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 seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2006). 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., 2006) 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 sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual 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 non-randomly 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.

Table of Contents

Commission Summary

Property Tax Administrator's Opinions and Recommendations

Correlation Section

Residential Real Property

- 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 Assessor Actions

Commercial Real Property

- 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 Assessor Actions

Agricultural Land

- 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 Assessor Actions

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report

Statistical Reports Section

R&O Statistical Reports

Residential Real Property, Qualified Commercial Real Property, Qualified Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified

Preliminary Statistical Reports

Residential Real Property, Qualified Commercial Real Property, Qualified Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified

Assessment Survey Section

County Reports Section

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 2007 County Agricultural Land Detail County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment

Special Valuation Section

Certification

Map Section

Valuation History Chart Section

2007 Commission Summary

33 Furnas

Residential Real Property -	Curr	ent			
Number of Sales		192	COD	23.47	
Total Sales Price	\$	7508265	PRD	108.27	
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	7515765	COV	35.76	
Total Assessed Value	\$	6757510	STD	34.81	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	39144.61	Avg. Abs. Dev.	22.87	
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	35195.36	Min	7.09	
Median		97.42	Max	251.50	
Wgt. Mean		89.91	95% Median C.I.	94.08 to 99.76	
Mean		97.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	85.63 to 94.19	
			95% Mean C.I.	92.42 to 102.27	
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County					
% of Records Sold in the Stu	7.38				
% of Value Sold in the Study	8.11				
Average Assessed Value of t	Average Assessed Value of the Base				

Residential Rea	al Property - History			
Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2007	192	97.42	23.47	108.27
2006	170	97.57	21.89	107.69
2005	197	99.50	16.88	106.31
2004	228	99.12	18.07	104.87
2003	251	98	19.41	103.53
2002	274	97	34.44	116.36
2001	227	96	37.02	122.47

2007 Commission Summary

33 Furnas

Commercial Real Property - Current					
Number of Sales		18	COD	10.86	
Total Sales Price	\$	472802	PRD	110.38	
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	442802	COV	19.71	
Total Assessed Value	\$	371205	STD	18.24	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	24600.11	Avg. Abs. Dev.	10.48	
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	20622.50	Min	37.58	
Median		96.47	Max	119.00	
Wgt. Mean		83.83	95% Median C.I.	91.58 to 99.63	
Mean		92.53	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	63.63 to 104.03	
			95% Mean C.I.	83.46 to 101.60	
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 5					
% of Records Sold in the St	3.93				
% of Value Sold in the Stud	2.16				
Average Assessed Value of	37,471				

Commercial Ro	eal Property - History			
Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2007	18	96.47	10.86	110.38
2006	16	93.75	22.17	105.40
2005	34	99.55	22.96	95.04
2004	40	97.63	23.39	97.16
2003	51	98	23.9	100.7
2002	44	98	30.46	106.96
2001	43	96	32.48	104.45

2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Furnas 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 RQ. 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 Furnas County is 97% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Furnas 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 Furnas County is 96% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Furnas County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Catherine D Lang
Catherine D. Lang

Property Tax Administrator

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The newly elected assessor brings over eight years of experience to Furnas County in working with the market information as a clerk and Deputy County Assessor for the development of statistical analyses of residential property. The county accomplished large assessment goals for 2007 as stated in the Three Year Plan of Assessment. New (06/05) costing tables and new depreciation tables were applied to improved properties in every village and town within the county. Properties within Oxford, Beaver City, Hendley, Wilsonville and rural residentials have all been reviewed. Land values did remain the same for 2007. The county continues to complete the assessment work in house with the aid of a part time appraiser on the limited \$70, 933 annual budget. The median and mean measures of central tendency reflect the assessors actions by the statistics being within the acceptable ranges. Although the qualitative measures appear to indicate assessment uniformity and proportionate issues, the statistics may be misleading. Nine assessor locations share the 192 qualified sales with the major locations being Arapahoe, Beaver City and Cambridge. Although Edison has 10 qualified residential sales, the disparity of different property classification codes distort the 81.33% median. Within the 10 sales in Edison, two are unimproved lots, two are mobile homes, three are flat valued unlivable properties, with three homes left in the sales file for this assessor location. The sample includes only two average quality residential homes. Residentials in Edison do not represent the average residential properties in Furnas County with only 82 houses in the village the average assessed value is \$27,690. The average assessed value countywide is \$35,195. Only one sale in the sample reflects an assessed value between \$20,000 to \$30,000. No recommendations for adjustments to Edison are made. Through the 2007 accomplishments and known assessment practices and the statistical information contained in the six tables, it is my opinion Furnas County has attained the level of value and has uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

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
2007	298	192	64.43
2006	270	170	62.96
2005	268	197	73.51
2004	286	228	79.72
2003	319	251	78.68
2002	339	274	80.83
2001	288	227	78.82

RESIDENTIAL: Table II for residential property within Furnas County indicates an increase in the total number of sales and the qualified number of sales used. Likewise the county has increased the percent used for the development of the qualified statistics. Historically Furnas County has used a high proportion of the available sales. This indicates that the measurements were done as fairly as possible and shows an indication that the county has not excessively trimmed the sample.

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 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.

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2007	95.46	3.51	98.81	97.42
2006	99.71	-0.43	99.28	97.57
2005	99.70	1.1	100.79	99.50
2004	100.43	1.65	102.08	99.12
2003	91	8.18	98.44	98
2002	91	7.1	97.46	97
2001	91	6.64	97.04	96

RESIDENTIAL: The 1.39 point spread between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are reflective and supportive of the assessors actions to the residential class of property for 2007.

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 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 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 Changes

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.

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

% Change in Total Asse Value in the Sales Fil	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	
4.8	2007	3.51
0.8	2006	-0.43
2.77	2005	1.1
-1.15	2004	1.65
7	2003	8
8.67	2002	7.1
5.67	2001	6.64

RESIDENTIAL: The 1.29 point spread between the sales file and the assessed value base (excluding growth) reflects the assessment actions in 2007 and does not illustrate unequal movement between the sales file and the base. The assessor implemented new valuations to all improvements within the county and this supports the table data.

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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean	
R&O Statistics	97.42	89.91	97.35	

RESIDENTIAL: The median and mean measures of central tendency are close and both within the acceptable ranges for the property class. Although the weighted mean falls below the parameters, there is no information available that indicates the median is not the best indicator of the level of value.

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In 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	23.47	108.27
Difference	8.47	5.27

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are above the acceptable ranges and would typically indicate problems with assessment uniformity. The preliminary coefficient of dispersion was 34.29 and the price related differential was 118.10. The qualitative measures are more an indication of the disparity within the nine assessor locations within the county and the disportionate measurements between low dollar sales. The Furnas County Assessor shows good proactive assessment practices by the ongoing work every year within each property class. The improved properties were revalued for 2007 using new January/2005 costing tables and new depreciation tables for all of the villages and assessor locations. 42 of the total 192 qualified residential sales have a selling price of under \$10,000. Sixty additional sales within the 192 sold for less than \$30,000. In Furnas County the average assessed value of residential properties is \$35,195. This indicates the disportionate measures for the nine different assessor locations. Based on the known positive

assessment practices in Furnas C	ounty, it is believed the county has uniform and proportionate
assessments for 2007.	J 1 1

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	192	192	0
Median	95.46	97.42	1.96
Wgt. Mean	86.86	89.91	3.05
Mean	102.58	97.35	-5.23
COD	34.29	23.47	-10.82
PRD	118.10	108.27	-9.83
Min Sales Ratio	2.69	7.09	4.4
Max Sales Ratio	849.00	251.50	-597.5

RESIDENTIAL: After reviewing the Preliminary Statistical measures and the reported assessment actions by the assessor, the changes shown in Table VII are accurate and supportive of the many accomplishments of the Furnas County Assessor in every assessor location within Furnas County for 2007.

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the 2007 commercial statistical information indicates the median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable ranges in Furnas County. New costing tables (01/06) and new depreciation tables were applied for improved commercial valuations in Furnas County. Land valuations remained the same. The 18 qualified commercial sales are spread out amongst eight assessor locations with four sales in Arapahoe being the highest number within a location. The new assessor accomplished the application of updated costing and new valuations to each improved commercial building in the county through a market review and analyses. Historically the county has shown a proactive approach through good assessment practices and uniform treatment between sold and unsold properties. Based on the statistical information contained in the six tables and the known solid assessment practices, it is believed the county has attained the level of value and uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

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
2007	47	18	38.3
2006	44	16	36.36
2005	48	34	70.83
2004	52	40	76.92
2003	65	51	78.46
2002	54	44	81.48
2001	51	43	84.31

COMMERCIAL: Furnas County has increased the percent of sales used in the commercial class of property from 2006, although five sales of the total sales file were substantially changed since the time of sale and thus eliminated from the percent used for 2007. This represents 10 percent of the total sales base. Hypothetically the percent used would increase to approximately 50 percent. The known assessment practices in Furnas County indicate the county has not excessively trimmed the sample.

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 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.

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2007	90.09	5.04	94.63	96.47
2006	93.75	-0.86	92.94	93.75
2005	99.55	0.88	100.42	99.55
2004	95.35	2,21	97.46	97.63
2003	95	4.48	99.26	98
2002	92	6.87	98.32	98
2001	95	-0.74	94.3	96

COMMERCIAL: The 1.84 point spread between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are reflective and supportive of the assessors actions to the commercial class of property for 2007.

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 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 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 Changes

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.

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File	d	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
16.67	2007	5.04
0	2006	-0.86
-9.49	2005	0.88
-17.4	2004	2.21
-7	2003	4
-3.03	2002	6.87
1.69	2001	-0.74

COMMERCIAL: Although Table IV indicates a 11.63 point spread between the sales file and the assessed base values, the actions to apply new valuations for all commercial improvements support the changes made countywide.

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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean	
R&O Statistics	96.47	83.83	92.53	

COMMERCIAL: The median and mean measures of central tendency are close and both within the acceptable ranges for the property class. Although the weighted mean falls below the parameters, there is no information available that indicates the median is not the best indicator of the level of value.

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In 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	10.86	110.38
Difference	0	7.38

COMMERCIAL: Table VI indicates the coefficient of dispersion is well within the acceptable range for commercial property. The price related differential is reflecting a problem with uniformity and regressivity. Both qualitative measures improved from the preliminary statistics. Based on the known assessment practices and accomplishments of the assessor, it is believed that uniformity and proportionate assessment have been achieved in Furnas County.

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	18	18	0
Median	90.09	96.47	6.38
Wgt. Mean	76.35	83.83	7.48
Mean	88.79	92.53	3.74
COD	30.04	10.86	-19.18
PRD	116.31	110.38	-5.93
Min Sales Ratio	30.93	37.58	6.65
Max Sales Ratio	177.50	119.00	-58.5

COMMERCIAL: After reviewing the Preliminary Statistical measures and the reported assessment actions by the assessor, the changes shown in Table VII are accurate and supportive of the many accomplishments of the Furnas County Assessor in every assessor location within Furnas County for 2007 in the commercial property class.

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

33 Furnas

	2006 CTL County Total	2007 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)	Percent Change	2007 Growth (New Construction Value)	% Change excl. Growth
1. Residential	79,878,115	83,363,160	3,485,045	4.36	684,780	3.51
2. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	8,755,960	10,447,970	1,692,010	19.32	*	- 19.32
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	88,634,075	93,811,130	5,177,055	5.84	684,780	5.07
5. Commercial	15,615,525	16,420,190	804,665	5.15	6,090	5.11
6. Industrial	704,645	741,395	36,750	5.22	12,055	3.5
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,787,290	20,464,340	2,677,050	15.05	198,385	13.94
8. Minerals	379,280	568,620	189,340	49.92	0	49.92
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	34,486,740	38,194,545	3,707,805	10.75	140,450	10.34
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	123,120,815	132,005,675	8,884,860	7.22	901,310	6.48
11. Irrigated	49,715,810	49,594,645	-121,165	-0.24		
12. Dryland	91,979,110	92,072,775	93,665	0.1		
13. Grassland	44,651,765	44,648,650	-3,115	-0.01		
14. Wasteland	554360	553,735	-625	-0.11		
15. Other Agland	985,690	1,141,105	155,415	15.77		
16. Total Agricultural Land	187,886,735	188,010,910	124,175	0.07		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	311,007,550	320,016,585	9,009,035	2.9	901,310	2.61

^{*}Growth is not typically identified separately within a parcel between ag-residential dwellings (line 3) and ag outbuildings (line 7), so for this display, all growth from ag-residential dwellings and ag outbuildings is shown in line 7.

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics PAGE:1 of 5 33 - FURNAS COUNTY

RESIDENTIAL						<u>. Statistics</u>				State Stat Run	
RESIDENTIAL					Type: Qualifie		004 D 4 L	D e 01/10	/2005	State Stat Han	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER	of Sales		192	MEDIAN:	97	cov:	35.76	95%	Median C.I.: 94.08	to 99.76	(!: Derived)
	les Price		,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.81	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 85.63	to 94.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 7	,515,765	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95	% Mean C.I.: 92.4	2 to 102.27	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 6	,757,510								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	39,144	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	251.50				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	35,195	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.09			Printed: 03/29/	2007 21:05:08
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	14	101.43	102.03	100.41	8.9	7 101.61	76.88	150.80	92.99 to 105.77	35,571	35,717
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	24	99.41	98.00	92.85	11.6	5 105.55	50.00	144.78	94.08 to 104.53	39,662	36,828
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	21	98.10	107.99	97.85	26.1	2 110.36	60.81	251.50	86.45 to 104.50	27,318	26,731
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	31	94.65	90.52	83.48	26.1	0 108.43	25.33	225.00	68.34 to 99.00	40,547	33,849
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	29	99.17	98.77	85.00	27.1	4 116.20	7.09	198.17	83.33 to 107.60	31,448	26,731
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	19	106.50	108.01	98.09	23.8	3 110.12	12.00	178.86	86.90 to 123.95	39,628	38,870
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	16	90.96	89.28	89.73	30.6	3 99.50	10.00	147.27	76.51 to 117.00	35,018	31,420
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	38	93.92	91.88	86.89	24.1	0 105.74	30.42	202.65	78.33 to 97.64	52,893	45,957
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	90	98.13	98.38	91.28	19.6	9 107.77	25.33	251.50	94.23 to 99.80	36,450	33,273
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	102	95.96	96.44	88.85	27.0		7.09	202.65	90.22 to 101.98	41,521	36,891
Calendar Yrs										, -	,
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	100	98.29	99.90	89.38	26.7	3 111.77	7.09	251.50	90.22 to 101.98	34,956	31,244
ALL										,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	- ,
	192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ARAPAHOE	47	99.80	101.39	96.62	16.7		58.40	178.86	94.40 to 104.32	41,330	39,933
BEAVER CITY	29	98.32	95.79	85.68	14.7		51.88	142.88	93.97 to 104.83	36,174	30,993
CAMBRIDGE	39	97.20	102.28	89.50	22.8		43.06	180.00	86.90 to 104.72	47,094	42,150
EDISON	10	81.33	71.72	70.06	30.9		10.00	103.35	46.60 to 102.24	12,520	8,772
HENDLEY	5	89.68	88.27	94.24	10.7		63.85	101.47	N/A	17,877	16,848
HOLBROOK	15	98.06	92.26	87.57	37.0		7.09	251.50	68.34 to 116.73	13,666	11,967
OXFORD	23	98.62	97.37	92.12	24.8		31.25	198.17	77.93 to 112.50	30,402	28,005
RURAL RES	18	94.27	102.40	85.84	32.3		12.00	202.65	82.93 to 112.80	83,055	71,295
WILSONVILLE	6	79.34	88.88	80.19	61.0		25.33	225.00	25.33 to 225.00	12,270	9,840
ALL	Ü	77.51	00.00	00.13	01.0	0 110.01	23.33	223.00	23.33 00 223.00	12,270	3,010
ADD	192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S			27.33	07.71	23.1	7 100.27	7.05	231.30	24.00 00 22.70	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
RANGE 1	176	98.08	97.71	91.48	23.1		7.09	251.50	94.23 to 99.80	34,436	31,501
2	2	80.64	80.64	80.16	23.1		78.34	82.93	N/A	182,500	146,295
3	14	94.27	95.11				12.00	200.33		77,857	
3 ALL	7.4	24.41	93.11	84.47	27.2	J 114.01	14.00	400.33	63.55 to 112.80	11,051	65,762
А⊔⊔	100	07 40	07.25	00 01	0.2 4	7 100 07	7 00	251 50	04 00 +- 00 76	20 144	25 105
	192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics PAGE:2 of 5 33 - FURNAS COUNTY

