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

35 Garden

Residential Real Property - Current					
Number of Sales		89	COD	28.39	
Total Sales Price	\$	2723283	PRD	116.49	
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	2714983	COV	45.70	
Total Assessed Value	\$	2460225	STD	48.24	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	30505.43	Avg. Abs. Dev.	27.10	
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	27642.98	Min	44.56	
Median		95.47	Max	374.20	
Wgt. Mean		90.62	95% Median C.I.	88.18 to 102.05	
Mean		105.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	84.92 to 96.31	
			95% Mean C.I.	95.54 to 115.58	
% of Value of the Class of all	Real	Property Value	e in the County	12.33	
% of Records Sold in the Stud	y Pei	riod		9.01	
% of Value Sold in the Study	Perio	od		7.75	
Average Assessed Value of the	e Bas	se		32,122	

Residential Real Property - History						
Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD		
2007	89	95.47	28.39	116.49		
2006	79	94.50	18.74	109.10		
2005	86	96.70	17.46	102.86		
2004	108	96.07	28.69	113.13		
2003	100	98	28.11	114.1		
2002	89	97	28.07	116.68		
2001	88	99	31.89	117.53		

2007 Commission Summary

35 Garden

Commercial Real Property - Current					
Number of Sales		14	COD	10.58	
Total Sales Price	\$	425800	PRD	100.82	
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	425500	COV	13.27	
Total Assessed Value	\$	407575	STD	12.81	
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	30392.86	Avg. Abs. Dev.	10.20	
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	29112.50	Min	79.20	
Median		96.43	Max	119.70	
Wgt. Mean		95.79	95% Median C.I.	84.96 to 109.99	
Mean		96.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	87.11 to 104.47	
			95% Mean C.I.	90.51 to 102.63	
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 2.25					
% of Records Sold in the Stud	y Pei	riod		8.19	
% of Value Sold in the Study	7.03				
Average Assessed Value of the	Bas	se		33,909	

Commercial Real Property - History						
Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD		
2007	14	96.43	10.58	100.82		
2006	17	94.63	17.40	104.05		
2005	16	97.85	19.11	102.05		
2004	20	95.59	40.41	120.24		
2003	18	96	36.86	114.28		
2002	19	96	30.93	102.87		
2001	15	96	8.54	102.71		

2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Garden 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 Garden County is 95% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Garden County is not 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 Garden County is 96% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Garden 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 2007 assessment actions taken by the Garden County Assessor brought the median statistical measure within the acceptable range for the assessor location of Lewellen. A 7% increase to improvements within Lewellen were applied for the current assessment year. The assessor and staff reviewed newer manufactured homes and equalized the subclass by application of 2005 costing and new depreciation tables. Although the weighted mean and mean measures are out of the acceptable parameters, the median is the best indicator that the county has attained the level of value. The qualitative measures reflect that the county may review uniform and proportionate assessment issues for residential properties in Garden County.

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	130	89	68.46
2006	112	79	70.54
2005	123	86	69.92
2004	142	108	76.06
2003	132	100	75.76
2002	118	89	75.42
2001	110	88	80

RESIDENTIAL: Table II indicates an increase in the total number of sales and number of qualified sales for the development of residential statistical information in Garden County in 2007. Historically Garden County has utilized a high proportion of the available sales. The assessor and deputy continue to be very knowledgeable on the market through a sales verification process. Over 68% of the total sales used for the measurement of residential statistics indicates the county has not excessively trimmed the sample and the measurements were done as fairly as possible.

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	94.19	2.58	96.62	95.47
2006	94.19	1.61	95.7	94.50
2005	90.09	4.98	94.57	96.70
2004	96.07	0.3	96.36	96.07
2003	98	0.68	98.67	98
2002	84	10.58	92.89	97
2001	98	-1.72	96.31	99

RESIDENTIAL: Table III indicates a 1.15 point spread between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio which reflects the increases to residential improvements within Lewellen. 24% of the qualified sales are within the assessor location of Lewellen.

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 Assess Value in the Sales File	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	
0.92	2007	2.58
3.22	2006	1.61
6.72	2005	4.98
1.21	2004	0.3
3	2003	1
18.22	2002	10.58
-0.32	2001	-1.72

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the percent change in the sales base compared to the percent change in the total assessed base (excluding growth) for residential property is in strong support of the assessment actions for 2007. The valuation increases for 2007 included improvements in Lewellen which represent 21 out of the 89 qualified residential sales.

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	95.47	90.62	105.56	

RESIDENTIAL: The median measure of central tendency is supportive that the county has attained the level of value for 2007 in the residential property class. Although the weighted mean and mean measures are outside of the acceptable parameters, there is no other information available to indicate the median is not the best indication 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

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	28.39	116.49
Difference	13.39	13.49

RESIDENTIAL: Both qualitative measures are well above the acceptable ranges for residential properties. Although the assessor increased residential improvements within Lewellen the overall coefficient of dispersion and price related differential indicate their may be uniform and proportionate assessments issures to review for equalization purposes in Garden 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	89	89	0
Median	94.19	95.47	1.28
Wgt. Mean	89.85	90.62	0.77
Mean	104.39	105.56	1.17
COD	28.63	28.39	-0.24
PRD	116.18	116.49	0.31
Min Sales Ratio	44.56	44.56	0
Max Sales Ratio	374.20	374.20	0

RESIDENTIAL: Table VII is supportive of the assessors actions to equalize the residential property class for 2007. The assessor increased Lewellen improvement values by 7% to equalize the assessor location that includes 21 of the 89 qualified residential sales in Garden County.

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the six tables for commercial property in Garden County indicate that an accurate measurement of the commercial property class has been achieved. Although the 14 qualified sales represent a small sample size, all three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and correlate to one another. Likewise the coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are also well within the acceptable parameters for qualitative measures. Although no overall changes were made for the 2007 assessment year, the assessor reviewed and revalued the travel-mobile home parks in the county. Based on the statistical information and known assessment practices, it is believed that Garden County has attained the level of value and uniform and proportionate assessment practices for the current assessment year.

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	27	14	51.85
2006	29	17	58.62
2005	55	16	29.09
2004	59	20	33.9
2003	47	18	38.3
2002	24	19	79.17
2001	23	15	65.22

COMMERCIAL: The percentage of qualified commercial sales has been over 50% for the past two years and shows a stable average of the percent used within the study period for Garden County commercial property. This table information indicates the county has used an adequate portion of the total sales to determine the level of value and 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	96.43	0.5	96.92	96.43
2006	94.63	1.84	96.37	94.63
2005	97.85	-0.28	97.57	97.85
2004	95.59	-13.91	82.29	95.59
2003	96	1.63	97.56	96
2002	96	0.21	96.2	96
2001	95	0.25	95.24	96

COMMERCIAL: The Preliminary Median and the R&O Ratio are identical and support the assessors actions that no overall changes were made in 2007 to the commercial properties in Garden county. The assessor continues to review the commercial market which is typically a small sample size with low dollar sales.

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 Asser Value in the Sales Fil		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2007	0.5
0	2006	1.84
0	2005	-0.28
0	2004	-13.91
0	2003	2
2.32	2002	0.21
31.89	2001	0.25

COMMERCIAL: No overall changes were made to the commercial property class for 2007. The .50 percent change in assessed value (excluding growth) reflects the new valuations of the mobile homes parks in the county.

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	96.43	95.79	96.57

COMMERCIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable parameters for each. All three measures strongly support each other. For direct equalization purposes the median will be used to best describe the level of value for commercial property in Garden County.

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	10.58	100.82
Difference	0	0

COMMERCIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are well within the ranges acceptable for commercial property in Garden County. Based on these qualified statistics either indicate that the county has uniform and proportionate assessment practices for 2007.

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	14	14	0
Median	96.43	96.43	0
Wgt. Mean	95.79	95.79	0
Mean	96.57	96.57	0
COD	10.58	10.58	0
PRD	100.82	100.82	0
Min Sales Ratio	79.20	79.20	0
Max Sales Ratio	119.70	119.70	0

COMMERCIAL: Table VII reflects no changes were made to the commercial class of property for the 2007 assessment year. This is consistent with the reported assessment actions by the assessor which are included in the 2007 Assessment Survey for Garden County.

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

35 Garden

	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	30,556,338	31,736,362	1,180,024	3.86	393,005	2.58
2. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	13,886,435	14,386,491	500,056	3.6	*	3.6
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	44,442,773	46,122,853	1,680,080	3.78	393,005	2.9
5. Commercial	5,680,808	5,798,507	117,699	2.07	89,018	0.5
6. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,246,487	7,392,122	145,635	2.01	569,880	-5.85
8. Minerals	334,397	96,457	-237,940	-71.15	0	-71.15
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	13,261,692	13,287,086	25,394	0.19	658,898	-4.78
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	57,704,465	59,409,939	1,705,474	2.96	1,051,903	1.13
11. Irrigated	16,972,989	17,119,629	146,640	0.86		
12. Dryland	32,164,495	32,151,289	-13,206	-0.04		
13. Grassland	148,767,292	148,742,218	-25,074	-0.02		
14. Wasteland	156564	156,564	0	0		
15. Other Agland	1,533,810	1,533,810	0	0		
16. Total Agricultural Land	199,595,150	199,703,510	108,360	0.05		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	257,299,615	259,113,449	1,813,834	0.7	1,051,903	0.3

^{*}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.

