,880	18.38%	1,680.05
107. 2T1	2.63	0.29%	3,975	0.26%	1,511.41
108. 2T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
109. 3T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
110. 3T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
111. 4T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
112. 4T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
113. Total	906.65	100.00%	1,522,740	100.00%	1,679.52
<hr/>					
Grass Total	22,821.35	88.87%	47,480,650	82.48%	2,080.54
CRP Total	1,951.58	7.60%	8,566,080	14.88%	4,389.31
Timber Total	906.65	3.53%	1,522,740	2.65%	1,679.52
<hr/>					
114. Market Area Total	25,679.58	100.00%	57,569,470	100.00%	2,241.84



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

19 Colfax

	2023 CTL County Total	2024 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2024 form 45 - 2023 CTL)	Percent Change	2024 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	437,090,218	476,031,145	38,940,927	8.91%	6,074,000	7.52%
02. Recreational	26,734,385	29,094,475	2,360,090	8.83%	9,075	8.79%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	140,457,680	148,292,745	7,835,065	5.58%	419,270	5.28%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>604,282,283</b>	<b>653,418,365</b>	<b>49,136,082</b>	<b>8.13%</b>	<b>6,502,345</b>	<b>7.06%</b>
05. Commercial	102,568,016	111,316,566	8,748,550	8.53%	762,920	7.79%
06. Industrial	28,144,765	28,146,845	2,080	0.01%	0	0.01%
<b>07. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-6)</b>	<b>130,712,781</b>	<b>139,463,411</b>	<b>8,750,630</b>	<b>6.69%</b>	<b>762,920</b>	<b>6.11%</b>
08. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	82,143,795	100,390,295	18,246,500	22.21%	3,975,835	17.37%
09. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
10. Non Ag Use Land	1,832,665	1,902,575	69,910	3.81%		
<b>11. Total Non-Agland (sum lines 8-10)</b>	<b>83,976,460</b>	<b>102,292,870</b>	<b>18,316,410</b>	<b>21.81%</b>	<b>3,975,835</b>	<b>17.08%</b>
12. Irrigated	465,354,915	470,004,315	4,649,400	1.00%		
13. Dryland	745,398,150	863,445,025	118,046,875	15.84%		
14. Grassland	56,622,165	57,569,470	947,305	1.67%		
15. Wasteland	977,590	977,255	-335	-0.03%		
16. Other Agland	1,016,480	1,025,725	9,245	0.91%		
<b>17. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>1,269,369,300</b>	<b>1,393,021,790</b>	<b>123,652,490</b>	<b>9.74%</b>		
<b>18. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>2,088,340,824</b>	<b>2,288,196,436</b>	<b>199,855,612</b>	<b>9.57%</b>	<b>11,241,100</b>	<b>9.03%</b>

## 2024 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	One
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	NA
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	Three
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1 apprentice a few hours a day
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$309,960
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$309,960 All of the cost of health care and benefits are paid from the county general budget, not the assessor's budget.
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	0
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	There is no separate fund. The County Board approves a budget for contracted services separate from the assessor budget. For 2024 the amount was \$155,300 for the reappraisal project.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$18,000 for MIPS, \$34,000 for GIS
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$3,000
<b>12.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$26,000

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS
4.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes, the county continues to maintain the cadastral maps.
5.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor office staff
6.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
7.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	<a href="https://colfax.gworks.com">https://colfax.gworks.com</a>
8.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor office staff
9.	<b>What type of aerial imagery is used in the cyclical review of properties?</b>
	Eagleview-Pictometry
10.	<b>When was the aerial imagery last updated?</b>
	Pictometry completed second set of imagery in April of 2023

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes

<b>3.</b>	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All except Leigh
<b>4.</b>	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

**D. Contracted Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Services in Clarkson, Howells and Leigh, Residential and Commercial for 2024
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	gWorks is responsible for the public information. Sidwell has been hired to complete all parcel maintenance
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	Eagleview Pictometry

**E. Appraisal /Listing Services**

<b>1.</b>	<b>List any outside appraisal or listing services employed by the county for the current assessment year</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Services for Clarkson, Howells and Leigh, Residential and Commercial to be completed by 2024
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	To be a licensed, or certified appraiser
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Yes