192

97.42

97.35

89.91

23.47

108.27

7.09

251.50 94.08 to 99.76

39,144

35,195

	COUNTI			<u> PAQI</u>	<u> </u>	<u>xo stausucs</u>				Canto Cant Dans	
RESIDENTIAL	1				Type: Qualific	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	06 Posted	Before: 01/19/	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales	ş:	192	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.76	95%	Median C.I.: 94.08	to 99.76	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	e: 7	7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.81		. Mean C.I.: 85.63		(Derivea)
TO	TAL Adj.Sales Price	e: 7	7,515,765	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87		% Mean C.I.: 92.4		
TO	OTAL Assessed Value	e: 6	5,757,510			1100.1100.000	22.07	, ,	72.1	2 00 102.27	
AVO	G. Adj. Sales Price	<u>:</u>	39,144	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	251.50				
1	AVG. Assessed Value	:	35,195	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.09			Printed: 03/29/.	2007 21:05:09
STATUS: IM	PROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	176	98.40	99.88	90.18	21.0	4 110.76	7.09	251.50	94.84 to 100.03	42,467	38,295
2	16	69.43	69.48	42.09	52.8	3 165.09	10.00	180.00	25.33 to 93.33	2,592	1,091
ALL											
	192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
PROPERTY T	YPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	185	97.19	96.78	89.82	23.6	1 107.75	7.09	251.50	93.87 to 99.17	40,263	36,165
06											
07	7	103.35	112.25	99.78	18.8	8 112.50	78.18	198.17	78.18 to 198.17	9,571	9,550
ALL											
	192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
SCHOOL DIST										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0018	70	99.03	98.58	96.23	23.4		7.09	251.50	94.23 to 103.06	34,640	33,335
33-0021	44	96.28	99.66	85.55	22.4		43.06	180.00	85.60 to 102.28	58,879	50,369
33-0540	70	98.55	96.08	90.89	20.9	7 105.71	10.00	200.33	93.44 to 102.24	31,879	28,976
42-0002	_	= 0 - 0 -									
73-0179	8	79.26	84.83	66.78	52.2	7 127.02	25.33	225.00	25.33 to 225.00	33,578	22,423
NonValid Sch	1001										
ALL											

33 - FURNAS COUNTY RESIDENTIAL		PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics Type: Qualified				Base Stat	State Stat Run	PAGE:3 of 5
			Date Range: 07/01	1/2004 to 06/30/2006	Posted B	efore: 01/19/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	192	MEDIAN:	97	cov:	35.76	95% Median C.I.:	94.08 to 99.76	(!: Av 101=0) (!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.63 to 94.19	

						, ,	COV.	33.70	250	11001011 0.1. 94.00	LO 33.70	(!: Derivea)
	TOTAI	L Sales Pric	e:	7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.81	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 85.63	to 94.19	
T	TOTAL Ad	j.Sales Pric	e:	7,515,765	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95	% Mean C.I.: 92.4	2 to 102.27	
	TOTAL As	ssessed Valu	e:	6,757,510								
A	AVG. Adj.	Sales Pric	e:	39,144	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	251.50				
	AVG. As	ssessed Valu	e:	35,195	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.09			Printed: 03/29/.	2007 21:05:09
YEAR BUIL	л *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR B	lank	23	63.85	72.40	51.19	60.5	141.42	10.00	225.00	31.25 to 85.60	3,340	1,710
Prior TO 1	.860											
1860 TO 1	.899	10	93.77	102.54	90.31	22.3	113.54	61.59	202.65	82.71 to 115.50	44,200	39,915
1900 TO 1	.919	45	96.33	93.60	86.60	14.7	108.09	48.15	142.88	89.80 to 99.82	35,160	30,448
1920 TO 1	.939	50	103.15	105.03	92.44	24.4	113.62	7.09	251.50	93.23 to 107.60	35,301	32,633
1940 TO 1	.949	13	99.01	106.09	89.30	24.7	118.80	65.58	178.86	77.44 to 132.80	40,730	36,373
1950 TO 1	.959	4	84.17	90.75	77.15	21.5	117.63	66.96	127.70	N/A	82,125	63,360
1960 TO 1	.969	18	100.16	105.01	100.76	12.6	104.22	73.45	150.80	94.40 to 106.43	52,611	53,008
1970 TO 1	.979	18	98.07	100.21	88.44	15.7	0 113.31	51.88	198.17	86.90 to 104.83	49,423	43,709
1980 TO 1	.989	7	107.45	107.46	88.07	16.4	122.01	63.55	142.63	63.55 to 142.63	68,893	60,677
1990 TO 1	.994	2	101.35	101.35	100.23	7.4	101.12	93.77	108.93	N/A	152,450	152,795
1995 TO 1	.999	2	72.67	72.67	71.24	40.7	102.00	43.06	102.28	N/A	83,950	59,810
2000 TO P	resent											
ALL												
		192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
SALE PRIC	E *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$											
1 TO	49	99 26	83.91	98.03	98.09	55.9	99.94	10.00	251.50	52.73 to 117.00	1,739	1,706
5000 TO	999	9 16	97.85	94.09	92.69	20.0	101.50	27.17	132.80	87.50 to 115.50	7,156	6,633
Total	\$											
1 TO	99	99 42	94.09	96.53	94.22	40.1	1 102.45	10.00	251.50	81.00 to 104.50	3,803	3,583
10000 TO	299	99 60	103.12	109.23	108.89	21.3	100.31	7.09	202.65	99.05 to 106.43	18,497	20,143
30000 TO	599	99 47	98.10	94.46	93.95	14.8	100.55	48.15	123.95	92.80 to 102.83	43,890	41,234
60000 TO	999	99 29	89.12	87.85	87.62	15.8	100.26	43.06	123.43	78.33 to 99.06	74,737	65,488
100000 TO	1499	99 9	82.93	83.91	84.79	13.7	98.96	58.40	108.93	66.61 to 96.22	119,822	101,599
150000 TO	2499	99 5	63.55	67.97	69.00	21.3	98.52	51.88	93.77	N/A	187,500	129,369
ALL												
		192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics PAGE:4 of 5 33 - FURNAS COUNTY

RESIDENTIAL							XO Statistics			State Stat Run		
KESIDENIIAL	•					Type: Qualifie			100	State Stat Rain		
				Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before:				3efore: 01/19/	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)	
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	192	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.76	95%	Median C.I.: 94.08	to 99.76	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 7	7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.81		. Mean C.I.: 85.63		, ,
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 7	7,515,765	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95	95% Mean C.I.: 92.42 to 102.27		
TO	OTAL Asses	sed Value	: 6	5,757,510								
AVO	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	39,144	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	251.50				
1	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	35,195	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.09			Printed: 03/29/.	2007 21:05:09
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	28	75.19	80.33	44.67	59.1	2 179.81	7.09	251.50	46.60 to 93.33	3,187	1,423
5000 TO	9999	16	99.50	114.00	106.74	22.3	3 106.80	72.87	198.17	94.84 to 132.23	6,687	7,138
Total \$	5											
1 TO	9999	44	90.59	92.57	78.52	43.9	7 117.90	7.09	251.50	75.00 to 104.50	4,459	3,501
10000 TO	29999	56	99.11	99.49	92.73	15.8	1 107.29	48.15	176.26	94.78 to 102.88	20,605	19,106
30000 TO	59999	56	98.21	102.58	93.67	21.2	7 109.51	43.06	202.65	93.97 to 104.00	45,451	42,574
60000 TO	99999	28	93.82	91.74	86.77	17.3	0 105.73	51.88	123.95	82.39 to 102.28	84,389	73,225
100000 TO	149999	5	96.22	99.43	98.16	9.2	4 101.30	82.93	113.78	N/A	123,980	121,694
150000 TO	249999	3	78.34	78.55	76.95	12.8	6 102.09	63.55	93.77	N/A	212,500	163,510
ALL												
		192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		23	63.85	72.40	51.19	60.5		10.00	225.00	31.25 to 85.60	3,340	1,710
10		13	98.06	116.81	98.75	27.6		78.18	251.50	87.85 to 132.80	7,915	7,816
20		59	99.76	99.65	90.54	19.2		7.09	178.86	93.87 to 104.37	26,394	23,896
30		85	98.62	99.94	90.98	18.7		48.15	202.65	94.09 to 102.83	51,038	46,437
40		12	95.31	94.35	87.44	16.5	6 107.90	58.40	123.95	78.34 to 113.78	120,041	104,959
ALL	_											
		192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195
STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
100		6	98.35	96.98	93.88	6.5		78.18	106.50	78.18 to 106.50	9,916	9,310
101		128	99.47	102.25	92.71	18.5		7.09	251.50	98.06 to 102.28	38,338	35,542
102		10	88.08	95.55	81.26	26.6	9 117.58	58.40	200.33	63.55 to 111.46	116,250	94,463
103		1	123.95	123.95	123.95			123.95	123.95	N/A	55,000	68,170
104		24	91.16	94.86	87.69	24.5		52.86	170.68	69.08 to 105.63	52,275	45,838
106		23	63.85	72.40	51.19	60.5	1 141.42	10.00	225.00	31.25 to 85.60	3,340	1,710
ALL	_											
		192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	7 108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195

33 - FUI	RNAS COUNTY					&O Statistics	Base S	tat	State Stat Run	PAGE:5 of 5	
112012211					Type: Qualific Date Rai	ed nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	06 Posted	Before: 01/19/	/2007		(1. AVT of -0)
	NUMBER of Sales	:	192	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.76	95%	Median C.I.: 94.08	to 99.76	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: '	7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.81			to 94.19	(Deriveu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: '	7,515,765	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87			2 to 102.27	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: (6,757,510								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	39,144	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	251.50				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	35,195	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.09			Printed: 03/29/.	2007 21:05:09
CONDITI	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	22	69.43	73.57	51.35	57.0	5 143.28	10.00	225.00	30.42 to 87.43	3,378	1,735
10	3	132.80	143.63	121.41	51.4	118.30	46.60	251.50	N/A	2,833	3,440
20	54	98.11	104.85	92.54	24.2	113.30	7.09	202.65	93.87 to 104.50	19,440	17,989
30	84	98.86	97.29	89.28	16.5	108.96	48.15	170.68	94.08 to 102.24	48,947	43,702
40	28	98.21	96.61	90.56	14.5	106.68	43.06	150.80	93.77 to 103.42	78,273	70,887
50	1	102.28	102.28	102.28			102.28	102.28	N/A	79,900	81,725
ALI											
	192	97.42	97.35	89.91	23.4	108.27	7.09	251.50	94.08 to 99.76	39,144	35,195

33 - FURNAS COUNTY			PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics Base Stat								PAGE:1 of 4
COMMERCIAL		Type: Qualified							State Stat Run		
	Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007								(!: AVTot=0)		
NUMBER of Sales:		18	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	COV: 19.71		Median C.I.: 91.58	to 99 63	(!: Av 101=0) (!: Derived)	
TOTAL Sales Price:		472,802	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	18.24		. Mean C.I.: 63.63		(:. Denveu)	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:		442,802	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48		% Mean C.I.: 83.4			
TOTAL Assessed Value:			371,205			1100.1120.221	10.10	, ,	0.1.0	0 00 101.00	
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:			24,600	COD:	10.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.00				
AVG. Assessed Value:			20,622	PRD:	110.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.58			Printed: 03/29/	2007 21:05:18
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/03 TO 09/30/03	1	101.75	101.75	101.75			101.75	101.75	N/A	60,000	61,050
10/01/03 TO 12/31/03	2	97.35	97.35	97.08	0.7	100.28	96.60	98.10	N/A	31,250	30,337
01/01/04 TO 03/31/04	1	97.85	97.85	97.85			97.85	97.85	N/A	10,000	9,785
04/01/04 TO 06/30/04	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	1,000	980
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	91.58	91.58	91.58			91.58	91.58	N/A	50,000	45,790
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	95.56	95.56	95.56			95.56	95.56	N/A	31,000	29,625
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	90.47	90.47	92.96	19.2	26 97.32	73.05	107.90	N/A	35,000	32,537
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	96.35	96.35	96.35			96.35	96.35	N/A	1,152	1,110
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	66.29	66.29	37.93	43.3		37.58	95.00	N/A	40,250	15,267
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	109.32	109.32	104.48	8.8		99.63	119.00	N/A	10,000	10,447
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	98.80	98.80	95.27	9.5		89.36	108.24	N/A	13,575	12,932
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 Study Years	2	79.99	79.99	67.19	19.2	27 119.05	64.57	95.40	N/A	14,750	9,910
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04	5	98.00	98.46	99.24	1.1	99.21	96.60	101.75	N/A	26,700	26,498
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	5	95.56	92.89	93.06	8.2	99.81	73.05	107.90	N/A	30,430	28,320
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	95.20	88.60	61.80	17.8	143.37	37.58	119.00	37.58 to 119.00	19,643	12,139
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	96.71	95.75	93.67	2.2	25 102.21	91.58	98.00	N/A	23,000	21,545
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	96.35	89.79	68.52	17.9	131.04	37.58	119.00	37.58 to 119.00	24,521	16,802
ALL											
	18	96.47	92.53	83.83	10.8	36 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ARAPAHOE	4	95.48	97.14	95.42	4.9		89.36	108.24	N/A	15,162	14,468
BEAVER CITY	2	98.86	98.86	98.76	0.7		98.10	99.63	N/A	17,500	17,282
CAMBRIDGE	3	101.75	100.41	100.00	5.3		91.58	107.90	N/A	50,000	50,000
EDISON	2	96.50	96.50	97.00	1.5		95.00	98.00	N/A	750	727
HOLBROOK	2	66.97	66.97	38.41	43.8		37.58	96.35	N/A	40,576	15,585
OXFORD	3	96.60	89.17	88.19	8.5	101.11	73.05	97.85	N/A	27,500	24,251
RURAL	1	64.57	64.57	64.57			64.57	64.57	N/A	27,000	17,435
WILSONVILLE	1	119.00	119.00	119.00			119.00	119.00	N/A	5,000	5,950

10.86 110.38

37.58 119.00 91.58 to 99.63

24,600

20,622

____ALL____

18 96.47

92.53

83.83

State Stat Run

COMMERCIAL				Type: Qualifie	d				State Stat Run	
					age: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	2007		(4.4777
NUMBER of S	ales:	18	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	19.71	95%	Median C.I.: 91.58	+0 00 63	(!: AVTot=0)
TOTAL Sales P		472,802	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	19.71		. Mean C.I.: 63.63		(!: Derived)
TOTAL Adj.Sales P	rice:	442,802	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48		% Mean C.I.: 83.4		
TOTAL Assessed V	alue:	371,205			AVG.ABS.DEV.	10.40	93	o Mean C.I 03.4	0 00 101.00	
AVG. Adj. Sales P	rice:	24,600	COD:	10.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.00				
AVG. Assessed V	alue:	20,622	PRD:	110.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.58			Printed: 03/29/	2007 21:05:18
LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURI	AN & RURA	ь							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE COU	NT MEDIA	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	17 96.60	94.17	85.08	9.54	4 110.69	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 101.75	24,458	20,810
3	1 64.5	64.57	64.57			64.57	64.57	N/A	27,000	17,435
ALL										
	18 96.4		83.83	10.86	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPI									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	18 96.4	92.53	83.83	10.86	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
ALL		, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	02.02	10.04	. 110 20	27 50	110 00	01 50 1 00 63	04 600	20 622
SCHOOL DISTRICT *	18 96.4	92.53	83.83	10.86	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600 Avg. Adj.	20,622 Avg.
RANGE COL	NT MEDIA	J MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	NI MEDIAI	MEAN	WGI. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIIN	MAA	95% Median C.I.	5410 11100	11000 101
33-0018	8 95.48	85.63	63.29	14.56	6 135.31	37.58	108.24	37.58 to 108.24	21,225	13,432
33-0021	3 101.75		100.00	5.35		91.58	107.90	N/A	50,000	50,000
33-0540	6 97.22		91.35	5.30		73.05	99.63	73.05 to 99.63	19,666	17,965
42-0002									,	,
73-0179	1 119.00	119.00	119.00			119.00	119.00	N/A	5,000	5,950
NonValid School										
ALL										
	18 96.4	92.53	83.83	10.86	5 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
YEAR BUILT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	1 95.00	95.00	95.00			95.00	95.00	N/A	500	475
Prior TO 1860										
1860 TO 1899										
1900 TO 1919	3 96.35		109.17	8.16		95.40	119.00	N/A	2,884	3,148
1920 TO 1939	3 99.63		103.63	3.28		98.10	107.90	N/A	25,000	25,908
1940 TO 1949	6 96.78		92.44	9.69	9 100.91	64.57	108.24	64.57 to 108.24	29,583	27,346
1950 TO 1959	1 73.09 1 89.30		73.05			73.05	73.05	N/A	30,000	21,915
1960 TO 1969 1970 TO 1979	1 89.36 3 96.60		89.36 61.06	20.80	0 126.67	89.36 37.58	89.36 97.85	N/A N/A	18,650	16,665 26,966
1970 TO 1979 1980 TO 1989	3 90.00	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	01.00	20.80	120.07	31.30	21.00	1N / A	44,166	20,900
1990 TO 1994										
1995 TO 1999										
2000 TO Present										
ALL										
	18 96.4	92.53	83.83	10.86	110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622

