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## Preface

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that "taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution." Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1 (1) (1998). The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is eighty percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2005). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2005) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of seventy-four and eighty percent of actual value; and, the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range seventy-four and eighty percent of its special value and recapture value.

To ensure that the classes of real property are assessed at these required levels of actual value, the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, hereinafter referred to as the Department, under the direction of the Property Tax Administrator, is annually responsible for analyzing and measuring the assessment performance of each county. This responsibility includes requiring the Property Tax Administrator to prepare statistical and narrative reports for the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and the county assessors. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R.S. Supp., 2005):
(2) ... the Property Tax Administrator shall prepare and deliver to the commission and to each county assessor his or her annual reports and opinions.
(3) The annual reports and opinions of the Property Tax Administrator shall contain statistical and narrative reports informing the commission of the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property within the county and a certification of the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level of value and quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in the county.
(4) In addition to an opinion of level of value and quality of assessment in the county, the Property Tax Administrator may make nonbinding recommendations for consideration by the commission.

The narrative and statistical reports contained in the Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator, hereinafter referred to as the R\&O, provide a thorough, concise analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county assessor to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The Property Tax Administrator's opinion of level of value and quality of assessment achieved by each county assessor is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Department regarding the assessment activities during the preceding year. This is done in recognition of the fact that the measurement of assessment compliance, in terms of the concepts of actual value and uniformity and proportionality mandated by Nebraska law, requires both statistical and narrative analysis.

The Department is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Department prepares an assessment sales ratio study in compliance with acceptable mass appraisal standards. The assessment sales ratio study is the primary mass appraisal performance evaluation tool. From the sales file, the Department prepares statistical analysis from a nonrandomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

However, just as the valuation of property is sometimes more art than science, a narrative analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio study. There may be instances when the analysis of assessment practices outweighs or limits the reliability of the statistical inferences of central tendency or quality measures. This may require an opinion of the level of value that is not identical to the result of the statistical calculation. The Property Tax Administrator's goal is to provide statistical and narrative analysis of the assessment level and practices to the Commission, providing the Commission with the most complete picture possible of the true level of value and quality of assessment in each county.

The Property Tax Administrator’s opinions of level of value and quality of assessment are stated as a single numeric representation for level of value and a simple judgment regarding the quality of assessment practices. Based on the information collected in developing this report the Property Tax Administrator may feel further recommendations must be stated for a county to assist the Commission in determining the level of value and quality of assessment within a county. These opinions are made only after considering all narrative and statistical analysis provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Department. An evaluation of these opinions must only be made after considering all other information provided in the R\&O.

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp.,
2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.
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## 2006 Commission Summary

Washington

| Commercial Real Property -Current |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | COD | $\mathbf{1 9 . 2 9}$ |
| Total Sales Price | 5500290 | PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 5 8}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | 5496490 | COV | 27.25 |
| Total Assessed Value | 5087645 | STD | 26.38 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | 109929.80 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 18.84 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | 101752.90 | Min | 50.33 |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 9}$ | Max | 175.46 |
| Wgt. Mean | 92.56 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 90.23 to 102.70 |
| Mean | 96.80 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 81.41 to 103.72 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 89.49 to 104.11 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 14.89
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.13
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period 2.21
Average Assessed Value of the Base 327,922

| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 5 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 40 | 98.36 | 15.22 | 108.75 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 40 | 94.25 | 20.94 | 106.19 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 39 | 95 | 19.58 | 103.11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 44 | 98 | 13.55 | 100.95 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 45 | 97 | 12.45 | 106.52 |

## 2006 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Washington County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Washington County is $94 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Washington County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Washington County is $98 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Washington County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

# 2006 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Washington County 

## Recommendations

It is my recommendation that the Tax Equalization and Review Commission make no adjustment.
Residential
Commercial
Agricultural

Dated this 10th day of April, 2006.


## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: As with last year the appraisal actions for the assessment of this property class are apparent, through the pro-active approach with the appraisal and office staff that many of the goals that were set have been achieved. These results are the product of the continued efforts for better equalization and uniformity within this class of property. The statistics that relate to the qualitative statistics have been maintained since last year's analysis. The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Department periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (1999), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 914 | 761 | 83.26 |
| 2002 | 800 | 671 | 83.88 |
| 2003 | 765 | 589 | 76.99 |
| 2004 | 861 | 593 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 8 7}$ |
| 2005 | 961 | 667 | 69.41 |
| 2006 | 1105 | 774 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 0 5}$ |

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: The sales qualification and utilization for this property class is the sole responsibility of the county assessor. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales is being utilized for the sales study, and would indicate that the county is not excessively trimming the residential sales file.

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R\&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The

## 2006 Correlation Section <br> for Washington County

analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R\&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 97 | 0.99 | 97.96 |  |
| 2002 | 94 | -0.4 | 93.62 | 98 |
| 2003 | 92 | 4.62 | 96.25 | 95 |
| 2004 | 93.48 | 2.86 | 96.16 | 94.10 |
| 2005 | 93.55 | -1.06 | 92.55 | 94.93 |
| 2006 | 91.36 | 5.32 | 96.22 | 94.36 |

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median level of value for this class of property indicates that the two percentages are somewhat similar and tend to support each other.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2006 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2006 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Change

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | 2001 | \% Change in Assessed Value <br> (excl. growth) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.01 | 2002 | 0.99 |
| 2.54 | 2003 | -0.4 |
| 3 | 2004 | 5 |
| -0.17 | 2005 | 2.86 |
| 1.54 | 2006 | -1.06 |
| 4.58 | 5.32 |  |

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: There is a less than a 1 point spread in the percent change for this property class, indicating a difference between the two units of measurement. This is not a significant difference and is not an issue.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Department: median ratio, weighted

## 2006 Correlation Section

mean ratio, and mean ratio. Because each measure of central tendency has its own strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Because the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for " indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of 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.

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 4 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 3 3}$ |

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: The median is the best indicator of the level of value for this county.

## 2006 Correlation Section <br> for Washington County

The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that the statistics for the qualified sales for this property type are all similar and all within the acceptable range.

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

IIn analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237 indicates that a COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240 indicates that a PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 11.66 | 102.37 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential are within the acceptable range as qualitative measures, and indicate a general level of good assessment uniformity for this property class as a whole.

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same
statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{7 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 4}$ | -7 |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 1 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{8 9 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ |
| Mean | $\mathbf{9 1 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 1 2}$ |
| COD | 11.76 | 11.66 | $-\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |
| PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 6}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 41.00 | 41.00 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | $\mathbf{1 7 1 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 3 . 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 7}$ |

Washington: RESIDENTIAL: The statistics for this class of property in this county represent the assessment actions completed for this property class for the 2006 assessment year.

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

Washington: COMMERCIAL: The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property. In this property class the level of value has been attained for this property class. Yet there are indicators that this class of property is not being treated proportionately. With the measure of central tendency for the weighted mean and the qualitative statistic of the price related differential indicating the assessment uniformity is not as good as could be expected. The county does have good appraisal and support staff and with continued efforts, better equalization and uniformity within this class of property can be achieved. Also it should be noted that the commercial appraisal staff spent a significant amount of time preparing for some major equalization hearings of which all concluded with the interests of the county successfully maintaining equalization. All this time in preparation took away from the actual completion of planned appraisal projects.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Department periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (1999), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

Total Sales Qualified Sales Percent Used

| 2001 | 118 | 46 | 38.98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002 | 100 | 44 | 44 |
| 2003 | 85 | 39 | 45.88 |
| 2004 | 83 | 40 | $\mathbf{4 8 . 1 9}$ |
| 2005 | 80 | 40 | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 1 4}$ |

Washington: COMMERCIAL: A review of the utilization grid reveals the percent of sales used per the combined efforts of the Department and the County. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales are being utilized for the sales file study period for this property type.

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

## 2006 Correlation Section <br> for Washington County

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R\&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R\&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 96 | 7.47 | 103.17 |  |
| 2002 | 95 | 5.98 | 100.68 | 97 |
| 2003 | 94 | 0.23 | 94.22 | 98 |
| 2004 | 86.90 | 1.77 | 88.44 | 94.25 |
| 2005 | 93.08 | -0.04 | 93.05 | 98.36 |
| 2006 | 97.69 | 0.05 | 97.74 | 97.69 |

Washington: COMMERCIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median
level of value for this class of property indicates that the two percentages are very similar and do support each other.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2006 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2006 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Change

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | 2001 | \% Change in Assessed Value <br> (excl. growth) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.29 | 2002 | 7.47 |
| 1.47 | 2003 | 5.98 |
| 2 | 2004 | 0 |
| 20.04 | 2005 | 1.77 |
| 17.54 | 2006 | -0.04 |
| 0 | 0.05 |  |

Washington: COMMERCIAL: There is an insignificant difference in the percent change for this property class, indicating little difference between the two units of measurement. This is not a significant difference and is not an issue. This relates directly to the county not changing any of the

## commercial values for this year's assessment cycle.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Department: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Because each measure of central tendency has its own strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Because the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for " indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of 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.

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 8 0}$ |

Washington: COMMERCIAL: With this information the median is the most reliable measure of the level of value for this class of property. The measures of central tendency illustrate the median and mean are within the acceptable range. But the weighted mean ratio for this class of property is not in line with the median and the mean but still falls within the acceptable range. This low weighted mean is also reflected in a high PRD and tends to indicate that the higher valued properties may (on the average) continue to be under assessed.

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

IIn analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237 indicates that a COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.
Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.
Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240 indicates that a PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 19.29 | 104.58 |
| Difference | 0 | 1.58 |

Washington: COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion on the qualified sales is within the acceptable range. The price-related differential is outside the range. This class of property must continue to be reviewed to establish closer uniformity. The limited number of qualified sales and also this property class not being a homogeneous grouping of properties or sales can contribute to a greater discrepancy with the quality statistics. This class of property may continue to be reviewed to establish closer uniformity.

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | 0 |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{9 2 . 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 7}$ |
| Mean | $\mathbf{9 6 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 5}$ |
| COD | 19.41 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 2}$ |
| PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 7}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | $\mathbf{5 0 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Max Sales Ratio | $\mathbf{1 7 5 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 5 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

Washington: COMMERCIAL: The above statistics support the actions of the assessor for this class of property for the 2006 assessment year.

## 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

|  | 2005 CTL <br> County Total | 2006 Form 45 <br> County Total | Value Difference <br> (2006 Form 45-2005 CTL) | Percent Change | 2006 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 736,886,715 | 801,552,010 | 64,665,295 | 8.78 | 25,427,235 | 5.32 |
| 2. Recreational | 1,248,515 | 1,299,380 | 50,865 | 4.07 | 31,700 | 1.54 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 199,168,285 | 220,980,210 | 21,811,925 | 10.95 | *------ | 10.95 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 937,303,515 | 1,023,831,600 | 86,528,085 | 9.23 | 25,458,935 | 6.52 |
| 5. Commercial | 108,444,110 | 111,574,470 | 3,130,360 | 2.89 | 3,102,510 | 0.03 |
| 6. Industrial | 107,643,990 | 118,298,640 | 10,654,650 | 9.9 | 10,573,860 | 0.08 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 42,700,385 | 44,324,050 | 1,623,665 | 3.8 | 8,666,835 | -16.49 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 258,788,485 | 274,197,160 | 15,408,675 | 5.95 | 13,676,370 | 0.67 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 1,196,092,000 | 1,298,031,175 | 101,939,175 | 8.52 | 47,802,140 | 4.53 |
| 11. Irrigated | 14,218,355 | 15,637,590 | 1,419,235 | 9.98 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 182,331,120 | 218,348,710 | 36,017,590 | 19.75 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 7,614,035 | 9,149,955 | 1,535,920 | 20.17 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 1719165 | 2,348,920 | 629,755 | 36.63 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 2,415 | 675 | -1,740 | -72.05 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 205,885,090 | 245,485,850 | 39,600,760 | 19.23 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,401,977,090 | 1,543,517,025 | 141,539,935 | 10.1 | 47,802,140 | 6.69 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 outbuildings is shown in line 7 .

## PA\&T 2006 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified

| NUMBER of Sales: | 774 |
| ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL Sales Price: | $92,201,501$ |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $92,150,804$ |
| TOTAL Assessed Value: | $85,810,965$ |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 119,057 |
| AVG. Assessed Value: | 110,866 |

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006
95\% Median C.I.: 93.75 to 95.42
GT. MEAN:
94 COV :
16.40

95\% Mean C.I.: 94.23 to 96.43

110,866

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs_ |  |
| 07/01/03 то 09/30/03 | 94 |
| 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 | 75 |
| 01/01/04 то 03/31/04 | 69 |
| 04/01/04 TO 06/30/04 | 132 |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 115 |
| 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 102 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 60 |
| 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 | 127 |
| __Study Years__ |  |
| 07/01/03 TO 06/30/04 | 370 |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 404 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 418 |
| _ALL |  |
|  | 774 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 98.43 | 100.53 | 97.68 |
| 96.44 | 97.37 | 95.66 |
| 98.18 | 97.09 | 98.10 |
| 92.89 | 94.76 | 92.68 |
| 94.94 | 93.95 | 91.85 |
| 92.57 | 93.93 | 92.07 |
| 92.66 | 93.18 | 90.74 |
| 91.43 | 93.30 | 89.97 |
| 96.74 | 97.19 | 95.42 |
| 93.24 | 93.62 | 91.11 |
| 94.02 | 94.72 | 93.15 |
| 94.36 | 95.33 | 93.12 |

COD
9.60
9.39
8.69
12.56
11.95
13.57
9.12
13.25
10.56
12.39
12.14
PRD
102.92
101.78
98.97
102.24
102.28
102.02
102.69
103.

101.85
102.
101.
MIN
66.85
61.44
62.32
52.69
41.88
41.00
52.64
49.70
52.69
41.00
41.00
41.00
MAX
154.9
139.1
118.9
183.5
143.69
160.2
136.79
171.02
183.51
171.02
183.51
183.

Printed: 03/29/2006 21:04:01
$11.66 \quad 102.37$
41.00
183.51
93.75 to 95.42

119,057
110,866

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: VGG. Adj. Sales Price:


94

AVG. Assessed Value:

92,201,501 $92,150,804$ 85,810,965

MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN:
MEAN :

COV:
95\% Median C.I.: 93.75 to 95.42
(!: Derived)
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

| RANGE | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: |
| 133 EST | 3 |
| ALLEN HILLS | 2 |
| ALLEN HILLS V | 11 |
| ARLINGTON V | 14 |
| BEAR | 130 |
| BLAIR V | 52 |
| BUR RIDGE | 1 |
| BUR RIDGE V | 2 |
| COOPERWOODS V | 2 |
| COUNTRYLAND | 2 |
| CREST RIDGE | 3 |
| CREST RIDGE V | 7 |
| CRYSTAL LAKE V | 7 |
| CUB | 127 |
| EAGLE | 10 |
| EAGLE VIEW | 4 |
| EAGLE VIEW V | 3 |
| FONTANELLE | 3 |
| FT CALHOUN V | 8 |
| GLYDEN BAKKE V | 2 |
| GOTTSCH 2V | 2 |
| HAWK | 19 |
| HEIDI HOLLO | 4 |
| HEIDI HOLLO V | 2 |
| HEIDI HOLLOW WEST | 4 |
| HEIDI HOLLOW WEST V | 5 |
| HERMAN | 13 |
| INDIAN | 11 |
| JENSEN ACRES | 1 |
| JENSEN ACRES V | 1 |
| KAERS | 1 |
| KAMEO | 1 |
| KAMEO 2 | 1 |
| KENNARD | 10 |
| KENNARD V | 1 |
| LAKELAND | 35 |
| LAKELAND V | 47 |
| LAKEVIEW | 1 |

# PA\&T 2006 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

774
$92,201,501$ 92,150,804 85,810,965

119, 057
110,866

| LONG CREEK V | 1 | 153.50 | 153.50 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LONGVIEW V | 1 | 99.09 | 99.09 |
| LOOKING GLASS | 4 | 99.63 | 99.71 |
| LOOKING GLASS V | 1 | 160.00 | 160.00 |
| MCGOWAN | 1 | 101.10 | 101.10 |
| MILLSTONE | 1 | 91.73 | 91.73 |
| MILLSTONE V | 17 | 102.69 | 104.02 |
| NASHVILLE | 2 | 79.09 | 79.09 |
| NORTHWOODS | 4 | 92.52 | 93.21 |
| NORTHWOODS V | 6 | 88.76 | 89.17 |
| OAK PARK 1 | 2 | 98.75 | 98.75 |
| OAK PARK 1V | 10 | 106.95 | 110.33 |
| OAK PARK 2 | 1 | 93.79 | 93.79 |
| OAK PARK 3V | 1 | 98.55 | 98.55 |
| OAK PARK 4V | 2 | 109.22 | 109.22 |
| OAK PARK V | 2 | 102.44 | 102.44 |
| OAK POINT FARMS | 1 | 106.88 | 106.88 |
| OLESON | 1 | 81.04 | 81.04 |
| PIONEER | 13 | 92.92 | 94.58 |
| RIVERSIDE V | 3 | 92.99 | 95.10 |
| ROLLING ACRES | 2 | 78.63 | 78.63 |
| ROLLING ACRES V | 3 | 69.70 | 86.52 |
| ROSENBAUM ARCES | 1 | 95.88 | 95.88 |
| RURAL | 64 | 93.76 | 92.63 |
| RURAL RES GB | 1 | 95.35 | 95.35 |
| RURAL V | 58 | 94.64 | 97.39 |
| RUTHS NASHVILLE | 6 | 69.48 | 73.63 |
| SHANNON | 2 | 96.27 | 96.27 |
| SHANNON V | 1 | 139.48 | 139.48 |
| SHERWOOD ACRES | 1 | 79.19 | 79.19 |
| SPRING VALLEY | 1 | 75.38 | 75.38 |
| SUNRISE V | 3 | 123.27 | 116.62 |
| SURREY HILLS | 1 | 88.97 | 88.97 |
| SURREY HILLS V | 1 | 61.44 | 61.44 |
| WASHINGTON | 1 | 87.96 | 87.96 |
| WASHINGTON V | 89.55 | 89.55 |  |
| WILDWOOD |  |  | 118.86 |
|  |  | 18.86 |  |

$\qquad$
95.33
(!: AVTot=0)

MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN: MEAN :

| COD: | 11.66 | MAX Sales Ratio: | 183.51 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| PRD: | 102.37 | MIN Sales Ratio: | 41.00 |

11.66 MAX Sales Ratio: $\quad 183.51$

| 94 | COV: | 16.40 | $95 \%$ Median C.I.: | 93.75 to 95.42 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 93 | STD: | 15.63 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 92.10 to 94.14 |
| 95 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 11.00 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I.: | 94.23 to 96.43 |


| 153.50 | 153.50 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 99.09 | 99.09 |
| 95.66 | 103.91 |
| 160.00 | 160.00 |
| 101.10 | 101.10 |
| 91.73 | 91.73 |


| 5.38 | 100.69 | 92.68 | 123.91 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 8.42 | 102.89 | 72.43 | 85.75 |
| 2.58 | 100.28 | 89.12 | 98.68 |


|  |  | Printed: 03/29 | 21:04:01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N/A | 55,000 | 84,425 |
|  | N/A | 56,000 | 55,490 |
|  | N/A | 155,961 | 155,823 |
|  | N/A | 1,000 | 1,600 |
|  | N/A | 250,000 | 252,740 |
|  | N/A | 285,000 | 261,430 |
| 97.27 | to 112.07 | 50,852 | 52,534 |
|  | N/A | 126,000 | 96,855 |
|  | N/A | 841,500 | 782,180 |
| 80.36 | to 99.88 | 186,750 | 166,466 |
|  | N/A | 217,304 | 214,555 |
| 86.34 | to 139.23 | 13,985 | 14,841 |
|  | N/A | 250,000 | 234,475 |
|  | N/A | 172,500 | 170,000 |
|  | N/A | 29,000 | 31,050 |
|  | N/A | 14,750 | 14,987 |
|  | N/A | 145,000 | 154,980 |
|  | N/A | 244,900 | 198,470 |
| 86.30 | to 101.66 | 168,957 | 155,629 |
|  | N/A | 63,173 | 60,000 |
|  | N/A | 233,000 | 183,155 |
|  | N/A | 38,700 | 31,365 |
|  | N/A | 200,000 | 191,750 |
| 86.55 | to 99.00 | 221,923 | 200,531 |
|  | N/A | 267,128 | 254,695 |
| 86.61 | to 101.54 | 82,483 | 75,656 |
| 52.64 | to 103.98 | 129,716 | 91,590 |
|  | N/A | 220,000 | 212,647 |
|  | N/A | 31,500 | 43,935 |
|  | N/A | 425,000 | 336,570 |
|  | N/A | 250,000 | 188,440 |
|  | N/A | 35,266 | 41,220 |
|  | N/A | 273,500 | 243,320 |
|  | N/A | 90,000 | 55,300 |
|  | N/A | 350,000 | 307,875 |
|  | N/A | 33,500 | 30,000 |
|  | N/A | 95,000 | 112,915 |
| 93.75 | to 95.42 | 119,057 | 110,866 |
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# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

92,201,50 92,150,80 85,810,965 119,057 110,866

T. MEAN:

WGT. MEAN

COD:
COD :
PRD :
02.37

95\% Median C.I.: 93.75 to 95.42
MEAN WGI. MEAN

| COV: | 16.40 |
| ---: | ---: |
| STD: | 15.63 |
| AVG.ABS.DEV: | 11.00 |
|  |  |
| Sales Ratio: | 183.51 |
| Sales Ratio: | 41.00 |

5\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 92.10 to 94.14
95\% Mean C.I.: 94.23 to 96.43

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 407 | 94.63 |
| 2 | 64 | 99.16 |
| 3 | 303 | 93.75 |

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED

| STATUS: IMPROVED, | UNIMPROVED \& IOLL |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN |
| 1 | 497 | 93.92 |
| 2 | 276 | 96.36 |
| 3 | 1 | 106.51 |



# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run
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# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run
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Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006



## PA\&T 2006 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified


## PA\&T 2006 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PA\&T 2006 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006


## PA\&T 2006 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
781
$92,462,233$
$92,411,536$
$82,626,61$
118,32
105,79

| RANGE | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/03 то 09/30/03 | 97 |
| 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 | 75 |
| 01/01/04 то 03/31/04 | 70 |
| 04/01/04 TO 06/30/04 | 133 |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 114 |
| 10/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 103 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 61 |
| 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 | 128 |
| _ Study Years |  |
| 07/01/03 то 06/30/04 | 375 |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 406 |
| Calendar Yrs_ |  |
| 01/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 420 |
| [ ALL_ |  |
|  | 781 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 96.69 | 97.35 | 94.54 |
| 92.90 | 93.83 | 92.20 |
| 94.61 | 93.27 | 95.33 |
| 90.91 | 90.40 | 88.80 |
| 92.89 | 90.11 | 88.30 |
| 90.02 | 88.80 | 87.71 |
| 87.80 | 89.35 | 86.71 |
| 86.24 | 88.53 | 85.89 |
| 93.48 | 93.42 | 92.02 |
| 89.39 | 89.16 | 87.12 |
| 91.43 | 90.41 | 89.44 |
| 91.36 | 91.21 | 89.41 |

COD
9.77
10.09
8.63
12.30
10.65
13.43
10.56
13.75
10.75
12.49
11.65
11.76

| PRD | MIN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 102.97 | 61.49 |
| 101.77 | 50.33 |
| 97.84 | 62.32 |
| 101.80 | 52.69 |
| 102.05 | 41.88 |
| 101.25 | 41.00 |
| 103.04 | 52.64 |
| 103.08 | 48.01 |
|  |  |
| 101.53 | 50.33 |
| 102.35 | 41.00 |
| 101.09 | 41.00 |
| 102.01 | 41.00 |

MA
150.8
139.13
112.80
171.4
125.5
135.32
130.30
158.53
171.44
158.
171.