## 2024 Residential Assessment Survey for Colfax County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																
	Assessor, Appraiser and Office Staff																
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation group recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Group</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>All parcels in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh; these are the medium sized towns in the county. They have K-12 schools, some shopping and business.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>All recreational parcels; this valuation group is the countywide collection of recreational cabins, mobile homes and houses usually associated with river or lake locations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>All parcels in the villages of Richland and Rogers; these are the smallest towns in the county. The towns have less than 100 parcels, no schools and few commercial parcels.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>All rural residential parcels; typically</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>All parcels in the city limits of Schuyler and in the surrounding subdivisions; this is the county seat, and the principal town in the county. It has significantly more stores, businesses, employment and services than any other town in the county.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">AG DW</td> <td>Agricultural dwelling outbuildings</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">AG OB</td> <td>Agricultural outbuildings</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	All parcels in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh; these are the medium sized towns in the county. They have K-12 schools, some shopping and business.	2	All recreational parcels; this valuation group is the countywide collection of recreational cabins, mobile homes and houses usually associated with river or lake locations.	3	All parcels in the villages of Richland and Rogers; these are the smallest towns in the county. The towns have less than 100 parcels, no schools and few commercial parcels.	4	All rural residential parcels; typically	5	All parcels in the city limits of Schuyler and in the surrounding subdivisions; this is the county seat, and the principal town in the county. It has significantly more stores, businesses, employment and services than any other town in the county.	AG DW	Agricultural dwelling outbuildings	AG OB	Agricultural outbuildings
<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																
1	All parcels in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh; these are the medium sized towns in the county. They have K-12 schools, some shopping and business.																
2	All recreational parcels; this valuation group is the countywide collection of recreational cabins, mobile homes and houses usually associated with river or lake locations.																
3	All parcels in the villages of Richland and Rogers; these are the smallest towns in the county. The towns have less than 100 parcels, no schools and few commercial parcels.																
4	All rural residential parcels; typically																
5	All parcels in the city limits of Schuyler and in the surrounding subdivisions; this is the county seat, and the principal town in the county. It has significantly more stores, businesses, employment and services than any other town in the county.																
AG DW	Agricultural dwelling outbuildings																
AG OB	Agricultural outbuildings																
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>																
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate market value, with Marshall and Swift costing used as the cost estimator. Depreciation is developed from the local market.																
<b>4.</b>	<b>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?</b>																
	Tables are developed by the county, and the Schuyler residential developed by Stanard Appraisal.																
<b>5.</b>	<b>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.</b>																
	Yes																
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																
	The county conducts an analysis of vacant lot sales as the primary method of establishing residential lot values.																
<b>7.</b>	<b>How are rural residential site values developed?</b>																
	A study was completed using vacant lot sales with additional value added with the septic, well and electrical amenities.																

**8. Are there form 191 applications on file?**

No

**9. Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?**

N/A

<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
1	2023	2022	2023	2023
2	2019	2022	2019	2018-19
3	2021	2022	2021	2021
4	2019	2022	2019	2018-19
5	2022	2022	2022	2022
AG DW	2019	2022	2019	2018-19
AG OB	2019	2022	2019	2018-19

## 2024 Commercial Assessment Survey for Colfax County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																		
	Assessor, Appraiser and Office Staff																		
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation group recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Group</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Valuation Grouping 01 consists of all parcels located within the town of Schuyler. As the county seat, this commercial district is the commercial hub for the area. This group also includes any commercial parcels located in suburban Schuyler.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Valuation Grouping 02 consists of all commercial properties in Colfax County located outside the town of Schuyler.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Valuation Grouping 01 consists of all parcels located within the town of Schuyler. As the county seat, this commercial district is the commercial hub for the area. This group also includes any commercial parcels located in suburban Schuyler.	2	Valuation Grouping 02 consists of all commercial properties in Colfax County located outside the town of Schuyler.									
<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>																		
1	Valuation Grouping 01 consists of all parcels located within the town of Schuyler. As the county seat, this commercial district is the commercial hub for the area. This group also includes any commercial parcels located in suburban Schuyler.																		
2	Valuation Grouping 02 consists of all commercial properties in Colfax County located outside the town of Schuyler.																		
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>																		
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate value in the commercial class, however, income information and comparable sales are considered when available.																		
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>																		
	The county hires specialized appraisers and searches for comparable sales in other counties.																		
<b>4.</b>	<b>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?</b>																		
	The county develops depreciation tables.																		
<b>5.</b>	<b>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.</b>																		
	Yes; in some cases depreciation is developed for individual occupancy codes or groups.																		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>																		
	Commercial lots are valued primarily using market information derived from vacant lot sales.																		
<b>7.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Group</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2022</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2022</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2022</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2023</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2023</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2023</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2023</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>	1	2022	2022	2022	2022	2	2023	2023	2023	2023
<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>															
1	2022	2022	2022	2022															
2	2023	2023	2023	2023															
	The rural commercial only was completed 2018-2019 and put on assessment for 2020.																		