33 - FURNAS	COUNTY				PA&T	2007 R&	&O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:3 of 4
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
							nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		(!: AVTot=0
	NUMBER	of Sales	ş:	18	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	19.71	95%	Median C.I.: 91.58	to 99.63	(!: Av Ioi=0)
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	472,802	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	18.24		. Mean C.I.: 63.63		(Deriveu
TOT	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	442,802	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48		% Mean C.I.: 83.4		
TO	TAL Asses	sed Value	:	371,205								
AVG	. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	24,600	COD:	10.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.00				
P	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	20,622	PRD:	110.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.58			Printed: 03/29/	2007 21:05:18
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	4	95.88	96.19	96.08	1.0	3 100.11	95.00	98.00	N/A	1,288	1,237
5000 TO	9999	2	113.62	113.62	112.22	4.7	4 101.25	108.24	119.00	N/A	6,750	7,575
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	6	97.18	102.00	107.76	6.6	94.65	95.00	119.00	95.00 to 119.00	3,108	3,350
10000 TO	29999	5	97.85	89.90	86.54	8.9	5 103.88	64.57	99.63	N/A	18,130	15,690
30000 TO	59999	5	95.56	92.94	93.82	8.3	4 99.06	73.05	107.90	N/A	38,700	36,309
60000 TO	99999	2	69.66	69.66	65.08	46.0	6 107.05	37.58	101.75	N/A	70,000	45,555
ALL	_											
		18	96.47	92.53	83.83	10.8	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
ASSESSED VA	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	4	95.88	96.19	96.08	1.0		95.00	98.00	N/A	1,288	1,237
5000 TO	9999	3	108.24	108.36	106.11	6.5	1 102.13	97.85	119.00	N/A	7,833	8,311
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	7	97.85	101.41	104.30	5.6		95.00	119.00	95.00 to 119.00	4,093	4,269
10000 TO	29999	6	92.46	86.71	84.86	11.9		64.57	99.63	64.57 to 99.63	23,608	20,034
30000 TO	59999	4	94.09	83.41	75.32	20.0	2 110.74	37.58	107.90	N/A	53,125	40,016
60000 TO	99999	1	101.75	101.75	101.75			101.75	101.75	N/A	60,000	61,050
ALL	_		06.45	00 50	02.02	10.0		25 50	110 00	01 50 . 00 60	04.600	00.600
COST RANK		18	96.47	92.53	83.83	10.8	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
		COLLINE	MEDIAN	MESS	MCT MEAN	00	ממת מי	MIN	MASZ	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE 10		COUNT 13	MEDIAN 96.35	MEAN 89.67	WGT. MEAN 76.82	CC 11.7		MIN 37.58	MAX 108.24	73.05 to 99.63	22,242	17,086
20		5	98.10	99.96	76.82 97.02	8.1		37.58 89.36	108.24	/3.05 to 99.63 N/A		
20 ALL		כ	90.10	99.96	91.02	8.1	∠ 105.05	09.30	119.00	IN / A	30,730	29,815

10.86

110.38

37.58 119.00 91.58 to 99.63

24,600

20,622

18

96.47

92.53

	RNAS COUNTY			PA&T	2007 R&	&O Statistics		Base S	tat	G G D	PAGE:4 of 4
COMMERC	IAL				Type: Qualifie	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	2007		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales	:	18	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	19.71	95%	Median C.I.: 91.5	8 to 99.63	(!: Av 10i=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	472,802	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	18.24		. Mean C.I.: 63.63		(Deliveu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	442,802	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48			46 to 101.60	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	371,205			11,011120.22	10.10			10 00 101.00	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	24,600	COD:	10.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.00				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	20,622	PRD:	110.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.58			Printed: 03/29/	/2007 21:05:18
OCCUPAL	NCY CODE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	2	95.20	95.20	95.33	0.2	1 99.86	95.00	95.40	N/A	1,500	1,430
344	2	103.77	103.77	105.65	3.9	8 98.22	99.63	107.90	N/A	27,500	29,052
350	1	73.05	73.05	73.05			73.05	73.05	N/A	30,000	21,915
353	3	98.10	98.82	99.37	1.7	5 99.45	96.60	101.75	N/A	40,833	40,575
406	5	96.35	95.42	94.12	2.2	7 101.39	89.36	98.00	N/A	12,360	11,633
442	1	37.58	37.58	37.58			37.58	37.58	N/A	80,000	30,060
484	1	119.00	119.00	119.00			119.00	119.00	N/A	5,000	5,950
528	2	86.41	86.41	75.03	25.2	7 115.16	64.57	108.24	N/A	17,750	13,317
532	1	91.58	91.58	91.58			91.58	91.58	N/A	50,000	45,790
AL	L										
	18	96.47	92.53	83.83	10.8	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
-	TY TYPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	18	96.47	92.53	83.83	10.8	6 110.38	37.58	119.00	91.58 to 99.63	24,600	20,622
04											
AL:	L										

110.38

37.58

119.00 91.58 to 99.63

24,600

20,622

18

96.47

92.53

83.83

DA 9 T 2007 D. L. Base Stat 33 - FURNAS COUNTY PAGE:1 of 5 RESID

33 - FURNAS COUNTY				PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistic	c	Base S	tat		PAGE:1 of 5
RESIDENTIAL					Type: Qualifie					State Stat Run	
						a nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
NIIMDEE	R of Sales		192	MEDIAN:	95						(!: AVTot=0)
	ales Price		,508,265		95 87	COV:	68.24		Median C.I.: 91.22		(!: Derived)
TOTAL Adj.Sa			,515,765	WGT. MEAN:		STD:	69.99		. Mean C.I.: 81.62		
TOTAL Adj.Sa				MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.73	95	% Mean C.I.: 92.6	8 to 112.48	
			,527,825	gop.	24.00	May Galam Baldar	0.40				
AVG. Adj. Sa AVG. Asses			39,144 33,999	COD: PRD:	34.29 118.10	MAX Sales Ratio: MIN Sales Ratio:	849.00 2.69				
	ssed value	:•	33,999	PRD.	118.10	MIN Sales Ratio.	2.69			Printed: 02/17/	
DATE OF SALE *	COLLEGE	MEDIAN		WEAR	90				050 Mallan G T	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Pilce	ASSU VAI
Qrtrs		00 27	00 10	07.77	10.0	7 101 45	76 00	140 06	01 70 +- 104 11	25 571	24 777
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	14	99.37	99.18	97.77	10.2		76.02	149.26	81.72 to 104.11	35,571	34,777
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	24	98.85	95.14	89.18	15.7		45.79	165.54	88.02 to 102.24	39,662	35,371
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	21	96.71	137.66	98.48	62.5		55.46	849.00	75.38 to 117.72	27,318	26,904
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	31	88.76	93.80	82.44	33.0		25.33	249.83	67.13 to 98.47	40,547	33,428
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	29	100.54	106.59	85.08	33.6		26.92	317.17	76.67 to 112.52	31,448	26,755
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	19	118.37	121.03	99.87	33.4		12.00	280.29	85.55 to 136.68	39,628	39,575
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	16	86.72	87.02	86.35	34.9		10.00	151.00	52.80 to 113.84	35,018	30,239
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	38	90.25	90.56	78.56	35.2	6 115.27	2.69	233.70	72.06 to 98.51	52,893	41,555
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	90	96.00	105.23	89.53	31.7	2 117.54	25.33	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	36,450	32,633
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	102	94.54	100.24	84.78	36.7	1 118.23	2.69	317.17	85.86 to 103.51	41,521	35,203
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	100	96.38	111.89	89.52	41.7	1 125.00	12.00	849.00	88.76 to 102.70	34,956	31,291
ALL											
	192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ARAPAHOE	47	100.32	102.65	96.83	19.4	8 106.02	52.80	280.29	93.67 to 103.63	41,330	40,019
BEAVER CITY	29	95.43	101.08	83.72	24.8	7 120.73	50.87	249.83	88.02 to 104.25	36,174	30,284
CAMBRIDGE	39	95.49	106.96	91.74	26.7	9 116.59	51.73	208.17	88.34 to 106.77	47,094	43,203
EDISON	10	62.84	72.18	63.78	50.2	0 113.17	10.00	154.83	39.94 to 117.72	12,520	7,985
HENDLEY	5	81.73	82.82	91.20	21.1	7 90.82	59.08	108.05	N/A	17,877	16,304
HOLBROOK	15	99.71	143.46	100.21	80.4	2 143.15	20.83	849.00	70.14 to 117.00	13,666	13,695
OXFORD	23	98.62	98.41	88.20	33.6	2 111.58	2.69	317.17	69.03 to 111.74	30,402	26,814
RURAL RES	18	75.75	93.02	69.76	52.3	5 133.34	12.00	233.70	47.82 to 103.51	83,055	57,939
WILSONVILLE	6	62.82	90.32	77.76	88.9	3 116.15	25.33	225.00	25.33 to 225.00	12,270	9,541
ALL											
	192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	176	96.60	104.67	91.82	33.5		2.69	849.00	93.33 to 100.54	34,436	31,619
2	2	69.34	69.34	68.78	3.9		66.62	72.06	N/A	182,500	125,530
3	14	75.75	81.06	65.29	42.5		12.00	226.95	45.57 to 103.51	77,857	50,835
ALL	•									,	,

118.10

2.69

849.00

91.22 to 99.71

39,144

33,999

34.29

192

95.46

102.58

Base Stat PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics PAGE:2 of 5 33 - FURNAS COUNTY

95.46

102.58

86.86

192

39,144

33,999

RESIDENT	IAL	l			Type: Qualific	ad	3			State Stat Run	
					• •	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	192	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	68.24	95%	Median C.I.: 91.22	+- 00 71	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: 7	,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	69.99		. Mean C.I.: 81.62		(!: Derivea)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price		7,515,765	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.73		% Mean C.I.: 92.6		
	TOTAL Assessed Value		5,527,825	112121	103	AVG.ABS.DEV.	32.73	95	6 Mean C.I 92.6	8 to 112.48	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price		39,144	COD:	34.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	849.00				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	33,999	PRD:	118.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.69			Printed: 02/17/.	2007 13:04:23
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	175	97.02	105.78	87.40	32.5	121.03	2.69	849.00	93.56 to 100.54	41,881	36,605
2	17	72.06	69.63	65.39	47.9	0 106.48	10.00	180.00	25.33 to 93.33	10,969	7,173
ALL_											
	192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999
PROPERTY	TYPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	185	94.75	100.40	86.56	32.9	4 115.99	2.69	849.00	90.50 to 99.03	40,263	34,853
06											
07	7	140.33	160.12	119.37	45.0	134.13	69.04	317.17	69.04 to 317.17	9,571	11,425
ALL_											
	192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999
	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0018	70	99.65	109.37	94.51	36.3		12.00	849.00	93.33 to 102.24	34,640	32,738
33-0021	44	94.22	102.39	83.36	27.4		47.82	208.17	85.09 to 104.11	58,879	49,083
33-0540	70	94.94	98.09	85.79	32.2	114.33	2.69	317.17	85.86 to 101.41	31,879	27,351
42-0002											
73-0179	8	62.82	83.45	60.26	73.4	8 138.47	25.33	225.00	25.33 to 225.00	33,578	20,235
NonValid											
ALL_											

34.29

118.10

2.69

849.00 91.22 to 99.71

33 - FUR	NAS CO	UNTY				PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistics	1	Base S	tat		PAGE:3 of 5
RESIDENT	'IAL						Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
								nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	06 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	2007		(4. 43777 (0)
		NUMBER of	Sales	:	192	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	68.24	95% 1	Median C.I.: 91.22	+0 99 71	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
	TO	OTAL Sales	s Price:	:	7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	69.99		. Mean C.I.: 81.62		(:: Derivea)
	TOTAL	Adj.Sales	s Price:	:	7,515,765	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.73			8 to 112.48	
	TOTAI	L Assessed	d Value:	:	6,527,825			AVO.ADD.DEV.	32.73	, , ,	72.00	0 00 112.40	
	AVG. A	Adj. Sales	s Price:		39,144	COD:	34.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	849.00				
	AVG	. Assessed	d Value:	:	33,999	PRD:	118.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.69			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:04:23
YEAR BUI	ILT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR	Blank		23	63.85	71.25	48.68	62.6	4 146.37	2.69	225.00	30.42 to 85.60	3,340	1,626
Prior TO	1860												
1860 TO	1899		10	92.77	102.31	85.25	28.5	4 120.01	59.25	233.70	72.06 to 114.36	44,200	37,680
1900 TO	1919		45	93.79	90.68	78.80	21.7	4 115.08	39.94	165.85	80.62 to 99.03	35,160	27,706
1920 TO	1939		50	98.57	115.64	87.66	42.2	8 131.92	43.38	849.00	81.22 to 107.49	35,301	30,944
1940 TO	1949		13	95.43	117.15	89.21	39.2		64.83	280.29	73.56 to 169.15	40,730	36,336
1950 TO	1959		4	70.31	105.66	67.83	60.4	4 155.76	59.70	222.30	N/A	82,125	55,708
1960 TO	1969		18	102.08	106.68	102.32	13.8		72.74	165.54	92.21 to 111.89	52,611	53,833
1970 TO	1979		18	105.12	121.76	91.69	36.2		50.87	317.17	86.33 to 135.54	49,423	45,314
1980 TO			7	103.51	102.99	78.92	18.5		47.82	140.54	47.82 to 140.54	68,893	54,372
1990 TO			2	98.20	98.20	96.99	8.3		89.99	106.41	N/A	152,450	147,857
1995 TO			2	97.77	97.77	97.33	9.2	1 100.45	88.76	106.77	N/A	83,950	81,707
2000 TO		ıt											
ALL_				05.46	100 50	06.06	24.0	0 110 10	0.60	0.40	01 00 . 00 81	20 144	22 222
SALE PRI	TOP *		192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144 Avg. Adj.	33,999 Avg.
RANGE	ICE .		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
LOW	w \$		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGI. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIIN	MAA	95% Median C.I.	bare rrice	noba vai
1 7		 4999	26	84.47	139.22	143.67	104.3	1 96.91	10.00	849.00	52.73 to 144.33	1,739	2,499
5000 TC		9999	16	96.28	98.70	94.57	39.1		2.69	222.30	69.00 to 114.36	7,156	6,767
	al \$,	.,
1 7		9999	42	91.91	123.78	108.48	75.4	9 114.11	2.69	849.00	73.73 to 114.36	3,803	4,125
10000 T	ТО	29999	60	102.94	112.56	112.15	26.1	1 100.36	12.00	233.70	98.11 to 112.52	18,497	20,745
30000	то	59999	47	94.44	90.53	90.04	17.3	6 100.54	39.94	122.75	85.86 to 100.60	43,890	39,521
60000 T	TO	99999	29	86.33	86.25	86.33	18.8	9 99.91	43.38	127.26	73.95 to 100.32	74,737	64,521
100000	то 1	.49999	9	76.46	76.10	75.69	18.5	1 100.55	45.57	106.41	58.09 to 94.75	119,822	90,688

24.77

34.29

99.92

118.10

45.79

2.69

89.99

849.00

N/A

91.22 to 99.71

187,500

39,144

113,001

33,999

150000 TO

____ALL____

249999

5

192

50.87

95.46

60.22

102.58

60.27

PAGE: 4 of 5
RESIDENTIAL

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006

Posted Before: 01/19/2007

RESIDENTIAL						Type: Qualific	ed nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted l	Before: 01/19	/2007	State Stat Kun	
	NIIMBER	of Sales	:	192	MEDIAN:	95						(!: AVTot=0)
		les Price		,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	93 87	COV:	68.24		Median C.I.: 91.22		(!: Derived)
TΩ	TAL Adj.Sa			,515,765	MEAN:	103	STD:	69.99		. Mean C.I.: 81.62		
	OTAL Asses			,527,825	MEAN.	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.73	95	% Mean C.I.: 92.6	8 to 112.48	
					COD:	34.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	849.00				
	G. Adj. Sa			39,144	COD: PRD:	118.10						
	AVG. Asses	sed value	•	33,999	PRD:	118.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.69			Printed: 02/17/.	
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	27	70.42	77.58	51.67	59.0		2.69	225.00	46.60 to 93.33	3,008	1,554
5000 TO	9999	17	99.71	171.33	106.42	93.9	5 161.00	56.63	849.00	69.04 to 249.83	7,635	8,125
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	44	82.16	113.80	85.34	78.7		2.69	849.00	63.85 to 102.22	4,796	4,093
10000 TO	29999	58	98.83	103.01	91.96	23.2		39.94	222.30	94.64 to 103.18	20,883	19,204
30000 TO	59999	61	95.43	101.43	91.59	24.9		43.38	233.70	88.86 to 104.11	47,970	43,937
60000 TO	99999	22	90.72	87.31	81.34	20.5		45.57	124.64	72.74 to 102.24	93,336	75,920
100000 TO	149999	6	83.41	85.82	77.32	28.3	6 111.00	47.82	127.26	47.82 to 127.26	156,483	120,987
150000 TO	249999	1	89.99	89.99	89.99			89.99	89.99	N/A	175,000	157,485
ALL												
		192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		23	63.85	71.25	48.68	62.6	4 146.37	2.69	225.00	30.42 to 85.60	3,340	1,626
10		13	99.71	186.26	108.44	107.5	7 171.77	59.08	849.00	70.42 to 249.83	7,915	8,583
20		59	98.11	103.54	89.45	27.4	1 115.75	47.62	280.29	88.76 to 104.25	26,394	23,610
30		85	96.71	98.89	87.37	23.1	4 113.19	39.94	233.70	91.96 to 101.41	51,038	44,592
40		12	98.33	93.33	82.99	22.1	5 112.47	47.82	127.26	66.62 to 122.75	120,041	99,619
ALL												
		192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999
STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
100		6	116.93	131.26	108.47	40.1	1 121.01	69.04	249.83	69.04 to 249.83	9,916	10,756
101		128	100.00	110.73	93.48	29.2	2 118.45	39.94	849.00	96.50 to 103.18	38,338	35,839
102		10	84.62	92.78	74.42	31.6	0 124.67	47.82	226.95	58.09 to 101.40	116,250	86,516
103		1	122.75	122.75	122.75			122.75	122.75	N/A	55,000	67,515
104		24	75.31	85.20	72.20	35.7	2 118.02	43.38	186.76	59.70 to 98.51	52,275	37,740
106		23	63.85	71.25	48.68	62.6	4 146.37	2.69	225.00	30.42 to 85.60	3,340	1,626
ALL												
		192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999