R

RESIDENTIAL		L		<u> </u>		<u>xo stausucs</u>		State Stat Run			
RESIDENTIAL					Type: Qualifie					State Stat Ran	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	3efore: 01/19/	/2007		
NUMBER	of Sales	; :	89	MEDIAN:	95	cov:	45.70	95%	Median C.I.: 88.18	to 102.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sa	les Price	2	,723,283	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	48.24		. Mean C.I.: 84.92		(=)
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	2:	,714,983	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.10	95	% Mean C.I.: 95.5	4 to 115.58	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	2	,460,225								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	30,505	COD:	28.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	374.20				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	27,642	PRD:	116.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.56			Printed: 03/27/.	2007 23:45:38
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	12	100.21	105.07	101.75	15.8	2 103.26	80.51	157.20	86.73 to 121.16	25,864	26,315
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	13	92.62	101.40	90.31	24.0	9 112.28	67.60	142.93	73.57 to 128.16	35,350	31,924
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	6	114.98	123.09	110.56	20.3	3 111.34	88.18	194.13	88.18 to 194.13	15,916	17,597
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	15	99.01	99.33	88.26	15.1		44.56	164.83	93.05 to 106.26	33,125	29,236
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	15	85.37	107.32	82.27	36.4		62.66	322.00	75.43 to 93.22	34,453	28,346
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	11	100.00	130.87	98.55	44.4		62.34	374.20	74.47 to 194.13	26,137	25,758
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	81.56	90.09	101.68	27.5		50.53	138.52	50.53 to 138.52	16,666	16,946
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	11	75.64	90.69	83.66	35.0		55.73	175.77	56.41 to 123.73	40,760	34,098
Study Years										20,100	22,020
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	46	100.95	104.51	93.59	18.8	4 111.67	44.56	194.13	93.05 to 109.50	29,615	27,715
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	43	87.45	106.69	87.63	39.2	1 121.75	50.53	374.20	80.24 to 101.24	31,457	27,564
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	47	95.47	112.30	89.69	32.0	8 125.21	44.56	374.20	88.49 to 103.55	29,717	26,652
ALL											
	89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
LEWELLEN	21	93.22	94.85	92.02	15.9	1 103.07	62.60	124.73	81.36 to 111.96	20,798	19,138
LISCO	4	99.02	93.82	96.19	11.5	9 97.54	70.99	106.26	N/A	12,295	11,827
OSHKOSH	58	99.19	112.56	94.72	33.4	6 118.83	50.53	374.20	88.18 to 103.55	31,787	30,109
RURAL	6	88.71	83.31	68.67	22.5	7 121.31	44.56	110.00	44.56 to 110.00	64,231	44,109
ALL											
	89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	UBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	79	95.47	107.85	94.20	29.7	8 114.48	50.53	374.20	88.18 to 102.33	28,866	27,193
2	2	88.71	88.71	85.74	12.7	3 103.46	77.41	100.00	N/A	63,358	54,321
3	8	96.85	87.22	66.05	18.5	1 132.05	44.56	110.00	44.56 to 110.00	38,481	25,415
ALL											
	89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642
STATUS: IMPROVED, U	NIMPROVE	D & IOLI	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	82	94.76	106.69	90.66	29.1	4 117.69	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	32,857	29,787
2	7	102.33	92.35	85.40	18.3	7 108.14	50.53	123.73	50.53 to 123.73	2,952	2,521
ALL											
	89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642

35 - GARDEN COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics	Base Stat	PAGE:2 of 4
DECTDENTTAT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL **Type: Qualified** State Stat Kun **MEDIAN:** 95 NUMBER of Sales: 89 95% Median C.I.: 88.18 to 102.05 45.70 COV: (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: 2,723,283 WGT. MEAN: 91 48.24 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 84.92 to 96.31 STD: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 2,714,983 MEAN: 106 27.10 95% Mean C.I.: 95.54 to 115.58 AVG.ABS.DEV: TOTAL Assessed Value: 2,460,225 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 30,505 COD: 28.39 MAX Sales Ratio: 374.20 AVG. Assessed Value: 27,642 PRD: 116.49 MIN Sales Ratio: 44.56 Printed: 03/27/2007 23:45:39 PROPERTY TYPE * Avg. Adj. Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 01 81 94.19 103.20 89.53 26.77 115.26 44.56 374.20 88.17 to 101.71 31,919 28,578 06 120.01 129.53 112.27 36.14 194.13 62.66 to 194.13 07 8 115.38 62.66 16,183 18,168 ALL 89 95.47 105.56 90.62 28.39 116.49 44.56 374.20 88.18 to 102.05 30,505 27,642 SCHOOL DISTRICT * Avg. Adj. Avg. RANGE Sale Price Assd Val COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. (blank) 25-0025 25-0095 88.18 to 102.05 35-0001 89 95.47 105.56 90.62 28.39 116.49 44.56 374.20 30,505 27,642 NonValid School ALL 89 95.47 105.56 90.62 28.39 116.49 44.56 374.20 88.18 to 102.05 30,505 27,642 YEAR BUILT * Avg. Adj. Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 0 OR Blank 14 104.22 117.38 103.23 33.03 113.70 50.53 211.47 67.60 to 194.13 8,137 8,400 Prior TO 1860 1860 TO 1899 1900 TO 1919 94.42 20.85 107.64 175.77 77.41 to 112.02 23,156 15 98.66 101.63 70.99 24,525 1920 TO 1939 26 93.47 95.78 89.78 20.24 106.69 44.56 142.93 81.36 to 109.50 25,050 22,489 1940 TO 1949 8 91.76 154.54 89.20 85.38 173.25 62.34 374.20 62.34 to 374.20 14,250 12,710 1950 TO 1959 6 90.77 100.22 97.73 19.83 102.54 73.57 157.20 73.57 to 157.20 44,750 43,734 1960 TO 1969 5 80.51 84.06 84.67 16.77 99.28 62.66 102.42 N/A 43,000 36,410 11 51,929 1970 TO 1979 99.01 102.67 92.68 16.35 110.78 75.64 164.83 80.24 to 138.52 56,033 1980 TO 1989 1 73.67 73.67 73.67 73.67 73.67 N/A 69,500 51,200 1990 TO 1994 113.93 113.93 1995 TO 1999 1 113.93 113.93 113.93 N/A 25,500 29,052 2000 TO Present 2 81.04 81.04 78.00 103.90 94.19 136,500 106,465 16.23 67.88 N/A _ALL___

116.49

44.56

374.20

88.18 to 102.05

30,505

27,642

28.39

89

95.47

105.56

90.62

35 - GARDEN COUNTY

PAGE: 3 of 4

State Stat Pun

RESIDENTIA	г.						, staustics				State Stat Run			
KEDIDENTIN	_			Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007										
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007				
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	89	MEDIAN:	95	cov:	45.70	95%	Median C.I.: 88.18	to 102.05	(!: Derived)		
	TOTAL Sal	les Price	:	2,723,283	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	48.24	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 84.92	to 96.31			
TC	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	2,714,983	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.10	95	% Mean C.I.: 95.5	4 to 115.58			
T	TOTAL Assess	sed Value	:	2,460,225										
AV	/G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	30,505	COD:	28.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	374.20						
	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	27,642	PRD:	116.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.56			Printed: 03/27/	2007 23:45:39		
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	12	124.27	168.05	146.20	55.3	1 114.95	55.73	374.20	102.33 to 211.47	2,285	3,340		
5000 TO	9999	11	93.71	98.09	101.76	24.6	6 96.40	50.53	164.83	67.60 to 139.98	7,589	7,722		
Total	\$													
1 TO	9999	23	106.26	134.59	112.75	46.7	5 119.38	50.53	374.20	93.71 to 139.98	4,821	5,436		
10000 TO	29999	33	95.47	98.97	99.10	23.1	1 99.87	56.41	175.77	81.75 to 113.93	18,335	18,170		
30000 TO	59999	22	96.29	98.05	96.15	13.9	9 101.98	73.57	157.20	84.58 to 102.42	43,664	41,982		
60000 TO	99999	7	85.37	80.07	78.61	14.0	3 101.86	44.56	99.01	44.56 to 99.01	73,628	57,880		
100000 TO	149999	2	83.84	83.84	84.09	12.3	4 99.70	73.49	94.19	N/A	102,500	86,193		
150000 TO	249999	2	74.06	74.06	73.71	8.3	4 100.48	67.88	80.24	N/A	159,000	117,198		
ALL														
		89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642		
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	12	107.06	146.63	109.52	60.1	6 133.88	50.53	374.20	80.62 to 211.47	2,743	3,004		
5000 TO	9999	12	90.58	105.18	93.49	30.5	2 112.50	67.60	194.13	72.36 to 106.66	7,623	7,127		
Total	\$													
1 TO	9999	24	102.19	125.90	97.73	45.9	1 128.82	50.53	374.20	80.62 to 123.73	5,183	5,065		
10000 TO	29999	30	97.07	99.64	95.38	23.0	2 104.47	56.41	164.83	81.75 to 113.93	18,285	17,440		
30000 TO	59999	27	99.36	100.48	93.80	18.2	7 107.12	44.56	175.77	86.73 to 104.40	45,485	42,666		
60000 TO	99999	6	89.57	87.21	86.52	9.4	3 100.80	73.49	99.01	73.49 to 99.01	82,650	71,505		
100000 TO	149999	2	74.06	74.06	73.71	8.3	4 100.48	67.88	80.24	N/A	159,000	117,198		
ALL														
		89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642		
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)		14	115.23	136.70	112.03	41.3	8 122.02	50.53	322.00	100.00 to 194.13	7,922	8,876		
10		4	91.00	154.72	85.90	91.3	5 180.12	62.66	374.20	N/A	9,187	7,891		
15		1	117.37	117.37	117.37			117.37	117.37	N/A	13,000	15,258		
20		34	86.87	92.60	81.79	22.1	5 113.21	44.56	164.83	80.62 to 98.66	29,588	24,201		
25		5	81.75	96.44	99.61	23.3	8 96.82	70.99	138.52	N/A	28,300	28,189		
30		31	99.01	100.47	94.21	15.8	4 106.65	67.60	175.77	92.62 to 104.33	45,381	42,752		
ALL														
		89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642		