95\% Median C.I.: 90.32 to 92.20
MEDIAN
91
89
91
STD:
16.21
14.78
10.74

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 88.38 to 90.44
95\% Mean C.I.: 90.17 to 92.25

Printed: 02/27/2006 15:21:53
Printed: 02/27/2006 15:21
Avg. Adj. Avg.
91.36
91.21
89.41
102.01
41.00
171.44
90.32 to 92.20

118,324
105,795

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run
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# PA\&T 2006 Preliminary Statistics <br> Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

State Stat Run

| 91 | COV: | 16.21 | $95 \%$ Median C.I.: | 90.32 to 92.20 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 89 | STD: | 14.78 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 88.38 to 90.44 |
| 91 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.74 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I.: | 90.17 to 92.25 |

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

## MEDIAN:

WGT. MEAN: MEAN : 92,411,536 82,626,610
118,324
105,795

LONG CREEK V

$$
95.75
$$ LONGVIEW V

LOOKING GLASS LOOKING GLASS V MCGOWAN MILLSTONE MILLSTONE V NASHVILLE NORTHWOODS NORTHWOODS V OAK PARK 1 OAK PARK 1V OAK PARK 2 OAK PARK 3V OAK PARK 4V OAK PARK V OAK POINT FARMS OLESON PIONEER RIVERSIDE V ROLLING ACRES ROLLING ACRES V ROSENBAUM ARCES RURAL
RURAL RES GB RURAL V RUTHS NASHVILLE SHANNON SHANNON V SHERWOOD ACRES SPRING VALLEY SUNRISE V SURREY HILLS SURREY HILLS V WASHINGTON WASHINGTON V WILDWOOD
$\qquad$ ALL___

| 1 | 95.75 | 95.75 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 135.32 | 135.32 |
| 1 | 99.09 | 99.09 |
| 4 | 99.46 | 99.62 |
| 1 | 160.00 | 160.00 |
| 1 | 95.10 | 95.10 |
| 1 | 82.38 | 82.38 |
| 17 | 98.89 | 100.04 |
| 2 | 79.09 | 79.09 |
| 4 | 91.36 | 94.77 |
| 6 | 82.57 | 82.97 |
| 2 | 97.14 | 97.14 |
| 10 | 102.36 | 99.59 |
| 1 | 89.79 | 89.79 |
| 1 | 91.45 | 91.45 |
| 2 | 74.07 | 74.07 |
| 2 | 92.14 | 92.14 |
| 1 | 99.83 | 99.83 |
| 1 | 76.96 | 76.96 |
| 13 | 91.36 | 92.96 |
| 3 | 92.99 | 95.10 |
| 2 | 74.34 | 74.34 |
| 3 | 69.70 | 86.52 |
| 1 | 90.72 | 90.72 |
| 67 | 88.33 | 87.97 |
| 1 | 98.90 | 98.90 |
| 59 | 86.61 | 89.96 |
| 6 | 68.45 | 73.28 |
| 2 | 91.71 | 91.71 |
| 1 | 107.73 | 107.73 |
| 1 | 76.18 | 76.18 |
| 1 | 71.38 | 71.38 |
| 3 | 99.31 | 98.93 |
| 1 | 85.31 | 85.31 |
| 1 | 50.33 | 50.33 |
| 1 | 87.96 | 87.96 |
| 1 | 89.55 | 89.55 |
| 1 | 111.70 | 111.70 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 |  | 9101 |


| COD : | 11.76 | MAX Sales Ratio: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRD : | 102.01 | MIN Sales Ratio: |
| 95.75 |  |  |
| 135.32 |  |  |
| 99.09 |  |  |
| 99.83 | 3.51 | 99.80 |
| 160.00 |  |  |
| 95.10 |  |  |
| 82.38 |  |  |
| 99.37 | 5.27 | 100.68 |
| 76.87 | 8.42 | 102.89 |
| 94.16 | 5.57 | 100.65 |
| 82.89 | 6.35 | 100.10 |
| 97.12 | 1.24 | 100.02 |
| 97.55 | 11.77 | 102.10 |
| 89.79 |  |  |
| 91.45 |  |  |
| 72.59 | 14.49 | 102.04 |
| 91.46 | 6.27 | 100.75 |
| 99.83 |  |  |
| 76.96 |  |  |
| 90.52 | 7.95 | 102.69 |
| 94.98 | 2.76 | 100.13 |
| 74.32 | 7.13 | 100.03 |
| 81.05 | 24.14 | 106.76 |
| 90.72 |  |  |
| 85.86 | 12.44 | 102.45 |
| 98.90 |  |  |
| 85.74 | 19.74 | 104.92 |
| 70.24 | 16.05 | 104.33 |
| 92.11 | 6.47 | 99.56 |
| 107.73 |  |  |
| 76.18 |  |  |
| 71.38 |  |  |
| 98.92 | 2.23 | 100.01 |
| 85.31 |  |  |
| 50.33 |  |  |
| 87.96 |  |  |
| 89.55 |  |  |
| 111.70 |  |  |

41.00

Printed: 02/27/2006 15:21:53

| 95.75 | 95.75 | N/A | 163,000 | 156,070 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 135.32 | 135.32 | N/A | 55,000 | 74,425 |
| 99.09 | 99.09 | N/A | 56,000 | 55,490 |
| 95.66 | 103.91 | N/A | 155,961 | 155,693 |
| 160.00 | 160.00 | N/A | 1,000 | 1,600 |
| 95.10 | 95.10 | N/A | 250,000 | 237,740 |
| 82.38 | 82.38 | N/A | 285,000 | 234,795 |
| 88.97 | 118.91 | 93.82 to 107.62 | 50,852 | 50,534 |
| 72.43 | 85.75 | N/A | 126,000 | 96,855 |
| 88.01 | 108.35 | N/A | 841,500 | 792,373 |
| 74.30 | 93.63 | 74.30 to 93.63 | 186,750 | 154,800 |
| 95.93 | 98.34 | N/A | 217,304 | 211,055 |
| 73.29 | 125.59 | 85.00 to 113.92 | 13,985 | 13,642 |
| 89.79 | 89.79 | N/A | 250,000 | 224,475 |
| 91.45 | 91.45 | N/A | 172,500 | 157,745 |
| 63.33 | 84.80 | N/A | 29,000 | 21,050 |
| 86.36 | 97.92 | N/A | 14,750 | 13,490 |
| 99.83 | 99.83 | N/A | 145,000 | 144,750 |
| 76.96 | 76.96 | N/A | 244,900 | 188,470 |
| 79.30 | 110.88 | 84.85 to 99.86 | 168,957 | 152,938 |
| 92.31 | 100.00 | N/A | 63,173 | 60,000 |
| 69.03 | 79.64 | N/A | 233,000 | 173,155 |
| 69.70 | 120.17 | N/A | 38,700 | 31,365 |
| 90.72 | 90.72 | N/A | 200,000 | 181,430 |
| 45.30 | 135.02 | 83.67 to 91.83 | 216,109 | 185,561 |
| 98.90 | 98.90 | N/A | 267,128 | 264,200 |
| 41.88 | 171.44 | 78.90 to 93.47 | 81,127 | 69,558 |
| 52.64 | 103.98 | 52.64 to 103.98 | 129,716 | 91,112 |
| 85.78 | 97.64 | N/A | 220,000 | 202,647 |
| 107.73 | 107.73 | N/A | 31,500 | 33,935 |
| 76.18 | 76.18 | N/A | 425,000 | 323,755 |
| 71.38 | 71.38 | N/A | 250,000 | 178,440 |
| 95.42 | 102.06 | N/A | 35,266 | 34,886 |
| 85.31 | 85.31 | N/A | 273,500 | 233,320 |
| 50.33 | 50.33 | N/A | 90,000 | 45,300 |
| 87.96 | 87.96 | N/A | 350,000 | 307,875 |
| 89.55 | 89.55 | N/A | 33,500 | 30,000 |
| 111.70 | 111.70 | N/A | 95,000 | 106,115 |
| 41.00 | 171.44 | 90.32 to 92.20 | 118,324 | 105,795 |

Exhibit 89 - Page 37

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:

91
MEDIAN:
92,462,233
92,411,536
82,626,610
118, 324
105,795
COV: 16.21 95\% Median C.I.: 90.32 to 92.20 (!: Derived)
MEAN: STD: 14.78 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 88.38 to 90.44

$$
\text { 95\% Mean C.I.: } 90.17 \text { to } 92.25
$$

| LOCATIONS: URBAN, | SUBURBAN | \& RURAL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN |
| 1 | 410 | 91.36 |
| 2 | 66 | 91.98 |
| 3 | 305 | 91.31 |
|  |  |  |

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

## 92,462,233

 92,411,536 82,626,610 118,32491
COV: $\quad 16.21$
STD: $\quad 14.78$
AVG.ABS.DEV: 10.74
MEDIAN:
T. MEAN:

MEAN :

COD:
RD: $\quad 1.76$ MAX Sales Ratio:
PRD: 102.01 MIN Sales Ratio: 41.00

95\% Median C.I.: 90.32 to 92.20
(!: Derived)

95\% Mean C.I.: 90.17 to 92.25

Printed: 02/27/2006 15:21:53

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| O OR Blank | 294 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 3 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 15 |
| 1900 TO 1919 | 91 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 23 |
| 1940 TO 1949 | 9 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 36 |
| 1960 TO 1969 | 35 |
| 1970 TO 1979 | 87 |
| 1980 TO 1989 | 35 |
| 1990 TO 1994 | 34 |
| 1995 TO 1999 | 48 |
| 2000 TO Present | 71 |
| ALL_工 |  |

MEDIAN
92.51
85.78
95.92
89.72
91.38
88.67
86.55
87.57
89.96
88.89
91.19
89.42
97.19

| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 92.41 | 88.47 |
| 88.97 | 86.54 |
| 95.91 | 93.38 |
| 88.78 | 86.46 |
| 88.79 | 87.47 |
| 84.32 | 82.52 |
| 88.93 | 88.56 |
| 90.14 | 88.86 |
| 90.61 | 89.24 |
| 88.02 | 86.73 |
| 89.40 | 88.74 |
| 89.50 | 89.74 |
| 96.13 | 94.21 |

COD
14.77
9.96
11.96
12.13
8.55
8.23
9.23
11.79
10.12
6.97
8.27
7.74
7.19

| PRD | MIN | MAX | $95 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 104.45 | 41.00 | 171.44 | 90. |


|  |  | 781 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| SALE PRICE * |  |  |  |
| RANGE |  |  |  |
| LOW \$ |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 8 | 1 |


| 1 TO | 4999 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 5000 | 124 |  |
| TO | 9999 | 36 |


| 1 TO | 9999 | 44 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 78 |


| 60000 TO | 99999 | 130 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 175 |

15000 TO 149999 | 175 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 249999 | 171 |

250000 TO 499999
$500000+$ $\qquad$
MEAN WGT

| 124.74 | 121.68 | 119.42 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 94.28 | 91.53 | 90.29 |
|  |  |  |
| 97.18 | 97.01 | 93.03 |
| 96.38 | 96.87 | 96.58 |
| 94.65 | 94.62 | 94.30 |
| 90.18 | 89.84 | 89.75 |
| 88.23 | 88.59 | 88.73 |
| 91.67 | 89.74 | 89.71 |
| 86.79 | 86.86 | 86.86 |
| 91.36 | 89.24 | 89.82 |
|  |  |  |
| 91.36 | 91.21 | 89.41 |

20.59
12.14
15.46
12.58
14.60
11.35
10.93
8.57
10.29
7.73
11.76
101.90
101.37
104.28
100.31
100.34
100.10
99.84
100.04
100.00
99.35
75.00
52.69
52.69
49.70
41.00
50.33
57.44
41.88
61.49
71.58

41.00

| 160.00 | 75.00 to 160.00 | 3,287 | 3,926 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 122.10 | 85.86 | to 100.00 | 7,025 | 6,343 |
|  |  |  | 6,346 | 5,903 |
| 160.00 | 87.34 to 100.45 | 21,416 | 20,683 |  |
| 138.46 | 92.04 to 100.00 | 44,882 | 42,322 |  |
| 171.44 | 91.35 to 97.78 | 79,688 | 71,519 |  |
| 128.71 | 88.02 to 93.15 | 123,853 | 109,892 |  |
| 150.86 | 85.60 to 90.58 | 185,927 | 166,792 |  |
| 112.80 | 89.97 to 93.47 | 311,922 | 270,936 |  |
| 108.17 | 82.61 to 91.17 | 730,857 | 656,458 |  |
| 108.35 | 71.58 to 108.35 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 118,324 | 105,795 |

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value
781
$92,462,233$
$92,411,536$
$82,626,610$
118,324
105,795

95\% Median C.I.: 90.32 to 92.20
(!: Derived)

|  | 91 | COV: | 16.21 | STD | 14.78 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| GT. MEAN: | 89 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 88.38 to 90.44 |  |  |


| RANGE | COUNT |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOW \$ |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 |
| 5 |  |


| 1 TO | 4999 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5000 тO | 9999 | 40 |
| Total \$ |  |  |
| 1 то | 9999 | 45 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 89 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 130 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 178 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 152 |
| 150000 то | 249999 | 151 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 31 |
| 500000 + |  | 5 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96.00 | 97.27 | 76.21 |
| 95.65 | 95.85 | 92.59 |
| 96.00 | 96.01 | 91.59 |
| 92.20 | 92.42 | 89.09 |
| 92.19 | 90.78 | 88.02 |
| 88.29 | 89.50 | 86.18 |
| 91.67 | 90.46 | 89.76 |
| 93.47 | 92.21 | 90.72 |
| 91.90 | 90.64 | 89.22 |
| 91.36 | 94.15 | 93.80 |


|  | 171.41. |
| :--- | :--- |


|  | 781 | 91.36 | 91.21 | 89.41 | 11.76 | 102.01 | 41.00 | 171.44 | 90.32 to 92.20 | 118,324 | 105,795 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 293 | 92.50 | 92.29 | 88.44 | 14.78 | 104.35 | 41.00 | 171.44 | 90.91 to 94.34 | 51,171 | 45,257 |
| 20 | 14 | 92.40 | 98.15 | 93.31 | 16.53 | 105.19 | 73.89 | 140.58 | 81.62 to 116.18 | 64,171 | 59,875 |
| 25 | 21 | 89.93 | 91.51 | 91.14 | 10.74 | 100.40 | 66.41 | 119.69 | 84.60 to 99.74 | 80,247 | 73,135 |
| 30 | 282 | 89.49 | 89.22 | 87.91 | 9.97 | 101.48 | 52.64 | 135.02 | 87.91 to 91.04 | 125,135 | 110,011 |
| 35 | 65 | 89.97 | 89.10 | 88.20 | 9.51 | 101.02 | 62.32 | 121.77 | 86.79 to 93.25 | 168,698 | 148,789 |
| 40 | 86 | 95.05 | 94.47 | 92.77 | 7.59 | 101.84 | 71.31 | 122.06 | 93.60 to 97.64 | 222,131 | 206,062 |
| 45 | 7 | 95.39 | 91.73 | 90.89 | 7.08 | 100.92 | 79.37 | 100.91 | 79.37 to 100.91 | 289,397 | 263,044 |
| 50 | 7 | 84.03 | 87.16 | 84.91 | 10.21 | 102.66 | 71.58 | 107.17 | 71.58 to 107.17 | 448,000 | 380,397 |
| 60 | 6 | 91.50 | 95.12 | 94.34 | 5.33 | 100.83 | 88.01 | 108.35 | 88.01 to 108.35 | 719,333 | 678,641 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 781 | 91.36 | 91.21 | 89.41 | 11.76 | 102.01 | 41.00 | 171.44 | 90.32 to 92.20 | 118,324 | 105,795 |

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 



# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 



# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006 

State Stat Run


## 2006 Assessment Practices Survey for Washington County

March 20, 2006

## I. General Office

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

The Washington County Assessor is a duly elected county official who holds a current assessor certificate issued by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation and has obtained adequate continuing education to hold said certificate.

1. Deputy on staff: One, who also holds a current assessor certificate.
2. Appraiser(s) on staff: Two
3. Other full-time employees: Three
4. Other part-time employees: One part-time employee who is a certified general appraiser.
5. Number of shared employees: None
6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 9 , 6 5 5}$
a. Does this include employee benefits? No, the employee benefits are paid out of the county general budget.
7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system: Computer fund and GIS fund is a shared budget between several county offices. And not a budget item in the assessors budget.
8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 9 , 6 5 5}$
a. Does this amount include employee benefits? No, the employee benefits are paid out of the county general budget.
9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: The appraisal funds are included in the office budget.
10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 0 9 0}$
11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget: These funds are maintained as part of the total budget.
12. Other miscellaneous funds: These funds are also maintained as part of the total budget.
13. Total budget $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 9 , 6 5 5}$
a. Was any of last year's budget not used? A little over $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0}$, new maps did not cost as much as budgeted. Note: Budget moneys not used are turned back to the county general budget. The County Board maintains an understanding that the next years budget will not be reduced for budgeted funds that are not used and are returned to the county general budget.

## B. Residential Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by: Appraisal staff
2. Valuation done by: Appraisal staff
3. Date of last appraisal: ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$

Urban: 2004
Suburban: 2004
Rural: 2004
Blair city will be adjusted by 6 percent, but the re-listing and reappraisal will be implemented for the 2007 assessment cycle. Other adjustments as needed by subclass until total reappraisal is completed and implemented.
4. Date of last "update": ${ }^{2}$

Urban: 2004
Suburban: 2004
Rural: 2004
The appraisal updates at this time correspond with the previous reappraisal.
5. Pickup work done by: ${ }^{3}$ Appraisal staff

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | $\mathbf{2 3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 9 0}$ |

An approximate 5 percent increase over last year's numbers.
6. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
Urban: 2005
Suburban: 2005
Rural: 2005
7. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?

Urban: 2004
Suburban: 2004
Rural: 2004
8. What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? ${ }^{4}$
Urban: N/A
Suburban: N/A
Rural: N/A
9. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:

Urban: 200
Suburban: 20
Rural: 235
10. How are these defined? The market areas are identified by subdivision boundaries.
C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by: Contract Appraiser
2. Valuation done by: Contract Appraiser
3. Date of last appraisal: ${ }^{1}$

Commercial: 2001
Industrial: 2001
4. Date of last "update": ${ }^{2}$

Commercial: 2001
Industrial: 2001
5. Pickup work done by whom: ${ }^{3}$ Contract Appraiser

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{6 4}$ |
| Industrial | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |

An approximate 5 percent increase over last year's numbers.
6. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
Commercial: 2001
Industrial: 2001
7. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information?
Commercial: 2003
Industrial: 2003
8. When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? ${ }^{5}$ Commercial: 2002
9. When was the last time that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? ${ }^{4}$ Urban: N/A
10. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
11. How are these defined? At this time the commercial market areas are defined by the down town zoned area of Blair and then all other commercially zoned areas. The industrial area is defined by zoning.

## D. Agricultural Appraisal Information

Last appraisal dates were reported. There are areas where appraisals have taken place last in 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004.

1. Data collection done by: Appraisal staff
2. Valuation done by: Appraisal staff
3. Date of last appraisal: ${ }^{1}$

Suburban: 2004
Rural: 2004
Agricultural: 2004
The market is reviewed every year and changes are made to the assessment to reflect changes in the market.
4. Date of last "update": ${ }^{2}$

Since the market is reviewed every year and change are made to the assessment that reflect changes to the market an update follows the same time frame as the appraisal.
5. Pickup work done by whom: ${ }^{3}$ Appraisal staff

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural | $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ |

6. When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? ${ }^{5}$ This approach to agricultural land values is not used.
7. When was the last date that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? ${ }^{4}$ The county uses market information to value the agricultural land but do not use the sales comparison approach to value.
8. What is the date of the soil survey currently used? 1964
9. What date was the last countywide land use study completed? 2000
a. By what method? Physical inspection
b. By whom? Appraisal staff
c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? The county does not feel they are current with present land use. But anytime an owner requests a change the changes have to be supported by FSA documentation. Land use does not rapidly change in this county.
10. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:

Recapture values are maintained in $\mathbf{1 6}$ market areas.
Special value is maintained across the whole county or one market area.
11. How are these defined? Market influences by location identify the market area lines which are implemented around transportation corridors and urban areas. Many of the market areas are graduate transition areas which help transition market values across the whole county.
12. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? Yes

## E. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1. Administrative software: TerraScan
2. CAMA software: TerraScan
3. Cadastral maps or GIS software: Cadastral maps printed in 1989-Other GIS Vender
a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? Assessor's office staff and this paper cadastral map is the official record for the county. Updates are maintained between the assessors and the surveyor's offices in a cooperative manner. b. Who maintains the GIS software and maps? Assessor's office staff also there is cooperation with the surveyor's office.
4. Personal Property software: TerraScan

## F. Zoning Information

1. Does the county have zoning? Yes
a. If so, is the zoning county wide? Yes
b. What municipalities in the county are zoned?

Arlington Blair *

Kennard
*County Seat
c. When was zoning implemented? 1970 but there have been updates to the original plan.

## G. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services: Bill Kaiser is a contract appraiser for the commercial and industrial class of properties.
2. Other Services: Terra Scan is contracted for support for the administrative and appraisal software maintenance. Applied Data Consultants has been contracted for help with the GIS programming and maintenance.

## Assessment Actions

2006 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

1. Residential: The county appraisal staff reappraised Blair city, but do to some inconsistencies from the update of the Marshall and Swift pricing to June 2005 the final product, the final values were not implemented. But Blair city analysis indicated a need to increase the original values by six percent. And in the village of Fort Calhoun the market indicated an increase of two percent to the improvements only was necessary.
2. Commercial: The contract appraiser worked (as planned) to reappraise the down town area of Blair city and Fort Calhoun. The county is switching from costing from the Marshall and Swift Manual to the Marshall and Swift pricing structure in the Terra Scan programming. But this project was not completed this year due to the time needed to prepare for three equalization cases that were being prepared to be heard in front of the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. These were significant cases that were eventually dropped at the last minute leaving the assessed values stand.
3. Agricultural:

Special Value - Based on preliminary analysis provided to the county by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation indicated the level of value for Special Value to be below the range. This analysis indicated a need for the county to increase the values for the dry land and the grass

# land to be increased by 20 percent and the irrigated increased by 10 percent. 

## Recapture Value - Based on sales (the market) adjustments were needed on a select group of market areas, most of the market areas values did not indicate a need to change from previous values.

Endnotes:
${ }^{1}$ Appraisal is defined by Regulation 50-001.02 as, "Appraisal shall mean a written opinion of value of real property. An appraisal shall set forth an opinion of value of an adequately described property, as of a specified date, and shall be supported by an analysis of relevant data. For the purposes of property taxation, appraisal, reappraisal, and mass appraisal are interchangeable terms; except, reappraisal may mean a subsequent or second appraisal needed to correct an error in an appraisal." Also, per 50-001.03, "Appraisal process shall mean a systematic analysis of the factors that affect the value of real property...it shall include the grouping of similar properties so that all properties within a class or subclass are collectively examined and valued."


#### Abstract

${ }^{2}$ Appraisal update is defined by Regulation 50-001.05 as, "Appraisal update shall mean an appraisal in which all or part of the data collection process is determined to be unnecessary (a limited appraisal) but there is a need to adjust values on all of the properties within a defined class or subclass. This includes, but is not limited to a recalibration of a market model or cost model involving implementation of more current cost data or adjustments to value by a percentage, and applied uniformly to all property within a defined class or subclass of property."


${ }^{3}$ Pickup work is defined by Regulation 50-001.06 as, "the collection of specific data relating to new construction, remodeling, additions, alterations, and removals of existing buildings or structures..."
${ }^{4}$ Regulation 50-001.16 defines sales comparison approach "shall mean a process of analyzing sales of similar recently sold properties in order to derive an indication of the most probable sales price of the property being appraised."
${ }^{5}$ Regulation 50-001.15 "Income Approach shall mean the approach to value that converts anticipated benefits (dollar income or amenities) to be derived from the ownership of property into a value estimate. Anticipated future income and/or reversions are discounted to a present worth figure through the capitalization process."
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## County 89 - Washington

| Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF) |  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Total <br> Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  | Rural |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records |  | Value | Records | Value |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |


|  | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Records | Value |  |  |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |


| Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Exempt | 290 | 18 | 251 | 559 |



Exhibit 89 - Page 56

County 89 - Washington
Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail

| Schedule V. Agricultural Records. | Records |  | Value |  | Acr | 位 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 118 | 119.000 | 4,403,675 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 119 |  | 15,238,925 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 133 | 131.270 | 231,720 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 121 | 202.500 | 840,485 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 0 |  | 0 | 124 |  | 2,284,740 |

2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Urban
38. FarmSite Total


| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 384 | 15,956.990 | 18,481,905 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 38,998,865 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 3,493 | 199,131.780 | 225,283,180 | 3,877 | 215,088.770 | 243,765,085 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 445,381,405 |  |  | 484,380,270 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 323.380 | 654,855 | 323.380 | 654,855 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 268.600 | 530,495 | 268.600 | 530,495 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 31.000 | 50,220 | 475.640 | 770,535 | 506.640 | 820,755 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 248.000 | 352,160 | 248.000 | 352,160 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 730.340 | 887,380 | 730.340 | 887,380 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 52.320 | 51,795 | 52.320 | 51,795 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 785 | 184.000 | 144,445 | 185.000 | 145,230 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 26,980 | 38.000 | 26,980 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 32.000 | 51,005 | 2,320.280 | 3,418,645 | 2,352.280 | 3,469,650 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 121.370 | 217,855 | 3,637.490 | 6,536,905 | 3,758.860 | 6,754,760 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 104.340 | 184,160 | 11,216.000 | 19,804,525 | 11,320.340 | 19,988,685 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 232.450 | 384,710 | 13,098.350 | 21,689,230 | 13,330.800 | 22,073,940 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 225.520 | 298,820 | 2,719.100 | 3,613,760 | 2,944.620 | 3,912,580 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 75.210 | 83,115 | 7,127.490 | 7,909,825 | 7,202.700 | 7,992,940 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 75.240 | 81,260 | 5,232.330 | 5,672,080 | 5,307.570 | 5,753,340 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 234.500 | 195,805 | 13,201.930 | 10,977,960 | 13,436.430 | 11,173,765 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 29.500 | 18,690 | 1,651.790 | 1,007,595 | 1,681.290 | 1,026,285 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,098.130 | 1,464,415 | 57,884.480 | 77,211,880 | 58,982.610 | 78,676,295 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 153.360 | 144,155 | 153.360 | 144,155 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 14,110 | 1,082.050 | 898,110 | 1,099.050 | 912,220 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 16.000 | 12,160 | 267.480 | 203,280 | 283.480 | 215,440 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 22.000 | 15,070 | 799.500 | 556,865 | 821.500 | 571,935 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 3,050 | 860.030 | 534,350 | 865.030 | 537,400 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 3,000 | 366.370 | 183,185 | 372.370 | 186,185 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 35.000 | 14,000 | 824.500 | 329,800 | 859.500 | 343,800 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 6,120 | 191.000 | 68,760 | 208.000 | 74,880 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 118.000 | 67,510 | 4,544.290 | 2,918,505 | 4,662.290 | 2,986,015 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 234.600 | 30,835 | 1,652.470 | 253,280 | 1,887.070 | 284,115 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,482.730 | 1,613,765 | 66,401.520 | 83,802,310 | 67,884.250 | 85,416,075 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
2