33 - FUI	RNAS COUNTY			PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistic	S	Base S	tat	~ ~ -	PAGE:5 of 5
RESIDENT	TIAL			1	Type: Qualifie	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	006 Posted	Before: 01/19/	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:		192	MEDIAN:	95	cov:	68.24	95%	Median C.I.: 91.22	to 99.71	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price:		7,508,265	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	69.99	95% Wgt		to 92.09	(II Zeitreu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:		7,515,765	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.73	95	% Mean C.I.: 92.68	8 to 112.48	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:		6,527,825								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		39,144	COD:	34.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	849.00				
	AVG. Assessed Value:		33,999	PRD:	118.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.69			Printed: 02/17/.	2007 13:04:23
CONDITI	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	22	69.43	72.37	48.75	59.1	0 148.46	2.69	225.00	26.92 to 89.90	3,378	1,647
10	3	185.00	360.20	222.41	144.5	8 161.95	46.60	849.00	N/A	2,833	6,301
20	54	96.82	112.07	92.08	37.7	0 121.71	47.62	317.17	90.50 to 103.65	19,440	17,901
30	84	96.86	96.68	83.36	23.4	0 115.99	39.94	249.83	88.02 to 101.40	48,947	40,800
40	28	98.58	97.94	90.96	15.3	6 107.67	47.82	149.26	91.06 to 103.63	78,273	71,195
50	1	106.77	106.77	106.77			106.77	106.77	N/A	79,900	85,310
ALI	<u></u>										
	192	95.46	102.58	86.86	34.2	9 118.10	2.69	849.00	91.22 to 99.71	39,144	33,999

33 - FURNAS COUNTY				PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistic	es	Base S	tat	a a 	PAGE:1 of
COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualifie					State Stat Run	
						nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	2007		/4 A T 700
NUMBER	of Sales	;:	18	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	41.01	95%	Median C.I.: 68.78	+ o 00 01	(!: AVTot=0
TOTAL Sal			472,802	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	36.41		. Mean C.I.: 55.47		(!: Derived
TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price	:	442,802	MEAN:	89						
TOTAL Assess			338,060	112121	0,5	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.07	95	% Mean C.I.: 70.69	9 to 106.90	
AVG. Adj. Sal			24,600	COD:	30.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.50				
AVG. Assess			18,781	PRD:	116.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.93			Printed: 02/17/.	2007 12:01:2
DATE OF SALE *	Jea varae		10,701	110	110.31	MIN DUICE RUCIO	30.33			Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs	COONI	MEDIAN	PHEMI	WOI. PLEAN	CO.	D IND	1.1114	PIAZ	Joe Median C.I.		
07/01/03 TO 09/30/03	1	97.33	97.33	97.32			97.33	97.33	N/A	60,000	58,395
10/01/03 TO 12/31/03	2	99.76	99.76	99.81	0.1	6 99.95	99.60	99.91	N/A	31,250	31,190
01/01/04 TO 03/31/04	1	115.40	115.40	115.40			115.40	115.40	N/A	10,000	11,540
04/01/04 TO 06/30/04	1	177.50	177.50	177.50			177.50	177.50	N/A	1,000	1,775
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	68.78	68.78	68.78			68.78	68.78	N/A	50,000	34,390
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	92.06	92.06	92.06			92.06	92.06	N/A	31,000	28,540
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	78.72	78.72	81.11	21.2	4 97.06	62.00	95.44	N/A	35,000	28,387
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	88.11	88.11	88.11			88.11	88.11	N/A	1,152	1,015
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	31.97	31.97	30.94	3.2	4 103.30	30.93	33.00	N/A	40,250	12,455
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	104.72	104.72	91.33	25.5		77.93	131.50	N/A	10,000	9,132
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	102.51	102.51	90.74	30.7		71.02	134.00	N/A	13,575	12,317
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	61.90	61.90	52.34	18.5		50.39	73.40	N/A	14,750	7,720
Study Years											
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04	5	99.91	117.95	100.44	19.2	1 117.43	97.33	177.50	N/A	26,700	26,818
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	5	88.11	81.28	79.34	12.8	7 102.44	62.00	95.44	N/A	30,430	24,144
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	72.21	75.27	52.97	40.0	7 142.09	30.93	134.00	30.93 to 134.00	19,643	10,406
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	103.73	113.44	82.88	31.8	3 136.87	68.78	177.50	N/A	23,000	19,061
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	77.93	74.13	58.82	34.6	7 126.03	30.93	131.50	30.93 to 131.50	24,521	14,423
ALL											
	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.0	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ARAPAHOE	4	82.73	92.62	90.70	24.6	7 102.12	71.02	134.00	N/A	15,162	13,752
BEAVER CITY	2	88.77	88.77	90.31	12.2	1 98.28	77.93	99.60	N/A	17,500	15,805
CAMBRIDGE	3	95.44	87.18	87.31	9.9	7 99.86	68.78	97.33	N/A	50,000	43,653
EDISON	2	105.25	105.25	129.33	68.6	5 81.38	33.00	177.50	N/A	750	970
HOLBROOK	2	59.52	59.52	31.74	48.0	3 187.51	30.93	88.11	N/A	40,576	12,880
OXFORD	3	99.91	92.44	88.00	17.8	2 105.04	62.00	115.40	N/A	27,500	24,200
RURAL	1	50.39	50.39	50.39			50.39	50.39	N/A	27,000	13,605
WILSONVILLE	1	131.50	131.50	131.50			131.50	131.50	N/A	5,000	6,575
ALL											

30.04 116.31

30.93 177.50 68.78 to 99.91

24,600

18,781

18

90.09

88.79

Base Stat PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics PAGE:2 of 4 33 - FURNAS COUNTY State Stat Run

COMMERCIAL

COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualifie	d				State Stat Run	
						ge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
NU	MBER of Sales	s:	18	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	41.01	95%	Median C.I.: 68.78	to 99.91	(!: Av 10i=0) (!: Derived)
TOTA	L Sales Price	e:	472,802	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:			. Mean C.I.: 55.47		(Berreu)
TOTAL Ad	lj.Sales Price	e:	442,802	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.07		% Mean C.I.: 70.6		
TOTAL A	ssessed Value	e:	338,060								
AVG. Adj	. Sales Price	e:	24,600	COD:	30.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.50				
AVG. A	ssessed Value	e:	18,781	PRD:	116.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.93			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:04:26
LOCATIONS: URBAN	N, SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	17	92.06	91.05	78.03	28.47	7 116.69	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 115.40	24,458	19,085
3	1	50.39	50.39	50.39			50.39	50.39	N/A	27,000	13,605
ALL											
	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.04	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
STATUS: IMPROVE	-									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.04	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
ALL	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.04	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
SCHOOL DISTRICT		90.09	00.79	70.35	30.04	4 110.31	30.93	177.50	00.70 (0 99.91	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	COONT	MEDIAN	PIEAN	WGI. MEAN	COI	D FRD	PIIN	MAM	93% Median C.1.		
33-0018	8	80.76	89.68	56.62	41.16	6 158.37	30.93	177.50	30.93 to 177.50	21,225	12,018
33-0021	3	95.44	87.18	87.31	9.9		68.78	97.33	N/A	50,000	43,653
33-0540	6	88.77	81.31	88.45	26.66		33.00	115.40	33.00 to 115.40	19,666	17,395
42-0002											
73-0179	1	131.50	131.50	131.50			131.50	131.50	N/A	5,000	6,575
NonValid School											
ALL											
	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.04	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	1	33.00	33.00	33.00			33.00	33.00	N/A	500	165
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	3	88.11	97.67	108.93	21.98		73.40	131.50	N/A	2,884	3,141
1920 TO 1939	3	95.44	90.99	93.05	7.5		77.93	99.60	N/A	25,000	23,261
1940 TO 1949	6	94.69	103.34	83.43	34.78	8 123.86	50.39	177.50	50.39 to 177.50	29,583	24,682
1950 TO 1959	1	62.00	62.00	62.00			62.00	62.00	N/A	30,000	18,600
1960 TO 1969	1	71.02	71.02	71.02	20 10	0 120 11	71.02	71.02	N/A	18,650	13,245
1970 TO 1979 1980 TO 1989	3	99.91	82.08	59.43	28.18	8 138.11	30.93	115.40	N/A	44,166	26,248
1990 TO 1989											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL											
	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.04	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
										,	, -

33 - FURNAS	COUNTY				PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistic	cs	Base S	tat		PAGE:3 of
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualifie					State Stat Run	
							nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		(!: AVTot=
	NUMBER	of Sales	;:	18	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	41.01	95%	Median C.I.: 68.78	3 to 99.91	(!: Av 10i=
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	472,802	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	36.41		. Mean C.I.: 55.47		(=
TOT	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	442,802	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.07		% Mean C.I.: 70.6		
TO	OTAL Asses	sed Value	:	338,060								
AVO	3. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	24,600	COD:	30.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.50				
I	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	18,781	PRD:	116.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.93			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:04:
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	4	80.76	93.00	92.97	49.2	9 100.03	33.00	177.50	N/A	1,288	1,19
5000 TO	9999	2	132.75	132.75	133.07	0.9	4 99.76	131.50	134.00	N/A	6,750	8,98
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	6	109.81	106.25	122.00	37.7	2 87.09	33.00	177.50	33.00 to 177.50	3,108	3,7
10000 TO	29999	5	77.93	82.87	77.22	24.0	2 107.31	50.39	115.40	N/A	18,130	14,0
30000 TO	59999	5	92.06	83.64	83.81	14.0	3 99.80	62.00	99.91	N/A	38,700	32,4
60000 TO	99999	2	64.13	64.13	59.39	51.7	7 107.99	30.93	97.33	N/A	70,000	41,57
ALL												
		18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.0	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,78
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Va
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	4	80.76	93.00	92.97	49.2	9 100.03	33.00	177.50	N/A	1,288	1,1
5000 TO	9999	1	131.50	131.50	131.50			131.50	131.50	N/A	5,000	6,5
Total \$										/-		
1 TO	9999	5	88.11	100.70	111.95	45.9		33.00	177.50	N/A	2,030	2,2
10000 TO	29999	9	77.93	81.48	63.82	32.3		30.93	134.00	50.39 to 115.40	26,683	17,0
30000 TO	59999	4	96.38	90.37	90.09	8.5	6 100.31	68.78	99.91	N/A	48,125	43,3
ALL	_		00.00	00 = 5	E.C. 25	20.0	4 116 35	20.02	100.50	60 80	04.600	10 =
OCT DANT		18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.0	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,78
COST RANK		COLLNE	MEDIAN	MESS	MOD MEAN	30		MIN	147.77	0 F % M - d i C T	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Va
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
10		13	88.11	86.93	71.08	33.7		30.93	177.50	50.39 to 115.40	22,242	15,8
20 ALL		5	97.33	93.65	86.25	18.7	6 108.57	68.78	131.50	N/A	30,730	26,50

116.31

30.93 177.50 68.78 to 99.91

24,600

18,781

18

90.09

88.79

76.35

COMMERC	IAL					<u>ninary Statistic</u>				State Stat Run	
					Type: Qualifie Date Rar	ea 1ge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted 1	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales		18	MEDIAN:	90	8					(!: AVTot=0
	TOTAL Sales Price		472,802	WGT. MEAN:	90 76	COV:				8 to 99.91	(!: Derived
	TOTAL Adj. Sales Price		442,802	WGI. MEAN:	89	STD:	36.41	_		7 to 97.23	
	TOTAL Assessed Value		338,060	MEAN.	09	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.07	95	% Mean C.I.: 70.	69 to 106.90	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price		24,600	COD:	30.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.50				
	AVG. Assessed Value		18,781	PRD:	116.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.93			Drintad, 02/17/	(2007 12.04.2
CCIIDAI	ICY CODE	•	10,701	I KD.	110.31	MIN BAICS RACIO.	30.23			Printed: 02/17/ Avg. Adj.	2007 13:04:2 Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	2	53.20	53.20	66.67	37.9		33.00	73.40	N/A	1,500	1,000
344	2	86.69	86.69	90.66	10.1		77.93	95.44	N/A	27,500	24,932
350	1	62.00	62.00	62.00	10.1	55.01	62.00	62.00	N/A	30,000	18,600
353	3	99.60	98.95	98.59	0.8	6 100.36	97.33	99.91	N/A	40,833	40,258
406	5	92.06	108.82	90.80	29.0		71.02	177.50	N/A	12,360	11,223
442	1	30.93	30.93	30.93			30.93	30.93	N/A	80,000	24,74
484	1	131.50	131.50	131.50			131.50	131.50	N/A	5,000	6,575
528	2	92.19	92.19	70.41	45.3	4 130.94	50.39	134.00	N/A	17,750	12,497
532	1	68.78	68.78	68.78			68.78	68.78	N/A	50,000	34,390
AL	- 										
	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.0	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
PROPER'	TY TYPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	18	90.09	88.79	76.35	30.0	4 116.31	30.93	177.50	68.78 to 99.91	24,600	18,781
04											
AL:	<u> </u>										

30.04

116.31

30.93

177.50 68.78 to 99.91

24,600

18,781

18

90.09

88.79

2007 Assessment Survey for Furnas County January 29, 2007

I. General Information

- A. Staffing and Funding Information
- 1. Deputy(ies) on staff: 1
- 2. Appraiser(s) on staff: One appraiser is utilized on a part-time basis
- 3. Other full-time employees: 0
- 4. Other part-time employees: 1
- 5. Number of shared employees: 0
- 6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: \$71,238
- **7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system**: The total amount of the computer expenses are allocated out of the county general budget and not the assessor's budget.
- 8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: \$70,933
- 9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: \$0
- 10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: \$450
- **11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:** \$18,000 is allocated from the county general fund for appraisal work
- 12. Other miscellaneous funds: \$0
- **13. Total budget:** \$70,933
 - 1. Was any of last year's budget not used? No
- **B.** Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

- **1. Data collection done by:** The part-time appraiser
- 2. Valuation done by: Assessor

3. Pickup work done by: The part-time appraiser

Property Type	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Residential	100	0	19	119

- 4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? June 2005
- 5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 2007
- 6. 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? The County Assessor uses a mass appraisal system which commonly does not involve enough sales to review properties with a Sales Comparison Approach
- 7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 10
- 8. How are these defined? These are defined by market areas and assessor locations
- 9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
- 10. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? Yes, the proximity to the village and surrounding the town identifies the suburban assessor location. Both suburban and rural residential locations are valued in a like manner using the same costing method.
- 11. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner? They are valued using the same Marshall and Swift costing tables, but depreciation tables differ by using market information.
- C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by: The part-time Appraiser

2. Valuation done by: Assessor

3. Pickup work done by whom: The part-time Appraiser

Property Type	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Commercial	8	0	8	16

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? January 2006

- 5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information? 2007
- 6. When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? The income/expense information is typically not available for very few sales in Furnas County.
- 7. 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? N/A
- 8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? 8
- 9. How are these defined? These are defined by assessor location and market
- 10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
- 11. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? No
- D. Agricultural Appraisal Information
- Data collection done by: The Furnas County Assessor and staff complete the land valuation process and the part-time appraiser completes the data collection for improvements.
- **2. Valuation done by:** The Furnas County Assessor
- **3. Pickup work done by whom:** Pickup work is completed by the part-time appraiser.

Property Type	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Agricultural	0	0	0	0

4. Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? No

How is your agricultural land defined? By the primary use of the property

- 5. When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? N/A
- **6.** What is the date of the soil survey currently used? 1979
- 7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed? 2005

- **a.** By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) FSA maps reviewed and updated land use acres by current owners FSA maps
- **b. By whom?** Assessor and staff
- c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? 100%
- 8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 1
- **9.** How are these defined? The market area is defined by market information that includes the entire county.
- 10. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? Yes, in 2002
- E. Computer, Automation Information and GIS
- 1. Administrative software: County Solutions, LLC
- 2. CAMA software: MIPS
- 3. Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? Yes
 - a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? Assessor
- 4. Does the county have GIS software? No
 - a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps? N/A
- 4. Personal Property software: MIPS
- F. Zoning Information
- 1. Does the county have zoning? Yes
 - a. If so, is the zoning countywide? Yes
 - **b. What municipalities in the county are zoned?** Cambridge, Arapahoe, Beaver City and Oxford
- c. When was zoning implemented? 1999

G. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services: Pritchard and Abbott are contracted to perform the Oil and Gas mineral appraisals.

2. Other Services: None

H. Additional comments or further explanations on any item from A through G:

The new Furnas County Assessor purchased a new Dell PC computer in the fall of 2006 which has been a huge asset to the office. Updated programs and electronic Mail has been utilized by the entire office staff.

II. Assessment Actions

2007 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

- 1. Residential- New (06/05) costing tables and new depreciation tables have been applied for new improvement values in all of the villages and towns located in Furnas County for 2007. The new assessor has updated and adopted a more detailed verification review process to ensure accurate market information. Properties in Oxford, Beaver City, Hendley, Wilsonville and rural residentials have all been reviewed for any routine changes needed according to market information. Land/lot values remained the same for 2007.
- **2.** Commercial- New (01/06) costing tables and new depreciation tables have been applied for new improved commercial valuations in Furnas County for 2007. Land/lots values remained the same for 2007.
- **3. Agricultural-** The only agricultural land values that changed for 2007 are the values for timberland in Furnas County. Prior values were established many years ago according to the percent of land cover of timber by each land classification group. Over the years, the timber cover has changed with natural seasonal changes. The new assessor applied an average value per land classification groups for timberland in 2007. No other agricultural land values changed for 2007 in Furnas County.