35 - GAR	DEN COUNTY			PA&T	2007 R&	&O Statistics		Base S	tat	G G 5	PAGE:4 of 4
RESIDENT	'IAL				Type: Qualifie	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30	/2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	89	MEDIAN:	95	COV	: 45.70	95%	Median C.I.: 88.18	to 102.05	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: :	2,723,283	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD			. Mean C.I.: 84.92		(Berreu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: :	2,714,983	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV			% Mean C.I.: 95.5		
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: ;	2,460,225			11,011,001,021	27.110		,5	1 00 110.00	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	30,505	COD:	28.39	MAX Sales Ratio	374.20				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	27,642	PRD:	116.49	MIN Sales Ratio	44.56			Printed: 03/27/	2007 23:45:39
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	101.37	102.59	95.35	27.3	6 107.60	50.53	211.47	55.73 to 123.73	8,017	7,643
100	9	124.80	130.56	118.12	29.6	5 110.52	62.66	194.13	80.51 to 194.13	12,333	14,568
101	55	93.22	105.27	87.85	28.1	7 119.83	44.56	374.20	86.28 to 101.24	35,871	31,514
102	2	118.83	118.83	118.16	7.8	5 100.56	109.50	128.16	N/A	28,000	33,086
103	1	99.36	99.36	99.36			99.36	99.36	N/A	55,800	55,443
104	11	86.73	89.26	91.72	18.7	2 97.33	56.41	120.46	70.99 to 112.02	32,834	30,114
301	1	85.37	85.37	85.37			85.37	85.37	N/A	77,900	66,501
ALL											
	89	95.47	105.56	90.62	28.3	9 116.49	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.05	30,505	27,642
CONDITIO	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	14	115.23	136.70	112.03	41.3	8 122.02	50.53	322.00	100.00 to 194.13	7,922	8,876
10	2	231.19	231.19	102.65	61.8	6 225.21	88.17	374.20	N/A	9,875	10,137
20	30	87.82	94.36	93.52	22.0	9 100.90	56.41	157.20	80.97 to 103.55	15,803	14,779
30	38	94.28	97.44	89.25	19.5	7 109.17	44.56	175.77	84.58 to 101.71	44,518	39,733
40	4	93.97	104.41	99.16	12.7	2 105.29	91.15	138.52	N/A	62,625	62,101

67.88

44.56

116.49

67.88

N/A

374.20 88.18 to 102.05

168,000

30,505

114,032

27,642

50

____ALL____

67.88

95.47

89

67.88

105.56

67.88

90.62

28.39

35 - GARDEN COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics	Base Stat	PAGE:1 of 4
COMMERCIAL	Type: Qualified		State Stat Run

COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualifie	d				State Stat Run	
					• •	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
NUMBER	of Sales	:	14	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.96	to 109.99	
TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:			. Mean C.I.: 87.11		
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:			% Mean C.I.: 90.5		
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	:	407,575								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 03/27/.	2007 23:45:46
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/03 TO 09/30/03											
10/01/03 TO 12/31/03	2	99.43	99.43	112.43	18.18	8 88.44	81.35	117.51	N/A	42,750	48,064
01/01/04 TO 03/31/04											
04/01/04 TO 06/30/04	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	15,000	13,869
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	3	85.53	85.65	85.97	0.58	8 99.62	84.96	86.46	N/A	60,166	51,727
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	0	106.00	106.00	106 54	2 2	0 100 20	102 70	100 00	27 / 2	0.000	0 500
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	106.89	106.89	106.54	2.90	0 100.32	103.78	109.99	N/A	9,000	9,588
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	94.63 79.20	94.63 79.20	94.63 79.20			94.63 79.20	94.63 79.20	N/A N/A	7,500 10,000	7,097 7,920
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	98.56	98.56	98.66	0.33	3 99.90	98.23	98.88	N/A N/A	19,000	18,745
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	119.70	119.70	119.70	0.3.	3 99.90	119.70	119.70	N/A N/A	1,000	1,197
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
Study Years	_	33.30	22.30	JJ.30			33.30	33.30	14/11	70,000	05,515
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04	3	92.46	97.11	109.45	13.04	4 88.72	81.35	117.51	N/A	33,500	36,666
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	6	90.54	94.23	88.09	9.4	7 106.97	84.96	109.99	84.96 to 109.99	34,333	30,242
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.88	99.06	97.58	8.42	1 101.52	79.20	119.70	N/A	23,800	23,224
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	86.00	87.35	86.47	2.45	5 101.02	84.96	92.46	N/A	48,875	42,263
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	98.56	97.45	97.53	6.86	6 99.92	79.20	109.99	79.20 to 109.99	12,250	11,947
ALL											
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.58	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
LEWELLEN	2	87.99	87.99	86.46	7.55	5 101.77	81.35	94.63	N/A	9,750	8,429
LISCO	1	119.70	119.70	119.70			119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,197
OSHKOSH	8	89.46	92.90	94.90	9.93		79.20	117.51	79.20 to 117.51	39,625	37,603
RURAL	3	103.78	104.36	100.78	3.43	3 103.54	99.30	109.99	N/A	29,333	29,563
ALL		06.40	06.55	05 50	10 5	. 100.00	F0 00	110 50	04.06 + 100.00	20.200	00 110
TOGATIONG - UDDAN - G	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.58	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392 Avg. Adj.	29,112
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE 1	9	86.46	91.15	94.05	9.23		79.20	MAX 117.51	81.35 to 98.23	34,611	32,552
2	1	98.88	98.88	98.88	9.23	J JU.J⊥	98.88	98.88	N/A	25,000	24,720
3	4	106.89	108.19	101.00	6.22	2 107.12	99.30	119.70	N/A N/A	22,250	22,471
ALL	1	200.00	100.19	101.00	0.22	107.12	JJ.30	117.70	14/11	22,250	22,171
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.58	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112
	= =									,	,2

35 - GARDEN COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics	Base Stat PAGE: 2 of 4
COMMERCIAL	Type: Qualified	State Stat Run
	Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before	re: 01/19/2007

COMMERCIAL				111641	Type: Qualifi	ed		State Stat Run					
			Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007										
NUM	BER of Sales	::	14	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.96	to 109 99			
TOTAL Sales Price:			425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	12.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 87.11					
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:			425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.20	95% Mean C.I.: 90.5					
TOTAL As	sessed Value	:	407,575			AVG.ADD.DEV.	10.20	, ,	1 nean c.1. 90.9	1 00 102.05			
AVG. Adj.	Sales Price	:	30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70						
AVG. As	sessed Value	:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 03/27/	2007 23:45:46		
STATUS: IMPROVED	, UNIMPROVE	D & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
1	10	89.46	92.03	95.15	9.5	96.71	79.20	117.51	81.35 to 99.30	39,350	37,443		
2	4	106.89	107.93	103.58	6.4	17 104.20	98.23	119.70	N/A	8,000	8,286		
ALL													
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112		
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)													
25-0025													
25-0095													
35-0001	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112		
NonValid School													
ALL													
·	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112		
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
0 OR Blank	4	106.89	108.09	102.49	6.3	32 105.47	98.88	119.70	N/A	11,000	11,273		
Prior TO 1860													
1860 TO 1899													
1900 TO 1919	2	80.28	80.28	80.37	1.3		79.20	81.35	N/A	11,000	8,841		
1920 TO 1939	4	93.54	92.71	90.68	3.9	102.24	85.53	98.23	N/A	16,375	14,849		
1940 TO 1949	1	86.46	86.46	86.46			86.46	86.46	N/A	110,500	95,541		
1950 TO 1959													
1960 TO 1969	1	84.96	84.96	84.96			84.96	84.96	N/A	40,000	33,982		
1970 TO 1979													
1980 TO 1989													
1990 TO 1994	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513		
1995 TO 1999	1	117.51	117.51	117.51			117.51	117.51	N/A	73,500	86,367		
2000 TO Present													
ALL													
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112		

35 - GARDEN	COUNTY				g, , g, , p	PAGE:3 of							
COMMERCIAL					State Stat Run								
						Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2003	to 06/30/2	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	2007		
NUMBER of Sales:				14	MEDIAN:	DIAN: 96		cov:		95% Median C.I.: 84.96		to 109.99	
TOTAL Sales Price:			425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96		STD:		95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 87.11	to 104.47		
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:			425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.A	AVG.ABS.DEV:		95	% Mean C.I.: 90.5	1 to 102.63		
TOTAL Assessed Value:				407,575									
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:			30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales	Ratio:	119.70					
AVG. Assessed Value:			29,112	PRD: 100.82 N		MIN Sales	IN Sales Ratio: 79.				Printed: 03/27/	/2007 23:45:4	
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	1	119.70	119.70	119.70				119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,197
5000 TO	9999	2	102.31	102.31	102.55	7.5	1 99	.76	94.63	109.99	N/A	7,750	7,948
Total \$													
1 TO	9999	3	109.99	108.11	103.59	7.6		.36	94.63	119.70	N/A	5,500	5,697
10000 TO	29999	6	95.35	92.32	93.43	8.3		8.80	79.20	103.78	79.20 to 103.78	14,166	13,236
30000 TO	59999	2	85.25	85.25	85.20	0.3		0.05	84.96	85.53	N/A	35,000	29,821
60000 TO	99999	2	108.41	108.41	108.63	8.4	0 99	.80	99.30	117.51	N/A	71,750	77,940
100000 TO	149999	1	86.46	86.46	86.46				86.46	86.46	N/A	110,500	95,541
ALL		14	96.43	06.55	95.79	10.5	0 100	.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	20 200	00 110
ASSESSED V	AT TTG: *	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100	.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392 Avg. Adj.	29,112 Avg.
RANGE	ALUE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	.Π	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$		COONI	MEDIAN	PHEMI	WOI. FILAN	CO	D	TRD	11111	HAM	JJ 6 McCarair C.1.	20.20 2220	
1 TO	4999	1	119.70	119.70	119.70				119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,197
5000 TO	9999	4	87.99	91.29	89.54	12.5	2 101	96	79.20	109.99	N/A	9,375	8,394
Total \$,	, , ,	.,
1 TO	9999	5	94.63	96.97	90.32	14.6	1 107	.36	79.20	119.70	N/A	7,700	6,955
10000 TO	29999	5	98.23	95.78	93.98	5.0	2 101	.92	85.53	103.78	N/A	18,600	17,479
30000 TO	59999	1	84.96	84.96	84.96				84.96	84.96	N/A	40,000	33,982
60000 TO	99999	3	99.30	101.09	98.98	10.4	2 102	2.13	86.46	117.51	N/A	84,666	83,807
ALL	_												
		14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100	.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112
COST RANK												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		4	106.89	108.09	102.49	6.3	2 105	.47	98.88	119.70	N/A	11,000	11,273
10		4	89.46	88.19	87.01	5.9	9 101	.35	79.20	94.63	N/A	35,750	31,106
20		6	91.88	94.48	99.81	11.4	6 94	.66	81.35	117.51	81.35 to 117.51	39,750	39,675