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 73.990 | 149,835 | 43.000 | 87,075 | 116.990 | 236,910 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 33.500 | 66,165 | 14.000 | 27,650 | 47.500 | 93,815 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.000 | 115,020 | 134.000 | 217,080 | 205.000 | 332,100 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 67.720 | 96,165 | 11.000 | 15,620 | 78.720 | 111,785 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 115.620 | 140,480 | 115.620 | 140,480 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,980 | 22.000 | 21,780 | 24.000 | 23,760 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 21.000 | 16,485 | 15.000 | 11,775 | 36.000 | 28,260 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 4,970 | 6.000 | 4,260 | 13.000 | 9,230 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 276.210 | 450,620 | 360.620 | 525,720 | 636.830 | 976,340 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 157.860 | 283,360 | 1,046.820 | 1,879,050 | 1,204.680 | 2,162,410 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 176.390 | 311,330 | 2,506.900 | 4,424,740 | 2,683.290 | 4,736,070 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 31.760 | 52,560 | 256.250 | 424,095 | 288.010 | 476,655 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 353.060 | 467,805 | 1,397.630 | 1,853,570 | 1,750.690 | 2,321,375 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 1,105 | 43.500 | 48,070 | 44.500 | 49,175 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 48.070 | 51,915 | 1,305.140 | 1,409,550 | 1,353.210 | 1,461,465 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 238.470 | 197,930 | 5,619.990 | 4,665,620 | 5,858.460 | 4,863,550 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 36.000 | 21,960 | 1,501.500 | 915,920 | 1,537.500 | 937,880 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,042.610 | 1,387,965 | 13,677.730 | 15,620,615 | 14,720.340 | 17,008,580 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.190 | 14,280 | 34.810 | 32,720 | 50.000 | 47,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 20,750 | 393.340 | 326,470 | 418.340 | 347,220 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 5,320 | 7.000 | 5,320 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 15,755 | 101.790 | 69,725 | 124.790 | 85,480 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 2,440 | 11.500 | 7,015 | 15.500 | 9,455 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 2,000 | 138.000 | 69,000 | 142.000 | 71,000 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 49.000 | 19,600 | 1,133.890 | 453,555 | 1,182.890 | 473,155 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 39.980 | 14,395 | 675.250 | 243,085 | 715.230 | 257,480 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 160.170 | 89,220 | 2,495.580 | 1,206,890 | 2,655.750 | 1,296,110 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 62.230 | 9,335 | 1,523.250 | 228,500 | 1,585.480 | 237,835 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,541.220 | 1,937,140 | 18,057.180 | 17,581,725 | 19,598.400 | 19,518,865 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.400 | 45,360 | 273.500 | 553,840 | 295.900 | 599,200 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 99.250 | 196,020 | 634.220 | 1,252,590 | 733.470 | 1,448,610 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 242.590 | 392,995 | 892.800 | 1,446,335 | 1,135.390 | 1,839,330 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 2,840 | 15.000 | 21,300 | 17.000 | 24,140 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 42.500 | 47,125 | 2,789.020 | 2,858,175 | 2,831.520 | 2,905,300 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 3.270 | 3,235 | 45.000 | 44,550 | 48.270 | 47,785 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 68.500 | 53,780 | 68.500 | 53,780 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 412.010 | 687,575 | 4,718.040 | 6,230,570 | 5,130.050 | 6,918,145 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.660 | 44,265 | 631.770 | 1,134,025 | 656.430 | 1,178,290 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 112.420 | 198,425 | 1,720.030 | 3,035,850 | 1,832.450 | 3,234,275 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 201.530 | 333,530 | 1,525.300 | 2,523,660 | 1,726.830 | 2,857,190 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 4.750 | 6,295 | 443.690 | 587,890 | 448.440 | 594,185 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 178.100 | 166,140 | 6,379.440 | 5,961,180 | 6,557.540 | 6,127,320 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 3.500 | 3,780 | 54.000 | 58,320 | 57.500 | 62,100 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 387.050 | 321,250 | 387.050 | 321,250 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 58.260 | 35,540 | 58.260 | 35,540 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 524.960 | 752,435 | 11,199.540 | 13,657,715 | 11,724.500 | 14,410,150 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.320 | 300 | 13.460 | 12,650 | 13.780 | 12,950 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 31.150 | 25,855 | 31.150 | 25,855 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,280 | 129.610 | 98,505 | 132.610 | 100,785 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.740 | 7,355 | 10.740 | 7,355 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 130.370 | 76,480 | 130.370 | 76,480 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 49.100 | 24,550 | 49.100 | 24,550 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 133.160 | 53,265 | 133.160 | 53,265 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 1,080 | 36.000 | 12,960 | 39.000 | 14,040 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 6.320 | 3,660 | 533.590 | 311,620 | 539.910 | 315,280 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 31.630 | 4,745 | 1,484.540 | 219,400 | 1,516.170 | 224,145 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 974.920 | 1,448,415 | 17,935.710 | 20,419,305 | 18,910.630 | 21,867,720 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
4

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 54,675 | 27.000 | 54,675 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 154.520 | 250,320 | 154.520 | 250,320 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 168.030 | 238,605 | 168.030 | 238,605 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 990 | 1.000 | 990 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 10,205 | 13.000 | 10,205 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 6,390 | 9.000 | 6,390 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 372.550 | 561,185 | 372.550 | 561,185 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.500 | 81,675 | 399.180 | 716,530 | 444.680 | 798,205 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 24,710 | 173.240 | 305,775 | 187.240 | 330,485 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 164.010 | 271,445 | 565.270 | 935,530 | 729.280 | 1,206,975 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 25.630 | 33,960 | 165.790 | 219,665 | 191.420 | 253,625 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 8,840 | 62.750 | 69,340 | 70.750 | 78,180 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 14,040 | 117.890 | 127,320 | 130.890 | 141,360 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 46.000 | 38,180 | 156.170 | 129,630 | 202.170 | 167,810 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 9,150 | 104.960 | 64,025 | 119.960 | 73,175 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 331.140 | 482,000 | 1,745.250 | 2,567,815 | 2,076.390 | 3,049,815 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 74.210 | 69,755 | 74.210 | 69,755 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.280 | 11,020 | 13.280 | 11,020 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 8,360 | 52.780 | 40,110 | 63.780 | 48,470 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 26,030 | 38.000 | 26,030 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,220 | 2.000 | 1,220 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 1,500 | 24.000 | 12,000 | 27.000 | 13,500 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 4,000 | 74.360 | 29,745 | 84.360 | 33,745 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 7,200 | 131.950 | 47,505 | 151.950 | 54,705 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 44.000 | 21,060 | 410.580 | 237,385 | 454.580 | 258,445 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 163.430 | 16,320 | 1,840.490 | 229,080 | 2,003.920 | 245,400 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 538.570 | 519,380 | 4,368.870 | 3,595,465 | 4,907.440 | 4,114,845 |



| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 8,460 | 245.850 | 231,105 | 254.850 | 239,565 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 199.490 | 165,575 | 199.490 | 165,575 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,280 | 31.000 | 23,560 | 34.000 | 25,840 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 40.300 | 27,610 | 40.300 | 27,610 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.850 | 12,110 | 19.850 | 12,110 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 192.980 | 96,490 | 192.980 | 96,490 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 3,200 | 139.000 | 55,600 | 147.000 | 58,800 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 43.500 | 15,660 | 43.500 | 15,660 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 13,940 | 911.970 | 627,710 | 931.970 | 641,650 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 70.310 | 10,545 | 575.580 | 84,840 | 645.890 | 95,385 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,595.100 | 3,348,695 | 28,407.860 | 36,555,300 | 31,002.960 | 39,903,995 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 6,075 | 3.000 | 6,075 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 11,850 | 6.000 | 11,850 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 17,925 | 9.000 | 17,925 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 186.200 | 334,240 | 227.130 | 407,705 | 413.330 | 741,945 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 119.760 | 219,760 | 1,151.120 | 2,031,785 | 1,270.880 | 2,251,545 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 128.670 | 212,970 | 385.660 | 638,275 | 514.330 | 851,245 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 22.370 | 29,650 | 433.970 | 579,915 | 456.340 | 609,565 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 7,735 | 97.530 | 107,770 | 104.530 | 115,505 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 118.260 | 136,400 | 754.560 | 817,685 | 872.820 | 954,085 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 157.020 | 130,320 | 1,603.050 | 1,330,560 | 1,760.070 | 1,460,880 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 185.230 | 112,990 | 1,261.710 | 769,610 | 1,446.940 | 882,600 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 924.510 | 1,184,065 | 5,914.730 | 6,683,305 | 6,839.240 | 7,867,370 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,820 | 28.720 | 26,995 | 31.720 | 29,815 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 11,620 | 159.780 | 132,625 | 173.780 | 144,245 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.530 | 22,445 | 29.530 | 22,445 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,370 | 85.070 | 58,280 | 87.070 | 59,650 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 10,370 | 17.000 | 10,370 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 11.920 | 5,960 | 91.590 | 45,795 | 103.510 | 51,755 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.690 | 6,280 | 334.710 | 133,890 | 350.400 | 140,170 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 1,800 | 413.910 | 149,015 | 418.910 | 150,815 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 51.610 | 29,850 | 1,160.310 | 579,415 | 1,211.920 | 609,265 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 183.420 | 51,290 | 1,510.930 | 396,425 | 1,694.350 | 447,715 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 450 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 450 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 5.230 |  | 5.230 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,162.540 | 1,265,655 | 8,594.970 | 7,677,070 | 9,757.510 | 8,942,725 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
7

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 134.500 | 272,365 | 134.500 | 272,365 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 61.000 | 120,475 | 59.000 | 116,525 | 120.000 | 237,000 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 343.650 | 556,715 | 343.650 | 556,715 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 7,100 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 7,100 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 551.590 | 670,190 | 551.590 | 670,190 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 66.000 | 127,575 | 1,088.740 | 1,615,795 | 1,154.740 | 1,743,370 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 117.360 | 210,660 | 509.610 | 914,755 | 626.970 | 1,125,415 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 258.340 | 455,970 | 431.160 | 760,990 | 689.500 | 1,216,960 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 504.370 | 834,730 | 1,004.140 | 1,660,655 | 1,508.510 | 2,495,385 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 149.530 | 198,130 | 118.830 | 157,450 | 268.360 | 355,580 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 98.980 | 109,375 | 997.320 | 1,083,255 | 1,096.300 | 1,192,630 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,240 | 3.000 | 3,240 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 65.000 | 53,950 | 312.130 | 259,065 | 377.130 | 313,015 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 9,150 | 17.280 | 10,540 | 32.280 | 19,690 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,208.580 | 1,871,965 | 3,393.470 | 4,849,950 | 4,602.050 | 6,721,915 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,880 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,880 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 11,620 | 15.340 | 12,730 | 29.340 | 24,350 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 6,080 | 9.000 | 6,840 | 17.000 | 12,920 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 5,480 | 13.500 | 9,250 | 21.500 | 14,730 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 12.000 | 7,320 | 12.000 | 7,320 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 32.000 | 12,800 | 26.500 | 10,600 | 58.500 | 23,400 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 1,800 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 1,800 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 69.000 | 39,660 | 76.340 | 46,740 | 145.340 | 86,400 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 306.230 | 45,940 | 398.280 | 49,050 | 704.510 | 94,990 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,649.810 | 2,085,140 | 4,956.830 | 6,561,535 | 6,606.640 | 8,646,675 |


| County 89 - Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Tota <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 12.050 | 21,630 | 159.320 | 285,980 | 171.370 | 307,610 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 47,655 | 262.590 | 463,475 | 289.590 | 511,130 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 18.000 | 29,790 | 127.410 | 210,865 | 145.410 | 240,655 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,975 | 138.500 | 183,515 | 141.500 | 187,490 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 67.000 | 73,760 | 67.000 | 73,760 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 17.090 | 18,455 | 76.550 | 82,675 | 93.640 | 101,130 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.790 | 24,725 | 522.250 | 433,475 | 552.040 | 458,200 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.370 | 8,765 | 291.760 | 177,970 | 306.130 | 186,735 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 121.300 | 154,995 | 1,645.380 | 1,911,715 | 1,766.680 | 2,066,710 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 30.000 | 24,900 | 30.000 | 24,900 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.800 | 2,890 | 3.800 | 2,890 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 10,275 | 15.000 | 10,275 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,000 | 2.000 | 1,000 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 72.460 | 28,985 | 72.460 | 28,985 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 94.550 | 34,035 | 94.550 | 34,035 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 217.810 | 102,085 | 217.810 | 102,085 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 19.000 | 2,850 | 203.790 | 30,565 | 222.790 | 33,415 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 140.300 | 157,845 | 2,066.980 | 2,044,365 | 2,207.280 | 2,202,210 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 2,025 | 1.000 | 2,025 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.000 | 37,525 | 19.000 | 37,525 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 84.000 | 136,080 | 84.000 | 136,080 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 125.000 | 136,825 | 125.000 | 136,825 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 6,930 | 7.000 | 6,930 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.310 | 10,450 | 13.310 | 10,450 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 249.310 | 329,835 | 249.310 | 329,835 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 391.310 | 702,410 | 391.310 | 702,410 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 244.490 | 431,525 | 244.490 | 431,525 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 192.000 | 317,760 | 192.000 | 317,760 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.750 | 3,645 | 2.750 | 3,645 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,274.570 | 1,184,990 | 1,274.570 | 1,184,990 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 101.280 | 84,065 | 101.280 | 84,065 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 610 | 1.000 | 610 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,207.400 | 2,725,005 | 2,207.400 | 2,725,005 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.380 | 4,850 | 6.380 | 4,850 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67. 3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 6,710 | 11.000 | 6,710 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17.380 | 11,560 | 17.380 | 11,560 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 144.020 | 21,600 | 144.020 | 21,600 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.500 | 225 | 1.500 | 225 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,619.610 | 3,088,225 | 2,619.610 | 3,088,225 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 79.510 | 142,720 | 112.510 | 201,955 | 192.020 | 344,675 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 174.770 | 308,470 | 264.280 | 466,460 | 439.050 | 774,930 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 91.770 | 151,875 | 326.310 | 540,045 | 418.080 | 691,920 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 49.310 | 65,340 | 161.900 | 217,200 | 211.210 | 282,540 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 115.650 | 98,345 | 200.940 | 180,515 | 316.590 | 278,860 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 18.230 | 19,690 | 95.680 | 103,340 | 113.910 | 123,030 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 86.520 | 71,815 | 353.790 | 309,495 | 440.310 | 381,310 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 58.630 | 35,765 | 312.720 | 204,180 | 371.350 | 239,945 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 674.390 | 894,020 | 1,828.130 | 2,223,190 | 2,502.520 | 3,117,210 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 4,700 | 5.000 | 4,700 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 7,470 | 57.500 | 47,725 | 66.500 | 55,195 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 760 | 1.000 | 760 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 685 | 4.000 | 2,740 | 5.000 | 3,425 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 610 | 1.000 | 610 | 2.000 | 1,220 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,000 | 53.000 | 26,500 | 55.000 | 27,500 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 64.620 | 25,845 | 149.840 | 59,935 | 214.460 | 85,780 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 52.320 | 18,835 | 214.440 | 77,200 | 266.760 | 96,035 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 129.940 | 54,445 | 485.780 | 220,170 | 615.720 | 274,615 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 39.010 | 5,850 | 210.250 | 31,535 | 249.260 | 37,385 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 843.340 | 954,315 | 2,524.160 | 2,474,895 | 3,367.500 | 3,429,210 |


| County 89 - Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Tota <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 8,975 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 8,975 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 6.400 | 11,295 | 34.850 | 61,510 | 41.250 | 72,805 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 21,515 | 13.000 | 21,515 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 39.090 | 51,795 | 35.010 | 46,390 | 74.100 | 98,185 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.020 | 5,545 | 5.020 | 5,545 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 4,320 | 53.620 | 57,905 | 57.620 | 62,225 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.100 | 6,725 | 93.590 | 77,685 | 101.690 | 84,410 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 6,710 | 53.800 | 32,820 | 64.800 | 39,530 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 73.590 | 89,820 | 288.890 | 303,370 | 362.480 | 393,190 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.280 | 2,145 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.280 | 2,145 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.700 | 9,710 | 11.700 | 9,710 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.780 | 9,440 | 13.780 | 9,440 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,000 | 2.000 | 1,000 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 18.000 | 7,200 | 18.000 | 7,200 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 27.250 | 9,810 | 27.250 | 9,810 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2.280 | 2,145 | 72.730 | 37,160 | 75.010 | 39,305 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 45.620 | 6,845 | 60.640 | 9,095 | 106.260 | 15,940 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 121.490 | 98,810 | 422.260 | 349,625 | 543.750 | 448,435 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.080 | 127,590 | 1,563.800 | 2,807,015 | 1,634.880 | 2,934,605 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 40,595 | 1,944.050 | 3,431,285 | 1,967.050 | 3,471,880 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 140.000 | 231,705 | 349.330 | 578,155 | 489.330 | 809,860 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 31,800 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 31,800 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 11,050 | 10.000 | 11,050 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 81.550 | 88,075 | 1,514.580 | 1,635,745 | 1,596.130 | 1,723,820 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 58.000 | 48,140 | 781.600 | 648,730 | 839.600 | 696,870 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 4,270 | 609.840 | 372,005 | 616.840 | 376,275 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 404.630 | 572,175 | 6,773.200 | 9,483,985 | 7,177.830 | 10,056,160 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 8,460 | 63.100 | 59,315 | 72.100 | 67,775 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 12.000 | 9,960 | 123.000 | 102,090 | 135.000 | 112,050 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 17,480 | 23.000 | 17,480 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 8,540 | 14.000 | 8,540 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 12.580 | 6,290 | 83.290 | 41,645 | 95.870 | 47,935 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 2,400 | 78.300 | 31,320 | 84.300 | 33,720 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.000 | 25,560 | 71.000 | 25,560 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 39.580 | 27,110 | 455.690 | 285,950 | 495.270 | 313,060 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 118.100 | 13,500 | 324.030 | 48,610 | 442.130 | 62,110 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 562.310 | 612,785 | 7,552.920 | 9,818,545 | 8,115.230 | 10,431,330 |


| County 89 - Washington 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area:Rural |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 8,975 | 5.000 | 8,975 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 6,625 | 5.000 | 6,625 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 15,600 | 10.000 | 15,600 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 139.000 | 16,500 | 139.000 | 16,500 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 149.000 | 32,100 | 149.000 | 32,100 |


| County 89 - Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market A | 16 |  |  |
|  |  |  | SubU |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.550 | 985 | 2.870 | 5,150 | 3.420 | 6,135 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 3,530 | 2.000 | 3,530 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.750 | 32,685 | 19.750 | 32,685 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,975 | 3.000 | 3,975 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 34.100 | 37,680 | 34.100 | 37,680 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.950 | 790 | 0.950 | 790 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 610 | 1.000 | 610 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.550 | 985 | 63.670 | 84,420 | 64.220 | 85,405 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.340 | 800 | 5.340 | 800 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.550 | 985 | 69.010 | 85,220 | 69.560 | 86,205 |

## County 89 - Washington <br> 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.500 | 15,190 | 16.500 | 33,415 | 24.000 | 48,605 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 18.500 | 36,540 | 10.500 | 20,740 | 29.000 | 57,280 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 8,100 | 21.500 | 34,830 | 26.500 | 42,930 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 14,200 | 10.000 | 14,200 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.500 | 3,465 | 3.500 | 3,465 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 25.500 | 20,020 | 12.000 | 9,420 | 37.500 | 29,440 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 17.500 | 12,425 | 24.000 | 17,040 | 41.500 | 29,465 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 74.000 | 92,275 | 98.000 | 133,110 | 172.000 | 225,385 |


| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 422.630 | 758,630 | 1,609.250 | 2,888,650 | 2,031.880 | 3,647,280 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 390.910 | 689,975 | 4,945.140 | 8,728,290 | 5,336.050 | 9,418,265 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 400.760 | 663,265 | 2,130.210 | 3,525,580 | 2,530.970 | 4,188,845 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 175.990 | 233,185 | 1,839.920 | 2,437,930 | 2,015.910 | 2,671,115 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.000 | 46,150 | 307.580 | 301,415 | 352.580 | 347,565 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 408.500 | 441,170 | 3,043.860 | 3,287,375 | 3,452.360 | 3,728,545 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 490.650 | 407,250 | 6,409.160 | 5,319,665 | 6,899.810 | 5,726,915 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 556.760 | 339,640 | 3,880.370 | 2,367,080 | 4,437.130 | 2,706,720 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,891.200 | 3,579,265 | 24,165.490 | 28,855,985 | 27,056.690 | 32,435,250 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 7,520 | 156.500 | 147,110 | 164.500 | 154,630 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 75.170 | 62,390 | 525.350 | 436,040 | 600.520 | 498,430 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.500 | 17,100 | 52.720 | 40,065 | 75.220 | 57,165 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 2,740 | 190.900 | 130,780 | 194.900 | 133,520 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 16.000 | 9,760 | 38.000 | 23,180 | 54.000 | 32,940 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 71.980 | 35,990 | 275.040 | 137,520 | 347.020 | 173,510 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 70.490 | 28,195 | 978.800 | 391,525 | 1,049.290 | 419,720 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 202.890 | 73,040 | 1,233.370 | 444,005 | 1,436.260 | 517,045 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 471.030 | 236,735 | 3,450.680 | 1,750,225 | 3,921.710 | 1,986,960 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 244.280 | 36,640 | 3,089.850 | 463,505 | 3,334.130 | 500,145 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,680.510 | 3,944,915 | 30,804.020 | 31,202,825 | 34,484.530 | 35,147,740 |


| County 89 - Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value |  <br> Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 75.000 | 134,625 | 41.000 | 73,595 | 116.000 | 208,220 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 88.000 | 155,320 | 205.630 | 362,940 | 293.630 | 518,260 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 36.270 | 60,025 | 159.500 | 263,975 | 195.770 | 324,000 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 34.000 | 45,050 | 83.770 | 110,995 | 117.770 | 156,045 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 123.080 | 136,005 | 123.080 | 136,005 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 31.700 | 34,235 | 50.990 | 55,070 | 82.690 | 89,305 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 107.910 | 89,565 | 335.280 | 278,280 | 443.190 | 367,845 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 88.000 | 53,680 | 156.540 | 95,490 | 244.540 | 149,170 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 460.880 | 572,500 | 1,155.790 | 1,376,350 | 1,616.670 | 1,948,850 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 3,760 | 5.000 | 4,700 | 9.000 | 8,460 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,490 | 61.600 | 51,130 | 64.600 | 53,620 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 760 | 1.000 | 760 | 2.000 | 1,520 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 30.000 | 20,550 | 30.000 | 20,550 |
| 67. 3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 6,710 | 11.000 | 6,710 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,000 | 17.750 | 8,875 | 19.750 | 9,875 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 1,200 | 112.270 | 44,910 | 115.270 | 46,110 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 5,040 | 214.790 | 77,320 | 228.790 | 82,360 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 14,250 | 453.410 | 214,955 | 480.410 | 229,205 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 26.790 | 4,020 | 182.800 | 27,420 | 209.590 | 31,440 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 640.000 |  | 640.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 514.670 | 590,770 | 1,792.000 | 1,618,725 | 2,306.670 | 2,209,495 |

## County 89 - Washington

2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

| AgLand | Acres | Value | SubU Acres | Value | Rura <br> Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 1,130.930 | 1,864,475 | 9,802.800 | 13,773,115 | 10,933.730 | 15,637,590 |
| 77. Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 11,990.550 | 15,875,390 | 158,287.200 | 202,473,320 | 170,277.750 | 218,348,710 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 1,138.930 | 599,585 | 15,286.140 | 8,550,370 | 16,425.070 | 9,149,955 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 1,544.650 | 238,715 | 13,345.260 | 2,110,205 | 14,889.910 | 2,348,920 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 450 | 1.500 | 225 | 4.500 | 675 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 645.230 | 0 | 645.230 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 15,808.060 | 18,578,615 | 196,722.900 | 226,907,235 | 212,530.960 | 245,485,850 |

## 2006 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

Market Area:
Average Assessed Value* Irrigated:

| 1 A 1 |
| :--- |
| 1 A |
| 2 A 1 |
| 2 A |
| 3 A 1 |
| 3 A |
| 4 A 1 |
| 4 A |
| Irrig |
| Dry |


| 1D1 | $3,758.860$ | $6.37 \%$ | $6,754,760$ | $8.59 \%$ | $1,797.023$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1D | $11,320.340$ | $19.19 \%$ | $19,988,685$ | $25.41 \%$ | $1,765.731$ |
| 2D1 | $13,330.800$ | $22.60 \%$ | $22,073,940$ | $28.06 \%$ | $1,655.860$ |
| 2D | $2,944.620$ | $4.99 \%$ | $3,912,580$ | $4.97 \%$ | $1,328.721$ |
| 3D1 | $7,202.700$ | $12.21 \%$ | $7,992,940$ | $10.16 \%$ | $1,109.714$ |
| 3D | $5,307.570$ | $9.00 \%$ | $5,753,340$ | $7.31 \%$ | $1,083.987$ |
| 4D1 | $13,436.430$ | $22.78 \%$ | $11,173,765$ | $14.20 \%$ | 831.602 |
| 4D | $1,681.290$ | $2.85 \%$ | $1,026,285$ | $1.30 \%$ | 610.415 |
| Dry Total | $58,982.610$ | $100.00 \%$ | $78,676,295$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,333.889$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 153.360 | $3.29 \%$ | 144,155 | $4.83 \%$ | 939.977 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $1,099.050$ | $23.57 \%$ | 912,220 | $30.55 \%$ | 830.007 |
| 2G1 | 283.480 | $6.08 \%$ | 215,440 | $7.21 \%$ | 759.983 |
| 2G | 821.500 | $17.62 \%$ | 571,935 | $19.15 \%$ | 696.208 |
| 3G1 | 865.030 | $18.55 \%$ | 537,400 | $18.00 \%$ | 621.250 |
| 3G | 372.370 | $7.99 \%$ | 186,185 | $6.24 \%$ | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 859.500 | $18.44 \%$ | 343,800 | $11.51 \%$ | 400.000 |
| 4G | 208.000 | $4.46 \%$ | 74,880 | $2.51 \%$ | 360.000 |
| Grass Total | $4,662.290$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,986,015$ | $100.00 \%$ | 640.461 |
| Irrigated Total | $2,352.280$ | $3.47 \%$ | $3,469,650$ | $4.06 \%$ | $1,475.015$ |
| Dry Total | $58,982.610$ | $86.89 \%$ | $78,676,295$ | $92.11 \%$ | $1,333.889$ |
| Grass Total | $4,662.290$ | $6.87 \%$ | $2,986,015$ | $3.50 \%$ | 640.461 |
| Waste | $1,887.070$ | $2.78 \%$ | 284,115 | $0.33 \%$ | 150.558 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 0.000 |
| Market Area Total | $67,884.250$ | $100.00 \%$ | $85,416,075$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $2,352.280$ | $21.51 \%$ | $3,469,650$ | $22.19 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $58,982.610$ | $34.64 \%$ | $78,676,295$ | $36.03 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $4,662.290$ | $28.39 \%$ | $2,986,015$ | $32.63 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,887.070$ | $12.67 \%$ | 284,115 | $12.10 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $67,884.250$ | $31.94 \%$ | $85,416,075$ | $34.79 \%$ |