Total Real Property Value	Records	6,095	Value 320,016,585	Total Growth	901,310
(Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)		3,300	320,010,000	(Sum 17, 25, & 41)	331,313

Schedule I:Non-Agricultural Records (Res and Rec)

		$\overline{}$					$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$
	Urk			SubUrban		Rural		al	Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
1. Res UnImp Land	378	389,425	17	48,675	19	16,460	414	454,560	
2. Res Improv Land	1,960	3,398,360	60	595,865	149	1,702,675	2,169	5,696,900	
3. Res Improvements	1,972	63,901,750	61	5,638,530	155	7,671,420	2,188	77,211,700	
4. Res Total	2,350	67,689,535	78	6,283,070	174	9,390,555	2,602	83,363,160	684,780
% of Total	90.31	81.19	2.99	7.53	6.68	11.26	42.69	26.04	75.97
5. Rec									
UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res+Rec Total	2,350	67,689,535	78	6,283,070	174	9,390,555	2,602	83,363,160	684,780
% of Total	90.31	81.19	2.99	7.53	6.68	11.26	42.69	26.04	75.97
								J	

Total Real Property Value Records 6,095 Value 320,016,585 Total Growth (Sum 17, 25, & 30) (Sum 17, 25, & 41)

Schedule I:Non-Agricultural Records (Com and Ind)

	Urb		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Growen
9. Comm UnImp Land	82	85,705	4	5,100	3	5,665	89	96,470	
10. Comm Improv Land	281	460,405	15	67,340	7	16,770	303	544,515	
11. Comm Improvements	328	13,999,144	17	1,109,851	16	670,210	361	15,779,205	
12. Comm Total	410	14,545,254	21	1,182,291	19	692,645	450	16,420,190	6,090
% of Total	91.11	88.58	4.66	7.20	4.22	4.21	7.38	5.13	0.67
13. Ind UnImp Land	2	8,970	0	0	0	0	2	8,970	
14. Ind Improv Land	4	74,935	1	6,145	0	0	5	81,080	
15. Ind Improvements	5	330,085	1	321,260	0	0	6	651,345	
16. Ind Total	7	413,990	1	327,405	0	0	8	741,395	12,055
% of Total	87.50	55.83	12.50	44.16	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.23	1.33
Comm+Ind Total	417	14,959,244	22	1,509,696	19	692,645	458	17,161,585	18,145
% of Total	91.04	87.16	4.80	8.79	4.14	4.03	7.51	5.36	2.01
17. Taxable Total	2,767	82,648,779	100	7,792,766	193	10,083,200	3,060	100,524,745	702,925
% of Total	90.42	82.21	3.26	6.25	6.30	9.34	50.20	31.41	77.98

Count	y 33 -	Furnas
-------	--------	---------------

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule II:Tax Increment	Financing (TIF)	Urban			SubUrban				
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess			
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0			
19. Commercial	2	7,085	574,695	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 Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	2	7,085	574,695
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2	7,085	574,695

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	0	0	8	568,620
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Total		Growth
	Records	Value	
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	8	568,620	(
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	(
25. Mineral Interest Total	8	568,620	

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

Concadio III Exempt Recorder III II	,			
	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	292	3	342	637

Schedule V: Agricultural Records Urba			SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	2	30,825	0	0	2,369	142,872,465	2,371	142,903,290
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	638	46,829,565	638	46,829,565
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	0	0	656	29,190,365	656	29,190,365
30. Ag-Total Taxable						_	3.027	218.923.220

County 33 - Furnas	200	07 County Abst	ract of Assessn	ment for Real	Property, Form	45	
Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:		Urban			SubUrban		
Non-Agricultural Detail	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	0		0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	0		0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		1.000			0.000		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
		Rural			Total		Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	8	7.120	17,800	8	7.120	17,800	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	411	424.300	1,060,750	411	424.300	1,060,750	
33. HomeSite Improvements	385		9,369,420	385		9,369,420	76,080
34. HomeSite Total				393	431.420	10,447,970	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	14	29.520	11,805	14	29.520	11,805	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	543	1,578.980	631,590	543	1,578.980	631,590	
37. FarmSite Improv	638		19,820,945	638		19,820,945	122,305
38. FarmSite Total				652	1,608.500	20,464,340	
39. Road & Ditches		7,508.950			7,509.950		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,045	9,549.870	30,912,310	198,385
Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:		I lab an			Ocale I I ale a co		
Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Records	Urban Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value	
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
		Rural	.,,	<u> </u>	Total		
40. Oans & Barles	Records	Acres	Value	Records	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	0	0.000	0	
44. Recapture Val			0			0	
·		Rural			Total		
10.0	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
43. Special Value	204	21,815.520	10,894,635	204	21,815.520	10,894,635	
44. Recapture Val			16,115,170			16,115,170	

Schedule IX: Aç	gricultural Records	: AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area			
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	5.000	5,250	0.000	0	546.470	573,795	551.470	579,045
46. 1A	15.700	14,285	0.000	0	34,436.900	31,311,565	34,452.600	31,325,850
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,513.000	1,985,270	2,513.000	1,985,270
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,620.620	1,214,490	1,620.620	1,214,490
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,211.900	1,258,255	2,211.900	1,258,255
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	100.000	53,000	100.000	53,000
51. 4A1	4.000	1,800	0.000	0	2,971.480	1,336,580	2,975.480	1,338,380
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,206.140	1,185,360	3,206.140	1,185,360
53. Total	24.700	21,335	0.000	0	47,606.510	38,918,315	47,631.210	38,939,650
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	14.000	7,840	0.000	0	230.200	128,915	244.200	136,755
55. 1D	3.000	1,650	0.000	0	120,725.880	66,399,250	120,728.880	66,400,900
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,488.670	3,407,355	7,488.670	3,407,355
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,736.020	1,531,765	3,736.020	1,531,765
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	18,183.760	7,091,665	18,183.760	7,091,665
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	237.000	80,580	237.000	80,580
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	23,372.060	7,479,065	23,372.060	7,479,065
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	12,595.010	3,652,555	12,595.010	3,652,555
62. Total	17.000	9,490	0.000	0	186,568.600	89,771,150	186,585.600	89,780,640
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	56.000	21,280	56.000	21,280
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,394.650	5,023,020	13,394.650	5,023,020
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,439.140	878,090	2,439.140	878,090
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,438.230	417,085	1,438.230	417,085
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,543.500	674,030	2,543.500	674,030
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	37.000	9,435	37.000	9,435
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	33,087.540	8,106,450	33,087.540	8,106,450
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	117,592.450	28,222,185	117,592.450	28,222,185
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	170,588.510	43,351,575	170,588.510	43,351,575
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,203.950	390,300	5,203.950	390,300
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,009.310	181,675	1,009.310	181,675
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	,
75. Total	41.700	30,825	0.000	0	410,976.880	172,613,015	411,018.580	172,643,840

Schedule IX: A	gricultural Records:	AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area:	3		
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	179.410	188,380	179.410	188,380
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	471.300	428,885	471.300	428,885
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	108.000	85,320	108.000	85,320
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	412.000	309,000	412.000	309,000
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	47.000	24,910	47.000	24,910
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	24.000	10,800	24.000	10,800
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	15.000	5,550	15.000	5,550
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,256.710	1,052,845	1,256.710	1,052,845
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	241.000	134,960	241.000	134,960
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	259.300	142,615	259.300	142,615
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	43.000	19,565	43.000	19,565
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	575.670	236,025	575.670	236,025
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	106.000	36,040	106.000	36,040
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	195.000	62,400	195.000	62,400
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	15.000	4,350	15.000	4,350
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,434.970	635,955	1,434.970	635,955
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	42.000	15,960	42.000	15,960
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	23.710	8,890	23.710	8,890
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	92.000	33,120	92.000	33,120
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	536.670	155,635	536.670	155,635
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	70.000	17,850	70.000	17,850
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	143.000	35,035	143.000	35,035
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	148.400	35,615	148.400	35,615
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,055.780	302,105	1,055.780	302,105
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	404.000	30,300	404.000	30,300
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,103.000	198,540	1,103.000	198,540
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,254.460	2,219,745	5,254.460	2,219,745

Schedule IX: A	gricultural Records	: AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area:	4		
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	495.800	520,590	495.800	520,590
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,029.850	937,160	1,029.850	937,160
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	184.000	145,360	184.000	145,360
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,242.000	931,500	1,242.000	931,500
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	1,710	3.000	1,710
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	167.000	88,510	167.000	88,510
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	88.000	39,600	88.000	39,600
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	50.000	18,500	50.000	18,500
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,259.650	2,682,930	3,259.650	2,682,930
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	69.000	38,640	69.000	38,640
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	327.000	179,850	327.000	179,850
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	67.000	30,485	67.000	30,485
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	386.000	158,260	386.000	158,260
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	59.000	20,060	59.000	20,060
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	121.000	38,720	121.000	38,720
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	30.000	8,700	30.000	8,700
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,059.000	474,715	1,059.000	474,715
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	27.000	10,260	27.000	10,260
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	96.100	36,040	96.100	36,040
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	19.000	6,840	19.000	6,840
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	42.000	12,180	42.000	12,180
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	4.220	1,075	4.220	1,075
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	236.000	57,825	236.000	57,825
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	672.610	161,430	672.610	161,430
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,096.930	285,650	1,096.930	285,650
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	384.570	28,845	384.570	28,845
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	691.800	124,525	691.800	124,525
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,491.950	3,596,665	6,491.950	3,596,665

Schedule IX: A	gricultural Records	s: AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area:	5		
	Urban				Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,844.530	1,936,755	1,844.530	1,936,755
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,463.340	2,241,640	2,463.340	2,241,640
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	590.630	466,600	590.630	466,600
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	973.100	729,825	973.100	729,825
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	6.000	3,420	6.000	3,420
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	499.000	264,470	499.000	264,470
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	37.000	16,650	37.000	16,650
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	67.000	24,790	67.000	24,790
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,480.600	5,684,150	6,480.600	5,684,150
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	541.940	303,485	541.940	303,485
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	416.100	228,855	416.100	228,855
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	199.000	90,545	199.000	90,545
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	394.880	161,900	394.880	161,900
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4.000	1,560	4.000	1,560
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	200.000	68,000	200.000	68,000
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	68.000	21,760	68.000	21,760
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	49.490	14,350	49.490	14,350
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,873.410	890,455	1,873.410	890,455
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	60.000	22,800	60.000	22,800
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	67.500	25,315	67.500	25,315
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	36.800	13,250	36.800	13,250
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	70.000	20,300	70.000	20,300
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	795	3.000	795
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	40.000	10,200	40.000	10,200
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	220.280	53,970	220.280	53,970
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,431.460	343,550	1,431.460	343,550
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,929.040	490,180	1,929.040	490,180
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	914.850	78,415	914.850	78,415
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,498.190	471,095	2,498.190	471,095
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000	,	0.000	,
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,696.090	7,614,295	13,696.090	7,614,295

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail					Market Area:	6		
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	193.000	202,650	193.000	202,650
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	537.110	488,770	537.110	488,770
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	122.000	96,380	122.000	96,380
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	355.000	266,250	355.000	266,250
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	1,710	3.000	1,710
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	318.000	168,540	318.000	168,540
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	19.000	8,550	19.000	8,550
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	6.000	2,220	6.000	2,220
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,553.110	1,235,070	1,553.110	1,235,070
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	82.000	45,920	82.000	45,920
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	58.410	32,125	58.410	32,125
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	21.000	9,555	21.000	9,555
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	318.000	130,380	318.000	130,380
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	197.000	66,980	197.000	66,980
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	18.000	5,760	18.000	5,760
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	1.000	290	1.000	290
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	695.410	291,010	695.410	291,010
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	8.000	3,040	8.000	3,040
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	17.000	6,375	17.000	6,375
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	40.000	11,600	40.000	11,600
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	40.000	10,200	40.000	10,200
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	49.000	12,005	49.000	12,005
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	733.000	175,920	733.000	175,920
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	887.000	219,140	887.000	219,140
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	345.000	25,875	345.000	25,875
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	835.500	165,270	835.500	165,270
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,316.020	1,936,365	4,316.020	1,936,365

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	24.700	21,335	0.000	0	60,156.580	49,573,310	60,181.280	49,594,645
77.Dry Land	17.000	9,490	0.000	0	191,631.390	92,063,285	191,648.390	92,072,775
78.Grass	0.000	0	0.000	0	175,557.260	44,648,650	175,557.260	44,648,650
79.Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,252.370	553,735	7,252.370	553,735
80.Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,137.800	1,141,105	6,137.800	1,141,105
81.Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
82.Total	41.700	30,825	0.000	0	440,735.400	187,980,085	440,777.100	188,010,910

					Market Area: 1
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	551.470	1.16%	579,045	1.49%	1,050.002
1A	34,452.600	72.33%	31,325,850	80.45%	909.244
2A1	2,513.000	5.28%	1,985,270	5.10%	790.000
2A	1,620.620	3.40%	1,214,490	3.12%	749.398
3A1	2,211.900	4.64%	1,258,255	3.23%	568.857
3A	100.000	0.21%	53,000	0.14%	530.000
4A1	2,975.480	6.25%	1,338,380	3.44%	449.803
4A	3,206.140	6.73%	1,185,360	3.04%	369.715
Irrigated Total	47,631.210	100.00%	38,939,650	100.00%	817.523
Dry:					
1D1	244.200	0.13%	136,755	0.15%	560.012
1D	120,728.880	64.70%	66,400,900	73.96%	550.000
2D1	7,488.670	4.01%	3,407,355	3.80%	455.001
2D	3,736.020	2.00%	1,531,765	1.71%	409.999
3D1	18,183.760	9.75%	7,091,665	7.90%	389.999
3D	237.000	0.13%	80,580	0.09%	340.000
4D1	23,372.060	12.53%	7,479,065	8.33%	320.000
4D	12,595.010	6.75%	3,652,555	4.07%	290.000
Dry Total	186,585.600	100.00%	89,780,640	100.00%	481.176
Grass:	·				
1G1	56.000	0.03%	21,280	0.05%	380.000
1G	13,394.650	7.85%	5,023,020	11.59%	375.001
2G1	2,439.140	1.43%	878,090	2.03%	359.999
2G	1,438.230	0.84%	417,085	0.96%	289.998
3G1	2,543.500	1.49%	674,030	1.55%	265.000
3G	37.000	0.02%	9,435	0.02%	255.000
4G1	33,087.540	19.40%	8,106,450	18.70%	245.000
4G	117,592.450	68.93%	28,222,185	65.10%	239.999
Grass Total	170,588.510	100.00%	43,351,575	100.00%	254.129
Irrigated Total	47,631.210	11.59%	38,939,650	22.55%	817.523
Dry Total	186,585.600	45.40%	89,780,640	52.00%	481.176
Grass Total	170,588.510	41.50%	43,351,575	25.11%	254.129
Waste	5,203.950	1.27%	390,300	0.23%	75.000
Other	1,009.310	0.25%	181,675	0.11%	179.999
Exempt	0.000	0.00%	,	211177	
Market Area Total	411,018.580	100.00%	172,643,840	100.00%	420.039
As Related to the C	County as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	47,631.210	79.15%	38,939,650	78.52%	
Dry Total	186,585.600	97.36%	89,780,640	97.51%	
Grass Total	170,588.510	97.17%	43,351,575	97.09%	
Waste	5,203.950	71.76%	390,300	70.48%	
Other	1,009.310	16.44%	181,675	15.92%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%	101,075	10.0270	
Market Area Total	411,018.580	93.25%	172,643,840	91.83%	
Market Alea Total	411,010.360	93.2370	172,043,040	91.03%	

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Market Area: Average Assessed Valu
1A1	179.410	14.28%	188,380	17.89%	1,049.997
1A	471.300	37.50%	428,885	40.74%	910.004
2A1	108.000	8.59%	85,320	8.10%	790.000
2A	412.000	32.78%	309,000	29.35%	750.000
3A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A	47.000	3.74%	24,910	2.37%	530.000
4A1	24.000	1.91%	10,800	1.03%	450.000
4A	15.000	1.19%	5,550	0.53%	370.000
Irrigated Total	1,256.710	100.00%	1,052,845	100.00%	837.778
Dry:					
1D1	241.000	16.79%	134,960	21.22%	560.000
1D	259.300	18.07%	142,615	22.43%	550.000
2D1	43.000	3.00%	19,565	3.08%	455.000
2D	575.670	40.12%	236,025	37.11%	410.000
3D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D	106.000	7.39%	36,040	5.67%	340.000
4D1	195.000	13.59%	62,400	9.81%	320.000
4D	15.000	1.05%	4,350	0.68%	290.000
Dry Total	1,434.970	100.00%	635,955	100.00%	443.183
Grass:	,		,		
1G1	42.000	3.98%	15,960	5.28%	380.000
1G	23.710	2.25%	8,890	2.94%	374.947
2G1	92.000	8.71%	33,120	10.96%	360.000
2G	536.670	50.83%	155,635	51.52%	290.001
3G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G	70.000	6.63%	17,850	5.91%	255.000
4G1	143.000	13.54%	35,035	11.60%	245.000
4G	148.400	14.06%	35,615	11.79%	239.993
Grass Total	1,055.780	100.00%	302,105	100.00%	286.143
				.=	
Irrigated Total	1,256.710	23.92%	1,052,845	47.43%	837.778
Dry Total	1,434.970	27.31%	635,955	28.65%	443.183
Grass Total	1,055.780	20.09%	302,105	13.61%	286.143
Waste	404.000	7.69%	30,300	1.37%	75.000
Other	1,103.000	20.99%	198,540	8.94%	180.000
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	5,254.460	100.00%	2,219,745	100.00%	422.449
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	1,256.710	2.09%	1,052,845	2.12%	
Dry Total	1,434.970	0.75%	635,955	0.69%	
Grass Total	1,055.780	0.60%	302,105	0.68%	
Waste	404.000	5.57%	30,300	5.47%	
Other	1,103.000	17.97%	198,540	17.40%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	5,254.460	1.19%	2,219,745	1.18%	