10.58

79.20

100.82

119.70 84.96 to 109.99

30,392

29,112

_ALL___

14

96.43

96.57

95.79

35 - GA	RDEN COUNTY			PA&T	2007 R&	&O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:4 of 4
COMMERC	TAL				Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
						nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sale	g:	14	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.	96 to 109.99	
	TOTAL Sales Price	e:	425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	12.81		. Mean C.I.: 87.		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	e:	425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.20			.51 to 102.63	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	e:	407,575								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	e:	30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70				
	AVG. Assessed Value	e:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 03/27/	2007 23:45:46
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)	4	106.89	108.09	102.49	6.3	2 105.47	98.88	119.70	N/A	11,000	11,273
325	1	84.96	84.96	84.96			84.96	84.96	N/A	40,000	33,982
326	1	79.20	79.20	79.20			79.20	79.20	N/A	10,000	7,920
343	1	86.46	86.46	86.46			86.46	86.46	N/A	110,500	95,541
344	1	98.23	98.23	98.23			98.23	98.23	N/A	13,000	12,770
350	1	94.63	94.63	94.63			94.63	94.63	N/A	7,500	7,097
353	3	85.53	94.80	105.45	14.0	9 89.90	81.35	117.51	N/A	38,500	40,596
435	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	15,000	13,869
438	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
AL											
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.9		29,112
	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	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.9	9 30,392	29,112
04	-										
AL	L										

79.20 119.70 84.96 to 109.99

30,392

29,112

10.58

14

96.43

96.57 95.79

PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics **Base Stat** PAGE:1 of 4 35 - GARDEN COUNTY State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL		Type: Qualified State St.						State Stat Run			
						nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	2007		
NUMBER	R of Sales	:	89	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	46.41	95% 1	Median C.I.: 88.17	to 101.71	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sa	ales Price	: 2	,723,283	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	48.45		. Mean C.I.: 84.25		(Derivea)
TOTAL Adj.Sa	ales Price	: 2	,714,983	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.96		% Mean C.I.: 94.3		
TOTAL Asses	ssed Value	: 2	,439,533								
AVG. Adj. Sa	ales Price	:	30,505	COD:	28.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	374.20				
AVG. Asses	ssed Value	:	27,410	PRD:	116.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.56			Printed: 02/17/.	2007 13:05:14
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	12	99.33	103.97	99.91	17.00	0 104.06	76.44	157.20	86.73 to 121.16	25,864	25,839
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	13	92.62	100.42	89.71	23.03		67.60	142.93	73.57 to 128.16	35,350	31,713
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	6	114.98	123.09	110.56	20.33		88.18	194.13	88.18 to 194.13	15,916	17,597
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	15	99.01	98.59	87.95	15.1		44.56	164.83	90.10 to 106.26	33,125	29,134
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	15	82.39	105.57	81.36	37.8		59.52	322.00	75.43 to 88.49	34,453	28,030
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	11	100.00	130.31	98.24	43.88		62.34	374.20	74.47 to 194.13	26,137	25,677
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	79.36	84.85	97.31	23.5		50.53	138.52	50.53 to 138.52	16,666	16,217
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 Study Years		75.64	90.41	83.50	35.43	3 108.28	55.73	175.77	56.41 to 123.73	40,760	34,033
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	46	100.75	103.71	92.85	18.88	8 111.69	44.56	194.13	92.62 to 106.26	29,615	27,498
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	43	87.45	105.13	86.83	38.6	7 121.07	50.53	374.20	76.58 to 100.00	31,457	27,316
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	47	95.47	111.37	89.17	32.30	124.89	44.56	374.20	88.18 to 102.42	29,717	26,500
ALL											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.63	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
LEWELLEN	21	90.10	89.89	87.28	14.89		59.52	123.73	78.00 to 101.77	20,798	18,152
LISCO	4	99.02	93.82	96.19	11.59		70.99	106.26	N/A	12,295	11,827
OSHKOSH RURAL	58 6	99.19 88.71	112.56	94.72	33.40		50.53 44.56	374.20 110.00	88.18 to 103.55	31,787	30,109
RURALALL	О	88.71	83.31	68.67	22.5	7 121.31	44.50	110.00	44.56 to 110.00	64,231	44,109
ALLL	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.63	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S		& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	79	94.19	106.53	93.30	30.0	2 114.18	50.53	374.20	88.17 to 101.77	28,866	26,931
2	2	88.71	88.71	85.74	12.7	3 103.46	77.41	100.00	N/A	63,358	54,321
3	8	96.85	87.22	66.05	18.5	1 132.05	44.56	110.00	44.56 to 110.00	38,481	25,415
ALL											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.63	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
STATUS: IMPROVED, U	UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	82	93.74	105.42	89.89	29.2		44.56	374.20	87.65 to 101.49	32,857	29,535
2	7	102.33	92.35	85.40	18.3	7 108.14	50.53	123.73	50.53 to 123.73	2,952	2,521
ALL											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.63	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410

35 - GARDEN COUNTY	PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics	Base Stat	PAGE:2 of 4
RESIDENTIAL	Type: Qualified	_	State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL			Type: Qualified State Stat Run								
						nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	89	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	46.41	95%	Median C.I.: 88.17	to 101.71	(!: Derived)
-	TOTAL Sales Price	:	2,723,283	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	48.45		. Mean C.I.: 84.25		(Berreu)
TOTAL	L Adj.Sales Price	:	2,714,983	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.96		% Mean C.I.: 94.3		
TOTA	AL Assessed Value	:	2,439,533			11,01111101111	20.70		71.5	3 00 111.10	
AVG.	Adj. Sales Price	:	30,505	COD:	28.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	374.20				
AVO	G. Assessed Value	:	27,410	PRD:	116.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.56			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:05:14
PROPERTY TYPE	E *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	81	93.71		88.76	26.6		44.56	374.20	87.65 to 101.24	31,919	28,332
06										•	•
07	8	120.01	128.83	111.70	36.7	115.34	59.52	194.13	59.52 to 194.13	16,183	18,076
ALL											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
SCHOOL DISTR	ICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0025											
25-0095											
35-0001	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
NonValid Schoo	ol										
ALL											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	14	104.22	116.96	100.63	33.4	116.23	50.53	211.47	67.60 to 194.13	8,137	8,188
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	15	98.66	99.82	93.24	19.5	107.06	70.99	175.77	77.41 to 106.26	24,525	22,867
1920 TO 1939	26	89.26	93.48	87.98	20.9	106.25	44.56	142.93	79.16 to 103.55	25,050	22,038
1940 TO 1949	8	89.14	153.88	88.37	87.1	.5 174.13	62.34	374.20	62.34 to 374.20	14,250	12,593
1950 TO 1959	6	90.77	100.22	97.73	19.8	33 102.54	73.57	157.20	73.57 to 157.20	44,750	43,734
1960 TO 1969	5	78.00	82.93	84.33	18.1	.2 98.34	59.52	102.42	N/A	43,000	36,261
1970 TO 1979	11	99.01	102.67	92.68	16.3	110.78	75.64	164.83	80.24 to 138.52	56,033	51,929
1980 TO 1989	1	73.67	73.67	73.67			73.67	73.67	N/A	69,500	51,200
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	113.93	113.93	113.93			113.93	113.93	N/A	25,500	29,052
2000 TO Prese	ent 2	81.04	81.04	78.00	16.2	103.90	67.88	94.19	N/A	136,500	106,465
ALL											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410

35 - GARDEN COUNTY

PAGE: 3 of 4

PAGE: 3 of 4

RESIDENTIAL							annary Statistic				State Stat Run	
						Type: Qualifie Date Rar	ea nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Refore: 01/19	/2007		
	MIIMDED	of Sales	. •	89	MEDIAN:							
	TOTAL Sa			,723,283		94	COV:	46.41		Median C.I.: 88.17		(!: Derived)
TIC	OTAL Adj.Sa			,723,203	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	48.45		. Mean C.I.: 84.25		
	TOTAL Adj.sa.			,439,533	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.96	95	% Mean C.I.: 94.3	3 to 114.46	
	G. Adj. Sa			30,505	COD:	28.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	374.20				
	AVG. Asses			27,410	PRD:	116.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.56			Drintad. 02/17/	2007 12.05.14
SALE PRICE		seu vaiue	-	27,410	FKD.	110.10	MIN Sales Racio:	44.50			Printed: 02/17/. Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	ı "	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$		COONI	MEDIAN	PIEAN	WGI. MEAN	CO	D FKD	PILIN	MAX	93% Median C.I.	5410 11100	11000 701
1 TO	 4999	12	124.27	168.05	146.20	55.3	1 114.95	55.73	374.20	102.33 to 211.47	2,285	3,340
5000 TO	9999	11	93.71	97.07	100.67	24.8		50.53	164.83	67.60 to 139.98	7,589	7,640
Total											,	, -
1 TO	9999	23	104.11	134.10	111.93	48.0	6 119.81	50.53	374.20	93.71 to 139.98	4,821	5,396
10000 TO	29999	33	90.34	96.85	97.39	23.9		56.41	175.77	79.16 to 105.83	18,335	17,857
30000 TO	59999	2.2	93.77	97.02	95.16	14.2	6 101.95	73.57	157.20	84.58 to 102.42	43,664	41,553
60000 TO	99999	7	85.37	80.07	78.61	14.0	3 101.86	44.56	99.01	44.56 to 99.01	73,628	57,880
100000 TO	149999	2	83.84	83.84	84.09	12.3	4 99.70	73.49	94.19	N/A	102,500	86,193
150000 TO	249999	2	74.06	74.06	73.71	8.3	4 100.48	67.88	80.24	N/A	159,000	117,198
ALL												
		89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
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	12	107.06	146.63	109.52	60.1		50.53	374.20	80.62 to 211.47	2,743	3,004
5000 TO	9999	12	90.58	104.24	92.50	30.6	6 112.69	67.60	194.13	72.36 to 106.26	7,623	7,051
Total	-											
1 TO	9999	24	101.91	125.43	97.00	46.1		50.53	374.20	80.62 to 123.73	5,183	5,028
10000 TO	29999	31	90.34	97.00	93.17	23.6		56.41	164.83	79.16 to 105.83	18,740	17,460
30000 TO	59999	26	96.92	100.10	93.18	19.2		44.56	175.77	86.73 to 104.40	45,989	42,851
60000 TO	99999	6	89.57	87.21	86.52	9.4		73.49	99.01	73.49 to 99.01	82,650	71,505
100000 TO	149999	2	74.06	74.06	73.71	8.3	4 100.48	67.88	80.24	N/A	159,000	117,198
ALL		89	04 10	104 20	00.05	20 6	2 116 10	44 56	274 20	00 17 +- 101 71	20 505	27 410
QUALITY		89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505 Avg. Adj.	27,410 Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		14	115.23	136.28	109.36	41.7		50.53	322.00	94.48 to 194.13	7,922	8,664
10		4	89.75	153.30	83.88	94.2		59.52	374.20	N/A	9,187	7,706
15		1	90.34	90.34	90.34	24.2	102.70	90.34	90.34	N/A	13,000	11,744
20		34	86.41	91.35	81.19	22.2	0 112.51	44.56	164.83	76.97 to 98.66	29,588	24,022
25		5	81.75	96.44	99.61	23.3		70.99	138.52	N/A	28,300	28,189
30		31	99.01	99.73	93.68	15.7		67.60	175.77	88.49 to 104.33	45,381	42,514
ALL				22.73							,	,
		89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	3 116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410