## 2006 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 116.990 | 18.37\% | 236,910 | 24.27\% | 2,025.044 |
| 1A | 47.500 | 7.46\% | 93,815 | 9.61\% | 1,975.052 |
| 2A1 | 205.000 | 32.19\% | 332,100 | 34.01\% | 1,620.000 |
| 2 A | 78.720 | 12.36\% | 111,785 | 11.45\% | 1,420.033 |
| 3A1 | 115.620 | 18.16\% | 140,480 | 14.39\% | 1,215.014 |
| 3A | 24.000 | 3.77\% | 23,760 | 2.43\% | 990.000 |
| 4A1 | 36.000 | 5.65\% | 28,260 | 2.89\% | 785.000 |
| 4A | 13.000 | 2.04\% | 9,230 | 0.95\% | 710.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 636.830 | 100.00\% | 976,340 | 100.00\% | 1,533.125 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 1,204.680 | 8.18\% | 2,162,410 | 12.71\% | 1,795.007 |
| 1D | 2,683.290 | 18.23\% | 4,736,070 | 27.85\% | 1,765.023 |
| 2D1 | 288.010 | 1.96\% | 476,655 | 2.80\% | 1,654.994 |
| 2D | 1,750.690 | 11.89\% | 2,321,375 | 13.65\% | 1,325.977 |
| 3D1 | 44.500 | 0.30\% | 49,175 | 0.29\% | 1,105.056 |
| 3D | 1,353.210 | 9.19\% | 1,461,465 | 8.59\% | 1,079.998 |
| 4D1 | 5,858.460 | 39.80\% | 4,863,550 | 28.59\% | 830.175 |
| 4D | 1,537.500 | 10.44\% | 937,880 | 5.51\% | 610.003 |
| Dry Total | 14,720.340 | 100.00\% | 17,008,580 | 100.00\% | 1,155.447 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 50.000 | 1.88\% | 47,000 | 3.63\% | 940.000 |
| 1G | 418.340 | 15.75\% | 347,220 | 26.79\% | 829.994 |
| 2G1 | 7.000 | 0.26\% | 5,320 | 0.41\% | 760.000 |
| 2G | 124.790 | 4.70\% | 85,480 | 6.60\% | 684.990 |
| 3G1 | 15.500 | 0.58\% | 9,455 | 0.73\% | 610.000 |
| 3G | 142.000 | 5.35\% | 71,000 | 5.48\% | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 1,182.890 | 44.54\% | 473,155 | 36.51\% | 399.999 |
| 4G | 715.230 | 26.93\% | 257,480 | 19.87\% | 359.996 |
| Grass Total | 2,655.750 | 100.00\% | 1,296,110 | 100.00\% | 488.039 |
| Irrigated Total | 636.830 | 3.25\% | 976,340 | 5.00\% | 1,533.125 |
| Dry Total | 14,720.340 | 75.11\% | 17,008,580 | 87.14\% | 1,155.447 |
| Grass Total | 2,655.750 | 13.55\% | 1,296,110 | 6.64\% | 488.039 |
| Waste | 1,585.480 | 8.09\% | 237,835 | 1.22\% | 150.008 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 19,598.400 | 100.00\% | 19,518,865 | 100.00\% | 995.941 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 636.830 | $5.82 \%$ | 976,340 | $6.24 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $14,720.340$ | $8.64 \%$ | $17,008,580$ | $7.79 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $2,655.750$ | $16.17 \%$ | $1,296,110$ | $14.17 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,585.480$ | $10.65 \%$ | 237,835 | $10.13 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $19,598.400$ | $9.22 \%$ | $19,518,865$ | $7.95 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area: 3

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 295.900 | 5.77\% | 599,200 | 8.66\% | 2,025.008 |
| 1A | 733.470 | 14.30\% | 1,448,610 | 20.94\% | 1,975.009 |
| 2A1 | 1,135.390 | 22.13\% | 1,839,330 | 26.59\% | 1,619.998 |
| 2A | 17.000 | 0.33\% | 24,140 | 0.35\% | 1,420.000 |
| 3A1 | 2,831.520 | 55.19\% | 2,905,300 | 42.00\% | 1,026.056 |
| 3A | 48.270 | 0.94\% | 47,785 | 0.69\% | 989.952 |
| 4A1 | 68.500 | 1.34\% | 53,780 | 0.78\% | 785.109 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 5,130.050 | 100.00\% | 6,918,145 | 100.00\% | 1,348.553 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 656.430 | 5.60\% | 1,178,290 | 8.18\% | 1,794.997 |
| 1D | 1,832.450 | 15.63\% | 3,234,275 | 22.44\% | 1,765.000 |
| 2D1 | 1,726.830 | 14.73\% | 2,857,190 | 19.83\% | 1,654.586 |
| 2D | 448.440 | 3.82\% | 594,185 | 4.12\% | 1,325.004 |
| 3D1 | 6,557.540 | 55.93\% | 6,127,320 | 42.52\% | 934.393 |
| 3D | 57.500 | 0.49\% | 62,100 | 0.43\% | 1,080.000 |
| 4D1 | 387.050 | 3.30\% | 321,250 | 2.23\% | 829.996 |
| 4D | 58.260 | 0.50\% | 35,540 | 0.25\% | 610.024 |
| Dry Total | 11,724.500 | 100.00\% | 14,410,150 | 100.00\% | 1,229.063 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 13.780 | $2.55 \%$ | 12,950 | $4.11 \%$ | 939.767 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 31.150 | $5.77 \%$ | 25,855 | $8.20 \%$ | 830.016 |
| 2G1 | 132.610 | $24.56 \%$ | 100,785 | $31.97 \%$ | 760.010 |
| 2G | 10.740 | $1.99 \%$ | 7,355 | $2.33 \%$ | 684.823 |
| 3G1 | 130.370 | $24.15 \%$ | 76,480 | $24.26 \%$ | 586.638 |
| 3G | 49.100 | $9.09 \%$ | 24,550 | $7.79 \%$ | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 133.160 | $24.66 \%$ | 53,265 | $16.89 \%$ | 400.007 |
| 4G | 39.000 | $7.22 \%$ | 14,040 | $4.45 \%$ | 360.000 |
| Grass Total | 539.910 | $100.00 \%$ | 315,280 | $100.00 \%$ | 583.949 |
| Irigated Total | $5,130.050$ | $27.13 \%$ |  | $1,348.553$ |  |
| Dry Total | $11,724.500$ | $62.00 \%$ | $6,918,145$ | $31.64 \%$ | $1,229.063$ |
| Grass Total | 539.910 | $2.86 \%$ | $14,410,150$ | $65.90 \%$ | 583.949 |
| Waste | $1,516.170$ | $8.02 \%$ | 315,280 | $1.44 \%$ | 147.836 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 224,145 | $1.03 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total | $18,910.630$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,156.371$ |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $5,130.050$ | $46.92 \%$ | $6,918,145$ | $44.24 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $11,724.500$ | $6.89 \%$ | $14,410,150$ | $6.60 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 539.910 | $3.29 \%$ | 315,280 | $3.45 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,516.170$ | $10.18 \%$ | 224,145 | $9.54 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $18,910.630$ | $8.90 \%$ | $21,867,720$ | $8.91 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 27.000 | 7.25\% | 54,675 | 9.74\% | 2,025.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 154.520 | 41.48\% | 250,320 | 44.61\% | 1,619.984 |
| 2A | 168.030 | 45.10\% | 238,605 | 42.52\% | 1,420.014 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 1.000 | 0.27\% | 990 | 0.18\% | 990.000 |
| 4A1 | 13.000 | 3.49\% | 10,205 | 1.82\% | 785.000 |
| 4A | 9.000 | 2.42\% | 6,390 | 1.14\% | 710.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 372.550 | 100.00\% | 561,185 | 100.00\% | 1,506.334 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 444.680 | 21.42\% | 798,205 | 26.17\% | 1,795.009 |
| 1D | 187.240 | 9.02\% | 330,485 | 10.84\% | 1,765.034 |
| 2D1 | 729.280 | 35.12\% | 1,206,975 | 39.58\% | 1,655.022 |
| 2D | 191.420 | 9.22\% | 253,625 | 8.32\% | 1,324.966 |
| 3D1 | 70.750 | 3.41\% | 78,180 | 2.56\% | 1,105.017 |
| 3D | 130.890 | 6.30\% | 141,360 | 4.64\% | 1,079.990 |
| 4D1 | 202.170 | 9.74\% | 167,810 | 5.50\% | 830.044 |
| 4D | 119.960 | 5.78\% | 73,175 | 2.40\% | 609.995 |
| Dry Total | 2,076.390 | 100.00\% | 3,049,815 | 100.00\% | 1,468.806 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 74.210 | 16.32\% | 69,755 | 26.99\% | 939.967 |
| 1G | 13.280 | 2.92\% | 11,020 | 4.26\% | 829.819 |
| 2G1 | 63.780 | 14.03\% | 48,470 | 18.75\% | 759.956 |
| 2G | 38.000 | 8.36\% | 26,030 | 10.07\% | 685.000 |
| 3G1 | 2.000 | 0.44\% | 1,220 | 0.47\% | 610.000 |
| 3G | 27.000 | 5.94\% | 13,500 | 5.22\% | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 84.360 | 18.56\% | 33,745 | 13.06\% | 400.011 |
| 4G | 151.950 | 33.43\% | 54,705 | 21.17\% | 360.019 |
| Grass Total | 454.580 | 100.00\% | 258,445 | 100.00\% | 568.535 |
| Irrigated Total | 372.550 | 7.59\% | 561,185 | 13.64\% | 1,506.334 |
| Dry Total | 2,076.390 | 42.31\% | 3,049,815 | 74.12\% | 1,468.806 |
| Grass Total | 454.580 | 9.26\% | 258,445 | 6.28\% | 568.535 |
| Waste | 2,003.920 | 40.83\% | 245,400 | 5.96\% | 122.459 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 4,907.440 | 100.00\% | 4,114,845 | 100.00\% | 838.491 |
| As Related to the County as a Whole |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 372.550 | 3.41\% | 561,185 | 3.59\% |  |
| Dry Total | 2,076.390 | 1.22\% | 3,049,815 | 1.40\% |  |
| Grass Total | 454.580 | 2.77\% | 258,445 | 2.82\% |  |
| Waste | 2,003.920 | 13.46\% | 245,400 | 10.45\% |  |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |  |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 4,907.440 | 2.31\% | 4,114,845 | 1.68\% |  |

## 2006 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

Market Area: 5

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 339.860 | 39.66\% | 688,220 | 49.31\% | 2,025.010 |
| 1A | 102.000 | 11.90\% | 201,455 | 14.43\% | 1,975.049 |
| 2A1 | 116.600 | 13.61\% | 188,890 | 13.53\% | 1,619.982 |
| 2A | 80.850 | 9.43\% | 114,805 | 8.23\% | 1,419.975 |
| 3A1 | 17.460 | 2.04\% | 21,215 | 1.52\% | 1,215.063 |
| 3A | 121.500 | 14.18\% | 120,285 | 8.62\% | 990.000 |
| 4A1 | 66.700 | 7.78\% | 52,365 | 3.75\% | 785.082 |
| 4A | 12.000 | 1.40\% | 8,520 | 0.61\% | 710.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 856.970 | 100.00\% | 1,395,755 | 100.00\% | 1,628.709 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 5,454.470 | 19.09\% | 9,790,825 | 25.92\% | 1,795.009 |
| 1D | 5,061.800 | 17.72\% | 8,934,185 | 23.65\% | 1,765.021 |
| 2D1 | 3,729.780 | 13.06\% | 6,172,840 | 16.34\% | 1,655.014 |
| 2D | 598.320 | 2.09\% | 792,770 | 2.10\% | 1,324.993 |
| 3D1 | 234.020 | 0.82\% | 258,595 | 0.68\% | 1,105.012 |
| 3D | 5,406.310 | 18.92\% | 5,838,815 | 15.46\% | 1,080.000 |
| 4D1 | 4,783.100 | 16.74\% | 3,969,980 | 10.51\% | 830.001 |
| 4D | 3,300.330 | 11.55\% | 2,013,195 | 5.33\% | 609.998 |
| Dry Total | 28,568.130 | 100.00\% | 37,771,205 | 100.00\% | 1,322.144 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 254.850 | 27.35\% | 239,565 | 37.34\% | 940.023 |
| 1G | 199.490 | 21.41\% | 165,575 | 25.80\% | 829.991 |
| 2G1 | 34.000 | 3.65\% | 25,840 | 4.03\% | 760.000 |
| 2G | 40.300 | 4.32\% | 27,610 | 4.30\% | 685.111 |
| 3G1 | 19.850 | 2.13\% | 12,110 | 1.89\% | 610.075 |
| 3G | 192.980 | 20.71\% | 96,490 | 15.04\% | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 147.000 | 15.77\% | 58,800 | 9.16\% | 400.000 |
| 4G | 43.500 | 4.67\% | 15,660 | 2.44\% | 360.000 |
| Grass Total | 931.970 | 100.00\% | 641,650 | 100.00\% | 688.487 |
| Irrigated Total | 856.970 | 2.76\% | 1,395,755 | 3.50\% | 1,628.709 |
| Dry Total | 28,568.130 | 92.15\% | 37,771,205 | 94.66\% | 1,322.144 |
| Grass Total | 931.970 | 3.01\% | 641,650 | 1.61\% | 688.487 |
| Waste | 645.890 | 2.08\% | 95,385 | 0.24\% | 147.679 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 31,002.960 | 100.00\% | 39,903,995 | 100.00\% | 1,287.102 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 856.970 | $7.84 \%$ | $1,395,755$ | $8.93 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $28,568.130$ | $16.78 \%$ | $37,771,205$ | $17.30 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 931.970 | $5.67 \%$ | 641,650 | $7.01 \%$ |
| Waste | 645.890 | $4.34 \%$ | 95,385 | $4.06 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $31,002.960$ | $14.59 \%$ | $39,903,995$ | $16.26 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area: 6

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 3.000 | 33.33\% | 6,075 | 33.89\% | 2,025.000 |
| 1A | 6.000 | 66.67\% | 11,850 | 66.11\% | 1,975.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 9.000 | 100.00\% | 17,925 | 100.00\% | 1,991.666 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 413.330 | 6.04\% | 741,945 | 9.43\% | 1,795.042 |
| 1D | 1,270.880 | 18.58\% | 2,251,545 | 28.62\% | 1,771.642 |
| 2D1 | 514.330 | 7.52\% | 851,245 | 10.82\% | 1,655.056 |
| 2D | 456.340 | 6.67\% | 609,565 | 7.75\% | 1,335.769 |
| 3D1 | 104.530 | 1.53\% | 115,505 | 1.47\% | 1,104.993 |
| 3D | 872.820 | 12.76\% | 954,085 | 12.13\% | 1,093.106 |
| 4D1 | 1,760.070 | 25.73\% | 1,460,880 | 18.57\% | 830.012 |
| 4D | 1,446.940 | 21.16\% | 882,600 | 11.22\% | 609.976 |
| Dry Total | 6,839.240 | 100.00\% | 7,867,370 | 100.00\% | 1,150.328 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 31.720 | 2.62\% | 29,815 | 4.89\% | 939.943 |
| 1G | 173.780 | 14.34\% | 144,245 | 23.68\% | 830.043 |
| 2G1 | 29.530 | 2.44\% | 22,445 | 3.68\% | 760.074 |
| 2G | 87.070 | 7.18\% | 59,650 | 9.79\% | 685.080 |
| 3G1 | 17.000 | 1.40\% | 10,370 | 1.70\% | 610.000 |
| 3G | 103.510 | 8.54\% | 51,755 | 8.49\% | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 350.400 | 28.91\% | 140,170 | 23.01\% | 400.028 |
| 4G | 418.910 | 34.57\% | 150,815 | 24.75\% | 360.017 |
| Grass Total | 1,211.920 | 100.00\% | 609,265 | 100.00\% | 502.727 |
| Irrigated Total | 9.000 | 0.09\% | 17,925 | 0.20\% | 1,991.666 |
| Dry Total | 6,839.240 | 70.09\% | 7,867,370 | 87.98\% | 1,150.328 |
| Grass Total | 1,211.920 | 12.42\% | 609,265 | 6.81\% | 502.727 |
| Waste | 1,694.350 | 17.36\% | 447,715 | 5.01\% | 264.239 |
| Other | 3.000 | 0.03\% | 450 | 0.01\% | 150.000 |
| Exempt | 5.230 | 0.05\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 9,757.510 | 100.00\% | 8,942,725 | 100.00\% | 916.496 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 9.000 | $0.08 \%$ | 17,925 | $0.11 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $6,839.240$ | $4.02 \%$ | $7,867,370$ | $3.60 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $1,211.920$ | $7.38 \%$ | 609,265 | $6.66 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,694.350$ | $11.38 \%$ | 447,715 | $19.06 \%$ |
| Other | 3.000 | $66.67 \%$ | 450 | $66.67 \%$ |
| Exempt | 5.230 | $0.81 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $9,757.510$ | $4.59 \%$ | $8,942,725$ | $3.64 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area: 7

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 134.500 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 2.000 | $1.38 \%$ | 1,880 | $2.18 \%$ | 940.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 29.340 | $20.19 \%$ | 24,350 | $28.18 \%$ | 829.925 |
| 2G1 | 17.000 | $11.70 \%$ | 12,920 | $14.95 \%$ | 760.000 |
| 2G | 21.500 | $14.79 \%$ | 14,730 | $17.05 \%$ | 685.116 |
| 3G1 | 12.000 | $8.26 \%$ | 7,320 | $8.47 \%$ | 610.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 58.500 | $40.25 \%$ | 23,400 | $27.08 \%$ | 400.000 |
| 4G | 5.000 | $3.44 \%$ | 1,800 | $2.08 \%$ | 360.000 |
| Grass Total | 145.340 | $100.00 \%$ | 86,400 | $100.00 \%$ | 594.468 |
|  | $1,154.740$ | $17.48 \%$ |  | $1,743,370$ | $20.16 \%$ |
| Irigated Total | $4,602.050$ | $69.66 \%$ | $6,721,915$ | $77.74 \%$ | $1,460.634$ |
| Dry Total | 145.340 | $2.20 \%$ | 86,400 | $1.00 \%$ | 594.468 |
| Grass Total | 704.510 | $10.66 \%$ | 94,990 | $1.10 \%$ | 134.831 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | $6,606.640$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  | 1,308 |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $1,154.740$ | $10.56 \%$ | $1,743,370$ | $11.15 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $4,602.050$ | $2.70 \%$ | $6,721,915$ | $3.08 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 145.340 | $0.88 \%$ | 86,400 | $0.94 \%$ |
| Waste | 704.510 | $4.73 \%$ | 94,990 | $4.04 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $6,606.640$ | $3.11 \%$ | $8,646,675$ | $3.52 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area: 8

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 30.000 | $13.77 \%$ | 24,900 | $24.39 \%$ | 830.000 |
| 2G1 | 3.800 | $1.74 \%$ | 2,890 | $2.83 \%$ | 760.526 |
| 2G | 15.000 | $6.89 \%$ | 10,275 | $10.07 \%$ | 685.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 2.000 | $0.92 \%$ | 1,000 | $0.98 \%$ | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 72.460 | $33.27 \%$ | 28,985 | $28.39 \%$ | 400.013 |
| 4G | 94.550 | $43.41 \%$ | 34,035 | $33.34 \%$ | 359.968 |
| Grass Total | 217.810 | $100.00 \%$ | 102,085 | $100.00 \%$ | 468.688 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,766.680$ | $80.04 \%$ | $2,066,710$ | $93.85 \%$ | $1,169.827$ |
| Grass Total | 217.810 | $9.87 \%$ | 102,085 | $4.64 \%$ | 468.688 |
| Waste | 222.790 | $10.09 \%$ | 33,415 | $1.52 \%$ | 149.984 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,207.280$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,202,210$ | $100.00 \%$ | 997.703 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,766.680$ | $1.04 \%$ | $2,066,710$ | $0.95 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 217.810 | $1.33 \%$ | 102,085 | $1.12 \%$ |
| Waste | 222.790 | $1.50 \%$ | 33,415 | $1.42 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,207.280$ | $1.04 \%$ | $2,202,210$ | $0.90 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 1.000 | 0.40\% | 2,025 | 0.61\% | 2,025.000 |
| 1A | 19.000 | 7.62\% | 37,525 | 11.38\% | 1,975.000 |
| 2A1 | 84.000 | 33.69\% | 136,080 | 41.26\% | 1,620.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 125.000 | 50.14\% | 136,825 | 41.48\% | 1,094.600 |
| 3A | 7.000 | 2.81\% | 6,930 | 2.10\% | 990.000 |
| 4 A 1 | 13.310 | 5.34\% | 10,450 | 3.17\% | 785.123 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 249.310 | 100.00\% | 329,835 | 100.00\% | 1,322.991 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 391.310 | 17.73\% | 702,410 | 25.78\% | 1,795.021 |
| 1D | 244.490 | 11.08\% | 431,525 | 15.84\% | 1,765.000 |
| 2D1 | 192.000 | 8.70\% | 317,760 | 11.66\% | 1,655.000 |
| 2D | 2.750 | 0.12\% | 3,645 | 0.13\% | 1,325.454 |
| 3D1 | 1,274.570 | 57.74\% | 1,184,990 | 43.49\% | 929.717 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 101.280 | 4.59\% | 84,065 | 3.08\% | 830.025 |
| 4D | 1.000 | 0.05\% | 610 | 0.02\% | 610.000 |
| Dry Total | 2,207.400 | 100.00\% | 2,725,005 | 100.00\% | 1,234.486 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 6.380 | $36.71 \%$ | 4,850 | $41.96 \%$ | 760.188 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 11.000 | $63.29 \%$ | 6,710 | $58.04 \%$ | 610.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4 G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 17.380 | $100.00 \%$ | 11,560 | $100.00 \%$ | 665.132 |
| Irrigated Total | 249.310 | $9.52 \%$ | 329,835 | $10.68 \%$ | $1,322.991$ |
| Dry Total | $2,207.400$ | $84.26 \%$ | $2,725,005$ | $88.24 \%$ | $1,234.486$ |
| Grass Total | 17.380 | $0.66 \%$ | 11,560 | $0.37 \%$ | 665.132 |
| Waste | 144.020 | $5.50 \%$ | 21,600 | $0.70 \%$ | 149.979 |
| Other | 1.500 | $0.06 \%$ | 225 | $0.01 \%$ | 150.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,178.88$ |
| Market Area Total | $2,619.610$ | $100.00 \%$ | $3,088,225$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 249.310 | $2.28 \%$ | 329,835 | $2.11 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,207.400$ | $1.30 \%$ | $2,725,005$ | $1.25 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 17.380 | $0.11 \%$ | 11,560 | $0.13 \%$ |
| Waste | 144.020 | $0.97 \%$ | 21,600 | $0.92 \%$ |
| Other | 1.500 | $33.33 \%$ | 225 | $33.33 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,619.610$ | $1.23 \%$ | $3,088,225$ | $1.26 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 192.020 | 7.67\% | 344,675 | 11.06\% | 1,794.995 |
| 1D | 439.050 | 17.54\% | 774,930 | 24.86\% | 1,765.015 |
| 2D1 | 418.080 | 16.71\% | 691,920 | 22.20\% | 1,654.994 |
| 2D | 211.210 | 8.44\% | 282,540 | 9.06\% | 1,337.720 |
| 3D1 | 316.590 | 12.65\% | 278,860 | 8.95\% | 880.823 |
| 3D | 113.910 | 4.55\% | 123,030 | 3.95\% | 1,080.063 |
| 4D1 | 440.310 | 17.59\% | 381,310 | 12.23\% | 866.003 |
| 4D | 371.350 | 14.84\% | 239,945 | 7.70\% | 646.142 |
| Dry Total | 2,502.520 | 100.00\% | 3,117,210 | 100.00\% | 1,245.628 |


| Grass: |
| :--- |
| 1G1 5.000 $0.81 \%$ 4,700 $1.71 \%$ 940.000 <br> 1 G 66.500 $10.80 \%$ 55,195 $20.10 \%$ 830.000 <br> 2G1 1.000 $0.16 \%$ 760 $0.28 \%$ 760.000 <br> $2 G$ 5.000 $0.81 \%$ 3,425 $1.25 \%$ 685.000 <br> 3G1 2.000 $0.32 \%$ 1,220 $0.44 \%$ 610.000 <br> $3 G$ 55.000 $8.93 \%$ 27,500 $10.01 \%$ 500.000 <br> $4 G 1$ 214.460 $34.83 \%$ 85,780 $31.24 \%$ 399.981 <br> $4 G$ 266.760 $43.32 \%$ 96,035 $34.97 \%$ 360.005 <br> Grass Total 615.720 $100.00 \%$ 274,615 $100.00 \%$ 446.006 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,502.520$ | $74.31 \%$ | $3,117,210$ | $90.90 \%$ | $1,245.628$ |
| Grass Total | 615.720 | $18.28 \%$ | 274,615 | $8.01 \%$ | 446.006 |
| Waste | 249.260 | $7.40 \%$ | 37,385 | $1.09 \%$ | 149.983 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,018.325$ |
| Market Area Total | $3,367.500$ | $100.00 \%$ | $3,429,210$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,502.520$ | $1.47 \%$ | $3,117,210$ | $1.43 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 615.720 | $3.75 \%$ | 274,615 | $3.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 249.260 | $1.67 \%$ | 37,385 | $1.59 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $3,367.500$ | $1.58 \%$ | $3,429,210$ | $1.40 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area:
11

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 5.000 | 1.38\% | 8,975 | 2.28\% | 1,795.000 |
| 1D | 41.250 | 11.38\% | 72,805 | 18.52\% | 1,764.969 |
| 2D1 | 13.000 | 3.59\% | 21,515 | 5.47\% | 1,655.000 |
| 2D | 74.100 | 20.44\% | 98,185 | 24.97\% | 1,325.033 |
| 3D1 | 5.020 | 1.38\% | 5,545 | 1.41\% | 1,104.581 |
| 3D | 57.620 | 15.90\% | 62,225 | 15.83\% | 1,079.920 |
| 4D1 | 101.690 | 28.05\% | 84,410 | 21.47\% | 830.071 |
| 4D | 64.800 | 17.88\% | 39,530 | 10.05\% | 610.030 |
| Dry Total | 362.480 | 100.00\% | 393,190 | 100.00\% | 1,084.721 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 2.280 | 3.04\% | 2,145 | 5.46\% | 940.789 |
| 1G | 11.700 | 15.60\% | 9,710 | 24.70\% | 829.914 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G | 13.780 | 18.37\% | 9,440 | 24.02\% | 685.050 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G | 2.000 | 2.67\% | 1,000 | 2.54\% | 500.000 |
| 4G1 | 18.000 | 24.00\% | 7,200 | 18.32\% | 400.000 |
| 4G | 27.250 | 36.33\% | 9,810 | 24.96\% | 360.000 |
| Grass Total | 75.010 | 100.00\% | 39,305 | 100.00\% | 523.996 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 362.480 | 66.66\% | 393,190 | 87.68\% | 1,084.721 |
| Grass Total | 75.010 | 13.79\% | 39,305 | 8.76\% | 523.996 |
| Waste | 106.260 | 19.54\% | 15,940 | 3.55\% | 150.009 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 543.750 | 100.00\% | 448,435 | 100.00\% | 824.708 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 362.480 | $0.21 \%$ | 393,190 | $0.18 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 75.010 | $0.46 \%$ | 39,305 | $0.43 \%$ |
| Waste | 106.260 | $0.71 \%$ | 15,940 | $0.68 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 543.750 | $0.26 \%$ | 448,435 | $0.18 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area:

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $7,177.830$ | $4.22 \%$ | $10,056,160$ | $4.61 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 495.270 | $3.02 \%$ | 313,060 | $3.42 \%$ |
| Waste | 442.130 | $2.97 \%$ | 62,110 | $2.64 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $8,115.230$ | $3.82 \%$ | $10,431,330$ | $4.25 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: $13$ <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 5.000 | 50.00\% | 8,975 | 57.53\% | 1,795.000 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 5.000 | 50.00\% | 6,625 | 42.47\% | 1,325.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 10.000 | 100.00\% | 15,600 | 100.00\% | 1,560.000 |


| Grass: |  |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $2 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $3 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G 1$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 10.000 | $6.71 \%$ | 15,600 | $48.60 \%$ | $1,560.000$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Waste | 139.000 | $93.29 \%$ | 16,500 | $51.40 \%$ | 118.705 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 149.000 | $100.00 \%$ | 32,100 | $100.00 \%$ | 215.436 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 10.000 | $0.01 \%$ | 15,600 | $0.01 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 139.000 | $0.93 \%$ | 16,500 | $0.70 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 149.000 | $0.07 \%$ | 32,100 | $0.01 \%$ |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres |  | Value |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value |
| 1A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Irigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  | 0.000 |
| 1D1 | 3.420 | $5.33 \%$ | 6,135 | $7.18 \%$ | $1,793.859$ |
| 1D | 2.000 | $3.11 \%$ | 3,530 | $4.13 \%$ | $1,765.000$ |
| 2D1 | 19.750 | $30.75 \%$ | 32,685 | $38.27 \%$ | $1,654.936$ |
| 2D | 3.000 | $4.67 \%$ | 3,975 | $4.65 \%$ | $1,325.000$ |
| 3D1 | 34.100 | $53.10 \%$ | 37,680 | $44.12 \%$ | $1,104.985$ |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.950 | $1.48 \%$ | 790 | $0.93 \%$ | 831.578 |
| 4D | 1.000 | $1.56 \%$ | 610 | $0.71 \%$ | 610.000 |
| Dry Total | 64.220 | $100.00 \%$ | 85,405 | $100.00 \%$ | $1,329.881$ |


| Grass: | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 G 1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2 G 1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $3 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4 G 1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4 G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 64.220 | $92.32 \%$ | 85,405 | $99.07 \%$ | $1,329.881$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Waste | 5.340 | $7.68 \%$ | 800 | $0.93 \%$ | 149.812 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,239.289$ |
| Market Area Total | 69.560 | $100.00 \%$ | 86,205 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 64.220 | $0.04 \%$ | 85,405 | $0.04 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 5.340 | $0.04 \%$ | 800 | $0.03 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 69.560 | $0.03 \%$ | 86,205 | $0.04 \%$ |

## 2006 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Acres |
| :--- |
| Irrigated: |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |
| 2A1 |
| \% of Acres |

2006 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area:
31

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 116.000 | 7.18\% | 208,220 | 10.68\% | 1,795.000 |
| 1D | 293.630 | 18.16\% | 518,260 | 26.59\% | 1,765.010 |
| 2D1 | 195.770 | 12.11\% | 324,000 | 16.63\% | 1,655.003 |
| 2D | 117.770 | 7.28\% | 156,045 | 8.01\% | 1,324.997 |
| 3D1 | 123.080 | 7.61\% | 136,005 | 6.98\% | 1,105.013 |
| 3D | 82.690 | 5.11\% | 89,305 | 4.58\% | 1,079.997 |
| 4D1 | 443.190 | 27.41\% | 367,845 | 18.87\% | 829.993 |
| 4D | 244.540 | 15.13\% | 149,170 | 7.65\% | 610.002 |
| Dry Total | 1,616.670 | 100.00\% | 1,948,850 | 100.00\% | 1,205.471 |


| Grass: |
| :--- |
| 1G1 9.000 $1.87 \%$ 8,460 $3.69 \%$ 940.000 <br> 1G 64.600 $13.45 \%$ 53,620 $23.39 \%$ 830.030 <br> 2G1 2.000 $0.42 \%$ 1,520 $0.66 \%$ 760.000 <br> $2 G$ 30.000 $6.24 \%$ 20,550 $8.97 \%$ 685.000 <br> 3G1 11.000 $2.29 \%$ 6,710 $2.93 \%$ 610.000 <br> $3 G$ 19.750 $4.11 \%$ 9,875 $4.31 \%$ 500.000 <br> $4 G 1$ 115.270 $23.99 \%$ 46,110 $20.12 \%$ 400.017 <br> $4 G$ 228.790 $47.62 \%$ 82,360 $35.93 \%$ 359.980 <br> Grass Total 480.410 $100.00 \%$ 229,205 $100.00 \%$ 477.102 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,616.670$ | $70.09 \%$ | $1,948,850$ | $88.20 \%$ | $1,205.471$ |
| Grass Total | 480.410 | $20.83 \%$ | 229,205 | $10.37 \%$ | 477.102 |
| Waste | 209.590 | $9.09 \%$ | 31,440 | $1.42 \%$ | 150.007 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 640.000 | $27.75 \%$ |  |  | 9 |
| Market Area Total | $2,306.670$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,209,495$ | $100.00 \%$ | 957.872 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,616.670$ | $0.95 \%$ | $1,948,850$ | $0.89 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 480.410 | $2.92 \%$ | 229,205 | $2.50 \%$ |
| Waste | 209.590 | $1.41 \%$ | 31,440 | $1.34 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 640.000 | $99.19 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,306.670$ | $1.09 \%$ | $2,209,495$ | $0.90 \%$ |

## 2006 Agricultural Land Detail

County 89 - Washington


| Total | $212,530.960$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 , 4 8 5 , 8 5 0}$ | $212,530.960$ | $100.00 \%$ | $245,485,850$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,155.059$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^0]2005 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR<br>WASHINGTON COUTNY<br>ASSESSMENT YEARS 2006, 2007, AND 2008<br>Date: June 15, 2005<br>PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:


#### Abstract

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


## DISCLAMER:

This Plan of Assessment was developed to meet the requirements of Nebraska Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. The reader should note that at the time this document is being prepared, the 2005 numbers are not available for State assessed personal property and State assessed real estate. In addition, homestead exemption applications are still being received, special valuation applications are being accepted and determinations on 775P exemptions are not finalized by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Finally, the protest process is ongoing and the sales file is incomplete for 2006.

For the reasons stated above, it is difficult on June $15^{\text {th }}$, to describe and determine all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions.

Thank you for your time and understanding.

## REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land:
2) $80 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3) $80 \%$ of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and $80 \%$ of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Reference, Nebraska Revised Statute 77-201 (R. S. Supplement 2004).

## RECORD MAINTENANCE:

## MAPPING

Washington County's cadastral maps were completed in 1989. They are currently being maintained in the County Surveyor's Office for the Assessor's Office. All parcel splits, new subdivisions and ownership changes are kept up to date by the Assessor's Staff and Surveyor's Staff.

## OWNERSHIP

Real estate transfer statements are received from the County Clerk on an ongoing basis. Ownership transfers are made on the property record cards and in our CAMA system along with the sale information.

Assessor's Office has ownership of the cadastral maps.

## REPORT GENERATION

Nebraska State Statutes require the production of many reports. In Washington County, report generation is the responsibility of the Deputy Assessor with final approval of all data by the County Assessor. The following reports are required by statute and completed each year:

Abstract - Real Estate<br>Abstract - Personal Property<br>Certification of Values<br>School District Taxable Value Report<br>Certificate of Taxes Levied

From time to time, corrections to the tax list are required. If appropriate, the Assessor's Office presents the correction book to the County Board for approval. Once approved, the online computer correction is completed by the Assessor's Office, the property record card is updated and the information is forwarded to the Treasurer's Office via TerraScan. TerraScan is Washington County's CAMA system.

## ADMINISTER HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION:

The Assessment Specialist works with the Assessor in conjunction with the administration of the homestead exemption worksheets, documentation, mailing of all forms, finding the median average of the county totals and updating of documents and computer records to reflect exemption values and taxes.

For the year of 2004 we had a total of 504 applicants and a value exempted of $\$ 38,364.565$ with a tax loss of $\$ 736,595.76$. The average median value for 2005 is not available at this time.

## ADMINISTER PERSONAL PROPERTY:

The Assessment Specialist works with the County Assessor in the administration of personal property. New business is obtained through following up on local and county building permits and discovery.

The County Assessor requested in 2005 that all personal property filers provide us with their federal depreciation worksheet as part of the updating process.

The 2005 value of centrally assessed and the final determination of 775P personal property is not available at this time.

The abstract totals for the year 2005 consisted of 725 commercial schedules with a value of $\$ 69,320,342$. The totals for agricultural schedules consisted of 513 with a value of $\$ 16,052,671$ and a combined total of \$85,373,013.

## ADMINISTER SPECIAL VALUATION:

The Assessor's Office administrates the filing of all special valuation applications for Washington County. This includes assisting the taxpayer in the completion of the application, verifying the information on the form and checking the zoning of the property for approval.

All corrections to the tax rolls for homestead exemption, personal property and special valuation are reviewed and approved by the County Assessor and the County Board in accordance with State rules and guidelines.

## GENERATE TAX ROLL:

The Assessor's Office also generates tax rolls for the real estate personal property, railroads and public services. Homestead exemption credits are also included on parcels approved for exemption on the tax rolls. The tax rolls are generated by the Assessor's office and the collection of the taxes are the responsibility of the County Treasurer.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF APPRAISAL:

## VALUE ALL REAL PROPERTY

The Assessor with the assistance of the Residential Appraiser, Commercial Appraiser and the Deputy Assessor are the core team. This is the team that identifies the value of real property for Washington County.

## DEVELOP PLAN OF REVIEW

This core team also develops a yearly plan as to what needs to be reviewed, audited and updated for the upcoming year. In Washington County, the plan of review includes a physical inspection every three to five years. This will include a spot check of measurements for accuracy, re-assessment of quality and condition scores, and the addition or subtraction of any physical improvements.

In 2003, the land in all suburban urban and rural areas were reviewed and equalized.
In 2004, new Marshall and Swift costing tables were loaded on our CAMA system with appropriate adjustments to the depreciation schedules. In addition, unimproved rural sites were reviewed, improved procedures for developers discounts have been implemented, and adjustments to rural market areas that should more accurately reflect the current market value.

## ESTABLISH PROCEDURE FOR PICKUP WORK

The requirement for pickup work is determined weekly. The Assessor's Office acquires building permits from planning and zoning, and the city and villages on an ongoing basis. The researching of building permits and market areas with current sales and discovery are used to identify potential pickup work. If the project is incomplete at the time of inspection, the property will be revisited on a date that is as close to December $31^{\text {st }}$ as possible. The project will be assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed based off of the inspection completed closest to January $1^{\text {st }}$ as possible. The value will be based off our own physical measurements, and not off the contractor's plans of specifications.

Pick up work is completed by the Commercial Appraiser, Residential Property Appraiser, and the Deputy Assessor with the approval of the County Assessor.
A filing system by legal description is comprised of a property record card with a permanent picture, complete site and improvement information.

## REVIEW SALES

The Assessor's Office reviews all sales that occur in Washington County. Residential lot sales are reviewed by an Assessment Specialist. Residential improved and agriculture improved and unimproved sales are being completed by another Assessment Specialist. Commercial sales are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser with final review being performed by the County Assessor and Deputy Assessor.

All sales are audited and reviewed by the Assessor. Updates to all values are performed on an annual basis. The Assessor with the assistance of the Residential Appraiser, Commercial Appraiser and the Deputy Assessor are the core team who value all real property for Washington County.

## PERSONNEL COUNT:

## Position: Assessor/Deputy Assessor (2)

## Position Description:

The Assessor administrates all the assessment duties as required by Nebraska State Statutes. He/she is responsible for completing many reports during the year within the statutory deadlines. The Assessor also works with the County Board of Supervisors as well as other elected officials. The Assessor also has to supervise the assessment and appraisal staff.

Continuing Education Requirements:
The Assessor/Deputy is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The Assessor/Deputy also attends other workshops and meetings to further his/her knowledge of the assessment field. The Assessor is currently a member of the Northeast Nebraska Assessor Association. The Deputy Assessor is a member of the Nebraska GIS conference and attends many workshops pertaining to GIS.

Position: Assessment Specialist (3)

## Position Description:

The Assessment Specialist has his/her areas of "expertise" in the various activities of the assessment field, such as personal property, homestead exemption, real estate transfers ( 521 's), and special valuations. All Assessment Specialists are able to assist in all areas of each activity, but every member has his or her own area for which they are responsible.

## Continuing Education Requirements:

The Assessment Specialist position at this time does not have a continuing education requirement. The current position holders have voluntarily taken classes such as Windows, TerraScan user education, as well as IAAO classes. Two of the current position holders have attained Assessor Certification. One position holder is currently a member of the Nebraska GIS conference and attends many workshops pertaining to GIS.

Position: $\quad$ Appraiser (2 plus 1part time)

## Position Description:

Establish property value on an annual basis, coordinate the re-evaluation process, compile the necessary data needed to support value, track recent sales, supervise job tasks of appraisal assistants, and complete the appraisal assistant evaluation process.

Continuing Education Requirements:
The Appraiser position at this time does not have a continuing education requirement. Current position holders have voluntarily taken several classes in mass appraisal, geographical information systems TerraScan user education.

One is a licensed appraiser and the other two have attained Assessor Certification.

## BUDGETING:

The proposed budget is being streamlined for 2005-2006. The major change is that the reappraisal and assessor budgets are being combined into one budget. It is our position that, if approved, the new format will allow for easier tracking of line items and reduce the effort required to ensure that double payment of bills does not occur.

Budget Worksheet 2005-2006

| 605-00 | County Assessor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-0100 | Official's Salary | \$ 46,159.00 |
| 1-0201 | Deputy's Salary | \$ 36,939.00 |
| 1-0305 | Regular Time Salaries | \$ 127,748.00 |
| 1-0405 | Part Time Salaries | \$ 38,019.00 |
| 1-0505 | Overtime | \$ 7,381.00 |
|  | Personnel Services Total | \$ 256,246.00 |
| 2-0100 | Postal Services | \$ 7,373.00 |
| 2-1701 | Meals | \$ 772.00 |
| 2-1702 | Lodging | \$ 2,060.00 |
| 2-1704 | Mileage Allowance | \$ 2,576.00 |
| 2-1801 | Dues Subscriptions Registration | \$ 1,032.00 |
| 2-2000 | Printing \& Publishing | \$ 1,668.00 |
|  | Assessor School | \$ 3,090.00 |
| 2-3910 | Operating Expenses Total | \$ 18,571.00 |
| 3-0100 | Office Supplies | \$ 6,257.00 |
| 3-0128 | Supplies - Data Processing | \$ 2,060.00 |
| 3-0211 | Tires \& Car Expenses | \$ 3,711.00 |
|  | Supplies and Materials Total | \$ 12,028.00 |
| 5-0315 | Data Processing Equipment | \$ 1,150.00 |
| 5-0500 | Office Equipment | \$ 938.00 |
| 5-1309 | Data Processing Software | 722.00 |
|  | Capital Outlay Total | \$ 2,810.00 |
|  | Total Expenditures | \$ 289,655.00 |

## HISTORY:

Washington County is currently using TerraScan for all computer functions. The appraisal part is being supplied by the current Marshall \& Swift package through TerraScan.

All residential, commercial, agricultural and personal property are entered into TerraScan, our current CAMA computer system. Washington County has the ability to digitize the county photo's in this system with a digital camera. However, in the interim, the county has elected to return to a 35 mm photo for the property records card. This option allows the office to retain extra computer space that would otherwise be used up via the digital process.

PROCESS TO THIS POINT
With TerraScan, Washington County has the capability of electronic pricing, generating reports, calculating personal property depreciation and performing many general tasks of the County Assessor's Office.

At this time, Washington County is starting to enter pictures and sketches into their CAMA system. Washington County's CAMA or TerraScan is located in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Small town sales are loaded in the system. They are also recorded in a hard copy sales book along with pictures and the current history of the property. The 521's are kept in binders and archived for future reference. All documents are in good condition and order in accordance with the book and page number.

## PICTURES AND SKETCHES

Pictures and sketches are kept in the parcel record card at this time.

## COMPARABLE SELECTION NEEDS WORK

Washington County has a hard copy sales book that includes pictures and sales sheet for all recent sales that have taken place in the county.

The county has an ongoing plan to keep the parcels updated to current through a review process of sales, building permits, discovery and drive by reviews.

## RE-LISTED TOWNS

Old records are presumed to be accurate and complete.

## WHAT WE NEED TO COMPLETE

June of 2003 Marshall and Swift costing tables are currently loaded on the CAMA system with appropriate adjustments to the depreciation schedules. For 2006, additional adjustments will be made as required.

## TOTAL RE-LISTING AND DATA ENTRY

The parcel cards are reviewed and edited on a yearly basis with any corrections being made to the card.
The three year plan is reviewed on a yearly basis with the overall decisions based on current budget constraints.

The Assessor's Office with the help of their consultant and the County Surveyor's Office has developed a parcel grid for the new Geographic Information System that mirrors the hard copy cadastral maps. In addition the parcel identifier numbers have been loaded. Other information is being developed for future GIS implementation.

PARCEL COUNT:

The following numbers are based off the 2005 abstract. Please be aware that additional changes have occurred since the abstract. These numbers do not include centrally assessed and the final determinations for 775P by the department of Property Assessment and Taxation.

List the number of residential parcels and value. The number of parcels is 7236 with a value of \$737,130,165.

List the number of commercial parcels and value. The number of parcels is 652 with a value of \$108,338,870.

List the number of industrial parcels and value. The number of parcels is 44 with a value of $\$ 107,633,525$.
List the number of agricultural parcels and value. The total number of agricultural parcels is 3,926 with a value of $\$ 190,643,250$. With addition of improvements and ag-sites being $\$ 193,228,255$.

The total number of parcels with greenbelt special value is 3,681 . The greenbelt value is $\$ 205,000,770$ with an eighty percent of market value of $\$ 467,226,495$.

The number of recreational parcels is 55 with a value of $\$ 1,248,515$.
List the number of personal property parcels and value for 2005. Personal property parcel total for commercial is 725 with a total value of $\$ 69,320,342$. The parcel total for agriculture is 513 with a total value of $\$ 16,052,671$.

List the number of homestead exemption applications and value. The information for the year of 2005 is not available at this time. Total number of exempt parcels for 2004 was 504 and a value exempted of $\$ 38,364,565$ with a tax loss of $736,595.76$.

## CADASTRAL MAPS:

Washington County's cadastral maps are in hard copy form. The rural areas have aerial photos, flown in 1988, along with mylars of the soil surveys. The urban and suburban areas only have area and ownership lines. A Geographic Information System is currently being implemented in Washington County.

## MAINTAINED BY ASSESSMENT

Washington County's cadastral maps are maintained by the County Surveyor's Office.

## IN GOOD CONDITION

The cadastral maps are updated as required and are in good condition.
Employees are attending GIS workshops and informational meetings for use in implementing our GIS mapping system.

## PROPERTY RECORD CARD:

The property record cards are a combination of hard copy, including a picture, along with a computer generated cost estimate and value summary sheet.

## MAINTAINED BY ASSESSMENT

The property record cards are updated as needed. When a property is reviewed a new picture is taken, and a walk around or drive by inspection is completed. The information is then updated on the property record card and the CAMA system.

## IN GOOD CONDITION

The property record cards are updated on a regular basis and are in good condition. All property record cards were updated with sales, transfers and building permit information. Computer data entry was completed at the same time.

REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS (521's):

## WHAT ARE THEY

The 521 's are in hard copy form with an attachment containing the document filed with the County Clerk's Office. The 521's document the legal description, the successor or "grantor" and the purchaser or the grantee's name and address. In addition, the sale price, and type of sale are listed.

## MAINTAINED BY ASSESSMENT

The 521's are in binders in the Assessor's Office for archival purposes.

## IN GOOD CONDITION

The 521 's are in hard copy form, bound by deed book and page number. They are kept in current status for referral use and archived in the vault for future reference.

## PROCEDURE MANUAL:

The Assessor's Office is documenting individual procedures for inclusion in a procedural manual.
Three members of the staff studied for assessor certification, tested and became State certified. With continuing education classes, job sharing and workshop participation, the Assessor's Office has become more diversified in areas of expertise.

## GENERALLY DESCRIBE EACH PROCESS IN THE OFFICE

Office functions have been previously addressed in this document. Each area has been instructed in specific office functions. Specific functions with help notes are available from TerraScan. In addition, compliance with Nebraska State Statutes and Regulations is a priority. Changes in the office have increased the areas of expertise within the Assessor's Office.

## LEAVES ROOM FOR INDIVIDUAL APPROACHES

The Assessor's Office is sharing in ideas, work flow analysis and planning. This has allowed the office to implement additional training functions for each employee, to streamline the office, and to increase workflow.

## BASED ON REGULATIONS AND IAAO GUIDELINES

The Assessor establishes the guidelines for this assessment function. The Assessor and the Appraisal Team are working closely on function guidelines and the processing of the values. Also, the Appraiser establishes guidelines for appraisal functions. The Staff Appraiser is assessor certified currently training another Assessment Specialist to assist with outside reviews and updating of hard copy cards. Both work closely with the Assessor in this process. The Staff Appraiser reviews existing farm sites, rural subdivisions and residential properties. Properties lying within the review area are also visually reviewed and updates are made to the property record card for any recent improvements or depreciable items noted.

The Deputy Assessor working closely with the commercial appraiser on appraisal techniques, software programs and reviewing lots, rural home sites and rural subdivisions.

## ASSESSMENT FUNCTIONS:

## SPECIFIC DUTIES ASSIGNED TO INDIVIDUALS

Assessor

Deputy Assessor
Commercial Appraiser

Residential Appraisers (2)

Assessment Specialist \#1
Assessment Specialist \#2
Assessment Specialist \#3

Assist county assessor
Responsible to report to county assessor concerning commercial prop.

Responsible to report to county assessor concerning residential prop.

Personal property, homestead and permissive exemptions.
Residential lot sales, 521 's and misc. Duties as needed.
Agricultural, residential improvements \& commercial sales 521's and green belt applications.

Procedures are established by the Assessor, State Statutes, and Regulations.

## APPRAISAL FUNCTIONS:

## SPECIFIC DUTIES ASSIGNED TO INDIVIDUALS

The Appraiser reviews residential improvements. The value for assessment purposes is determined by the Residential Appraiser with assistance from the Assessor.

Agricultural improvements, both old and new are reviewed by the residential appraiser. The assessed values are determined by the Residential Appraiser with assistance from the Assessor.

Residential urban, suburban, and rural sites are reviewed and assessed values are determined by the Assessor and the Residential Appraiser.

Commercial land and improvements, both old and new are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser. The assessed values are determined by the Commercial Appraiser.

Industrial land and improvements, both old and new are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser. The assessed values are determined by the Commercial Appraiser.

Procedures are established by State Regulations and appraiser field work monitored by the Appraiser. All residential field work is completed and monitored by the Residential Appraiser. For 2003, due to job sharing one of the Assessment Specialists is assisting the Residential Appraiser.

All commercial field work is completed and monitored by the Commercial Appraiser.
All industrial field work is completed and monitored by the Commercial Appraiser.
All agricultural improvement field work is completed and monitored by the Residential Appraiser. Due to job sharing, one of the Assessment Specialists is assisting the Residential Appraiser. All agricultural unimproved field work is completed by the Assessor and staff.

## SALES ANALYZED BY THE APPRAISER

All 521 's are reviewed for completion and accuracy
Residential sales are reviewed by the appraiser. This review includes a drive-by inspection along with a new picture.

Commercial and industrial sales are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser.
A drive by review, card update and new picture of property are part of this review.

## ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS TO CLASSES AND SUBCLASSES

Annual adjustments to classes and subclasses are based on statistical analysis of sales by market area or subclass. Annual adjustments are accomplished with the assistance of statistical information that is provided by the State and sales information. These adjustments are applied by area.

## CLASS OR SUBCLASS

Every three to five years the new updated Marshall \& Swift cost estimates are loaded on our CAMA system with new depreciation numbers being established for the individual properties. The most recent update was in June of 2003.

Land values are adjusted, based on sales of similar properties, to reflect market values. Land values are increasing at a very fast rate and have to be reviewed and may need to be adjusted on a yearly bases.

## PROPERTY REVIEW:

Detailed review of all property is scheduled every three to five years

## RE-MEASURE RESIDENTIAL

Residential properties are normally inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

## COMMERCIAL

Commercial properties are normally inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

INDUSTRIAL
Industrial properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

AGRICULTURAL

Agricultural properties are inspected every three to five years, if any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

## INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR INSPECTION

Interior inspections are done on all new construction and for all property protests prior to meeting with the County Board of Equalization. Exterior inspections are done with each sale and during any pickup work on a related property located within the same area.

## RESIDENTIAL

Residential properties/exteriors are inspected on an ongoing basis. If any changes are noted or if the Assessor's information appears suspect the properties are reviewed and re-measured. Interior inspections are more difficult in Washington County since the majority of homeowners are working. Interior inspections are usually required by the County Board of Equalization as part of the protest process prior to any decision being formed by the Board.

## COMMERCIAL

Commercial properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if contrary information appears, the properties are inspected on the exterior and interior.

## INDUSTRIAL

Industrial properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if contrary information appears, the properties are inspected on the exterior and interior.

## AGRICULTURAL

Agricultural properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are inspected on the exterior.

## DEPRECIATION ANALYSIS BASED ON RCN AND SALES:

## RESIDENTIAL

All residential sales are entered into TerraScan, Washington County's CAMA data base system. The system generates a printout that indicates a current RCN along with a sales price per sq. ft. The depreciation indicated by the sales is applied back to similar properties.

COMMERCIAL
All commercial sales are entered into a data base that generates a report that indicates overall depreciation based on current RCN, along with a sale price per sq. ft. The depreciation indicated by the sales is applied back to similar properties.

INDUSTRIAL
There are very few sales of industrial property. The depreciation used for industrial property in Washington County is usually observed condition along with age and life.

All agricultural sales are entered into TerraScan. The system generates a report that indicates a current RCN along with a sales price per sq. ft . The depreciation indicated by the sales is applied back to similar properties.

## SALES REVIEW:

## DONE ON MONTHLY BASIS

The sale review is conducted by the Assessment Specialist. The County Assessor ensures the review of 521's.

## INTERVIEW BUYER WHERE POSSIBLE

All sellers receive a form pertaining to the sale. This form is to be filled out and mailed back to the Assessor. The County has found that this is the most efficient way to complete the process. A sketch is then added to the electronic file. All pictures and sketches are retained on hard copy.

The sales book is maintained by the Assessment Specialists with counter copies available to the public.
DISCUSSION OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY:

## HOW MUCH IS COMPLETE IN THE CAMA SYSTEM

All parcels in Washington County are in the TerraScan system. At this time the Assessor's Office in the process of loading pictures and sketches in the CAMA system.

Hard copy files contains a picture and sketch of each parcel. It is estimated that it will be 3 to 5 years before all the pictures and sketches will be loaded into the computer database.

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION
2006
Initiate the second year of a four-year plan to perform a physical review and re-listing of all residential properties in Washington County. If Blair is completed in 2005, Arlington and Ft Cahoun will be the most likely choices for 2006 re-listing. Residential properties that are not re-valued should be adjusted by percentage, if required, to reflect appreciation of value.