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Market Area: Average Assessed Valu
1A1	495.800	15.21%	520,590	19.40%	1,050.000
1A	1,029.850	31.59%	937,160	34.93%	909.996
2A1	184.000	5.64%	145,360	5.42%	790.000
2A	1,242.000	38.10%	931,500	34.72%	750.000
3A1	3.000	0.09%	1,710	0.06%	570.000
3A	167.000	5.12%	88,510	3.30%	530.000
4A1	88.000	2.70%	39,600	1.48%	450.000
4A	50.000	1.53%	18,500	0.69%	370.000
Irrigated Total	3,259.650	100.00%	2,682,930	100.00%	823.073
Dry:					
1D1	69.000	6.52%	38,640	8.14%	560.000
1D	327.000	30.88%	179,850	37.89%	550.000
2D1	67.000	6.33%	30,485	6.42%	455.000
2D	386.000	36.45%	158,260	33.34%	410.000
3D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D	59.000	5.57%	20,060	4.23%	340.000
4D1	121.000	11.43%	38,720	8.16%	320.000
4D	30.000	2.83%	8,700	1.83%	290.000
Dry Total	1,059.000	100.00%	474,715	100.00%	448.267
Grass:	,		,		
1G1	27.000	2.46%	10,260	3.59%	380.000
1G	96.100	8.76%	36,040	12.62%	375.026
2G1	19.000	1.73%	6,840	2.39%	360.000
2G	42.000	3.83%	12,180	4.26%	290.000
3G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G	4.220	0.38%	1,075	0.38%	254.739
4G1	236.000	21.51%	57,825	20.24%	245.021
4G	672.610	61.32%	161,430	56.51%	240.005
Grass Total	1,096.930	100.00%	285,650	100.00%	260.408
	0.050.050	50.040/	0.000.000	74.500/	202.272
Irrigated Total	3,259.650	50.21%	2,682,930	74.59%	823.073
Dry Total	1,059.000	16.31%	474,715	13.20%	448.267
Grass Total	1,096.930	16.90%	285,650	7.94%	260.408
Waste	384.570	5.92%	28,845	0.80%	75.005
Other	691.800	10.66%	124,525	3.46%	180.001
Exempt	0.000	0.00%	2 522 22	402.222	
Market Area Total	6,491.950	100.00%	3,596,665	100.00%	554.019
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	3,259.650	5.42%	2,682,930	5.41%	
Dry Total	1,059.000	0.55%	474,715	0.52%	
Grass Total	1,096.930	0.62%	285,650	0.64%	
Waste	384.570	5.30%	28,845	5.21%	
Other	691.800	11.27%	124,525	10.91%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	6,491.950	1.47%	3,596,665	1.91%	

-					Market Area: 5
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	1,844.530	28.46%	1,936,755	34.07%	1,049.999
1A	2,463.340	38.01%	2,241,640	39.44%	910.000
2A1	590.630	9.11%	466,600	8.21%	790.003
2A	973.100	15.02%	729,825	12.84%	750.000
3A1	6.000	0.09%	3,420	0.06%	570.000
3A	499.000	7.70%	264,470	4.65%	530.000
4A1	37.000	0.57%	16,650	0.29%	450.000
4A	67.000	1.03%	24,790	0.44%	370.000
Irrigated Total	6,480.600	100.00%	5,684,150	100.00%	877.102
Dry:					
1D1	541.940	28.93%	303,485	34.08%	559.997
1D	416.100	22.21%	228,855	25.70%	550.000
2D1	199.000	10.62%	90,545	10.17%	455.000
2D	394.880	21.08%	161,900	18.18%	409.997
3D1	4.000	0.21%	1,560	0.18%	390.000
3D	200.000	10.68%	68,000	7.64%	340.000
4D1	68.000	3.63%	21,760	2.44%	320.000
4D	49.490	2.64%	14,350	1.61%	289.957
Dry Total	1,873.410	100.00%	890,455	100.00%	475.312
Grass:	1,070.110	100.0070	000,100	100.0070	17 0.0 12
1G1	60.000	3.11%	22,800	4.65%	380.000
1G	67.500	3.50%	25,315	5.16%	375.037
2G1	36.800	1.91%	13,250	2.70%	360.054
2G	70.000	3.63%	20,300	4.14%	290.000
3G1	3.000	0.16%	795	0.16%	265.000
3G	40.000	2.07%	10,200	2.08%	255.000
4G1	220.280	11.42%	53,970	11.01%	245.006
4G	1,431.460	74.21%	343,550	70.09%	239.999
Grass Total	1,929.040	100.00%	490,180	100.00%	254.105
Irrigated Total	6,480.600	47.32%	5,684,150	74.65%	877.102
Dry Total	1,873.410	13.68%	890,455	11.69%	475.312
Grass Total	1,929.040	14.08%	490,180	6.44%	254.105
Waste	914.850	6.68%	78,415	1.03%	85.713
Other	2,498.190	18.24%	471,095	6.19%	188.574
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	13,696.090	100.00%	7,614,295	100.00%	555.946
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	6,480.600	10.77%	5,684,150	11.46%	
Dry Total	1,873.410	0.98%	890,455	0.97%	
Grass Total	1,929.040	1.10%	490,180	1.10%	
Waste	914.850	12.61%	78,415	14.16%	
Other	2,498.190	40.70%	471,095	41.28%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%	,550		
Market Area Total	13,696.090	3.11%	7,614,295	4.05%	
	.0,000.000	0.11.70	1,511,200	1.0070	

					Market Area: 6
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	193.000	12.43%	202,650	16.41%	1,050.000
1A	537.110	34.58%	488,770	39.57%	909.999
2A1	122.000	7.86%	96,380	7.80%	790.000
2A	355.000	22.86%	266,250	21.56%	750.000
3A1	3.000	0.19%	1,710	0.14%	570.000
3A	318.000	20.48%	168,540	13.65%	530.000
4A1	19.000	1.22%	8,550	0.69%	450.000
4A	6.000	0.39%	2,220	0.18%	370.000
Irrigated Total	1,553.110	100.00%	1,235,070	100.00%	795.223
Dry:					
1D1	82.000	11.79%	45,920	15.78%	560.000
1D	58.410	8.40%	32,125	11.04%	549.991
2D1	21.000	3.02%	9,555	3.28%	455.000
2D	318.000	45.73%	130,380	44.80%	410.000
3D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D	197.000	28.33%	66,980	23.02%	340.000
4D1	18.000	2.59%	5,760	1.98%	320.000
4D	1.000	0.14%	290	0.10%	290.000
Dry Total	695.410	100.00%	291,010	100.00%	418.472
Grass:	0001110		201,010	10010070	
1G1	8.000	0.90%	3,040	1.39%	380.000
1G	17.000	1.92%	6,375	2.91%	375.000
2G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G	40.000	4.51%	11,600	5.29%	290.000
3G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G	40.000	4.51%	10,200	4.65%	255.000
4G1	49.000	5.52%	12,005	5.48%	245.000
4G	733.000	82.64%	175,920	80.28%	240.000
Grass Total	887.000	100.00%	219,140	100.00%	247.057
			<u> </u>		
Irrigated Total	1,553.110	35.98%	1,235,070	63.78%	795.223
Dry Total	695.410	16.11%	291,010	15.03%	418.472
Grass Total	887.000	20.55%	219,140	11.32%	247.057
Waste	345.000	7.99%	25,875	1.34%	75.000
Other	835.500	19.36%	165,270	8.54%	197.809
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	4,316.020	100.00%	1,936,365	100.00%	448.645
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	е			
Irrigated Total	1,553.110	2.58%	1,235,070	2.49%	
Dry Total	695.410	0.36%	291,010	0.32%	
Grass Total	887.000	0.51%	219,140	0.49%	
Waste	345.000	4.76%	25,875	4.67%	
Other	835.500	13.61%	165,270	14.48%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	4,316.020	0.98%	1,936,365	1.03%	
	.,0.0.020	0.0070	.,500,000		

	Urban		SubU	SubUrban		Rural	
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	
Irrigated	24.700	21,335	0.000	0	60,156.580	49,573,310	
Dry	17.000	9,490	0.000	0	191,631.390	92,063,285	
Grass	0.000	0	0.000	0	175,557.260	44,648,650	
Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,252.370	553,735	
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,137.800	1,141,105	
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	
Total	41.700	30,825	0.000	0	440,735.400	187,980,085	

AgLand	Tota Acres	ıl Value	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	60,181.280	49,594,645	60,181.280	13.65%	49,594,645	26.38%	824.087
Dry	191,648.390	92,072,775	191,648.390	43.48%	92,072,775	48.97%	480.425
Grass	175,557.260	44,648,650	175,557.260	39.83%	44,648,650	23.75%	254.325
Waste	7,252.370	553,735	7,252.370	1.65%	553,735	0.29%	76.352
Other	6,137.800	1,141,105	6,137.800	1.39%	1,141,105	0.61%	185.914
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	440,777.100	188,010,910	440,777.100	100.00%	188,010,910	100.00%	426.544

^{*} Department of Property Assessment & Taxation Calculates

2006 Plan of Assessment for Furnas County Assessment Years 2007, 2008 and 2009 Date: June 15, 2006

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Nebr. 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 the 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.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112 (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, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R.S.Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Furnas County:

Per the 2006 County Abstract, Furnas County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Minerals	9		.001
Residential	2588	.41	.256
Commercial	455	.07	.051
Industrial	5		.002
Recreational	0		
Agricultural	3026	.48	.687
Special Value	201	.03	.003

Agricultural land - 440814.40 taxable acres. 14% irrigated, 43% dry, 40% grassland, .02% waste and .01% timber.

Other pertinent facts – 41% residential, 07% commercial and 51% agricultural (including special value)

For more information see 2006 Reports and Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources

A. Assessor's Office staff includes:

Melody Crawford, Assessor

Bobbi Noel, Deputy

Gerald Eugene Witte, Appraiser

The Assessor and Deputy both hold Assessor's Certificates and will attend necessary training to obtain hours needed to keep certificates current. The high cost of approved training is a budgetary concern for Furnas County, due to three employees holding a certificate.

The County Appraiser is a Registered Nebraska Appraiser, and also holds a Nebraska Real Estate License. He is responsible for gathering information on any new improvements and additions or alterations to existing improvements from Building Permits, County-wide zoning permits and any Assessor notes. His rotating review work involves looking at all improvements on each parcel, checking as to measurements of buildings, quality of construction, depreciation percentage and all information shown in Assessor's records for accuracy. Inspection of the interior of houses is done whenever possible.

- B Cadastral Maps and aerial photos are in need of replacements. The most current source is the FSA CD
- C Property Record Cards contain Cama pricing sheets and pictures, Lot size drawing, Mips county solutions yearly values.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

- A Both Assessor and Deputy Assessor handle transfers each month. A verification form is mailed out.
- B. Office pulls property record cards for Appraiser to review information.
- C. All arm length sales are entered in a Computer by type such as Residential, Commercial or Agriculture. Under each type is a more detailed description. Residential by year construction, Quality and Style. Commercial by City, School Dist, Type or use.Ag by major land use, acres, Geo code, Land Area & School dist.
- D. Approaches to Value
 - 1) Market Approach: Sales comparison,
 - 2) Cost Approach: Marshall Swift manual Commercial 2000, Residential 2000.
 - 3) Land valuation studies are used to establish market areas, special value for agricultural land and agricultural land.
- E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation
- F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.
- G. Notices and Public Relations

Level of value, Quality, and Uniformity of assessment year 2006:

Property Class	Median	Cod*	PRD*
Residential	97.00	21.89	107.69
Commercial	93.00	22.17	105.40
Agricultural Land	74.00	15.59	102.68
Special Value Agland	76.00	18.03	103.74
Recapture Value	79.00	30.00	100.08

^{*}COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related Differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2006 Reports and Opinions.

Assessment actions Planned for Assessment year 2007

2007 Assessment year Assessor & Office Staff

Residential

- 1. Obtain pricing updates on CAMA program to be applied to residential homes and outbuildings.
- 2. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2007.
- 3. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct and verify sales
- 4. Update files from the Appraisers review work such as date of inspection.
- 5. Get the review work ready for the next year.

Commercial

- 1. Reprice commercial properties on new Marshall & Swift manual
- 2. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2007
- 3. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
- 4. Update files from the Appraisers review work such as date of inspection.
- 5. Get the review work ready for the next year.

Agricultural

- 1. Obtain pricing updates on CAMA program to be applied to rural homes and outbuildings.
- 2. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2007
- 3. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
- 4. Use current FSA CD to update land use, if available.

County Appraiser

- 1. Complete pickup work using Building Permits, County wide zoning and Assessors notes.
- 2. Finish door to door review of Oxford, Beaver City and Hendley. Review Rural out buildings and take pictures. New pictures are taken when needed.
- 3. Review all property protests with the Commissioner
- 4. Attend Board of Equalization hearings

Assessment actions planned for Assessment year 2008

2008 Assessment year Assessor & Office Staff

Residential

- 1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2008.
- 2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct and verify sales.
- 3. Update files from the Appraisers review work such as date of inspection.
- 4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

Commercial

- 1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2008
- 2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
- 3. Update files from the Appraisers review work such as date of inspection.
- 4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

Agricultural

- 1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2008
- 2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
- 3. Use current FSA CD to update land use, if available.

County Appraiser

- 1. Complete pickup work using Building Permits, County wide zoning and Assessors notes.
- 2. Finish door to door review of all improvements in the Rural and take digital pictures of improvements.
- 3. Review all property protests with the Commissioner
- 4. Attend Board of Equalization hearings.

Assessment actions Planned for Assessment year 2009

2009 Assessment year Assessor & Office Staff

Residential

- 1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2009.
- 2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct and verify sales.
- 3. Update files from the Appraisers review work such as date of inspection.
- 4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

Commercial

- 1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2009
- 2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
- 3. Update files from the Appraisers review work such as date of inspection.
- 4. Get the review work ready for the next year.

Agricultural

- 1. Complete pickup work by March 1, 2009
- 2. Complete study of current sales ratio reports to determine if level of value and quality of assessment is correct.
- 3. Use current FSA CD to update land use, if available.

County Appraiser

- 1. Complete pickup work using Building Permits, County wide zoning and Assessors notes.
- 2. Finish door to door review of Cambridge, Holbrook and remaining rural. New pictures are taken when needed.
- 3. Review all property protests with the Commissioners
- 4. Attend Board of Equalization hearings

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

- 1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
- 2. Annually prepare the file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed value update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report.
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report.
- 3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of approximately 694 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
- 4. Permissive Exemption: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
- 5. Taxable Government Owned Property- annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
- 6. Homestead Exemptions; administer approximately 292 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
- 7. Centrally Assessed review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
- 8. Tax Increment Financing management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
- 9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
- 10. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

- 11. Tax List Corrections- prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval
- 12. County Board of Equalization attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests-assemble and provide information
- 13. TERC Appeals- prepare information attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation
- 14. TERC Statewide Equalization- attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
- 15. Education: Assessor Education attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain 60 hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification

Conclusion:

Estimated Appraisal Budget needs for 2006-2007 include:

Appraisal Budget \$18000
Prichard & Abbott \$600
Gene Witte \$14400
Mileage (est) \$2300
Ethanol Appraisal \$700

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor: <u>Carolyn Wentling</u> Date: <u>June 15, 2006</u>

Amendment: Carolyn Wentling resigned as Furnas County Assessor, as of July 31, 2006. The language has been changed to reflect this.

2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Furnas 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

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

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Catherine D. Lang

Property Tax Administrator

SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION For Furnas County

I. Agricultural Land Value Correlation

In Furnas County there are seventy-one qualified unimproved agricultural sales that are valued as having non-influenced values. The measures of central tendency rounded (median 75%, weighted mean 70%, mean 74%) are similar and offer strong support for each other. The measures of dispersion will indicate the coefficient of dispersion (15.20%) is within the acceptable parameters and the price-related differential (104.99%) is slightly above the range. Overall the measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion united with the knowledge of the assessment practices are an indicator that the standards of level of value and quality of assessment have been met. The actions of the assessor are apparent and through consistent and efficient use of market analysis and market areas the results have created equalization and uniformity within Furnas County.