35 - GAI	RDEN COUNTY			PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statis	tics	Base S	tat		PAGE:4 of 4
RESIDEN:	TIAL				Type: Qualific	•				State Stat Run	
					Date Ra	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/3	30/2006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	89	MEDIAN:	94	CO	V: 46.41	95%	Median C.I.: 88.17	to 101 71	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	2,723,283	WGT. MEAN:	90	ST			. Mean C.I.: 84.25		(:. Derivea)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	2,714,983	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DE		_		3 to 114.46	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	2,439,533				. 20.30			3 00 111.10	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	30,505	COD:	28.63	MAX Sales Rati	o: 374.20				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	27,410	PRD:	116.18	MIN Sales Rati	o: 44.56			Printed: 02/17/.	2007 13:05:14
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	101.17	102.00	91.65	28.0	0 111.30	50.53	211.47	55.73 to 123.73	8,017	7,347
100	9	124.80	129.93	117.46	30.1	.5 110.62	59.52	194.13	78.00 to 194.13	12,333	14,486
101	55	91.15	103.79	87.14	28.3	119.10	44.56	374.20	84.58 to 100.00	35,871	31,259
102	2	118.83	118.83	118.16	7.8	100.56	109.50	128.16	N/A	28,000	33,086
103	1	99.36	99.36	99.36			99.36	99.36	N/A	55,800	55,443
104	11	86.73	88.27	90.90	18.5	97.11	56.41	120.46	70.99 to 106.26	32,834	29,846
301	1	85.37	85.37	85.37			85.37	85.37	N/A	77,900	66,501
ALI											
	89	94.19	104.39	89.85	28.6	116.18	44.56	374.20	88.17 to 101.71	30,505	27,410
CONDITI										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	14	115.23		109.36	41.7		50.53	322.00	94.48 to 194.13	7,922	8,664
10	2	231.19		102.65	61.8		88.17	374.20	N/A	9,875	10,137
20	30	87.82		91.27	20.9		56.41	157.20	79.16 to 101.77	15,803	14,423
30	38	92.84		88.83	20.1		44.56	175.77	84.58 to 101.71	44,518	39,547
40	4	93.97		99.16	12.7	105.29	91.15	138.52	N/A	62,625	62,101
50	1	67.88	67.88	67.88			67.88	67.88	N/A	168,000	114,032

116.18 44.56 374.20 88.17 to 101.71

30,505

27,410

____ALL____

89

94.19

104.39

89.85

5 - GARDEN COUNTY			PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics Base State State State								
COMMERCIAL				1	Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
					Date Ra	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		
NUMBER	of Sales	; :	14	MEDIAN:	96	cov:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.96	5 to 109.99	
TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	12.81	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 87.11	l to 104.47	
TOTAL Adj.Sa			425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.20	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.	51 to 102.63	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	:	407,575								
AVG. Adj. Sa			30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 02/17/	
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 10/01/03 TO 12/31/03	2	99.43	99.43	112.43	18.1	L8 88.44	81.35	117.51	N/A	42,750	48,06
01/01/03 TO 12/31/03 01/01/04 TO 03/31/04	2	99.43	99.43	112.43	10.1	10 00.11	01.33	117.51	N/A	42,730	40,00
04/01/04 TO 06/30/04	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	15,000	13,86
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	3	85.53	85.65	85.97	0.5	58 99.62	84.96	86.46	N/A	60,166	51,72
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04										•	•
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	106.89	106.89	106.54	2.9	100.32	103.78	109.99	N/A	9,000	9,58
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	94.63	94.63	94.63			94.63	94.63	N/A	7,500	7,09
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	79.20	79.20	79.20			79.20	79.20	N/A	10,000	7,92
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	98.56	98.56	98.66	0.3	99.90	98.23	98.88	N/A	19,000	18,74
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	119.70	119.70	119.70			119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,19
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,51
Study Years		00.46	05 11	100 45	12.0	00.70	01 25	117 51	27 / 2	22 500	26.66
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	3 6	92.46 90.54	97.11 94.23	109.45 88.09	13.0 9.4		81.35 84.96	117.51 109.99	N/A 84.96 to 109.99	33,500 34,333	36,66
07/01/04 10 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.88	99.06	97.58	8.4		79.20	119.70	N/A	23,800	30,24 23,22
Calendar Yrs	3	20.00	22.00	27.30	0.1	101.52	73.20	117.70	N/A	25,000	23,22
01/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	86.00	87.35	86.47	2.4	15 101.02	84.96	92.46	N/A	48,875	42,26
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	98.56	97.45	97.53	6.8	36 99.92	79.20	109.99	79.20 to 109.99	12,250	11,94
ALL											
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,11
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
LEWELLEN	2	87.99	87.99	86.46	7.5	101.77	81.35	94.63	N/A	9,750	8,42
LISCO	1	119.70	119.70	119.70			119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,19
OSHKOSH	8	89.46	92.90	94.90	9.9		79.20	117.51	79.20 to 117.51	39,625	37,60
RURAL	3	103.78	104.36	100.78	3.4	103.54	99.30	109.99	N/A	29,333	29,56
ALL	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,11
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S				93.19	10.5	100.02	13.40	112./U	04.50 LO 105.99	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	9	86.46	91.15	94.05	9.2		79.20	117.51	81.35 to 98.23	34,611	32,55
2	1	98.88	98.88	98.88			98.88	98.88	N/A	25,000	24,72
_		106.00	100 10	101.00		107 10	00 00	110 50		22,050	,

100.82

99.30

79.20

119.70

119.70

N/A

84.96 to 109.99

22,250

30,392

22,471

29,112

6.22

10.58

3

_ALL___

106.89

96.43

108.19

96.57

101.00

95.79

35 - GARDEN COUNTY COMMERCIAL				PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics Base Stat State Stat F								
COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualific	ed nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	MC Dogtod I	Dafama, 01/10	/2007	Siute Siut Kun		
				MEDIAN		nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	000 Postea 1					
	BER of Sales		14	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.96	to 109.99		
	Sales Price		425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	12.81	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 87.11	to 104.47		
-	.Sales Price		425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.20	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.5	1 to 102.63		
	sessed Value		407,575									
	Sales Price		30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70					
AVG. Ass	sessed Value	:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 02/17/	′2007 13:05:17	
STATUS: IMPROVED,	UNIMPROVE	D & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	10	89.46	92.03	95.15	9.5		79.20	117.51	81.35 to 99.30	39,350	37,443	
2	4	106.89	107.93	103.58	6.4	104.20	98.23	119.70	N/A	8,000	8,286	
ALL												
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112	
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
25-0025												
25-0095	1.4	06.42	06 55	05 50	10 5	100.00	70.00	110 70	04.06 100.00	20 200	00 110	
35-0001	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112	
NonValid School												
ALLL	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112	
YEAR BUILT *	11	90.43	90.37	93.19	10.5	100.02	79.20	119.70	04.90 00 109.99	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	4	106.89	108.09	102.49	6.3		98.88	119.70	N/A	11,000	11,273	
Prior TO 1860	±	100.05	100.03	102.19	0.3	103.17	30.00	117.70	14/11	11,000	11,273	
1860 TO 1899												
1900 TO 1919	2	80.28	80.28	80.37	1.3	99.88	79.20	81.35	N/A	11,000	8,841	
1920 TO 1939	4	93.54	92.71	90.68	3.9	7 102.24	85.53	98.23	N/A	16,375	14,849	
1940 TO 1949	1	86.46	86.46	86.46			86.46	86.46	N/A	110,500	95,541	
1950 TO 1959												
1960 TO 1969	1	84.96	84.96	84.96			84.96	84.96	N/A	40,000	33,982	
1970 TO 1979												
1980 TO 1989												
1990 TO 1994	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513	
1995 TO 1999	1	117.51	117.51	117.51			117.51	117.51	N/A	73,500	86,367	
2000 TO Present												