The third year of a five-year plan to load all sketches on-line.
2007
Initiate the third year of a four-year plan to perform a physical review and re-listing of all residential properties in Washington County. Residential properties that are not re-valued should be adjusted by percentage, if required, to reflect appreciation of value.

The fourth year of a five-year plan to load all sketches on-line.
2008
Initiate the fourth year of a four-year plan to perform a physical review and re-listing of all residential properties in Washington County. Residential properties that are not re-valued should be adjusted by percentage, if required, to reflect appreciation of value.

The fifth and final year of a five-year plan to load all sketches on-line.

## DISCUSSION OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY:

## HOW MUCH IS COMPLETED IN THE CAMA SYSTEM

All commercial property information is stored in the Marshall \& Swift cost estimator. This is an appraisal data base that includes the land size along with the property characteristics.

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION
In 2004, the county is planning to start a 3 to 5 year cycle of re-valuing the commercial and industrial property in Washington County. The county will start with small towns. The Commercial Appraiser reviews sales files to determine which subclasses require attention.

DISCUSSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY:

## HOW MUCH IS COMPLETED IN THE CAMA SYSTEM

All land parcels including improvements are located in the TerraScan system. The photo's, sketches and cadastral mapping are not located on TerraScan, however, they are located on hard copy for archival purposes.

LAND
All agricultural land in Washington County is valued four times. A market value is established based off of best use. A recapture value is established based on $80 \%$ of market value. A special use value is established based on uninfluenced agriculture use. Finally, an assessed value is established based on $80 \%$ of the special use value.

The Assessor reviews these values, as required.

## IMPROVEMENTS

All agricultural improvements in Washington County are valued with the Marshall \& Swift cost manual. The acre of ground under the house was re-valued in 2003 for all of the rural areas. For 2006, the first acre of ground under the house will be re-valued again if the sales file confirm.

## ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION

The houses and out buildings are scheduled for re-valuation over a four-year period beginning in 2005.

## CONCLUSION:

DISCUSS PROPOSED END RESULT
Washington County has a good system to document growth, building permits, new buildings and commercial property sales. A system is in place for tracking personal property and new business in the county. Any furthering of a GIS system, total re-listing or additional education will need to be approved by the county board due to budgeting.

## ADVANTAGES OF GOOD RECORDS

Good records maintain our information in an archival condition that exemplifies the respect and integrity of the data for the Assessor's Office, Washington County and State.

ANNUAL RE-VALUE

The decision of the annual re-value is done by the Assessor and the Appraisal Team.

## LESS STICKER SHOCK

Washington County will always have sticker shock in varying degrees as due to the appreciated values of ag land, residential property and home sites. This sticker shock is not only in Washington County but also surrounding counties.

July 26, 2005

Nebraska Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation
Attn: Jerome P. Tooker - Field Liasion
1033 "O" Street
Suite 600
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Re: The Washington County 2005 Plan of Assessment

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

As you are aware, the timing of the plan of assessment and the number of years changed. The 2004 plan of assessment was due prior to September $1^{\text {st }}$ and included five years.

Please contact me if you have questions or if more is required.
Sincerely,

Steven Mencke
Washington County Assessor
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008
(402)426-6800

July 26, 2005

## Washington County Board of Equalization

Attn: Harlo Wilcox - Chairman
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008

Re: The Washington County 2005 Plan of Assessment

## Dear Mr. Wilcox and the Board of Equalization,

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

For 2005, the timing of the plan of assessment and the number of years changed. The 2004 plan of assessment was due prior to September $1^{\text {st }}$ and included five years.

Please contact me if you have questions or if more is required.
Sincerely,

Steven Mencke
Washington County Assessor
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008
(402)426-6800

## 2006 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Washington County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Agricultural Land

## Not Applicable

## Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is $78 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Recapture Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is $75 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

# 2006 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Washington County 

## Recommendations

It is my recommendation that the Tax Equalization and Review Commission make no adjustment.

Residential Commercial Agricultural

Dated this 10th day of April, 2006.


Property Tax Administrator

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For <br> Washington County 

## I Agricultural Land Correlation

"Non applicable"<br>Refer to Sections II and Sections III

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For <br> Washington County 

## II Special Value Correlation

The measurement methodology was developed by the Department utilizing information from counties where only agricultural influence was recognized. I have reviewed the rents and rent to value ratios used to develop the preliminary measurements of Washington County with the assessor. The county accepted the results. But the assessor offered his opinion that the sales used to develop the data that was used for this analysis may have also been influenced by nonagricultural interests, causing even these sales to be unreliable for determining the non influenced values in other counties.

Based upon a review of the preliminary statistics, the county adjusted all three subclasses of unimproved agricultural land which caused all three subclasses of unimproved agricultural land to move within the acceptable range.


ESTIMATED LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2006 ABSTRACT

| $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Estimated Rent } \end{gathered}$ | $2006 \begin{gathered}\text { Assessed } \\ \text { Value }\end{gathered}$ | USE | Estimated Value | Average Rent per Acre | 2006 <br> Indicated Level of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,635,800 | 15,637,590 | IRRIGATED | 20,447,504 | 149.61 | 76.48\% |
| 16,047,324 | 218,348,710 | DRYLAND | 279,083,901 | 94.24 | 78.24\% |
| 500,460 | 9,149,955 | GRASSLAND | 12,511,496 | 30.47 | 73.13\% |
| 18,183,584 | 243,136,255 | All MAJOR USES | 312,042,901 | 92.02 | 77.92\% |

CHANGES BY AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE FOR EACH MAJOR USE

| Average Value Per Acre of IRRIGATED Agricultural Land <br> -Special Valuation |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2005 | $@$ | $\$$ |
| 2006 | $@$ | $\$$ |
| PERCENT CHANGE | $=$ | $1,299.76$ |


| Average Value Per Acre of DRY Agricultural Land - <br> Special Valuation | @ | $\$$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | $@$ | $\$$ |
| 2006 | $1,069.30$ |  |
| PERCENT CHANGE | $=$ | $19.92 \%$ |


| Average Value Per Acre of GRASS Agricultural Land - <br> Special Valuation |
| :--- |
| 2005 |
| 2006 |

NOTES:

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For <br> Washington County 

## III Recapture Value Correlation

The statistics support the action taken by the assessor for the 2006 assessment year. This is a realistic portrayal of how the recapture (market) values are keeping up with the market values for the class as a whole and represents the actions taken by the assessor towards better equalization and assessment uniformity. Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related deferential are significantly above the targeted level. Keeping in mind the non homogeneous nature of the whole agricultural land sales file would indicate that the county has in the past worked towards the improvement of the assessment of the agricultural land in the county and does not indicate unacceptable assessment practices. The assessor's office has been compelled to monitor the actions of the market values due to the high activity or interest in the purchase of tracts of agricultural land and then being developed for other uses such as for rural residential.

Refer to the following statistical analysis:

Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006


Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006


Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006
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Date Range: 07/01/2002 to 06/30/2005 Posted Before: 02/03/2006


Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation 1033 "O" Street<br>Lincoln, Nebraska 68508<br>\section*{RE: Methodology for Determining Special and Recapture Valuation for Agricultural Land in Washington County.}

To the Department,
Special valuation in Washington County for 2006 has increased for the three major land use categories. The preliminary statistical analysis provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, indicated the value of grassland and dry land in Washington County should be increased by twenty percent, and the value of irrigated ground should be increased by ten percent for 2006. As a result of the change to three major land classes, Washington County's special valuations for 2006 are similar or equal to surrounding counties.

The 2006 recapture valuations in Washington County increased in Market Area 1 and 26. The valuations in other market areas did not change for 2006. Sales from the past three years were analyzed by area, and used to establish the 2006 recapture values.

Market areas have been used in the past and will continue to be used for the eighty percent and one hundred percent valuations in 2006. For 2006 Washington County continues to use two subclasses per market area based on size of the parcel. In all but one market area, the under 38 acre tracts will utilize a graduated or sliding valuation which decreases the valuation on a per acre basis as the size of the parcel increases. For the 38 acre tracts and above, the valuation will be on an established (flat) per acre basis which was determined for that specific market area.

Please contact me if more is required.
Sincerely,

Steven Mencke
Washington County Assessor
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008
(402)426-6800
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## Purpose Statements

## Commission Summary

Displays essential statistical information from other reports contained in the R\&O. It is intended to provide an overview for the Commission, and is not intended as a substitute for the contents of the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$.

## Property Tax Administrator's Opinions \& Recommendations

Contains the conclusions and recommendations reached by the Property Tax Administrator regarding level of value and quality of assessment based on all the data provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Department regarding the assessment activities of the county.

## Correlation Section

Contains the narrative analysis of the assessment actions and statistical results which may influence the determination of the level of value and quality of assessment for the three major classes of real property. This section is divided into three parts: Residential Real Property; Commercial Real Property; and, Agricultural Land. All information for a class of real property is grouped together to provide a thorough analysis of the level of value and quality of assessment for the class of real property.

Each part of the Correlation Section contains the following sub-parts:
I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratios
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the County Assessor Actions

Sub-part I is the narrative conclusion of all information known to the Department regarding the class of property under analysis. Sub-parts II through VII compare important statistical indicators that the Department relies on when comparing assessment actions to statistical results and provide the explanation necessary to understand the conclusions reached in Sub-part I.

The Correlation Section also contains the 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, Compared with the 2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report which compares data from two annual administrative reports filed by the county assessor. It compares the data from the 2005 CTL to establish the prior year's assessed valuation and compares it to the data from the 2006 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, to demonstrate the annual change in assessed valuation that has occurred between assessment years. This report displays the amount of assessed dollars of change in value and the percentage change
in the value of various classes and subclasses of real property. It also analyzes real property growth valuation in the county.

## Statistical Reports Section

Contains the statistical reports prepared by the Department pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. Section 77-1327(3) (R. S. Supp., 2005) and the Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999). These statistical reports are the outputs of the assessment sales ratio study of the county by the Department.

The statistical reports are prepared and provided to the county assessors at least four times each year. The Department, pursuant to 350 Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 12, Sales File, and Directive 05-10, Responsibilities of the County or State Assessor and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation in the Development of the Real Property Sales File for Assessment Year 2006, September 9, 2005, provided Draft Statistical Reports, to each county assessor on or before Friday, September 16, 2005, based on data in the sales file as of Monday, September 13, 2005, and on or before Friday, November 18, 2005, based on data in the sales file as of Friday, November 16, 2005. The purpose of the Draft Statistical Reports was to provide the statistical indicators of the sales in the biannual rosters that were also provided to the county assessors on the aforementioned dates.

The Department provided the 2006 Preliminary Statistical Reports to the county assessors and the Commission on or before Tuesday, February 7, 2006, based on data in the sales file as of Monday, January 30, 2006.

The Statistical Reports Section contains statistical reports from two points in time:
R\&O Statistical Reports, in which the numerator of the assessment sales ratio is the 2006 assessed valuation of the property in the sales file as of the 2006 Abstract Filing Date.

Preliminary Statistical Reports, in which the numerator of the assessment sales ratio is the final 2005 assessed value of the property in the sales file.

All statistical reports are prepared using the query process described in the Technical Specification Section of the 2006 R\&O.

## County Assessment Survey

Part one contains the General Information developed in a combined effort between the Department and the county assessor to describe the funding and staffing of the county assessor's office. It also documents the appraisal information as it relates to the three major classes of property; residential, commercial and agricultural land.

Part two of the Assessment Survey entitled "Assessment Actions" is also a joint effort between the Department and the county assessor to document the 2006 assessment actions taken to address the three classes of real property in the county.

## County Reports Section

Contains reports from and about a county which are referenced in other sections of the R\&O:

## County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

A required administrative report filed annually with the Department by the county assessor. It is a summation of the 2006 assessed values and parcel record counts of each defined class or subclass of real property in the county and the number of acres and total assessed value by Land Capability Group (LCG) and by market area (if any).

## County Agricultural Land Detail

A report prepared by the Department. The Department relies on the data submitted by the county assessor on the Abstract of Assessment of Real Property, Form 45, Schedule IX and computes by county and by market area (if any) the average assessed value of each LCG and land use.

## The County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment-Update

The Three Year Plan of Assessment is prepared by the county assessor and updated annually pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (R. S. Supp., 2005). It explains the scope and detail of the assessment processes planned by the county assessor for the next assessment year and subsequent two assessment years.

## Special Valuation Section

The recognition of special valuation in a county, in whole or in part, presents challenges to the measurement of level of value and quality of assessment of special value and recapture value. Special valuation is a unique assessment process that imposes an obligation upon the assessment officials to assess qualified real property at a constrained taxable value. It presents challenges to measurement officials by limiting the use of a standard tool of measurement, the assessment sales ratio study. The Purpose Statements provides the legal and policy framework for special valuation and describes the methodology used by the Department to measure the special value and recapture value in a county.

Special valuation is deemed recognized if the county assessor has determined that there are factors other than agricultural or horticultural influences on the actual value of agricultural land and has established a special value that is different than the recapture (full market value) value for part or all of the agricultural land in the county. If a county has implemented special valuation, all information necessary for the measurement of agricultural land in that county will be contained in the Special Valuation Section of the R\&O of the Property Tax Administrator.

## Nebraska Constitutional Provisions:

Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1, (1) (1998): Taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as provided by this Constitution.

Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1, (4) (1998): the Legislature may provide that agricultural land and horticultural land, as defined by the Legislature, shall constitute a separate and distinct class of property for purposed of taxation and may provide for a different method of taxing agricultural land and horticultural land which results in values that are not uniform and proportionate with all other real property and franchises but which results in values that are uniform and proportionate upon all property within the class of agricultural land and horticultural land.

Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1, (5) (1998): the Legislature to enact laws to provide that the value of land actively devoted to agricultural or horticultural use shall for property tax purposes be that value which such land has for agricultural or horticultural use without regard to any value which such land might have for other purposes or uses.

## Nebraska Statutory Provisions for Agricultural Land:

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003): Actual value, defined. Actual value of real property for purposes of taxation means the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade. Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in section $77-1371$, (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach. Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, or in an arm's length transaction, between a willing buyer and willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable concerning all the uses of which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used. In analyzing the uses and restrictions applicable to real property, the analysis shall include a consideration of the full description of the physical characteristics of the real property and an identification of the property rights being valued.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp., 2005): Property taxable; valuation; classification. (1) Except as provided in subsections (2) through (4) of this section, all real property in this state, not expressly exempt therefrom, shall be subject to taxation and shall be valued at its actual value. (2) Agricultural land and horticultural land as defined in section 77-1359 shall constitute a separate and distinct class of property for purposes of property taxation, shall be subject to taxation, unless expressly exempt from taxation, and shall be valued at eighty percent of its actual value. (3) Agricultural land and horticultural land actively devoted to agricultural or horticultural purposes which has value for purposes other than agricultural or horticultural uses and which meets the qualifications for special valuation under section 77-1344 shall constitute a separate and distinct class of property for purposes of property taxation, shall be subject to taxation, and shall be valued for taxation at eighty percent of its special value as defined in section 77-1343 and at eighty percent of its recapture value as defined in section 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under section 77-1347.......

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359(1) (R.R.S., 2003): Agricultural and horticultural land; terms defined. Agricultural land and horticultural land shall mean land which is primarily used for the production of agricultural or horticultural products, including wasteland lying in or adjacent to and in common ownership or management with land used for the production of agricultural or horticultural products. Land retained or protected for future agricultural or horticultural uses under a conservation easement as provided in the Conservation and Preservation Easements Act shall be defined as agricultural land or horticultural land. Land enrolled in a federal or state program in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural or horticultural production shall be defined as agricultural land or horticultural land. Land that is zoned predominantly for purposes other than agricultural or horticultural use shall not be assessed as agricultural land or horticultural land.

## Nebraska Statutory Provisions for Special Valuation:

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(3) (R. S. Supp., 2005): Creates a separate and distinct class of property for special valuation for purposes of property taxation, shall be subject to taxation, and shall be valued for taxation at eighty percent of its special value as defined in Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1343 (R. S. Supp., 2004) and at eighty percent of its recapture value as defined in Neb. Rev. Stat. §771343 (R. S. Supp., 2004).

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1343(5) (R. S. Supp., 2004): Definition of recapture valuation. Recapture valuation means the actual value of the land pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R. R. S., 2003).

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1343(6) (R. S. Supp., 2004): Definition of special valuation. Special valuation means the value that the land would have for agricultural or horticultural purposes or uses without regard to the actual value the land would have for other purposes or uses.

## Nebraska Statutory Provisions for Measurement of Level of Value:

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(4) (R. S. Supp., 2005): For purposes of determining the level of value of agricultural and horticultural land subject to special valuation under section 77-1343 to 771348, the Property Tax Administrator shall annually make and issue a comprehensive study developed in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques to establish the level of value if in his or her opinion the level of value cannot be developed through the use of the comprehensive assessment ratio studies developed in subsection (3) of this section.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023(2) (R.S. Supp., 2004): An acceptable range is the percentage of variation from a standard for valuation as measured by an established indicator of central tendency of assessment. Acceptable ranges are: (a) For agricultural and horticultural land as defined in section 77-1359, seventy-four to eighty percent of actual value; (b) for lands defined in section 77-1344 receiving special valuation, seventy-four to eighty percent of special valuation as defined in section 77-1343; and (c) for all other real property, ninety-two to one hundred percent of actual value.

## Discussion of the Constitutional and Statutory Provisions:

Nebraska law requires that all values of real property for tax purposes shall be uniform and proportionate. Agricultural land may be treated differently from other real property for tax purposes, but the assessed values shall be uniform and proportionate within the class of agricultural land. Additionally, agricultural land may be valued for tax purposes at its value solely for agricultural use without regard to the value the land might have for any other purpose and use; however, these values must be uniform and proportionate within the application of this constitutional provision.

Nebraska's statutory structure for the valuation of agricultural land is fairly straightforward. The valuation policy is based on actual or market value. Actual value is a common, market standard that is used to determine the value of a property for many purposes, including taxation. Actual value is also a measure that is governed by practices and principles familiar to most people. Additionally, using actual value as the standard by which to determine valuation of real property provides the property owner with the ability to judge the proportionality of the valuation with other like property or other classes of property.

## Discussion of Special Valuation:

The policy of special valuation was developed as the conversion of agricultural land to other uses demanded action for two purposes: one, the systematic and planned growth and development near and around urban areas; and two, to provide a tax incentive to keep agricultural uses in place until the governing body was ready for the growth and development of the land. Special value is both a land management tool and a tax incentive for compliance with the governing body's land management needs. As alternative, more intensive land uses put pressure for the conversion of underdeveloped land, economic pressures for higher and more intensive uses from non-agricultural development provide economic incentives to landowners to sell or convert their land. Governments, in order to provide for the orderly and efficient expansion of their duties, may place restrictions on landowners who convert land from one land use to a higher more intensive land use. Additionally, the existing landowners who may wish to continue their agricultural operations have an incentive to continue those practices until the governing body is ready for the conversion of their property to a more intensive use.

Without special valuation, existing agricultural landowners in these higher intensive use areas would be forced to convert their land for tax purposes, as the market value of the land could be far greater than its value for agricultural purposes and uses. The history of special valuation would indicate that the other purposes and uses are those not normally or readily known within the agricultural sector and are more intensive, such as residential, recreational, commercial or industrial development.

There are two scenarios that exist when special valuation is implemented in a county:
One, special valuation is applicable in a defined area of the county or only for certain types of land in the county. In these situations the county has found that use of the land for non-agricultural purposes and uses influences the actual value of some of the
agricultural land in the county. In these situations, the Department must measure the level of value of agricultural land, special value, and recapture value. If the methodology of the county assessor states that the county assessor used sales of similar land that are not influenced by the non-agricultural purposes and uses of the land, then the sales of uninfluenced land are used to determine the special valuation of the influenced land. The sales of the influenced land are used to determine the recapture value of the influenced land. The sales of agricultural land that are not influenced by the non-agricultural purposes and uses are used to measure the level of value of uninfluenced agricultural land.

Two, special valuation is applicable in the entire county. In this situation the county has found that the actual value of land for other purposes and uses other than agricultural purposes and uses influences the actual value of all of the agricultural land in the county. In these situations, the Department must measure the level of value of special value and recapture value.

## Measurement of Special Valuation

The Department has two options in measuring the level of value of special valuation. In a county where special valuation is not applicable in the entire county and the land that is subject to special value is similar to agricultural land that is not subject to special value, the Department can analyze the level of value outside the special valuation area and determine if the level of value in that area should be deemed to be the level of value for special valuation. If the land in the special value area is dissimilar to other agricultural land in the county so there is no comparability of properties, the Department would analyze the valuations applicable for special value to determine if they correlate with the valuations in other parts of the county or other counties, even though direct comparability may not exist.

In a county where special valuation is applicable throughout the entire county, the Department has developed an income based measurement methodology which does not rely on the sales of agricultural land in the county. In developing this methodology, the Department considered all possible mass appraisal techniques. There is, however, no generally accepted approach for the measurement of constrained values. For example, the assessment/sales ratio study measures influences of the "whole" market. In counties where there are nonagricultural influences throughout the county, there are no sales in that county without a nonagricultural influence on value. As a result, the Department had to examine and adapt professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques to the measurement of special valuation other than the assessment sales ratio. As the Department analyzed the three professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques relating to the valuation of real property, the Department discarded the use of the cost approach as not being suited to the analysis of unimproved agricultural land. With respect to the sales comparison approach, in counties that are 100 percent special valuation, any sales data would have to be "surrogate" sales from other counties where nonagricultural influences have no impact on sales of agricultural land. This analysis would provide a significant level of subjectivity in terms of whether the counties from which the surrogate sales are drawn are truly comparable to the county that is being measured. The Department ultimately chose to adapt the income approach to this process. First, the income approach could rely on income data from the
county being measured. Second, the Department could, to some degree, reduce the subjectivity of the process because nonagricultural influences do not influence the cash rent that land used for agricultural purposes commands in the market place.

## Rent Data

For purposes of determining the income for the Department's measurement technique, the Department gathered cash rent data for agricultural land. There were three sources for cash rent data. One, the annual study done by the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, titled Nebraska Farm Real Estate Market Developments 2004-2005. Two, the Board of Educational Lands and Funds (BELF), which provides a statewide schedule of crop land rental rates and grass land rental rates. The databases provided by BELF contained a summary presentation of all of the rental contracts that were examined by county, parcel size, land use, contract rent, BELF rent estimate and classification and notes relating to lease conditions. This data was provided for both cropland and grassland. Three, the annual survey entitled Farm and Ranch Managers Cash Rental Rate Survey, which is provided to the Department from BELF.

Gross rental amounts are used in the Department's methodology because the marketplace tends to take expenses and taxes (items that must be accounted for in any income approach to value) into account in the determination of the amount the lessee will pay the lessor for the rental of agricultural land.

## Rate Data

The second portion of the income methodology is the development of a "rate". The Department sought to correlate the available data and determine a single rate for each major land use. By doing this, the final values which were developed as a standard for comparison with the special valuation varied by county based on the rent estimates that were made. The calculation for the rate was done in several steps. First, the abstract of assessment was used to determine the assessed valuation for each land classification group for the counties not using special valuation that were comparable to the special valuation counties. Second, that assessed valuation was divided by the level of value for agricultural land as determined by the Commission to reach $100 \%$ of the value of agricultural land without nonagricultural influences. In turn, the Department took the rent estimates for each LCG in those counties and multiplied them by the number of acres in that LCG to generate total income. That amount was then divided by the total value of agricultural land to determine a rate for that county. The rates for the comparable counties were then arrayed, in a manner similar to assessment/sales ratios. In developing the rates, a starting point was the use of "comparable" counties to those using special valuation.

The Department looked to counties where there was not an active process of special valuation in place or unrecognized nonagricultural influences. Additionally, the Department looked to comparable counties in the proximity of the counties being measured. The most significant group was made up of the counties that were geographically adjacent to the eight special valuation counties. Further, the Department looked at the distribution of land uses in the comparable counties and whether they were similar to those in the subject counties. The Department then sorted counties and rates based on land use mix. As the Department worked through the process, land use mix and the adjacent county mix tended to drive the analysis. The
eight primary special valuation counties were all strongly weighted toward dryland use; the eight eastern Special Value counties ranged from about $62 \%$ to $83 \%$ dryland use.

For 2006, the analysis indicated an irrigated rate of $8.00 \%$, slightly lower than the rate of $8.25 \%$ used in 2005 . Initially the rate of $5.50 \%$ was selected for dryland measurement. This rate was significantly lower that the 2005 rate of $6.25 \%$. After receiving input from the eight eastern counties being measured the Department decided to soften its dryland rate estimate to 5.75\%. The analysis also indicated a rate of $4.00 \%$ for grassland, slightly lower than the rate of $4.25 \%$ used in 2005. The lowered rates are deemed to be a direct reflection of significant valuation increases in the values in the comparable counties.

Additionally for 2006, the Department is required to produce a measurement of the Special Value process in Scotts Bluff County. The database was expanded to include the whole state, and a separate analysis was developed. It was apparent very early that the rates developed for the eastern Special Value analysis had no relationship to the western counties, so the rate analysis was done including the ten (excluding Scotts Bluff) western counties. Using grouping and analysis techniques similar to those used in the eastern part of the state, within the ten western counties, the Department chose a dryland conversion rate of $7.75 \%$, and a grassland conversion rate of $4.00 \%$.

The irrigation rate selection was more complex due to a shortage of comparable counties. Scotts Bluff County is the heaviest irrigated county among the western counties. The irrigation is predominantly in the Platte River valley, has been developed over many years for the production of corn, dry edible beans and sugar beets, and has large areas leveled for gravity irrigation. More than $40 \%$ of Scotts Bluff County's agricultural land is irrigated. The second highest irrigated county is Box Butte County with just over 20\% irrigation. Box Butte's irrigated land consists of mostly upland soils with pivot application. Much of the other irrigation development in the panhandle region is either similar to Box Butte or is found in spot locations used for feed grain or hay production in otherwise cattle grazing regions. The only 2 areas deemed to be comparable are Market area 2 from Sioux County which is essentially the same soils and irrigation development as the central and northwestern portions of Scotts Bluff County, and market area 1 in Morrill County which is Platte River valley land that is an eastern extension of Scotts Bluff County. Analysis of the entire western counties indicated an irrigated rate of nearly $15.00 \%$, but the two comparable market areas produced rates of $10.04 \%$ and $12.80 \%$ respectively. The department selected a rate for the conversion of rent estimates in Scotts Bluff County of 11.50\%. For 2006, the preliminary estimates of the LOV in Scotts Bluff County were prepared using the following rates: Irrigated 11.50\%, Dryland 7.75\% and Grassland 4.00\%.

## Valuation Calculation

The applicable rates were applied to the rental income for each land use multiplied by the number of acres for that use. The result of this calculation was to reach total special valuation, which represents of the value for agricultural purposes only.