PAGE: 1 of 5

PAGE: 1 of 5

AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVI	ED		I A		CXV Ag Type: Qualific	MCUILUITAI SIAII)	sucs			Query: 5917	
					•		rge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	06 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER o	f Sales:		71	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	20.44	95%	Median C.I.: 71.6	5 to 78 32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sale	s Price:	7	7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.13		. Mean C.I.: 65.6		(!: Derivea) (!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sale	s Price:	7	,688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39		% Mean C.I.: 70.		(:. unu+1\A1=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assesse	d Value:	5	,419,290			AVG.ADD.DEV.	11.55	, ,	· 110411 0.11. 70.	15 60 77.55	
, ,	AVG. Adj. Sale	s Price:		108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assesse	d Value:		76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:35:31
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrt	rs											
07/01/03	TO 09/30/03	4	81.24	79.18	77.50	5.6	7 102.16	68.54	85.69	N/A	65,000	50,375
10/01/03	TO 12/31/03	5	75.04	67.53	64.99	20.4	7 103.91	38.98	87.06	N/A	101,120	65,717
01/01/04	TO 03/31/04	10	68.78	68.21	66.44	7.7	9 102.66	57.20	78.24	61.69 to 75.62	106,978	71,074
04/01/04	TO 06/30/04	10	78.57	79.17	77.09	16.8	9 102.70	52.42	105.36	63.96 to 102.92	93,770	72,287
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04	5	78.32	82.37	80.97	7.9	6 101.73	73.53	91.53	N/A	108,900	88,171
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04	6	77.13	78.33	78.65	15.1	2 99.59	59.85	94.75	59.85 to 94.75	187,493	147,465
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05	3	64.17	65.40	65.18	6.3	1 100.34	59.94	72.08	N/A	137,675	89,730
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	4	75.43	70.36	65.93	18.7	7 106.72	41.07	89.49	N/A	92,500	60,982
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	5	78.24	73.65	64.06	22.9	1 114.97	38.76	106.17	N/A	80,690	51,691
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	6	78.79	78.49	78.24	13.3	1 100.33	63.22	98.34	63.22 to 98.34	64,914	50,785
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	7	73.32	71.21	65.46	8.1	9 108.79	47.20	79.75	47.20 to 79.75	135,500	88,700
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	6	77.49	71.55	60.02	20.8	7 119.21	43.32	102.81	43.32 to 102.81	120,166	72,125
Stu	dy Years											
07/01/03	TO 06/30/04	29	73.63	73.38	70.81	14.6	7 103.63	38.98	105.36	64.63 to 81.87	95,623	67,713
07/01/04	TO 06/30/05	18	75.59	75.52	74.98	14.3	5 100.73	41.07	94.75	66.63 to 89.49	136,249	102,153
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	24	76.06	73.62	65.66	16.2	6 112.13	38.76	106.17	64.69 to 80.31	102,601	67,367
Cal	endar Yrs											
01/01/04	TO 12/31/04	31	73.63	75.99	75.04	13.8		52.42	105.36	68.16 to 80.74	118,611	89,008
	TO 12/31/05	18	74.10	73.16	68.29	18.2	5 107.12	38.76	106.17	63.22 to 83.65	87,553	59,793
ALL												

71

74.92

74.01

70.49

15.20

38.76

106.17

104.99

71.65 to 78.32

108,281

76,328

PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

33 - FURNAS COUNTY

PAGE:2 of 5

33 - FURNAS COUNTY			PA	<u>&T 2007 R</u>	<u>k&O Ag</u>	<u>ricultural Stati</u>	stics	Dase B	tat	0 5015	1110212 01 3
AGRICUL:	TURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifi	ed				Query: 5917	
					Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	9/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	71	MEDIAN:	75	cov:	20.44	95%	Median C.I.: 71.6	5 to 78.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	:	7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.13		. Mean C.I.: 65.6		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	7,688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	_		49 to 77.53	(** ***********************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	5,419,290								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:35:31
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4103	1	73.53	73.53	73.53			73.53	73.53	N/A	37,500	27,575
4105	2	61.47	61.47	53.58	33.1	9 114.72	41.07	81.87	N/A	84,750	45,412
4107	3	86.69	78.90	64.95	21.3	8 121.48	47.20	102.81	N/A	185,000	120,158
4109	2	67.78	67.78	67.61	11.5	7 100.25	59.94	75.62	N/A	132,812	89,797
4111	3	66.63	72.86	76.07	18.7	9 95.78	57.20	94.75	N/A	326,695	248,526
4265	4	74.82	74.90	72.91	12.5	5 102.74	62.86	87.12	N/A	73,620	53,673
4267	6	72.32	72.21	69.90	10.9	6 103.31	59.85	87.06	59.85 to 87.06	137,050	95,800
4269	4	76.64	78.15	76.03	4.9	8 102.79	73.63	85.69	N/A	72,750	55,310
4271	5	78.32	77.14	76.24	15.9	4 101.18	53.92	105.36	N/A	120,110	91,572
4273	6	73.83	73.16	73.98	6.3	8 98.89	64.32	79.75	64.32 to 79.75	76,416	56,535
4343	1	78.24	78.24	78.24			78.24	78.24	N/A	45,000	35,210
4345	1	72.91	72.91	72.91			72.91	72.91	N/A	130,000	94,780
4347	3	89.49	78.58	63.29	18.7	8 124.16	47.91	98.34	N/A	121,000	76,581
4349	3	74.92	64.88	58.06	18.5	8 111.75	38.98	80.74	N/A	58,724	34,093
4511	7	74.88	72.34	65.09	17.8	7 111.13	43.32	106.17	43.32 to 106.17	102,333	66,613
4513	6	71.17	70.24	67.78	20.6	3 103.63	38.76	94.48	38.76 to 94.48	102,350	69,370
4515	6	77.17	77.55	74.08	13.8	1 104.67	63.96	91.53	63.96 to 91.53	95,191	70,520
4517	6	73.15	75.64	71.29	13.7	3 106.10	52.42	102.92	52.42 to 102.92	81,700	58,244
4519	2	84.31	84.31	84.01	0.7	8 100.35	83.65	84.97	N/A	53,750	45,157
ALI	·										
	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	69	75.04	74.65	71.05	14.7	3 105.06	38.76	106.17	72.08 to 79.54	108,333	76,971
4	1	41.07	41.07	41.07			41.07	41.07	N/A	117,500	48,255
5	1	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	95,480	60,015
ALI	·										
	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOI	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
ALI	<u> </u>										
	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	0 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics
Type: Qualified 33 - FURNAS COUNTY Query: 5917 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

__ALL____

71

74.92

74.01

70.49

		Before: 01/19/2007	Posted I	7/01/2003 to 06/30/2006	Date Range:				
(!: Derived)	71.65 to 78.32	95% Median C.I.:	20.44	cov:	75	MEDIAN:	71	NUMBER of Sales:	
(!: land+NAT=0)	65.60 to 75.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	15.13	STD:	70	WGT. MEAN:	7,736,000	TOTAL Sales Price:	(AgLand)
(** ***********************************		-		-	E 4		7 600 000	momat add delea Dedage	(A T 1)

PAGE:3 of 5

(11gEdilla)				,,		, 0	SID.	15.13	JJ6 WYL	. Mean C.1 05.0	0 60 75.38	(!: lana+NA1=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	es Price	:	7,688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95	% Mean C.I.: 70.	49 to 77.53	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	ed Value	: !	5,419,290								
	AVG. Adj. Sal	es Price	:	108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assess	ed Value	:	76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:35:31
SCHOOL	DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)												
33-0018		14	78.28	76.62	70.45	14.2	108.76	47.20	105.36	59.94 to 85.69	114,798	80,876
33-0021		9	73.52	69.68	68.62	9.1	101.54	41.07	79.75	64.32 to 77.85	81,633	56,016
33-0540		38	74.26	73.54	70.67	17.3	104.07	38.76	106.17	64.69 to 81.47	119,253	84,273
42-0002		1	76.11	76.11	76.11			76.11	76.11	N/A	104,984	79,905
73-0179		9	72.91	76.01	70.55	13.4	107.74	52.42	102.92	64.63 to 84.97	78,833	55,617
NonValid	School											
ALI												
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
ACRES I	N SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10.01	TO 30.00	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
30.01	TO 50.00	1	69.40	69.40	69.40			69.40	69.40	N/A	24,000	16,655
50.01	TO 100.00	14	78.89	78.16	73.40	14.7	76 106.49	38.98	106.17	63.22 to 87.12	46,648	34,238
100.01	TO 180.00	32	72.64	71.02	65.47	17.8	108.48	38.76	102.81	63.96 to 80.31	100,566	65,840
180.01	TO 330.00	18	75.58	75.24	71.99	11.2	104.51	47.20	105.36	71.32 to 79.75	139,568	100,478
330.01	TO 650.00	5	73.32	76.62	78.69	14.4	97.37	61.69	94.75	N/A	254,477	200,241
ALI												
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	20 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE >	95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		6	69.99	67.33	61.10	17.6	110.19	41.07	82.26	41.07 to 82.26	78,324	47,858
DRY-N/A		34	77.94	76.55	74.89	12.8	39 102.21	38.76	105.36	72.77 to 80.31	94,504	70,774
GRASS		6	66.43	73.59	68.29	16.5	107.76	61.42	102.92	61.42 to 102.92	74,566	50,919
GRASS-N/	A	14	76.98	76.85	74.62	10.0	103.00	59.85	94.48	64.32 to 85.69	90,498	67,526
IRRGTD		1	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	95,480	60,015
IRRGTD-N	/A	10	61.92	66.76	64.46	27.2	22 103.58	43.32	106.17	47.20 to 94.75	219,503	141,490

15.20

104.99

38.76

106.17

71.65 to 78.32

108,281

76,328

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics 33 - FURNAS COUNTY Query: 5917

Type: Qualified

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

		Before: 01/19/2007	Posted	: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006	Date Range:				
(!: Derived)	71.65 to 78.32	95% Median C.I.:	20.44	COV:	75	MEDIAN:	71	NUMBER of Sales:	
(!: land+NAT=0)	65.60 to 75.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	15.13	STD:	70	WGT. MEAN:	7,736,000	TOTAL Sales Price:	(AgLand)
(70 49 +0 77 53	95% Mean C T :	11 30	VIG YES DEVI-	74	MEAN:	7,688,000	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	(AgLand)

PAGE:4 of 5

95% Mean C.I.: 70.49 to 77.53 AVG.ABS.DEV: 11.39 TOTAL Assessed Value: 5,419,290 (AgLand) AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 108,281 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 106.17 15.20 AVG. Assessed Value: 76,328 PRD: 104.99 MIN Sales Ratio: 38.76 Printed: 04/02/2007 20:35:31 Avg. Adj. MAJORITY LAND USE > 80% Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE WGT. MEAN 95% Median C.I. COUNT MEDIAN MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX DRY 21 73.52 72.15 70.31 15.44 102.62 38.76 105.36 64.63 to 80.61 105,723 74,333 DRY-N/A 19 79.54 78.50 77.41 10.65 101.40 38.98 102.81 72.91 to 86.69 76,994 59,604 **GRASS** 6 66.43 73.59 68.29 16.54 107.76 61.42 102.92 61.42 to 102.92 74,566 50,919 GRASS-N/A 14 76.98 76.85 74.62 10.05 103.00 59.85 94.48 64.32 to 85.69 90,498 67,526 IRRGTD 4 69.24 70.11 72.70 21.78 96.43 47.20 94.75 N/A 240,641 174,951 IRRGTD-N/A 7 57.20 64.30 58.37 25.62 110.15 43.32 106.17 43.32 to 106.17 189,707 110,730 ALL38.76 71.65 to 78.32 71 74.92 74.01 70.49 15.20 104.99 106.17 108,281 76,328 Avg. Adj. Avg. MAJORITY LAND USE > 50% Sale Price Assd Val RANGE MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. COUNT DRY 40 76.83 75.17 73.13 13.63 102.78 38.76 105.36 72.77 to 80.05 92,077 67,337 GRASS 19 76.11 76.48 73.47 12.34 104.10 59.85 102.92 64.69 to 83.65 85,283 62,653 GRASS-N/A 1 64.32 64.32 64.32 64.32 64.32 N/A 94,000 60,460 IRRGTD 9 62.86 68.03 66.15 24.21 102.83 47.20 106.17 47.91 to 94.75 221,946 146,828 IRRGTD-N/A 2 59.12 59.12 52.38 26.73 112.87 43.32 74.92 N/A 146,500 76,732 ALL 71 74.92 74.01 70.49 15.20 104.99 38.76 106.17 71.65 to 78.32 108,281 76,328 Avg. Adj. Avg. SALE PRICE * Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Low \$ 5000 TO 9999 80.74 80.74 80.74 80.74 80.74 N/A 8,174 6,600 Total \$ 1 TO 80 74 00 74 00 74 00 74 00 74 NT / 7\ Q 174 6 600 0000

1 10	9999	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,1/4	6,600
10000 TO	29999	3	85.69	86.00	84.34	13.04	101.97	69.40	102.92	N/A	20,000	16,868
30000 TO	59999	11	81.87	82.55	83.34	10.17	99.05	63.22	106.17	72.77 to 98.34	43,281	36,070
60000 TO	99999	26	75.53	76.14	75.52	13.12	100.81	38.98	102.81	68.54 to 82.65	76,618	57,865
100000 TO	149999	14	73.57	72.30	72.51	12.20	99.71	41.07	105.36	59.94 to 79.75	119,597	86,722
150000 TO	249999	13	61.69	62.11	61.61	17.93	100.82	38.76	86.69	47.91 to 77.65	184,592	113,718
250000 TO	499999	3	66.63	69.53	71.30	23.79	97.51	47.20	94.75	N/A	359,195	256,115
ALL	_											
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.20	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328

PAGE: 5 of 5

PAGE: 5 of 5

	TURAI	L UNIMPRO	VED		FA		XV Ag Type: Qualifi		llurai Staus	sucs			Query: 5917	
									/01/2003 to 06/30/20	06 Posted l	Before: 01/19	/2007		
		NUMBER	of Sales:	:	71	MEDIAN:	75		cov:	20.44	95% 1	Median C.I.: 71.6	5 to 78.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)		TOTAL Sa	les Price:	:	7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70		STD:	15.13	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 65.6	0 to 75.38	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOT	AL Adj.Sa	les Price:	:	7,688,000	MEAN:	74		AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95	% Mean C.I.: 70.	49 to 77.53	(,
(AgLand)	TO	TAL Assess	sed Value:	:	5,419,290									
	AVG	. Adj. Sa	les Price:	:	108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX	Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	A	VG. Asses	sed Value:	:	76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN	Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02/	/2007 20:35:31
ASSESSE	D VA	LUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$_													
5000 T	O.	9999	1	80.74	80.74	80.74				80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
Tot	al \$													
1	TO	9999	1	80.74	80.74	80.74				80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
10000	TO	29999	8	82.26	80.80	78.82	11.4	10	102.51	63.22	102.92	63.22 to 102.92	29,375	23,153
30000	TO	59999	20	73.82	72.00	68.85	15.7	76	104.58	38.98	106.17	64.69 to 80.05	68,955	47,476
60000	TO	99999	30	74.98	73.88	69.89	14.2	29	105.71	38.76	102.81	71.59 to 80.61	110,886	77,497
100000	TO	149999	9	73.32	73.60	71.30	16.2	21	103.23	47.91	105.36	57.20 to 86.69	184,616	131,628
150000	TO	249999	2	56.92	56.92	57.06	17.0)7	99.74	47.20	66.63	N/A	335,250	191,305
250000	TO	499999	1	94.75	94.75	94.75				94.75	94.75	N/A	407,087	385,735
ALL		_												
			71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	20	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328

SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION For Furnas County

II. Special Value Correlation

Only a small portion of Furnas County is affected by special value (primarily along the river). For assessment valuation purposes, the special value has been established using similar uninfluenced sales that have occurred in the surrounding area and valued the same as other agricultural property in the county. It is the opinion that the level of value for special value within Furnas County is equal to uninfluenced agricultural level of value.