## 2024 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Colfax County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>							
	Assessor, Appraiser and Office Staff							
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 65%; text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Area 1 is the only market area in the county so there are no unique characteristics that create a difference in value.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	1	Area 1 is the only market area in the county so there are no unique characteristics that create a difference in value.	2017
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
1	Area 1 is the only market area in the county so there are no unique characteristics that create a difference in value.	2017						
	<p>Land use was verified by comparing the GIS base maps from 2014 to the most recent maps from 2016. If there were any questions that were not clearly shown on the maps, the land owner was called to verify the current land use.</p> <p>*The county plans to start a land use review in the summer of 2024 and plans to develop a timeline for the entire county over a few years.</p>							
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>							
	The county plots and analyzes sales to annually monitor the potential for different markets.							
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>							
	The county calls and fills out questionnaires with an interview, verifies land use, and physically reviews parcels. They also call landowners if there are any questions from the review. If questions remain, the county will drive to the property for on-site review if the parcel is accessible.							
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not what methodology is used to determine market value?</b>							
	Yes; both have a first acre valued at \$30,000; beginning in 2022. Secondary site acres are valued at \$5,000 for both ag and rural residential sites.							
<b>6.</b>	<b>What separate market analysis has been conducted where intensive use is identified in the county?</b>							
	Since there are no feedlot sales, the county took an average of the dry land capability group values. This methodology was based on the fact that the land owner could put the land back into crop ground.							
<b>7.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>							
	The county relies on sales analysis and sales review to identify any potential influences. The county has used their own sales and also gathered and reviewed sales from nearby counties to analyze the market for WRP acres.							
<b>7a.</b>	<b>Are any other agricultural subclasses used? If yes, please explain.</b>							
	No							



	<b><u>If your county has special value applications, please answer the following</u></b>
<b>8a.</b>	<b>How many parcels have a special valuation application on file?</b>
	N/A
<b>8b.</b>	<b>What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist in the county?</b>
	No
	<b><u>If your county recognizes a special value, please answer the following</u></b>
<b>8c.</b>	<b>Describe the non-agricultural influences recognized within the county.</b>
	N/A
<b>8d.</b>	<b>Where is the influenced area located within the county?</b>
	N/A
<b>8e.</b>	<b>Describe in detail how the special values were arrived at in the influenced area(s).</b>
	N/A

COLFAX COUNTY ASSESSOR  
BILL WHITE  
411 E. 11<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
SCHUYLER, NE. 68661

June 1, 2023

I, William P. White, duly elected assessor of Colfax County, present this plan of assessment, pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, to the Colfax County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year and to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 of each year.

Respectively Submitted

William P. White  
Colfax County Assessor

## GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF COUNTY

Based on the counties abstract  
Colfax County has a total parcel count of 8,414 parcels.

Residential-----	3,761
Industrial-----	4
Commercial-----	578
Agricultural-----	3,838
Rec land-----	233
Exempt-----	520

Colfax County also processes approximately 1,200 Personal Property filings and 300 Homestead Exemptions each year.

The Colfax County Assessor's Office consists of the Assessor, Deputy Assessor/Appraiser and two full time clerks.

### **Budget**

2023 General Budget: 309,960

The general budget includes the salaries for the administrative personnel, educational classes, office supplies, office equipment, data processing costs, Sidwell services, and GIS.

### **Policy Manual**

Colfax County has a written policy manual, which is updated each year.

### **Responsibilities**

Record maintenance: Cadastral Maps

The office staff maintains the maps by keeping the ownership and descriptions current (Reg 10-004.03).

Property Record Cards: The office staff maintains the property record cards by keeping current the required legal, ownership, classification codes and changes made to the assessment information of the property (Reg. 10-004).

### **Report Generation**

County Abstract of Assessment Report for Real Property must be completed and certified by the county assessor on or before March 19, to the Property Tax Administrator (Reg.

60-004.03), (Statute 77-1514).

**Certification of Values:** Pursuant to section 13-509 and 13-518 the county assessor must certify taxable valuations to political subdivisions on or before August 20 of each year.

**School District Taxable Value Report:** Pursuant to Section 79-1016 the assessor on or before Aug. 25, shall provide the current values, by property class, for the county, school districts and supplement TIF information if applicable, to the Property Tax Administrator.

**Tax List Corrections:** Tax list corrections are generated to correct clerical errors (77-128), any overvalued, undervalued, and omitted real property.

**Generate Tax Roll:** The assessor's office will on or before November 22 complete and deliver the Tax List to the county treasurer..

**Certificate of Taxes Levied:** On or before December 1 of each year the assessor will certify to the Property Tax Administrator the total taxable valuation and the Certificate of Taxes Levied.