Measurement Calculation

Finally, to calculate the level of value achieved by a county, the Department took value calculated from the income approach, representing the total special valuation for a county and compared it to the amount of special valuation provided by the county on its annual abstract of assessment to reach the estimated level of value for special valuation in each subject county.

## Measurement of Recapture Valuation

The measurement of recapture valuation is accomplished by using the Department's sales file and conducting a ratio study using the recapture value instead of the assessed or special value in making the comparison to selling price. The Department has the capability of providing statistical reports utilizing all agricultural sales or utilizing only the sales that have occurred with recapture valuation stated by the county assessor on the sales file record.

## Measurement of Agricultural Land Valuation

In a county where special valuation is not applicable in the entire county, the Department must measure the level of value of the agricultural land valuation. This is accomplished by using part of the agricultural land sales file using sales that are not in the area where special valuation is available. Other than using only the applicable part of the sales file, this is the same measurement process that is used by the Department for agricultural land in a county that has no other purposes and uses for its agricultural land.

## Purpose Statements Section

Describes the contents and purpose of each section in the R\&O.

## Glossary

Contains the definitions of terms used throughout the R\&O.

## Technical Specifications Section

Contains the calculations used to prepare the Commission Summary, the Correlation Section tables, the Statistical Reports Query, and the Statistical Reports.

## Certification

Sets forth to whom, how and when copies of the R\&O are distributed.

## Map Section

The Map section contains a collection of maps that the Property Tax Administrator has gathered that pertain to each county. These maps may be used as a supplement to the R\&O.

## Valuation History Charts Section

The Valuation History chart section contains five charts for each county. The first four charts display taxable valuations by property class and subclass, annual percentage change, cumulative percentage change, and the rate of annual percent change over the time period of 1992 to 2005. The fifth chart displays 2005 taxable valuations by property type for each city within the county and compares to the county's valuation for each class and subclass of property. The fifth chart also displays populations for the cities and the county.

## Glossary

Actual Value: The market value or fair market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade. Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in sections 771371 (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach. Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, or in an arm's length transaction, between a willing buyer and willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable concerning all the uses of which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used. In analyzing the uses and restrictions applicable to real property, the analysis shall include a consideration of the full description of the physical characteristics of the real property and an identification of the property rights being valued.

Adjusted Sale Price: A sale price that is the result of adjustments made to the purchase price reported on the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521, for the affects of personal property or financing included in the reported purchase price. If the sale price is adjusted, it is the adjusted sale price that will be used as the denominator in the assessment sales ratio. The IAAO considers adjustments for time. However, currently the Department does not recognize adjustments for time.

Agricultural Land: Land that is agricultural land and horticultural land as defined in Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1343(1) (R. S. Supp., 2004) and Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359(1) (R. R. S., 2003).

Agricultural Land Market Areas: Areas with defined characteristics within which similar agricultural land is effectively competitive in the minds of buyers and sellers with other comparable agricultural land in the area within a county. These areas are defined by the county assessor.

Agricultural Property Classification: Includes all properties in the state-wide sales file with Property Classification Code: Property parcel type-05 Agricultural, all Statuses. A subclassification is defined for the Status-2: unimproved agricultural properties (see, Agricultural Unimproved Property Classification).

Agricultural Unimproved Property Classification: Includes all properties in the state-wide sales file with Property Classification Code: Property parcel type-05 Agricultural, Status-2.

Arm's Length Transaction: A sale between two or more parties, each seeking to maximize their positions from the transaction. All sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

Assessed Value: The value of a parcel of real property established by a government that will be the basis for levying a property tax. In Nebraska, the assessed value of a parcel of real property is first established by the county assessor of each county. For purposes of the Department's sales file, the assessed value displays the value for land, improvements and total. The assessed value is the numerator in the assessment sales ratio.

Assessment: The official act of the county assessor to discover, list, value, and determine the taxable value of real property in a county and placing it on the assessment roll.

Assessment Level: The legal requirement for the assessed value of all parcels of real property. In Nebraska, the assessment level for the classes of residential and commercial real property is one hundred percent of actual value; the assessment level for the class of agricultural and horticultural land is $80 \%$ of actual value; and, the assessment level for agricultural land receiving special valuation is $80 \%$ of special value and recapture value.

Assessment Sales Ratio: The ratio that is the result of the assessed value divided by the sale price, or adjusted sale price, of a parcel of real property that has sold within the study period of the state-wide sales file.

Assessor Location: Categories in the state-wide sales file which are defined by the county assessor to represent a class or subclass of property that is not required by statute or regulation. Assessor location allows the county assessor to further sub-stratify the sales in the state-wide sales file.

Average Absolute Deviation (AVG.ABS.DEV.): The arithmetic mean of the total absolute deviations from a measure of central tendency such as the median. It is used in calculating the coefficient of dispersion (COD).

Average Assessed Value: The value that is the result of the total assessed value of all sold properties in the sample data set divided by the total of the number of sales in the sample data set.

Average Selling Price: The value that is the result of the total sale prices of all properties in the sample data set divided by the total of the number of sales in the sample data set.

Central Tendency, Measure of: A single point in a range of observations, around which the observations tend to cluster. The three most commonly used measures of central tendency calculated by the Department are the median ratio, weighted mean ratio and mean ratio.

Coefficient of Dispersion (COD): A measure of assessment uniformity. It is the average absolute deviation calculated about the median expressed as a percentage of the median.

Coefficient of Variation (COV): The measure of the relative dispersion of the sample data set about the mean. It is the standard deviation expressed in terms of a percentage of the mean.

Commercial Property Classification: Includes all properties in the state-wide sales file with Property Classification Code: Property parcel type-02 Multi-Family, all Statuses; Property parcel type 03-Commercial, all Statuses; and, Property parcel type 04-Industrial, all Statuses.

Confidence Interval (CI): A calculated range of values in which the measure of central tendency of the sales is expected to fall. The Department has calculated confidence intervals around all three measures of central tendency.

Confidence Level: The required degree of confidence in a confidence interval commonly stated as 90,95 , or 99 percent. For example, a 95 percent confidence interval would mean that one can be $95 \%$ confident that the measure of central tendency used in the interval falls within the indicated range.

Direct Equalization: The process of adjusting the assessed values of parcels of real property, usually by class or subclass, using adjustment factors or percentages, to achieve proportionate valuations among the classes or subclasses.

Equalization: The process to ensure that all locally assessed real property and all centrally assessed real property is assessed at or near the same level of value as required by law.

Geo Code: Each township represented by a state-wide unique sequential four-digit number starting with the township in the most northeast corner of the state in Boyd County going west to the northwest corner of the state in Sioux County and then proceeding south one township and going east again, until ending at the township in the southwest corner of the state in Dundy County.

Growth Value: Is reported by the county assessor on the Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45. Growth value includes all increases in valuation due to improvements of real properties as a result of new construction, improvements, and additions to existing buildings. Growth value does not include a change in the value of a class or subclass of real property as a result of the revaluation of existing parcels, the value changes resulting from a change in use of the parcel, or taxable value added because a parcel has changed status from exempt to taxable. There is no growth value for agricultural land.

Indirect Equalization: The process of computing hypothetical values that represent the best estimate of the total taxable value available at the prescribed assessment level. Usually a function used to ensure the proper distribution of intergovernmental transfer payments between state and local governments, such as state aid to education.

Level of Value: The level of value is the most probable overall opinion of the relationship of assessed value to actual value achieved by the county assessor for a class or subclass of centrally assessed property. The Property Tax Administrator is annually required to give an opinion of the level of value achieved by each county assessor to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. The acceptable range for levels of value for classes of real property are provided in Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (3) (R.S. Supp., 2005).

Location: The portion of the Property Classification Code that describes the physical situs of the real property by one of the following descriptions:

1-Urban, a parcel of real property located within the limits of an incorporated city or village.
2-Suburban, a parcel of real property located outside the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.
3-Rural, a parcel of real property located outside an urban or suburban area, or located in an unincorporated village or subdivision which is outside the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.

Majority Land Use: The number of acres compared to total acres by land use for agricultural land. The thresholds used by the Department are: $95 \%, 80 \%$ and $50 \%$. If "N/A" appears next to any category it means there are "other" land classifications included within this majority grouping.

Maximum Ratio: The largest ratio occurring in the arrayed sample data set.
Mean Ratio: The ratio that is the result of the total of all assessment/sales ratios in the sample data set divided by the number of ratios in the sample data set.

Median Ratio: The middle ratio of the arrayed sample data set. If there is an even number of ratios, the median is the average of the two middle ratios.

Minimally Improved Agricultural Land: A statistical report that uses the sales file data for all sales of parcels classified as Property Classification Code: Property parcel type-05 Agricultural, which have non-agricultural land and/or improvements of minimal value, the assessed value is determined to be less than $\$ 10,000$ and less than $5 \%$ of the selling price.

Minimum Ratio: The smallest ratio occurring in the arrayed sample data set.
Non-Agricultural Land: For purposes of the County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, land located on a parcel that is classified as Property Classification Code: Property parcel type-05 Agricultural, which is not defined as agricultural and horticultural land, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359 (R. R. S., 2003).

Number of Sales: The total number of sales contained in the sales file that occurred within the applicable Sale Date Range for the class of real property.

Population: The set of data from which a statistical sample is taken. In assessment, the population is all parcels of real property within a defined class or subclass in the county.

Price Related Differential (PRD): A measure of assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). It measures the relative treatment of properties based upon the selling price of the properties. It is calculated by dividing the mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio.

Property Classification Code: A code that is required on the property record card of all parcels of real property in a county. The Property Classification Code enables the stratification of real property into classes and subclasses of real property within each county. The classification code is a series of numbers which is defined in Title 350, Nebraska Administrative Code, ch.10004.02.

Property Parcel Type: The portion of the Property Classification Code that indicates the predominant use of the parcel as determined by the county assessor. The Property parcel types are:

01-Single Family Residential<br>02-Multi-Family Residential<br>03-Commercial<br>04-Industrial<br>05-Agricultural<br>06-Recreational<br>07-Mobile Home<br>08-Minerals, Non-Producing<br>09-Minerals, Producing<br>10-State Centrally Assessed<br>11-Exempt<br>12-Game and Parks

Purchase Price: The actual amount, expressed in terms of money, paid for a good or service by a willing buyer. This is the amount reported on the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521, Line 22.

Qualified Sale: A sale which is an arm's length transaction included in the state-wide sales file. The determination of the qualification of the sale may be made by the county assessor or the Department.

Qualitative Statistics: Statistics which assist in the evaluation of assessment practices, such as the coefficient of dispersion (COD) and the price related differential (PRD).

Quality of Assessment: The quality of assessment achieved by the county assessor for a class or subclass of real property. The Property Tax Administrator is annually required to give an opinion of the quality of assessment achieved by each county assessor to the Commission.

Recapture Value: For agricultural and horticultural land receiving special valuation, the assessed value of the land if the land becomes disqualified from special valuation. Recapture value means the actual value of the land pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003). Special value land is valued for taxation at $80 \%$ of its recapture value, if recapture is triggered.

Residential Property Classification: Includes all properties in the state-wide sales file with Property Classification Code: Property parcel type-01 Single Family, all Statuses; Property parcel type-06 Recreational, all Statuses; and, Property parcel type-07 Mobile Home, Statuses 1 and 3.

Sale: All transactions of real property for which the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521, is filed and with stated consideration of more than one hundred dollars or upon which more than one dollar and seventy-five cents or two dollars and twenty-five cents (effective 7/1/05) of documentary stamp taxes are paid.

Sale Date Range: The range of sale dates reported on Real Estate Transfer Statements, Form 521, that are included in the sales assessment ratio study for each class of real property.

Sale Price: The actual amount, expressed in terms of money, received for a unit of goods or services, whether or not established in a free and open market. The sale price may be an indicator of actual value of a parcel of real property. An estimate of the sales price may be made from the amount of Documentary Stamp Tax reported on the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521, as the amount recorded on the deed. The sale price is part of the denominator in the assessment sales ratio.

Sample Data Set: A set of observations selected from a population.
Special Value: For agricultural and horticultural land receiving special valuation, the assessed value of the land if the land is qualified for special valuation. Special value means the value that the land has for agricultural or horticultural purposes or uses without regard to the actual value that land has for other purposes and uses. Special value land is valued for taxation at $80 \%$ of its special value.

Standard Deviation (STD): The measure of the extent of the absolute difference of the sample data set around the mean. This calculation is the first step in calculating the coefficient of variation (COV). It assumes a normalized distribution of data, and therefore is not relied on heavily in the analysis of assessment practices.

Statistics: Numerical descriptive data calculated from a sample, for example the median, mean or COD. Statistics are used to estimate corresponding measures for the population.

Status: The portion of the Property Classification Code that describes the status of a parcel:
1-Improved, land upon which buildings are located.
2-Unimproved, land without buildings or structures.
3-Improvement on leased land (IOLL), any item of real property which is located on land owned by a person other than the owner of the item.

Total Assessed Value: The sum of all the assessed values in the sample data set.

Total Sale Price: The sum of all the sale prices in the sample data set. If the selling price of a sale was adjusted for qualification, then the adjusted selling price would be used.

Usability: The coding for the treatment of a sale in the state-wide sales file database.
1-use the sale without adjustment
2-use the sale with an adjustment
3-substantially changed sale should not be used in study
4-exclude the sale
Valuation: Process or act to determine the assessed value of all parcels of real property in the county each year.

Weighted Mean Ratio: The ratio that is the result of the total of all assessed values of all properties in the sample data set divided by the total of all sale prices of all properties in the sample data set.

## Commission Summary Calculations

## For all classes of real property

For Statistical Header Information and History: see Statistical Calculations

## For Residential Real Property

$\%$ of value of this class of all real property value in the county:
Abstract \#4 value + Abstract \#16 value/Abstract Total Real Property Value
\% of records sold in study period:
Total Sales from Sales File/Abstract \#4 records + Abstract \#16 records
$\%$ of value sold in the study period:
Total Value from Sales File/Abstract \#4 value + Abstract \# 16 value
Average assessed value of the base:
Abstract \#4 value + Abstract \#16 value/Abstract \#4 records + Abstract \# 16 records

## For Commercial Real Property

$\%$ of value of this class of all real property value in the county:
Abstract \#8 value + Abstract \# 12 value/Abstract Total Real Property Value
\% of records sold in study period:
Total Sales from Sales File/Abstract \#8 records + Abstract \# 12 records
\% of value sold in the study period:
Total Value from Sales File/Abstract \#8 value + Abstract \# 12 value
Average assessed value of the base:
Abstract \#8 value + Abstract \#12 value/Abstract \# 8 records + Abstract \# 12 records

## For Agricultural Land

$\%$ of value of this class of all real property value in the county:
Abstract \#30 value/Abstract Total Real Property Value
$\%$ of records sold in the study period:
Total Sales from Sales File/Abstract \#30 records
$\%$ of value sold in the study period:
Total Value from Sales File/Abstract \#30 value

Average assessed value of the base:
Abstract \#30 value/Abstract \#30 records

## Correlation Table Calculations

## I. Correlation - Text only

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 2001 |  |  |  |
| 2002 |  |  |  |
| 2003 |  |  | XX.XX |
| 2004 |  |  | XX.XX |
| 2005 |  |  | XX.XX |
| 2006 |  |  | XX.XX |

Chart: Yes
Stat Type: Total \& Qualified
Stat Title: R\&O
Study Period: Standard
Property Type: Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Unimproved
Display: XX.XX
History: 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005
Field: no2006
Calculation:
Percent of Sales Used: Round([Qualified]/[Total]*100,2)

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratios

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2001 |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 |  | XX.XX | XX.XX |  |

Chart: Yes
Stat Type: Qualified
Stat Title: R\&O and Prelim
Study Period: Standard
Property Type: Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Unimproved
Display: XX.XX
History: 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005
Field: median
Calculations:
\%Chngexclgrowth: Round(IIf([proptype]="Residential",(([Trended 4 (resgrowvalsum)]!SumOftotalvalue-[Trended 4 (resgrowvalsum)]!SumOfgrowth-
Avg(ctl05cnt!RESID+ct105cnt!RECREAT))*100)/Avg(ct105cnt!RESID+ct105cnt!RECREAT),II
f([proptype]="Commercial",(([Trended 5 (comgrowvalsum)]!SumOftotalvalue-[Trended 5 (comgrowvalsum)]!SumOfgrowth-
Avg(ctl05cnt!COMM+ct105cnt!INDUST))*100)/Avg(ct105cnt!COMM+ct105cnt!INDUST),IIf([ proptype]="AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED",(([Trended 6 (agvalsum)]!SumOftotalvalueAvg(ctl05cnt!TOTAG))*100)/Avg(ctl05cnt!TOTAG),Null))),2)
Trended Ratio: Round(IIf([proptype]="Residential",([Trended 1 (Prelim).median]+([Trended 1
(Prelim).median]*([Trended 4 (resgrowvalsum)]!SumOftotalvalue-[Trended 4
(resgrowvalsum)]!SumOfgrowth-
$\operatorname{Avg}(\mathrm{ctl05} \mathrm{cnt}!$ RESID $+\mathrm{ct105} \mathrm{cnt}!$ RECREAT $))) /(\operatorname{Avg}(\mathrm{ct105} \mathrm{cnt}!$ RESID $+\mathrm{ct105} \mathrm{cnt}!$ RECREAT $) * 100)$
*100), IIf([proptype]="Commercial",[Trended 1 (Prelim).median]+([Trended 1
(Prelim).median]*(([Trended 5 (comgrowvalsum)]!SumOftotalvalue-[Trended 5
(comgrowvalsum)]!SumOfgrowth-
Avg(ctl05cnt!COMM+ct105cnt!INDUST)))*100)/(Avg(ctl05cnt!COMM+ctl05cnt!INDUST)*10
$0), \operatorname{IIf}([$ proptype $]=" A g r i c u l t u r a l ~ U n i m p r o v e d ",[T r e n d e d ~ 1 ~(P r e l i m) . m e d i a n]+([T r e n d e d ~ 1 ~$
(Prelim).median $]^{*}(([$ Trended 6 (agvalsum).SumOftotalvalue]-
$\left.\left.\left.\left.\left.\operatorname{Avg}(\mathrm{ctl05} \mathrm{cnt}!\mathrm{TOTAG})))^{*} 100\right) /\left(\operatorname{Avg}(\mathrm{ct105} \mathrm{cnt}!\text { TOTAG })^{*} 100\right), \mathrm{Null}\right)\right)\right), 2\right)$
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

| \% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File |  | \% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2001 |  |
|  | 2002 |  |
|  | 2003 |  |
|  | 2004 |  |
| XX.XX | 2005 | XX.XX (from Table III Calc) |
|  | 2006 |  |

Chart: Yes
Stat Type: Qualified
Stat Title: R\&O and Prelim
Study Period: Yearly (most recent twelve months of sales)
Property Type: Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Unimproved
Display: XX.XX
History: 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005
Field: aggreg
Calculation:
\%ChngTotassvalsf: IIf(Val([Percent Change 2 (Prelim).aggreg])=0,"N/A",Round(([Percent Change 1 (R\&O).aggreg]-[Percent Change 2 (Prelim).aggreg])/[Percent Change 2
(Prelim).aggreg]* 100,2 )
\% Change in Assessed Value Excl. Growth, use \%Chngexclgrowth from Table III calc.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios

| Median | Weighted Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| R\&O Statistics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Chart: Yes
Stat Type: Qualified
Stat Title: R\&O
Study Period: Standard
Property Type: Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Unimproved
Display: XX
History: None
Field: median, aggreg and mean

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics |  |  |
| Difference | XX | XX |

Chart: No
Stat Type: Qualified
Stat Title: R\&O
Study Period: Standard
Property Type: Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Unimproved
Display: XX
History: None
Field: PRD and COD
Calculations:
CODDIff: Round(IIf([2006R\&O]!proptype="Residential",IIf(Val([2006R\&O]!cod)>15,
$\operatorname{Val}([2006 \mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}]!\operatorname{cod})-15,0), \operatorname{IIf}(\mathrm{Val}([2006 \mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}]!\mathrm{cod})>20, \mathrm{Val}([2006 \mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}]!\mathrm{cod})-20,0)), 2)$
PRDDiff: Round(IIf(Val([2006R\&O]!prd)>103,Val([2006R\&O]!prd)-103, IIf(Val([2006R\&O]!prd)<98,Val([2006R\&O]!prd)-98,0)),2)

## VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the County Assessor Actions

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  |  | XX |
| Median |  |  | XX |
| Weighted Mean |  |  | XX |
| Mean |  |  | XX |
| COD |  |  | XX |
| PRD |  |  | XX |
| Min Sales Ratio |  |  | XX |
| Max Sales Ratio |  | XX |  |

Chart: No
Stat Type: Qualified
Stat Title: R\&O and Prelim
Study Period: Standard
Property Type: Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Unimproved
Display: XX
History: None
Field: no2006, median, aggreg, mean, COD, PRD, min and max
Calculations:
no2006Diff: R\&O.no2006-Prelim. 20052006
medianDiff: R\&O.median-Prelim.median
meanDiff: R\&O.mean-Prelim.mean
aggregDiff: R\&O.aggreg-Prelim.aggreg
CODDiff: R\&O. COD-Prelim. COD
PRDDiff: R\&O. PRD-Prelim. PRD
minDiff: R\&O. Min-Prelim. Min
maxDiff: R\&O. Max-Prelim. Max

## Statistical Reports Query

The Statistical Reports contained in the Reports and Opinions for each county derive from the sales file of the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. The sales file contains all recorded real property transactions with a stated consideration of more than one-hundred dollars (\$100) or upon which more than one dollar and seventy-five cents (\$1.75) in documentary stamp taxes are paid as shown on the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521. Transactions meeting these criteria are considered sales.

The first query performed by the sales file is by county number. For each of the following property classifications, the sales file performs the following queries:

## Residential:

Property Class Code: Property Type 01, all Statuses
Property Type 06, all Statuses
Property Type 07, Statuses 1 and 3
Sale Date Range: July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005
Qualified:
All sales with County Assessor Usability Code: blank, zero, 1 or 2.
If blank or zero will be considered a Usability of 1.

## Commercial:

Property Class Code: Property Type 02 , all Statuses
Property Type 03, all Statuses
Property Type 04, all Statuses
Sale Date Range: July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2005
Qualified: All sales with Department Usability Code: zero, 1 or 2
If blank or zero will be considered a Usability of 1.

## Unimproved Agricultural:

Property Class Code: Property Type 05, Status 2
Sale Date Range: July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2005
Qualified: All sales with Department Usability Code: zero, 1 or 2.
If blank or zero will be considered a Usability of 1.

## Agricultural: (Optional)

Property Class Code: Property Type 05 , Status 1 and 2
Sale Date Range: July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2005
Qualified:
All sales with Department Usability Code: zero, 1 or 2.
If blank or zero will be considered a Usability of 1

## Minimally Improved Agricultural: (Optional)

Property Class Code: Property Type 05 , All Statuses
Sale Date Range: July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2005
Qualified:
All sales with Department Usability Code: zero, 1 or 2.
If blank or zero will be considered a Usability of 1 .
Once a record is deemed qualified agricultural, the program will determine: If the current year assessed value improvement plus the non-agricultural total value is less than $5 \%$ and $\$ 10,000$ of the Total Adjusted Selling Price, the record will be deemed Minimally Improved.

## Statistical Calculations

The results of the statistical calculations that make up the header of the Statistical Reports are:
Number of Sales
Total Sales Price
Total Adj. Sales Price
Total Assessed Value
Avg. Adj. Sales Price
Avg. Assessed Value
Median
Weighted Mean
Mean
COD
PRD
COV
STD
Avg. Abs. Dev.
Max Sales Ratio
Min Sales Ratio
95\% Median C.I.
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.
95\% Mean C.I.

## Coding Information \& Calculations

Each sale in the sales file becomes a record in the sales file program. All statistical calculations performed by the sales file program round results in the following manner: if the result is not a whole number, then the program will round the result five places past the decimal and truncate to the second place past the decimal. Sales price and assessed value are whole numbers.

## Number of Sales

- Coded as Count, Character, 5-digit field.
- The Count is the total number of sales in the sales file based upon the selection of Total or Qualified. For purposes of this document, Qualified and Sale Date Range is assumed.


## Total Sales Price

- Coded as TotSalePrice, Character, 15 -digit field.
- The Total Sales Price is based on the Total Sale Amount, shown on Line 24 of the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521, for each record added together.
- Calculation
- Sum SaleAmt


## Total Adj. Sales Price

- Coded as TotAdjSalePrice, Character, 15-digit field.
- The Total Adjusted Sales Price is the Total Sale Amount for each record plus or minus any adjustments made to the sale by the county assessor, Department or the Commission (from an appeal).
- Calculation
- Sum SaleAmt + or - Adjustments


## Total Assessed Value

- Coded as TotAssdValue, Character, 15-digit field.
- The Total Assessed Value is based on the Entered Total Current Year Assessed Value Amount for each record. If the record is an agricultural record, Property Classification Code: Property Parcel Type-05, then the Total Assessed Value is the Entered Current Year Total Value adjusted by any value for Non-Ag Total and Current Year Total Improvements, so that the Total Assessed Value used in the calculations for these records is the assessed value for the agricultural land only.
- Calculation
- Sum TotAssdValue


## Avg. Adj. Sales Price

- Coded as AvgAdjSalePrice, Character, 15-digit field.
- The Average Adjusted Sale Price is dependant on the TotAdjSalePrice and the Count defined above.
- Calculation
- TotAdjSalePrice/Count


## Avg. Assessed Value

- Coded as AvgAssdValue, Character, 15-digit field.
- The Average Assessed Value is dependant on the TotAssdValue and the Count defined above.
- Calculation
- TotAssdValue/Count


## Median

- Coded as Median, Character, 12-digit field.
- The Median ratio is the middle ratio when the records are arrayed in order of magnitude by ratio.
- If there is an odd number of records in the array, the median ratio is the middle ratio of the array.
- If there is an even number of records in the array, the median ratio is the average of the two middle ratios of the array.
- Calculation
- Array the records by order of the magnitude of the ratio from high to low
- Divide the Total Count in the array by 2 equals Record Total
- If the Total Count in the array is odd:
- Count down the number of whole records that is the Record Total + 1. The ratio for that record will be the Median ratio
- If the Total Count in the array is even:
- Count down the number of records that is Record Total. This is ratio 1.
- Count down the number of records that is Records Total +1 . That is ratio 2 .
- (ratio $1+$ ratio 2$) / 2$ equals the Median ratio.