PAGE: 1 of 5

PAGE: 1 of 5

33 - FURNAS COUNTY					'A&T 2007	/ Specia	<u>I Value Statistic</u>	<u>es </u>	Dusc B	ıuı		
AGRICULTUR!	AL UNIMPROVE	D				Type: Qualifi					Query: 5917	
						Date Ran	age: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	06 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of	Sales:		71	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	20.44	95%	Median C.I.: 71.6	5 to 78.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales	Price:	7	7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.13		. Mean C.I.: 65.6		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TC	TAL Adj.Sales	Price:	7	,688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	_	% Mean C.I.: 70.		(<i>unu</i> 117211 =0)
(AgLand) T	TOTAL Assessed	Value:	5	,419,290			11/0111201221	11.07		, , ,	15 00 77.00	
AV	7G. Adj. Sales	Price:		108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assessed	Value:		76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:05:03
DATE OF SA	LE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	C	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs_												
07/01/03 TO	09/30/03	4	81.24	79.18	77.50	5.6	7 102.16	68.54	85.69	N/A	65,000	50,375
10/01/03 TO	12/31/03	5	75.04	67.53	64.99	20.4	7 103.91	38.98	87.06	N/A	101,120	65,717
01/01/04 TO	03/31/04	10	68.78	68.21	66.44	7.7	9 102.66	57.20	78.24	61.69 to 75.62	106,978	71,074
04/01/04 TO	06/30/04	10	78.57	79.17	77.09	16.8	9 102.70	52.42	105.36	63.96 to 102.92	93,770	72,287
07/01/04 TO	09/30/04	5	78.32	82.37	80.97	7.9	6 101.73	73.53	91.53	N/A	108,900	88,171
10/01/04 TO	12/31/04	6	77.13	78.33	78.65	15.1	2 99.59	59.85	94.75	59.85 to 94.75	187,493	147,465
01/01/05 TO	03/31/05	3	64.17	65.40	65.18	6.3	1 100.34	59.94	72.08	N/A	137,675	89,730
04/01/05 TO	06/30/05	4	75.43	70.36	65.93	18.7	7 106.72	41.07	89.49	N/A	92,500	60,982
07/01/05 TO	09/30/05	5	78.24	73.65	64.06	22.9	1 114.97	38.76	106.17	N/A	80,690	51,691
10/01/05 TO	12/31/05	6	78.79	78.49	78.24	13.3	1 100.33	63.22	98.34	63.22 to 98.34	64,914	50,785
01/01/06 TO	03/31/06	7	73.32	71.21	65.46	8.1	9 108.79	47.20	79.75	47.20 to 79.75	135,500	88,700
04/01/06 TO	06/30/06	6	77.49	71.55	60.02	20.8	7 119.21	43.32	102.81	43.32 to 102.81	120,166	72,125
Study												
07/01/03 TO		29	73.63	73.38	70.81	14.6		38.98	105.36	64.63 to 81.87	95,623	67,713
07/01/04 TO		18	75.59	75.52	74.98	14.3		41.07	94.75	66.63 to 89.49	136,249	102,153
07/01/05 TO		24	76.06	73.62	65.66	16.2	6 112.13	38.76	106.17	64.69 to 80.31	102,601	67,367
	ar Yrs											
01/01/04 TO		31	73.63	75.99	75.04	13.8		52.42	105.36	68.16 to 80.74	118,611	
01/01/05 TO		18	74.10	73.16	68.29	18.2	5 107.12	38.76	106.17	63.22 to 83.65	87,553	59,793
ALL												

71

74.92

74.01

70.49

15.20

104.99

38.76

106.17 71.65 to 78.32

108,281

76,328

Base Stat PA&T 2007 Special Value Statistics 33 - FURNAS COUNTY

PAGE:2 of 5

AGRICULT	TURAL UNIMPROVED	_		71007	Type: Qualifi	ed				Query: 5917	
						nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales:		71	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	20.44	95% 1	Median C.I.: 71.65	i to 78.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:	7,	736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.13		. Mean C.I.: 65.60		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,	688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39			19 to 77.53	(<i>unu</i> 114211-0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,	419,290			11,0,1120,122,	11.00		, , ,	.,	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assessed Value:		76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02/	2007 20:05:03
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4103	1	73.53	73.53	73.53			73.53	73.53	N/A	37,500	27,575
4105	2	61.47	61.47	53.58	33.1	9 114.72	41.07	81.87	N/A	84,750	45,412
4107	3	86.69	78.90	64.95	21.3	8 121.48	47.20	102.81	N/A	185,000	120,158
4109	2	67.78	67.78	67.61	11.5	7 100.25	59.94	75.62	N/A	132,812	89,797
4111	3	66.63	72.86	76.07	18.7	9 95.78	57.20	94.75	N/A	326,695	248,526
4265	4	74.82	74.90	72.91	12.5	5 102.74	62.86	87.12	N/A	73,620	53,673
4267	6	72.32	72.21	69.90	10.9	6 103.31	59.85	87.06	59.85 to 87.06	137,050	95,800
4269	4	76.64	78.15	76.03	4.9	8 102.79	73.63	85.69	N/A	72,750	55,310
4271	5	78.32	77.14	76.24	15.9	4 101.18	53.92	105.36	N/A	120,110	91,572
4273	6	73.83	73.16	73.98	6.3	8 98.89	64.32	79.75	64.32 to 79.75	76,416	56,535
4343	1	78.24	78.24	78.24			78.24	78.24	N/A	45,000	35,210
4345	1	72.91	72.91	72.91			72.91	72.91	N/A	130,000	94,780
4347	3	89.49	78.58	63.29	18.7	8 124.16	47.91	98.34	N/A	121,000	76,581
4349	3	74.92	64.88	58.06	18.5	8 111.75	38.98	80.74	N/A	58,724	34,093
4511	7	74.88	72.34	65.09	17.8	7 111.13	43.32	106.17	43.32 to 106.17	102,333	66,613
4513	6	71.17	70.24	67.78	20.6	3 103.63	38.76	94.48	38.76 to 94.48	102,350	69,370
4515	6	77.17	77.55	74.08	13.8	1 104.67	63.96	91.53	63.96 to 91.53	95,191	70,520
4517	6	73.15	75.64	71.29	13.7	3 106.10	52.42	102.92	52.42 to 102.92	81,700	58,244
4519	2	84.31	84.31	84.01	0.7	8 100.35	83.65	84.97	N/A	53,750	45,157
ALL											
	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	0 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	69	75.04	74.65	71.05	14.7	3 105.06	38.76	106.17	72.08 to 79.54	108,333	76,971
4	1	41.07	41.07	41.07			41.07	41.07	N/A	117,500	48,255
5	1	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	95,480	60,015
ALL											
	71 74.		74.01	70.49	15.2	0 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	0 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
ALL											
	71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	0 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328

PA&T 2007 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

76,328

108,281

	MIDAL INTERPOVER						ı value Stausu	CS			Query: 5917	
AGRICULI	TURAL UNIMPROVEI	,			'	Type: Qualifi		00 D (1)	D 6 01/1/	N200#	Query. 3717	
	_	_					nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	J06 Posted	Before: 01/19	0/2007		
	NUMBER of			71	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	20.44	95%	Median C.I.: 71.	65 to 78.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales			7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.13	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 65.	60 to 75.38	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales			7,688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95	% Mean C.I.: 70	.49 to 77.53	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed	Value:	:	5,419,290								
	AVG. Adj. Sales	Price	:	108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assessed	Value	:	76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:05:03
SCHOOL	DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	C	!OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)												
33-0018		14	78.28	76.62	70.45	14.2	108.76	47.20	105.36	59.94 to 85.69	114,798	80,876
33-0021		9	73.52	69.68	68.62	9.1	101.54	41.07	79.75	64.32 to 77.85	81,633	56,016
33-0540		38	74.26	73.54	70.67	17.3	104.07	38.76	106.17	64.69 to 81.47	119,253	84,273
42-0002		1	76.11	76.11	76.11			76.11	76.11	N/A	104,984	79,905
73-0179		9	72.91	76.01	70.55	13.4	107.74	52.42	102.92	64.63 to 84.97	78,833	55,617
NonValid	l School											
ALL	<u></u>											
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
ACRES I	N SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	C	!OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10.01	TO 30.00	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
30.01	TO 50.00	1	69.40	69.40	69.40			69.40	69.40	N/A	24,000	16,655
50.01	TO 100.00	14	78.89	78.16	73.40	14.7	76 106.49	38.98	106.17	63.22 to 87.12	46,648	34,238
100.01	TO 180.00	32	72.64	71.02	65.47	17.8	108.48	38.76	102.81	63.96 to 80.31	100,566	65,840
180.01	TO 330.00	18	75.58	75.24	71.99	11.2	24 104.51	47.20	105.36	71.32 to 79.75	139,568	100,478
330.01	TO 650.00	5	73.32	76.62	78.69	14.4	97.37	61.69	94.75	N/A	254,477	200,241
ALL	<u> </u>											
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	20 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 95	%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	C	!OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		6	69.99	67.33	61.10	17.6	110.19	41.07	82.26	41.07 to 82.26	78,324	47,858
DRY-N/A		34	77.94	76.55	74.89	12.8	102.21	38.76	105.36	72.77 to 80.31	94,504	70,774
GRASS		6	66.43	73.59	68.29	16.5	107.76	61.42	102.92	61.42 to 102.92	74,566	50,919
GRASS-N/	'A	14	76.98	76.85	74.62	10.0	103.00	59.85	94.48	64.32 to 85.69	90,498	
IRRGTD		1	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	95,480	
IRRGTD-N	I/A	10	61.92	66.76	64.46	27.2	103.58	43.32	106.17	47.20 to 94.75	219,503	
ALL	ı											
	_											

15.20

38.76

104.99

106.17 71.65 to 78.32

74.92

74.01

70.49

Base Stat PA&T 2007 Special Value Statistics 33 - FURNAS COUNTY

PAGE:4 of 5

AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPRO	OVED				Specia Type: Qualifi	ir vaiue Stausu	CS			Query: 5917	
							nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	0/2007	٠ ،	
	NUMBER	R of Sales	:	71	MEDIAN:	75	g				F . FO 20	
(AgLand)		ales Price		7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	7 5	COV:	20.44		Median C.I.: 71.6		(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa			7,688,000	MEAN:	74	STD:	15.13		. Mean C.I.: 65.60		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses			5,419,290	MEAN.	7-1	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95	% Mean C.I.: 70.	49 to 77.53	
(AgLand)	AVG. Adj. Sa			108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Asses			76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Defeate of 04/02	(2007, 20, 05, 02
WA TOD TIME	Y LAND USE >			70,320	TID	101.55	MIN DATES RACTO:	30.70			Avg. Adj.	/2007 20:05:03 Avg.
RANGE	L LAND USE >	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		21	73.52	72.15	70.31	15.4		38.76	105.36	64.63 to 80.61	105,723	74,333
DRY-N/A		19	79.54	78.50	77.41	10.6		38.98	103.30	72.91 to 86.69	76,994	59,604
GRASS		6	66.43	73.59	68.29	16.5		61.42	102.81	61.42 to 102.92	74,566	50,919
	7											
GRASS-N/A	. A	14 4	76.98 69.24	76.85	74.62	10.0		59.85 47.20	94.48 94.75	64.32 to 85.69 N/A	90,498	67,526
	/ 7	7	57.20	70.11 64.30	72.70 58.37	21.5		47.20		43.32 to 106.17	240,641	174,951
IRRGTD-N/		/	57.20	64.30	58.37	25.6	02 110.15	43.32	106.17	43.32 (0 106.17	189,707	110,730
ALL_		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	20 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
MAJORITY	Y LAND USE >	> 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		40	76.83	75.17	73.13	13.6	102.78	38.76	105.36	72.77 to 80.05	92,077	67,337
GRASS		19	76.11	76.48	73.47	12.3	104.10	59.85	102.92	64.69 to 83.65	85,283	62,653
GRASS-N/A	A	1	64.32	64.32	64.32			64.32	64.32	N/A	94,000	60,460
IRRGTD		9	62.86	68.03	66.15	24.2	102.83	47.20	106.17	47.91 to 94.75	221,946	146,828
IRRGTD-N/	/A	2	59.12	59.12	52.38	26.7	73 112.87	43.32	74.92	N/A	146,500	76,732
ALL_												
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328
SALE PRI	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov												
5000 TC	9999	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
Tota												
1 7	ro 9999	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
10000 7	ro 29999	3	85.69	86.00	84.34	13.0	101.97	69.40	102.92	N/A	20,000	16,868
30000 T		11	81.87	82.55	83.34	10.1	L7 99.05	63.22	106.17	72.77 to 98.34	43,281	36,070
60000 1	ro 99999	26	75.53	76.14	75.52	13.1	100.81	38.98	102.81	68.54 to 82.65	76,618	57,865
100000 1	го 149999	14	73.57	72.30	72.51	12.2		41.07	105.36	59.94 to 79.75	119,597	86,722
150000 1	го 249999	13	61.69	62.11	61.61	17.9	100.82	38.76	86.69	47.91 to 77.65	184,592	113,718
250000 1		3	66.63	69.53	71.30	23.7	79 97.51	47.20	94.75	N/A	359,195	256,115
ALL_												
		71	74.92	74.01	70.49	15.2	20 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328

Base Stat PAGE:5 of 5

33 - FUR	NAS COUNTY				PA&T 2007	' Specia	<u>l Value Statisti</u>	CS	Base S	tat		PAGE:5 OI 5
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPE	ROVED				Type: Qualifi					Query: 5917	
						Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	0/2007		
	NUMBE	R of Sale	es:	71	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	20.44	95%	Median C.I.: 71.6	5 to 78.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL S	ales Prid	e:	7,736,000	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.13			0 to 75.38	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.S	ales Prid	e:	7,688,000	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	_		49 to 77.53	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asse	ssed Valu	ie:	5,419,290			11/0/11/20/22/	11.00		, , ,	15 00 77.00	
	AVG. Adj. S	ales Prio	:e:	108,281	COD:	15.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	106.17				
	AVG. Assessed Value: ASSESSED VALUE *			76,328	PRD:	104.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.76			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:05:03
ASSESSEI	O VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
5000 TO	9999	1	80.74	4 80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
Tota	al \$											
1 7	ro 9999	1	80.74	4 80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	8,174	6,600
10000 7	ro 29999	8	82.26	80.80	78.82	11.4	102.51	63.22	102.92	63.22 to 102.92	29,375	23,153
30000	ro 59999	20	73.82	2 72.00	68.85	15.7	76 104.58	38.98	106.17	64.69 to 80.05	68,955	47,476
60000	ro 99999	30	74.98	73.88	69.89	14.2	29 105.71	38.76	102.81	71.59 to 80.61	110,886	77,497
100000 7	го 149999	9	73.32	2 73.60	71.30	16.2	103.23	47.91	105.36	57.20 to 86.69	184,616	131,628
150000 7	го 249999	2	56.92	2 56.92	57.06	17.0	99.74	47.20	66.63	N/A	335,250	191,305
250000	ro 499999	1	94.75	5 94.75	94.75			94.75	94.75	N/A	407,087	385,735
ALL_												
			74.92	2 74.01	70.49	15.2	20 104.99	38.76	106.17	71.65 to 78.32	108,281	76,328

SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION For Furnas County

III. Recapture Value Correlation

There is only one sale that occurred during the timeframe of the sales study that carried a "recapture" value, there is no statistical sample evidence to indicate that the recapture value within the county is outside of the acceptable range. Likewise, due to the lack of a significant sample, there is no evidence to indicate that the quality of assessment or assessment uniformity for recapture value is outside of the acceptable range.

33 - FURNAS COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				PA	PA&T 2007 Recapture Value Statistics Base State							Query: 5917	PAGE:1 of 3
	31,212 10					Type: Qualifie Date Rai		1/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	2007	2 7 2 2 2	
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	1	MEDIAN:	67	-	cov:	0.00		Median C.I.:	NT / A	(I. D
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal			394,000	WGT. MEAN:	67		STD:	0.00		. Mean C.I.:	N/A N/A	(!: Derived (!: land+NAT=0
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price	:	394,000	MEAN:	67	7	VG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	_	% Mean C.I.:	N/A	(:. unu+1\A1 =0
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value	:	264,260				VG.ABS.DEV.	0.00	, , ,	o ricaii C.I	N/A	
()	AVG. Adj. Sal			394,000	COD:	0.00	MAX S	ales Ratio:	67.07				
	AVG. Assess			264,260	PRD:	100.00		ales Ratio:	67.07			Printed: 04/02	/2007 19:22:10
DATE OF	SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrt	rs												
07/01/03	TO 09/30/03												
10/01/03	TO 12/31/03												
01/01/04	TO 03/31/04												
04/01/04	TO 06/30/04												
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04												
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04												
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05												
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06												
	dy Years												
07/01/03	TO 06/30/04												
	TO 06/30/05	1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
	TO 06/30/06												
	endar Yrs												
	TO 12/31/04										/-		
	TO 12/31/05	1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
ALL	1		67.07	67.07	67.07				67 07	67.07	NT / N	204 000	264 260
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP	1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000 Avg. Adj.	264,260 Avg.
RANGE	E / IOMNSHIP	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	ער	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
4105		1	67.07	67.07	67.07	CO	ענ	PRD	67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
	ı	1	07.07	07.07	07.07				07.07	07.07	N/A	394,000	204,200
АПП	1	1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
AREA (M	ARKET)		07.07	07.07	07.07				07.07	07.07	14/11	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	,	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4		1	67.07	67.07	67.07	20		_ 112	67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
ALL	1	-	/	o,	- · · · · ·					- · • · · ·	,	3,1,000	201,200
		1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UI										<u> </u>	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	-	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2		1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260
ALL	1											•	
		1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260

	NAS COUNTY URAL UNIMPROV	ÆD		PA&T 2007 Recapture Value Statistics Type: Qualified						Base Stat		Query: 5917	PAGE:3 of 3	
			Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007											
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	1	MEDIAN:	67		cov:	0.00	95% N	Median C.I.:	N/A	(!: Derived)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	es Price	:	394,000	WGT. MEAN:	67		STD:	0.00	95% Wgt.	. Mean C.I.:	N/A	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	es Price	:	394,000	MEAN:	67		AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	959	Mean C.I.:	N/A	,	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	ed Value	:	264,260										
	AVG. Adj. Sal	es Price	:	394,000	COD:	0.00	MAX	Sales Ratio:	67.07					
	AVG. Assessed Value:		:	264,260	PRD:	100.00 MI		Sales Ratio:	67.07	67.07		Printed: 04/02/2007 19:22:10		
ASSESSED	VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low	v \$													
Tota	al \$													
250000 T	го 499999	1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260	
ALL_														
		1	67.07	67.07	67.07				67.07	67.07	N/A	394,000	264,260	

The Methodology for determining Special Value in Furnas County For 2006

The Special Value is set annually by using the qualified unimproved, uninfluenced agricultural land sales in the County. The Special Value is on the timberland within one mile of the Republican River and the River itself. The market areas are blended across the County.

Certification

This is to certify that the 2007 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 Furnas County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7005 1160 0001 1213 8310.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Property Assessment & Taxation