MIPS/County Solutions LLC of 725 S. 14<sup>th</sup> Street Lincoln, NE. 68508 maintains all of our administrative programs.

### **Homestead Exemptions**

The assessor's office on or before June 30 of each year, accepts applications for Homestead Exemption (77-3510 thru 77-3528). The assessor's office staff also helps the applicant complete the necessary forms.

### **Filing for Personal Property**

The assessor's office on or before February 1 of each year sends a letter to all persons with personal property, explaining the procedure for filing Personal Property, the penalties for late filing and requesting they bring in or mail their depreciation worksheets to the assessor's office. We then complete the Personal Property Schedule and return a copy to the taxpayer.

### **Real Property**

#### **Residential**

In 2023, Colfax County has updated the revaluation findings from Stanard Appraisal for the city of Schuyler's Residential properties for the 2023 tax year. This revaluation includes an updated land study, depreciation tables, and new Marshall & Swift pricing.

For the tax year 2023 Colfax County has hired Standard Appraisal to revalue the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh's Residential Property, conduct a land study, update depreciation tables, and new Marshall & swift pricing. This will be implemented for the tax year 2024.

In tax year 2023, Colfax County conducted aerial flights from our vendor Eagleview Pictometry. Our office will use their software, Change Finder, to conduct a review of land use and changes to buildings and improvements. This project will continue throughout 2024 with changes to be implemented for tax year 2025.

CAMA Coding: This office will be conducting a review of our CAMA coding for Residential properties. This review will focus on Residential properties in Rural/Agricultural areas but may extend to Suburban areas as well. The goal of this review is for consistency in coding for Recreational use and zoning. This project will begin in 2023, continue throughout 2024 to be implemented for tax year 2025.

In the tax year 2024 we plan on reviewing sales of the rural properties and address any problem area.

The 2023 level of value is Assessment Ratio: 96, COD 17.15 and the PRD: 103.85

### **Computerized**

Colfax County has implemented MIPS new PC Administrative system and CAMA 3.150

### **Commercial Property**

In 2023, Colfax County has updated the revaluation findings from Stanard Appraisal for the city of Schuyler's Commercial properties for the 2023 tax year. This revaluation includes an updated land study, depreciation tables, and new Marshall & Swift pricing.

For the tax year 2023 Colfax County has hired Standard Appraisal to revalue the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh's Commercial Property, conduct a land study, update depreciation tables, and new Marshall & swift pricing. This will be implemented for the tax year 2024.

In tax year 2023, Colfax County conducted aerial flights from our vendor Eagleview Pictometry. Our office will use their software Change Finder to conduct a review of land use and changes to buildings and improvements. This project will continue throughout 2024 with changes to be implemented for tax year 2025.

In the tax year 2024 we plan on reviewing commercial sales in the rural area and addressing any problem areas.

The 2023 level of value is Assessment Ratio:95 COD 18.79 and the PRD:101.64

### **Agricultural**

We have one market area in the county. When we verify our agland sales we also check with the buyer or seller regarding land use. We are continuing to update our GIS system. We are working with gWorks from Lincoln, NE.

In tax year 2023, Colfax County conducted aerial flights from our vendor Eagleview Pictometry. Our office will use their software Change Finder to conduct a review of land use and changes to buildings and improvements. This project will continue throughout 2024 with changes to be implemented for tax year 2025.

CAMA Coding: This office will be conducting a review of our CAMA coding for Agricultural properties. This review will focus on Residential properties in Rural/Agricultural areas but may extend to Suburban areas as well. The goal of this review is for consistency in coding for Recreational use and zoning. This project will begin in 2023, continue throughout 2024 to be implemented for tax year 2025

For 2023 the level of value was Assessment Ratio:74 COD: 16.97 and the PRD: 102.16

In the assessment years ahead, we plan to continue reviewing our agland sales.

### **Pick-up Work**

Pick-up work is usually started in August of each year and completed by February 1. We receive building permits monthly from the city clerks. The county in 1999 implemented zoning, which requires a zoning permit before any construction can be started, the zoning office will then submit a copy of this permit to the assessor's office, which helps us tract new construction in the rural areas.

### **Sales Review**

Real Estate Transfers (Form 521) are delivered to the assessor's office each month from the clerk's office. The assessor and the office staff complete the Real Estate Transfer Statements. The assessor or office staff does verification of sales information by contacting the buyer or seller by telephone or in person. If no response from buyer or seller we try to contact the abstractor or the realtor involved in the sales.

The assessor, appraiser and/or office staff complete drive by reviews checking for changes that are different than the current property record card. Things we look for are additional buildings, heating & cooling changes, also changes in square footage (additions to house).