79.20 119.70 84.96 to 109.99

30,392

29,112

___ALL____

14

96.43 96.57 95.79 10.58

35 - GARDEN	COUNTY				PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics Base Stat								
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualific	•				State Stat Run		
							nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted l	Before: 01/19/	/2007			
	NUMBER	of Sales	;:	14	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.96	to 109.99		
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	12.81		. Mean C.I.: 87.11			
TOT	AL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.20		% Mean C.I.: 90.5			
TO	TAL Asses	sed Value	Value: 407,575										
AVG	. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70					
A	VG. Asses	sed Value	:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 02/17/		
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	1	119.70	119.70	119.70			119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,19	
5000 TO	9999	2	102.31	102.31	102.55	7.5	1 99.76	94.63	109.99	N/A	7,750	7,94	
Total \$													
1 TO	9999	3	109.99	108.11	103.59	7.6		94.63	119.70	N/A	5,500	5,69	
10000 TO	29999	6	95.35	92.32	93.43	8.3		79.20	103.78	79.20 to 103.78	14,166	13,23	
30000 TO	59999	2	85.25	85.25	85.20	0.3	3 100.05	84.96	85.53	N/A	35,000	29,82	
60000 TO	99999	2	108.41	108.41	108.63	8.4	0 99.80	99.30	117.51	N/A	71,750	77,94	
100000 TO	149999	1	86.46	86.46	86.46			86.46	86.46	N/A	110,500	95,54	
ALL	-												
		14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,11	
ASSESSED VA	LUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$_			110 50	110 50	110 50			110 50	110 50	27./2	1 000	1 10	
1 TO	4999	1	119.70	119.70	119.70	10 5	0 101 06	119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,19	
5000 TO	9999	4	87.99	91.29	89.54	12.5	2 101.96	79.20	109.99	N/A	9,375	8,39	
Total \$_ 1 TO	9999	 5	94.63	96.97	90.32	14.6	1 107.36	79.20	119.70	N/A	7,700	6,95	
10000 TO	29999	5	98.23	95.78	93.98	5.0		85.53	103.78	N/A N/A	18,600	17,47	
30000 TO	59999	1	84.96	84.96	84.96	5.0	2 101.92	84.96	84.96	N/A	40,000	33,98	
60000 TO	99999	3	99.30	101.09	98.98	10.4	2 102.13	86.46	117.51	N/A	84,666	83,80	
ALL	2222	3	22.30	101.00	50.50	10.1	2 102.13	00.40	117.31	IV/ A	01,000	03,00	
	_	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,11	
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)		4	106.89	108.09	102.49	6.3		98.88	119.70	N/A	11,000	11,27	
10		4	89.46	88.19	87.01	5.9		79.20	94.63	N/A	35,750	31,10	
20		6	91.88	94.48	99.81	11.4		81.35	117.51	81.35 to 117.51	39,750	39,67	
ALL													

79.20 119.70 84.96 to 109.99

30,392

29,112

10.58

14

96.43

96.57 95.79

35 - GA	RDEN COUNTY			PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistic	S	Base S	tat	a	PAGE:4 of 4
COMMERC	IAL				Type: Qualific	v				State Stat Run	
					Date Ra	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted 1	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	14	MEDIAN:	96	cov:	13.27	95%	Median C.I.: 84.96	to 109.99	
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	425,800	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	12.81		. Mean C.I.: 87.11		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	425,500	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.20	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.5	1 to 102.63	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	407,575								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	30,392	COD:	10.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	119.70				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	29,112	PRD:	100.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.20			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:05:17
OCCUPAI	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)	4	106.89	108.09	102.49	6.3	2 105.47	98.88	119.70	N/A	11,000	11,273
325	1	84.96	84.96	84.96			84.96	84.96	N/A	40,000	33,982
326	1	79.20	79.20	79.20			79.20	79.20	N/A	10,000	7,920
343	1	86.46	86.46	86.46			86.46	86.46	N/A	110,500	95,541
344	1	98.23	98.23	98.23			98.23	98.23	N/A	13,000	12,770
350	1	94.63	94.63	94.63			94.63	94.63	N/A	7,500	7,097
353	3	85.53	94.80	105.45	14.0	9 89.90	81.35	117.51	N/A	38,500	40,596
435	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	15,000	13,869
438	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
AL	L										
	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112
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	14	96.43	96.57	95.79	10.5	8 100.82	79.20	119.70	84.96 to 109.99	30,392	29,112
04											
AL	L										

79.20 119.70 84.96 to 109.99

30,392

29,112

14

96.43

96.57

95.79

10.58

2007 Assessment Survey for Garden County February 22, 2007

I. General Information

- A. Staffing and Funding Information
- 1. Deputy(ies) on staff: 1
- **2. Appraiser(s) on staff:** Jerry Knoche is hired as needed for training listers and analyzing review areas in Garden County.
- **3. Other full-time employees:** One as of February 1, 2007.
- **4. Other part-time employees:** Two listers are utilized as need for reappraisal work.
- 5. Number of shared employees: 0
- 6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: \$76,000
- 7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system: \$7,860
- 8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: \$75,250
- 9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: N/A
- 10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: \$2,100
- **11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:** The assessor requested \$30,000 but the county board adopted \$28,800
- 12. Other miscellaneous funds: N/A
- **13. Total budget:** Assessors budget \$75,250 Appraisal budget \$28,800
 - 1. Was any of last year's budget not used? Yes, a small amount.
- **B.** Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

- **1. Data collection done by:** The Garden County Assessor, staff and listers.
- **2. Valuation done by:** The Garden County Assessor

3. Pickup work done by: the Garden County Assessor, staff and listers.

Property Type	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Residential	31	1	33	65

- 4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 2005 for all new pickup work and 2000 for prior
- 5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 2005
- 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? 2006
- 7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 4
- **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? No
- 11. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner? Yes
- C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information
- **1. Data collection done by:** The Garden County Assessor, staff and listers
- **2. Valuation done by:** The Garden County Assessor
- **3. Pickup work done by whom:** The Garden County Assessor, staff and listers

Property Type	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Commercial	0	0	7	7

- 4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 2005 for all new pickup work and 2000 for prior
- 5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information? A low number of

commercial sales in Garden County have made it difficult to develop accurate depreciation schedules.

- 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? N/A
- 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? 4
- **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
- 1. Data collection done by: The Garden County Assessor and staff
- **2. Valuation done by:** The Garden County Assessor
- **3. Pickup work done by whom:** The Garden County Assessor and staff

Property Type	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Agricultural	22	0	25	47

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? 1998
- 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 for current irrigated acres with

personal property schedules and self reporting tools.

- **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 areas were defined by market information within 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 1999
- E. Computer, Automation Information and GIS
- 1. Administrative software: County Solutions
- 2. CAMA software: County Solutions
- 3. Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? Yes
 - a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? Assessor and staff
- 4. Does the county have GIS software? No
 - a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps? N/A
- 4. Personal Property software: County Solutions
- F. Zoning Information
- 1. Does the county have zoning? Yes
 - a. If so, is the zoning countywide? Yes including Lisco
 - **b. What municipalities in the county are zoned?** Oshkosh and Lewellen
- c. When was zoning implemented? 1999
- **G.** Contracted Services

- **1. Appraisal Services:** Jerry Knoche is contracted for appraisal work and Prichard and Abbott are contracted to perform the Oil and Gas mineral appraisals in Garden County.
- 2. Other Services: County Solutions
- H. Additional comments or further explanations on any item from A through G:

II. Assessment Actions

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

- 1. Residential- A statistical analyses completed by the Garden County Assessor for residential improvements determined changes were warranted in Lewellen for 2007. No land values changed. Valuations of improvements within Lewellen increased 7% to equalize residential valuations within the county. The county also equalized newer manufactured homes by applying 2005 costing tables and new depreciation.
- 2. Commercial- The assessor continues to review the few sales that are typically very low dollar sales for commercial property in Garden County. The county applied new 2007 values on the commercial trailer parks according to market data. No overall changes were made for the overall class for the current assessment year.
- 3. Agricultural- No overall land valuation changes were supported in 2007 although new irrigated acres were updated on property record cards according to the NRCS certifications. The differences shown on acres and total valuations are reflected in the real estate abstract for Garden County. The assessor continues to utilize information provided on sales questionnaire forms as a tool towards equalization in each property class.

County 35 - Garden

Total Real Property Value Records 4,419 Value 259,113,449 Total Growth (Sum 17, 25, & 30)

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

			SubUrban						$\overline{}$
	Urb				Rur		Tot		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
1. Res UnImp Land	69	142,092	17	49,142	27	66,900	113	258,134	
2. Res Improv Land	644	1,922,062	71	557,104	147	1,159,051	862	3,638,217	
3. Res Improvements	648	19,268,982	71	2,374,635	156	6,196,394	875	27,840,011	
4. Res Total	717	21,333,136	88	2,980,881	183	7,422,345	988	31,736,362	393,005
% of Total	72.57	67.21	8.90	9.39	18.52	23.38	22.35	12.24	37.36
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	717	21,333,136	88	2,980,881	183	7,422,345	988	31,736,362	393,005
% of Total	72.57	67.21	8.90	9.39	18.52	23.38	22.35	12.24	37.36
				j				Ţ	j

County 35 - Garden

Total Real Property Value Records 4,419 Value 259,113,449 Total Growth (Sum 17, 25, & 30) (Sum 17, 25, & 41)

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

ı	Urb		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Growen
9. Comm UnImp Land	14	29,885	4	16,077	4	25,694	22	71,656	
10. Comm Improv Land	120	288,433	12	93,319	17	256,252	149	638,004	
11. Comm Improvements	120	3,328,071	12	650,704	17	1,110,072	149	5,088,847	
12. Comm Total	134	3,646,389	16	760,100	21	1,392,018	171	5,798,507	89,018
% of Total	78.36	62.88	9.35	13.10	12.28	24.00	3.86	2.23	8.46
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Ind 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
Comm+Ind Total	134	3,646,389	16	760,100	21	1,392,018	171	5,798,507	89,018
% of Total	78.36	62.88	9.35	13.10	12.28	24.00	3.86	2.23	8.46
17. Taxable Total	851	24,979,525	104	3,740,981	204	8,814,363	1,159	37,534,869	482,023
% of Total	73.42	66.55	8.97	7.94	17.60	19.77	26.22	14.48	45.82

Caunt	, 25	Garden
Count	/ 33 =	Garuen

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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0		
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0		

	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records	Urban		SubUrb	an	Rural	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	0	0	11	50,790
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	8	45,667

	Total		Growth	
	Records	Value		
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	11	50,790		0
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	8	45,667		0
25. Mineral Interest Total	19	96,457		0

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	64	3	28	95

Schedule V: Agricultural Records Urb		SubUrban			Rur	al	Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	28	797,578	2,689	168,478,622	2,717	169,276,200
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	26	1,045,250	498	33,595,144	524	34,640,394
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	26	1,050,377	498	16,515,152	524	17,565,529
30. Ag-Total Taxable							3.241	221.482.123

County 35 - Garden	20	07 County Abs	tract of Assess	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	4	4.000	6,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	18	20.250	150,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	19		758,741	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	23	75.340	56,507	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	25		291,636	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			70.010		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	67	68.000	190,500	71	72.000	196,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	312	387.220	2,587,500	330	407.470	2,737,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	316		10,693,750	335		11,452,491	0
34. HomeSite Total			-,,	406	479.470	14,386,491	-
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	28	96.940	76,402	28	96.940	76,402	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	445	1,528.170	1,146,175	468	1,603.510	1,202,682	
37. FarmSite Improv	482	,	5,821,402	507	,	6,113,038	569,880
38. FarmSite Total				535	1,700.450	7,392,122	
39. Road & Ditches		2,900.610			2,970.620	, ,	
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				941	5,150.540	21,778,613	569,880
Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:		Urban			SubUrban		
Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value	Records	Urban Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value	
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	51	6,558.110	1,630,164	
44. Recapture Val			0		,,	2,944,379	
•	_	Rural		_	Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
43. Special Value	3,150	1,029,898.480	197,962,642	3,201	1,036,456.590	199,592,806	
44. Recapture Val			211,382,417			214,326,796	