## Weighted Mean

- Coded as Aggreg, Character, 12-digit field.
- Calculation
- (TotAssdValue/TotAdjSalePrice)*100


## Mean

- Coded Mean, Character, 12-digit field
- Mean ratio is dependant on TotalRatio which is the sum of all ratios in the sample.
- Calculation
- TotalRatio/RecCount

COD

- Coded COD, Character, 12-digit field
- Calculation
- Subtract the Median from Each Ratio
- Take the Absolute Value of the Calculated Differences
- Sum the Absolute Differences
- Divide by the Number of Ratios to obtain the "Average Absolute Deviation"
- Divide by the Median
- Multiply by 100


## PRD

- Coded PRD, Character, 12-digit field
- Calculation
- (MeanRatio/AggregRatio)*100


## COV

- Coded COV, Character, 12-digit field
- Calculation
- Subtract the Mean from each ratio
- Square the Calculated difference
- Sum the squared differences
- Divide the number of ratios less one to obtain the Variance of the ratios
- Compute the Squared Root to obtain the Standard Deviation
- Divide the Standard Deviation by the Mean
- Multiply by 100


## STD

- Coded StdDev, Character, 12-digit field
- Calculation
- Subtract the Mean Ratio from each ratio
- Square the resulting difference
- Sum the squared difference
- Divide the number of ratios less one to obtain the Variance of the ratios
- Compute the squared root of the variance to obtain the Standard Deviation


## Avg. Abs. Dev.

- Coded AvgABSDev, Character, 12-digit field
- Calculation
- Subtracting the Median ratio from each ratio
- Summing the absolute values of the computed difference
- Dividing the summed value by the number of ratios


## Max Sales Ratio

- Coded Max, Character, 12-digit field
- The Maximum ratio is the largest ratio when the records are arrayed in order of magnitude of ratio.


## Min Sales Ratio

- Coded Min, Character, 12-digit field
- The Minimum ratio is the smallest ratio when the records are arrayed in order of magnitude of ratio.


## 95\% Median C.I.

- Coded MedianConfInterval, Character, 12-digit field
- The Median Confidence Interval is found by arraying the ratios and identifying the ranks of the ratios corresponding to the Lower and Upper Confidence Limits. The equation for the number of ratios ( j ), that one must count up or down from the median to find the Lower and Upper Confidence Limits is:
- Calculation
- If the number of ratios is Odd
- $j=1.96 x \sqrt{ } / 2$
- If the number of ratios is Even
- $j=1.96 x \sqrt{ } \mathrm{n} / 2+0.5$
- Keep in mind if the calculation has anything past the decimal, it will be rounded to the next whole number and the benefit of the doubt is given
- If the sample size is 5 or less, then N/A is given as the confidence interval
- If the sample size is 6-8, then the Min and Max is the given range


## 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.

- Coded AggregConfInterval, Character, 12-digit field
- Calculation
- Items needed for this calculation
- Number of sales
- Assessed Values - Individual and Summed
- Assessed Values Squared - Individual and Summed
- Average Assessed Value
- Sale Prices - Individual and Summed
- Sales Prices Squared - Individual and Summed
- Average Sale Price
- Assessed Values x Sale Prices - Individual and Summed
- The Weighted Mean
- The $t$ value for the sample size
- The actual calculation:
$\mathrm{CI}(\overline{\mathrm{A}} / \overline{\mathrm{S}})-\overline{\mathrm{A}} / \overline{\mathrm{S}} \pm \mathrm{tx} \mathrm{x} \stackrel{\sqrt{ } \Sigma \mathrm{A}^{2}-2(\mathrm{~A} / \mathrm{S}) \Sigma(\mathrm{A} \times \mathrm{S})+(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S})^{2}\left(\Sigma \mathrm{~S}^{2}\right)}{ }$
- If the sample size is 5 or less, then N/A is given as the confidence interval


## 95\% Mean C.I.

- Coded MeanConfInterval, Character, 12-digit field
- The Mean Confidence Interval is based on the assumption of a normal distribution and can be affected by outliers.
- Calculation
- Lower Limit
- The Mean - ((t-value * The Standard Deviation)/the Square Root of the Number of Records)
- Upper Limit
- The Mean + ((t-value * The Standard Deviation)/the Square Root of the Number of Records)
- If the number of records is $>30$, then use 1.96 as the $t$-value
- If the number of records is $<=30$, then a "Critical Values of t " Table is used based on sample size. Degrees of freedom = sample size minus 1
- If the sample is 1 or less, then N/A is given as the confidence interval


## Ratio Formulas

- Residential and Commercial Records
- If the Assessed Value Total Equals Zero, the system changes the Assessed Value to $\$ 1.00$ for the ratio calculations. It does not make the change to the actual data.
- If the Sale Amount is Less Than $\$ 100.00$ AND the Adjustment Amount is Zero. The system derives an Adjustment Amount based upon the Doc Stamp fee (Doc Stamp Fee/.00175).
- Ratio Formula is: (Assessed Value Total/(Sale Amount + Adjustment Amount))*100.
- Agricultural Records
- If the Sale Amount is Less Than $\$ 100.00$ AND the Adjustment Amount is Zero. The system derives an Adjustment Amount based upon the Doc Stamp fee (Doc Stamp Fee/.00175).
- If the Sale Amount - Assessed Improvements Amount - Entered Non-Ag Amount + Adjustment Amount $=0$. The system adds $\$ 1.00$ to the Adjustment Amount.
- If the Assessed Land Amount - Entered Non-Ag Amount Equals Zero. The system adds $\$ 1.00$ to the Assessed Land Amount.
- Ratio Formula is:
a. If No Greenbelt: (Agland Total Amount)/(Sale Amount - Assessed Improvements - Entered NonAg Amount + Adjustment Amount))*100.
b. If Greenbelt: (Recapture Amount/(Sale Amount - Assessed Improvements Amount - Entered NonAg Amount + Adjustment Amount))*100.


## Map Source Documentation

Each map contains a legend which describes the information contained on the map.
School District Map: Compiled and edited by the Nebraska Department of Education. The map has been altered by the Department to reflect current base school districts.

Market Area Map: Information obtained from the county assessor. Compiled and edited by the staff of the Tech Support Division of the Department.

Registered Wells Map: Obtained from the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources website.

GeoCode Map: Compiled and edited by the staff of the Tech Support Division of the Department.

Sections, Towns, Rivers \& Streams, Topography, and Soil Class Map: Obtained from the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources website.

## Valuation History Chart Specifications

EXHIBITS 1B - 93B Valuation History Charts. There are five charts for each county. The first four charts display history of taxable valuations by property class and subclass, annual percentage change, cumulative percentage change, and the rate of annual percent change over the time periods specified. The fifth chart displays 2005 taxable valuations by property type for each city within the county and compares the county's valuation for each class and subclass of property. The fifth chart also displays populations for the cities and the county. Note: The list of cities for each county is based on the 2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) and may not include certain cities/villages that did not levy a property tax or are unincorporated.

Chart 1 (Page 1) Real Property Valuations - Cumulative \%Change 1992-2005
Source: Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL.
Property Class: Residential \& Recreational, Commercial \& Industrial, Total Agricultural Land
Chart 2 (Page 2) Real Property \& Growth Valuations - Cumulative \%Change 1995-2005
Source: Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL \& Growth Valuations from County Abstract of Assessment Reports.
Property Class \& Subclass: Residential \& Recreational, Commercial \& Industrial, Agricultural Improvements \& Site Land

Chart 3 (Page 3) Agricultural Land Valuations - Cumulative \%Change 1992-2005
Source: Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL.
Property Class \& Subclass: Irrigated Land, Dry Land, Grass Land, Waste Land, Other Agland, Total Agricultural Land

## Chart 4 (Page 4) Agricultural Land Valuation-Average Value per Acre History 1992-2005

Source: County Abstract of Assessment Report for Real Property
Property Class \& Subclass: Irrigated Land, Dry Land, Grass Land, Waste Land, Other Agland, Total Agricultural Land

## Chart 5 (Page 5) City Valuations by Property Type Compared to County Valuation 2005

Source: Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL, County Populations per US Bureau of Census 2000, and City Populations as certified December 2005 by NE Department of Revenue

Property Class \& Subclass: Personal Property, Centrally Assessed Personal Property \& Centrally Assessed Real Property, Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Recreational, Agricultural Land, AgDwelling \& Farm Home Site Land, Ag-Improvements \& Farm Site Land, Mineral Interests, Total Taxable Value

City Class, Population, \& Zoning Authority:

| City Class: | Village | Second Class | First Class | Primary Class | Metropolitan |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Population: | $100-800$ | $801-5,000$ | $5,001-100,000$ | $100,001-299,999$ | 300,000 or more |
| Zoning Auth | 1 mile outside city | 1 mile outside city | 2 mile outside city | 3 mile outside city | 3 mile outside city |
| Neb. Rev. Stat.§ § | $17-201 \& 17-1001$ | $17-101 \& 17-1001$ | $16-101 \& 16-901$ | $15-101 \& 15-905$ | $14-101 \& 14-419$ |

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2006 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:
-Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

- One copy to the Washington county County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70931160000112129264.

Dated this 10th day of April, 2006.
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## Soil Classes

0 - Lakes and Ponds1- Excessively drained sandy soils formed in alluvium in valleys and eolian sand on uplands in sandhills
2 - Excessively drained sandy soils formed in eolian sands on uplands in sandhills
3 - Moderately well drained silty soils on uplands and in depressions formed in loess
4 - Well drained silty soils formed in loess on uplands
5 - Well drained silty soils formed in loess and alluvium on stream terraces
$\square 6$ - Well to somewhat excessively drained loamy soils formed in weathered sandstone and eolian material on uplands
7-Somewhat poorly drained soils formed in alluvium on bottom lands
$\square 8$ - Moderately well drained silty soils with clayey subsoils on uplands Exhibit 89A - page 5
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| Tax | Irrigated Land |  |  |  | Dryland |  |  |  | Grassland |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%ochg |
| 1992 | 11,735,670 | -- | -- | -- | 131,319,630 | -- | -- | -- | 4,217,725 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1993 | 13,639,400 | 1,903,730 | 16.22\% | 16.22\% | 164,263,735 | 32,944,105 | 25.09\% | 25.09\% | 4,461,280 | 243,555 | 5.77\% | 5.77\% |
| 1994 | 13,387,895 | -251,505 | -1.84\% | 14.08\% | 163,096,350 | -1,167,385 | -0.71\% | 24.20\% | 4,461,710 | 430 | 0.01\% | 5.78\% |
| 1995 | 13,360,935 | -26,960 | -0.20\% | 13.85\% | 161,952,770 | -1,143,580 | -0.70\% | 23.33\% | 4,439,185 | -22,525 | -0.50\% | 5.25\% |
| 1996 | 12,661,215 | -699,720 | -5.24\% | 7.89\% | 160,846,715 | -1,106,055 | -0.68\% | 22.48\% | 4,935,670 | 496,485 | 11.18\% | 17.02\% |
| 1997 | 12,483,615 | -177,600 | -1.40\% | 6.37\% | 160,678,195 | -168,520 | -0.10\% | 22.36\% | 5,054,325 | 118,655 | 2.40\% | 19.84\% |
| 1998 | 12,193,040 | -290,575 | -2.33\% | 3.90\% | 161,318,765 | 640,570 | 0.40\% | 22.84\% | 5,447,240 | 392,915 | 7.77\% | 29.15\% |
| 1999 | 12,179,260 | -13,780 | $-0.11 \%$ | 3.78\% | 161,305,700 | -13,065 | -0.01\% | 22.83\% | 5,586,600 | 139,360 | 2.56\% | 32.46\% |
| 2000 | 12,095,210 | -84,050 | -0.69\% | 3.06\% | 159,879,490 | -1,426,210 | -0.88\% | 21.75\% | 5,392,495 | -194,105 | -3.47\% | 27.85\% |
| 2001 | 12,331,290 | 236,080 | 1.95\% | 5.08\% | 159,169,665 | -709,825 | -0.44\% | 21.21\% | 5,164,125 | -228,370 | -4.23\% | 22.44\% |
| 2002 | 12,478,255 | 146,965 | 1.19\% | 6.33\% | 159,001,500 | -168,165 | -0.11\% | 21.08\% | 5,131,570 | -32,555 | -0.63\% | 21.67\% |
| 2003 | 12,475,465 | -2,790 | -0.02\% | 6.30\% | 158,874,325 | -127,175 | -0.08\% | 20.98\% | 5,192,345 | 60,775 | 1.18\% | 23.11\% |
| 2004 | 14,328,420 | 1,852,955 | 14.85\% | 22.09\% | 181,481,395 | 22,607,070 | 14.23\% | 38.20\% | 5,947,370 | 755,025 | 14.54\% | 41.01\% |
| 2005 | 14,218,355 | -110,065 | -0.77\% | 21.16\% | 182,331,120 | 849,725 | 0.47\% | 38.85\% | 7,614,035 | 1,666,665 | 28.02\% | 80.52\% |
| 1992-2005 Rate Ann.\%chg: |  | Irrigated | 1.49\% |  |  | Dryland | 2.56\% |  |  | Grassland | 4.65\% |  |
| Tax | Waste Land ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ |  |  |  | Other Agland ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ |  |  |  | Total Agricultural |  |  |  |
| Year | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmltv\%chg | Value | Value Chg | Ann\%chg | Cmilv\%chg |
| 1992 |  | -- | -- | -- | 17,179,790 | -- | -- | -- | 164,452,815 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1993 |  | -- | -- | -- | 22,440,305 | 5,260,515 | 30.62\% | 30.62\% | 204,804,720 | 40,351,905 | 24.54\% | 24.54\% |
| 1994 |  | -- | -- | -- | 24,601,575 |  | 0.00\% | 43.20\% | 205,547,530 | 742,810 | 0.36\% | 24.99\% |
| 1995 |  | -- | -- | -- | 2,740,625 | -21,860,950 | -88.86\% | -84.05\% | 182,493,515 | -23,054,015 | -11.22\% | 10.97\% |
| 1996 |  | -- | -- | -- | 634,760 | -2,105,865 | -76.84\% | -96.31\% | 179,078,360 | -3,415,155 | -1.87\% | 8.89\% |
| 1997 |  | -- | -- | -- | 6,502,530 | 5,867,770 | 924.41\% | -62.15\% | 184,718,665 | 5,640,305 | 3.15\% | 12.32\% |
| 1998 |  | -- | -- | -- | 1,733,155 | -4,769,375 | -73.35\% | -89.91\% | 180,692,200 | -4,026,465 | -2.18\% | 9.87\% |
| 1999 |  | -- | -- | -- | 1,521,830 | -211,325 | -12.19\% | -91.14\% | 180,593,390 | -98,810 | -0.05\% | 9.81\% |
| 2000 |  | -- | -- | -- | 1,429,090 | -92,740 | -6.09\% | -91.68\% | 178,796,285 | -1,797,105 | -1.00\% | 8.72\% |
| 2001 |  | -- | -- | -- | 1,217,125 | -211,965 | -14.83\% | -92.92\% | 177,882,205 | -914,080 | -0.51\% | 8.17\% |
| 2002 |  | -- | -- | -- | 1,230,440 | 13,315 | 1.09\% | -92.84\% | 177,841,765 | -40,440 | -0.02\% | 8.14\% |
| 2003 | 913,900 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 70,990 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 177,527,025 | -314,740 | -0.18\% | 7.95\% |
| 2004 | 959,305 | 45,405 | 4.97\% | 4.97\% | 70,990 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 202,787,480 | 25,260,455 | 14.23\% | 23.31\% |
| 2005 | 1,719,165 | 759,860 | 79.21\% | 88.11\% | 2,415 | -68,575 | -96.60\% | -96.60\% | 205,885,090 | 3,097,610 | 1.53\% | 25.19\% |
| Cnty\# County |  |  |  |  |  | 1992-2005 Rate Ann.\%chg: |  |  |  | Total Agland | 1.74\% |  |
|  | 89 |  | FL area | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | WASHINGTON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CHART 3 | EXHIBIT | 89B | Page 3 |

(1) Waste land data was reported with other agland 1992-2002 due CTL reporting form structure; beginning with 2003 wasteland isolated from other agland.

Source: 1992-2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL State of Nebraska Dept. of Property Assessment \& Taxation
Prepared as of 03/01/2006

AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative \% Change 1992-2005 (from Abstracts) ${ }^{(1)}$

| Tax Year | IRRIGATED LAND |  |  |  |  | DRYLAND |  |  | Ann\%chg AvgVal/acre | Cmilv\%chg AvgVal/Acre | GRASSLAND |  |  | 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 |  |  | Value | Acres | Avg Value per Acre |  |  |
| 1992 | 14,205,880 | 12,983 | 1,094 | -- | -- | 131,236,465 | 175,809 | 746 | -- | -- | 4,234,145 | 16,621 | 255 | -- | -- |
| 1993 | 13,650,150 | 11,072 | 1,233 | 12.71\% | 12.71\% | 164,278,730 | 175,255 | 937 | 25.60\% | 25.60\% | 4,463,940 | 16,401 | 272 | 6.67\% | 6.67\% |
| 1994 | 13,400,315 | 11,044 | 1,213 | -1.62\% | 10.88\% | 163,311,900 | 175,204 | 932 | -0.53\% | 24.93\% | 4,665,105 | 17,824 | 262 | -3.68\% | 2.75\% |
| 1995 | 13,360,935 | 11,026 | 1,212 | -0.08\% | 10.79\% | 162,969,175 | 174,773 | 932 | 0.00\% | 24.93\% | 4,455,480 | 16,371 | 272 | 3.82\% | 6.67\% |
| 1996 | 12,944,725 | 11,056 | 1,171 | -3.38\% | 7.04\% | 161,650,885 | 173,356 | 932 | 0.00\% | 24.93\% | 4,901,810 | 16,452 | 298 | 9.56\% | 16.86\% |
| 1997 | 12,459,300 | 10,655 | 1,169 | -0.17\% | 6.86\% | 160,662,110 | 172,237 | 933 | 0.11\% | 25.07\% | 4,945,015 | 16,628 | 297 | -0.34\% | 16.47\% |
| 1998 | 12,309,605 | 10,820 | 1,138 | -2.65\% | 4.02\% | 161,571,995 | 172,085 | 939 | 0.64\% | 25.87\% | 5,454,165 | 16,417 | 332 | 11.78\% | 30.20\% |
| 1999 | 12,193,040 | 10,717 | 1,138 | 0.00\% | 4.02\% | 161,255,570 | 171,844 | 938 | -0.11\% | 25.74\% | 5,630,070 | 16,443 | 342 | 3.01\% | 34.12\% |
| 2000 | 12,169,330 | 10,678 | 1,140 | 0.18\% | 4.20\% | 160,819,985 | 170,988 | 941 | 0.32\% | 26.14\% | 5,515,030 | 16,192 | 341 | -0.29\% | 33.73\% |
| 2001 | 11,976,830 | 10,529 | 1,138 | -0.18\% | 4.02\% | 160,787,100 | 171,547 | 937 | -0.43\% | 25.60\% | 5,265,390 | 16,154 | 326 | -4.40\% | 27.84\% |
| 2002 | 12,543,785 | 11,072 | 1,133 | -0.44\% | 3.56\% | 159,070,055 | 170,463 | 933 | -0.43\% | 25.07\% | 5,119,505 | 16,090 | 318 | -2.45\% | 24.71\% |
| 2003 | 12,455,905 | 11,021 | 1,130 | -0.26\% | 3.29\% | 159,059,775 | 170,408 | 933 | 0.00\% | 25.07\% | 5,215,285 | 16,126 | 323 | 1.57\% | 26.67\% |
| 2004 | 14,345,470 | 11,032 | 1,300 | 15.07\% | 18.86\% | 181,572,715 | 169,766 | 1,070 | 14.64\% | 43.37\% | 5,991,535 | 16,213 | 370 | 14.42\% | 44.93\% |
| 2005 | 14,283,855 | 10,990 | 1,300 | -0.04\% | 18.81\% | 182,690,080 | 170,850 | 1,069 | -0.02\% | 43.34\% | 7,624,305 | 16,462 | 463 | 25.32\% | 81.62\% |

1992-2005 Rate Ann.\%chg AvgVal/Acre: $1.33 \% \quad$| $2.81 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |

|  | WASTE LAND ${ }^{(2)}$ |  |  |  |  | OTHER AGLAND ${ }^{(2)}$ |  |  |  |  | TOTAL AGRICULTURAL LAND ${ }^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year | 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 |
| 1992 | 615,155 | 15,379 | 40 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 |  | -- | -- | 150,291,645 | 220,793 | 681 | -- | -- |
| 1993 | 603,240 | 15,081 | 40 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 182,996,060 | 217,809 | 840 | 23.35\% | 23.35\% |
| 1994 | 604,185 | 15,105 | 40 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 181,981,505 | 219,177 | 830 | -1.19\% | 21.88\% |
| 1995 | 603,420 | 15,086 | 40 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 181,389,010 | 217,256 | 835 | 0.60\% | 22.61\% |
| 1996 | 572,720 | 15,408 | 37 | -7.50\% |  | 98,485 | 672 | 146 |  |  | 180,168,625 | 216,943 | 830 | -0.60\% | 21.88\% |
| 1997 |  |  |  |  |  | 646,725 | 15,738 | 41 | -- |  | 178,713,150 | 215,258 | 830 | 0.00\% | 21.88\% |
| 1998 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,887,335 | 15,669 | 120 | 192.68\% |  | 181,223,100 | 214,992 | 843 | 1.57\% | 23.79\% |
| 1999 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,780,275 | 15,651 | 114 | -5.00\% |  | 180,858,955 | 214,655 | 843 | 0.00\% | 23.79\% |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,497,275 | 15,490 | 97 | -14.91\% |  | 180,001,620 | 213,348 | 844 | 0.12\% | 23.94\% |
| 2001 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,473,060 | 15,558 | 95 | -2.06\% |  | 179,502,380 | 213,787 | 840 | -0.47\% | 23.35\% |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,260,165 | 15,472 | 81 | -14.74\% |  | 177,993,510 | 213,096 | 835 | -0.60\% | 22.61\% |
| 2003 | 1,345,425 | 15,191 | 89 | n/a | n/a | 71,050 | 98 | 725 | n/a | n/a | 178,147,440 | 212,844 | 837 | 0.24\% | 22.91\% |
| 2004 | 968,875 | 15,198 | 64 | -28.37\% | n/a | 70 | 2 | 47 | -93.56\% | n/a | 202,878,665 | 212,211 | 956 | 14.22\% | 40.39\% |
| 2005 | 1,708,135 | 14,781 | 116 | 81.28\% | n/a | 450 | 5 | 100 | 114.29\% | n/a | 206,306,825 | 213,087 | 968 | 1.27\% | 42.17\% |

1992-2005 Rate Ann.\%chg AvgVal/Acre:
2.74\%

[^2]2005 City Valuations by Property Type Compared to County Valuations by Property Type

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { County } \\ \text { Population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | County: | Personal Property | CentralAsd Personal | CentralAsd Real | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | Agdwell \& Homesite | AgImprvmts Farmsite | Minerals | Total Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18,780 | WASHINGTON | 85,521,543 | 16,696,648 | 10,280,009 | 736,886,715 | 108,444,110 | 107,643,990 | 1,248,515 | 205,885,090 | 199,168,285 | 42,700,385 | 0 | 1,514,475,290 |
| cnty sectorvalu | ue \% of total value: | 5.65\% | 1.10\% | 0.68\% | 48.66\% | 7.16\% | 7.11\% | 0.08\% | 13.59\% | 13.15\% | 2.82\% |  | 100.00\% |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { City } \\ \text { Population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cities: | Personal Property | CentralAsd Personal | CentralAsd <br> Real | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | Agdwell \& Homesite | AgImprvmts Farmsite | Minerals | Total Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,197 | ARLINGTON | 373,585 | 623,106 | 252,881 | 47,794,310 | 4,005,610 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53,049,492 |
| 7,512 | BLAIR | 12,146,281 | 6,292,944 | 2,562,495 | 278,424,265 | 80,290,955 | 4,496,510 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 384,213,450 |
| 856 | FORT CALHOUN | 2,989,953 | 355,596 | 36,482 | 37,166,830 | 6,125,625 | 2,894,810 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49,569,296 |
| 310 | HERMAN | 110,350 | 135,305 | 25,116 | 6,837,780 | 1,140,625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,249,176 |
| 371 | KENNARD | 320,980 | 230,064 | 276,881 | 11,913,555 | 508,795 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13,250,275 |
| 126 | WASHINGTON | 50,897 | 1,403 | 460 | 5,406,480 | 208,525 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,667,765 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total of All | City Values: | 15,992,046 | 7,638,418 | 3,154,315 | 387,543,220 | 92,280,135 | 7,391,320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 513,999,454 |
| \% total citysec | ct of coty sector | 18.70\% | 45.75\% | 30.68\% | 52.59\% | 85.09\% | 6.87\% |  |  |  |  |  | 33.94\% |


| \%citypop. to entypop. | Cities: | Personal Property | CentralAsd <br> Personal | CentralAsd <br> Real | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Recreation | Agland | Agdwell \& Homesite | Aglmprvmts Farmsite | Minerals | Total Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.37\% | ARLINGTON | 0.44\% | 3.73\% | 2.46\% | 6.49\% | 3.69\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50\% |
| 40.00\% | BLAIR | 14.20\% | 37.69\% | 24.93\% | 37.78\% | 74.04\% | 4.18\% |  |  |  |  |  | 25.37\% |
| 4.56\% | FORT CALHOUN | 3.50\% | 2.13\% | 0.35\% | 5.04\% | 5.65\% | 2.69\% |  |  |  |  |  | 3.27\% |
| 1.65\% | HERMAN | 0.13\% | 0.81\% | 0.24\% | 0.93\% | 1.05\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.54\% |
| 1.98\% | KENNARD | 0.38\% | 1.38\% | 2.69\% | 1.62\% | 0.47\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.87\% |
| 0.67\% | WASHINGTON | 0.06\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 0.73\% | 0.19\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.37\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cnty\# | $\begin{gathered} \hline 89 \\ \hline \text { WASHINGTON } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | FLarea | 9 |  |  |  |  | HART | EXHIB | 89 B | Page 5 |

[^3]
[^0]:    * Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates

[^1]:    (1) Resid. \& Recreat. excludes agdwell \& farm homesite land; Comm. \& Indust. excludes minerals; Agland includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste, \& other agland, excludes farmsite land. Source: 1992-2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports CTL State of Nebraska Dept. of Property Assessment \& Taxation Prepared as of 03/01/2006

[^2]:    (1) Valuation on Abstracts vs CTL will vary due to different dates of reporting; (2) Waste land data was reported with other agland 1997-2002 due to reporting form chgs source: 1992-2005 Abstracts

    State of Nebraska Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Prepared as of 03/01/2006

[^3]:    Sources: 2005 Certificate of Taxes Levied CTL, 2000 US Census; Dec2005 City Pop. per NE Dept Revenue State of Nebraska Dept. of Property Assessment \& Taxation Prepared as of 03/01/2006