County 35 - Garden

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: A	edule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail Market Area: 1							
	Urban		SubUrban	1	Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	168.440	133,909	3,458.590	2,749,581	3,627.030	2,883,490
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,351.230	966,132	1,351.230	966,132
48. 2A	0.000	0	121.560	72,330	4,821.740	2,868,942	4,943.300	2,941,272
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	14.670	7,555	14.670	7,555
50. 3A	0.000	0	525.200	228,464	11,069.340	4,815,174	11,594.540	5,043,638
51. 4A1	0.000	0	854.700	269,234	14,277.980	4,497,588	15,132.680	4,766,822
52. 4A	0.000	0	92.370	25,402	1,764.740	485,318	1,857.110	510,720
53. Total	0.000	0	1,762.270	729,339	36,758.290	16,390,290	38,520.560	17,119,629
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	46.680	15,404	66,656.550	21,996,683	66,703.230	22,012,087
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,914.270	917,997	2,914.270	917,997
57. 2D	0.000	0	6.000	1,800	17,589.730	5,276,920	17,595.730	5,278,720
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	541.910	140,897	541.910	140,897
59. 3D	0.000	0	66.450	14,618	11,632.310	2,559,108	11,698.760	2,573,726
60. 4D1	0.000	0	13.600	2,176	5,747.570	919,610	5,761.170	921,786
61. 4D	0.000	0	5.770	750	2,348.640	305,326	2,354.410	306,076
62. Total	0.000	0	138.500	34,748	107,430.980	32,116,541	107,569.480	32,151,289
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	35.100	8,579	4,103.460	958,607	4,138.560	967,186
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	668.450	140,256	668.450	140,256
66. 2G	0.000	0	28.920	5,898	6,993.270	1,418,628	7,022.190	1,424,526
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	66.930	12,195	66.930	12,195
68. 3G	0.000	0	428.200	79,114	39,916.290	7,352,160	40,344.490	7,431,274
69. 4G1	0.000	0	2,169.850	390,506	278,152.320	50,055,894	280,322.170	50,446,400
70. 4G	0.000	0	1,299.950	214,491	533,930.990	88,105,890	535,230.940	88,320,381
71. Total	0.000	0	3,962.020	698,588	863,831.710	148,043,630	867,793.730	148,742,218
72. Waste	0.000	0	10.180	102	15,646.750	156,462	15,656.930	156,564
73. Other	0.000	0	686.000	167,544	6,845.390	1,366,266	7,531.390	1,533,810
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		341.120		341.120	
75. Total	0.000	0	6,558.970	1,630,321	1,030,513.120	198,073,189	1,037,072.090	199,703,510

County 35 - Garden

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

	Urban		SubUrbar	1	Rural		Total	
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	1,762.270	729,339	36,758.290	16,390,290	38,520.560	17,119,629
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	138.500	34,748	107,430.980	32,116,541	107,569.480	32,151,289
78.Grass	0.000	0	3,962.020	698,588	863,831.710	148,043,630	867,793.730	148,742,218
79.Waste	0.000	0	10.180	102	15,646.750	156,462	15,656.930	156,564
80.Other	0.000	0	686.000	167,544	6,845.390	1,366,266	7,531.390	1,533,810
81.Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	341.120	0	341.120	0
82.Total	0.000	0	6,558.970	1,630,321	1,030,513.120	198,073,189	1,037,072.090	199,703,510

2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 35 - Garden

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Market Area: Average Assessed Valu
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	3,627.030	9.42%	2,883,490	16.84%	795.000
2A1	1,351.230	3.51%	966,132	5.64%	715.001
2A	4,943.300	12.83%	2,941,272	17.18%	595.001
3A1	14.670	0.04%	7,555	0.04%	514.996
3A	11,594.540	30.10%	5,043,638	29.46%	435.001
4A1	15,132.680	39.28%	4,766,822	27.84%	315.001
4A	1,857.110	4.82%	510,720	2.98%	275.007
Irrigated Total	38,520.560	100.00%	17,119,629	100.00%	444.428
Dry:					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	66,703.230	62.01%	22,012,087	68.46%	330.000
2D1	2,914.270	2.71%	917,997	2.86%	315.000
2D	17,595.730	16.36%	5,278,720	16.42%	300.000
3D1	541.910	0.50%	140,897	0.44%	260.000
3D	11,698.760	10.88%	2,573,726	8.01%	219.999
4D1	5,761.170	5.36%	921,786	2.87%	159.999
4D	2,354.410	2.19%	306,076	0.95%	130.001
Dry Total	107,569.480	100.00%	32,151,289	100.00%	298.888
Grass:			-,,		
1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	4,138.560	0.48%	967,186	0.65%	233.701
2G1	668.450	0.08%	140,256	0.09%	209.822
2G	7,022.190	0.81%	1,424,526	0.96%	202.860
3G1	66.930	0.01%	12,195	0.01%	182.205
3G	40,344.490	4.65%	7,431,274	5.00%	184.195
4G1	280,322.170	32.30%	50,446,400	33.92%	179.958
4G	535,230.940	61.68%	88,320,381	59.38%	165.013
Grass Total	867,793.730	100.00%	148,742,218	100.00%	171.402
Irrigated Total	38,520.560	3.71%	17,119,629	8.57%	444.428
Dry Total	107,569.480	10.37%	32,151,289	16.10%	298.888
Grass Total	867,793.730	83.68%	148,742,218	74.48%	171.402
Waste	15,656.930	1.51%	156,564	0.08%	9.999
Other	7,531.390	0.73%	1,533,810	0.77%	203.655
Exempt	341.120	0.03%			
Market Area Total	1,037,072.090	100.00%	199,703,510	100.00%	192.564
As Related to the (County as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	38,520.560	100.00%	17,119,629	100.00%	
Dry Total	107,569.480	100.00%	32,151,289	100.00%	
Grass Total	867,793.730	100.00%	148,742,218	100.00%	
Waste	15,656.930	100.00%	156,564	100.00%	
Other	7,531.390	100.00%	1,533,810	100.00%	
Exempt	341.120	100.00%			
Market Area Total	1,037,072.090	100.00%	199,703,510	100.00%	

2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 35 - Garden

	Urban		SubUrba	n	Rural			
AgLand	Acres Value		Acres	Value	Acres	Value		
Irrigated	0.000	0	1,762.270	729,339	36,758.290	16,390,290		
Dry	0.000	0	138.500	34,748	107,430.980	32,116,541		
Grass	0.000	0	3,962.020	698,588	863,831.710	148,043,630		
Waste	0.000	0	10.180	102	15,646.750	156,462		
Other	0.000	0	686.000	167,544	6,845.390	1,366,266		
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	341.120	0		
Total	0.000	0	6,558.970	1,630,321	1,030,513.120	198,073,189		

	Tota	ıl				% of	Average
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	Value*	Assessed Value*
Irrigated	38,520.560	17,119,629	38,520.560	3.71%	17,119,629	8.57%	444.428
Dry	107,569.480	32,151,289	107,569.480	10.37%	32,151,289	16.10%	298.888
Grass	867,793.730	148,742,218	867,793.730	83.68%	148,742,218	74.48%	171.402
Waste	15,656.930	156,564	15,656.930	1.51%	156,564	0.08%	9.999
Other	7,531.390	1,533,810	7,531.390	0.73%	1,533,810	0.77%	203.655
Exempt	341.120	0	341.120	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	1,037,072.090	199,703,510	1,037,072.090	100.00%	199,703,510	100.00%	192.564

^{*} Department of Property Assessment & Taxation Calculates

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

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

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." Nebraska 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; (will be changed to 75% in 2007)
- 3) 80% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for (also changed to 75% in 2007) 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 Garden County:

	<u>Parcels</u>	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Base
Residential	982	22.48	11.59
Commercial	163	3.73	2.13
Agricultural	3204	73.35	86.13
Special Value	93	2.13	.15
Mineral	19	.44	.15

Garden County has 1,036,859.99 acres of agricultural land; 3.67% consists of irrigated land, 83.71% consists of grassland, 10.39% is dryland, and 2.23% is waste, etc.

Garden County has a State Game Refuge which lies 210 yards back from the river banks of the North Platte River (NE Statute 37-706). In the northern half of the county lies Crescent Lake National Wildlife. It is a federal refuge consisting of approximately 45,698 acres.

New Property: For assessment year 2006, an estimated 40 building permits and/or information statements and zoning permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

2005 yearly pickup work consisted of over 270 parcels of property; these included newly constructed buildings, removed/deteriorated improvements, updating CRP acreages, and adding newly irrigated land. In April, 2005 we had aerial photos taken on all improvements in the county. We compared these to existing photos to determine any new construction, buildings removed, etc. that had not been reported. Many unreported buildings and changes were then assessed and/or updated.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training:

The Assessor's staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor, and one part time clerk.

We will submit a budget for around \$76,000 (not fully determined yet) for the office and \$30,000 for appraisal work. The assessor and deputy get the required hours of training necessary to retain assessor's certificates.

B. Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos:

The Garden County Cadastral Maps were prepared in the 1940's. The assessor and staff keep ownership current, and all split outs are updated on the maps. We also have aerial photos of all land in the county, and mylar overlays with soil types and acres. These aerials were purchased in 1997 from the Bureau of Land Management in Cheyenne. In March of this year we had aerial photos taken of all improvements in the county.

C. Property Record Cards:

The Garden County Assessor's property record cards are very complete, detailed, and easy to follow. Our records list the legal description of each property, 911 address (situs), cadastral map and aerial photo numbers, pictures of improvements, and assessed summary of current and prior values. The records also have the PAT's six digit school codes on each property card. In addition we have the combination code which includes all districts each parcel pays taxes into (school, county, community college, Natural Resource District, ESU District, Ag Society, Airport Authority, etc.); we also have the school district number, fire district number and cemetery number (i.e. 131F2C2).

Our property record cards have all necessary information to show values, how values were arrived at, and physical, locational and any functional depreciations appropriate for the final values. We have an appraisal book with depreciation tables, cost tables, etc. available for anyone who wishes to view it.

Improvements on our records have the Replacement Cost New, with depreciation applied for the current condition, locations, etc. This reflects the cost approach. The sales approach is shown by the current adjusted valuations. In a rural county like ours, for most properties the income approach is not applicable.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration:

The Garden County Assessor's office has contracted with MIPS/County Solutions for CAMA pricing and an administrative package. This works very well. Currently we do not have GIS.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List and Inventory all property:

The appropriate paperwork for Real Estate Transfers is completed as soon as possible after they are brought to our office by the County Clerk's personnel. Ownership changes, etc. are completed in the computer, on the property record card and folder, in the real estate books, in the cadastral map, on index cards, on a tablet of changes for the Treasurer's office, and on soil mylars if the sale includes agricultural land.

Methods of discovering changes in real estate include county zoning permits, city building permits, information from realtors and appraisers, reports by taxpayers and neighbors, ongoing inspections by staff as we travel throughout the county, and a variety of other sources. New

pivots listed on Personal Property Schedules indicate newly irrigated land. The County Board approved funding for new aerial photos of all improvements this spring.

B. Data Collection:

We perform extensive pickup work each year. Data and information is collected by our appraiser and a staff member or by two staff members.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions:

We monitor sales of each classification of property; sales studies are ongoing, and are used extensively for valuation updates each year. We prepare spread sheets of residential, commercial and agricultural sales each year based on the qualified sales rosters. We also prepare maps with all sales plotted to indicate any potential market areas of value, etc. We run miscellaneous "what-ifs" to determine the most appropriate percentage valuation increases to bring values to the ranges.

D. Approaches to Value:

1) Market Approach: sales comparisons:

As mentioned above we perform extensive sales studies, and the market approach is shown by the current adjusted valuations.

- 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used and date of manual and latest depreciation study: Unless pickup work has been done to a property, the date of the Marshall & Swift manual used on improvements is 1993. However, percentages of valuation adjustments have been applied since that time to keep values current. Our records have the Replacement Cost New of improvements, with depreciation applied for the current condition, location, etc. This reflects the cost approach.
- 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market:; In a rural county like Garden County, for most properties the income approach is not applicable or workable.
- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land: As stated above, we complete extensive sales studies, prepare various spread sheets of sales, plat all sales on a map of the county to indicate any potential areas of market, etc. We also run various "what ifs" using numerous potential changes in values to different classes of land to determine the most equitable and appropriate overall increases in values to achieve the required statistics for levels of values.

D. Reconciliation of Final Value and Documentation:

Our property record cards have all necessary information to show values, how values were arrived at, etc. On improved parcels we have the Replacement Cost New of improvements and physical, locational and any functional depreciations appropriate for the final values. Each file does not contain a correlation section that summarizes the results of each approach to value that has been completed for each parcel. We do not have a copy of these items in every card as suggested by the PAT, because this is simply not possible or sensible. Office space does not allow for additional file cabinets to hold the extra (and unnecessary) paperwork. We do, however, have an appraisal book with depreciation tables, cost tables, etc. easily available for anyone who wish to view it.

E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions:

All assessment actions are taken with the assessment sales ratio studies in mind, to insure that the actions taken result in the proper valuations to meet the required statistics.

F. Notices and Public Relations:

The assessor and staff believe in keeping the public informed of laws and requirements of the office. Articles are put in the paper about homestead exemptions, personal property filing deadlines, valuation changes, budgets of all taxing entities to inform taxpayers where their taxes go, etc.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2006:

		Coefficient of	Price Related
Property Class	<u>Median</u>	<u>Dispersion</u>	Differential
Residential	95	18.74	109.10
Commercial	95	17.40	104.05
Agricultural	76	12.06	99.35
Special Value	76		

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2007:

Residential:

In October of 2006 we hired an outside appraiser, Jerry Knoche, to train our staff and two local people in listing property, and to oversee a county wide reappraisal project. We hired the two local personnel to assist our office in achieving this project. Last fall we started reviewing the residential properties in Oshkosh. We are currently working on this. As soon as Oshkosh is completed, we will begin listing rural properties. When cold weather returns we will start the process in Lewellen, and then Lisco.

Commercial: See above. When we have completed reappraising all residential properties in the county, we will do the same to commercial.

Agricultural Land: As stated earlier, all arm's length sales are very closely studied, and if our stats are out of range for 2007 values will again be adjusted. We will continue to monitor land use changes, new pivots, etc. on personal property schedules, etc. and update land records accordingly.

Special Value: Agland: As with ag land, sales will be monitored. Because we have so few sales of river land in each three year sales period, any changes in value are hard to determine and/or justify.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008:

We will continue taking steps to work on a reappraisal of all residential, commercial and farm improvements as time and money allow. We will also continue to monitor land use changes, sales, etc., and value land accordingly.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

We will continue the above.

Other Functions Preformed by the Assessor's Office, But Not Limited to:

- 1. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership changes
- 2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Real Estate Abstract and Personal Property Abstract
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Land & 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 550 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
- 4. Permissive Exemptions: 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 150 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 record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports ad allocation of ad valorem tax.
- 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 and 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 and/or Appraisal Education attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Anyone currently holding an assessor's certificate is required to obtain a minimum of 60 hours every 4 years.
- 16. Prepare, maintain and update a Garden County Procedures Manual.

Conclusion

The Garden County Assessor and staff strive very diligently to complete all duties and responsibilities required of the office, while doing so within the budget we are allowed. We are attempting to do a reappraisal of the county, but it will be in conjunction with all other duties of the office.

We run an efficient, user-friendly office which both serves the public and obeys the Nebraska Statutes, Regulations, and Directives which we are obligated to follow. I believe we do so in a very appropriate, congenial manner.

Respectfully submitted:		
Janet L. Shaul, Garden County Assessor	Date	

2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Garden 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 Garden County is 74% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Garden 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 Garden County is 74% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Garden 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 Garden County is 74% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Garden 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 Garden County

I. Agricultural Land Value Correlation

In Garden County there are fifty-seven qualified unimproved agricultural sales that are valued as having non-influenced values. The measures of central tendency rounded (median 74%, weighted mean 71%, mean 72%) are similar and offer support for each other. The measures of dispersion will indicate the coefficient of dispersion (12.74%) and the price-related differential (100.15%) to be within the prescribed parameters. 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. Through use of market analysis and market areas the results have created equalization and uniformity within Garden County.

35 - GARDEN COUNTY

PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 1 of 4

	DEN COUNTI		L	PA	<u>& 1 2007 K</u>	<u> </u>	<u>ricultural Statis</u>	<u>sucs</u>			0		
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPRO	VED			7	Гуре: Qualifi	ed		Query: 6046				
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	06 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007			
	NUMBER	of Sales:		57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95% I	Median C.I.: 69.9	9 to 76.01		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	es Price:	6	,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	14.69		. Mean C.I.: 66.7		(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	es Price:	6	,358,745	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.45			75 to 75.38	(** ***********************************	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value:	4	,543,638									
	AVG. Adj. Sal	es Price:		111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46					
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:		79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02/	/2007 20:35:52	
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	2	73.44	73.44	74.78	2.9	7 98.20	71.26	75.62	N/A	182,012	136,117	
10/01/03	TO 12/31/03	9	74.58	72.17	72.98	9.3	0 98.90	49.22	88.16	65.66 to 76.98	43,456	31,714	
01/01/04	TO 03/31/04	7	71.73	73.97	72.71	5.5	8 101.73	67.70	80.28	67.70 to 80.28	79,876	58,078	
04/01/04	TO 06/30/04	6	72.14	64.85	63.24	22.3	7 102.53	12.55	94.66	12.55 to 94.66	100,286	63,425	
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04	4	72.24	68.25	68.49	14.8	0 99.65	48.44	80.08	N/A	132,243	90,571	
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04	2	90.70	90.70	87.32	9.7	9 103.87	81.82	99.58	N/A	33,487	29,241	
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05	2	95.34	95.34	87.43	8.5	2 109.05	87.22	103.46	N/A	301,741	263,802	
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	3	78.50	77.22	77.83	6.7	5 99.23	68.64	84.53	N/A	179,395	139,615	
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	3	68.87	60.22	56.71	18.5	0 106.19	36.79	75.01	N/A	112,249	63,661	
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	4	69.21	63.38	70.70	15.9	4 89.65	39.68	75.44	N/A	154,000	108,874	
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	7	74.26	73.10	73.58	6.8	0 99.36	62.50	84.16	62.50 to 84.16	147,140	108,258	
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	8	68.57	69.14	61.93	13.0	1 111.66	46.09	87.51	46.09 to 87.51	90,302	55,920	
Stu	dy Years												
07/01/03	TO 06/30/04	24	74.01	70.97	70.19	10.9	5 101.12	12.55	94.66	69.99 to 76.97	79,832	56,031	
07/01/04	TO 06/30/05	11	80.08	79.70	78.68	13.2		48.44	103.46	66.67 to 99.58	157,965	124,292	
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	22	71.43	68.14	67.71	12.9	8 100.63	36.79	87.51	64.34 to 75.44	122,961	83,257	
Cale	endar Yrs												
	TO 12/31/04	19	74.13	71.64	68.75	14.4		12.55	99.58	67.70 to 80.08	92,463	63,572	
	TO 12/31/05	12	74.20	71.38	75.10	17.0	5 95.04	36.79	103.46	65.02 to 84.53	174,534	131,077	
ALL													

57

74.16

71.56

71.45

12.74

100.15

12.55

103.46 69.99 to 76.01

111,556

79,712

Base Stat PAGE:2 of 4 PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics 35 - GARDEN COUNTY

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED			PA			riculturai Stati	SUCS	Query: 6046				
AGRICULT	CURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifi			~ ,				
					Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	0/2007			
	NUMBER of Sales		57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95%	Median C.I.: 69.99	9 to 76.01		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	: 6	5,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	14.69	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 66.73	3 to 76.18	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price		5,358,745	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.45	95	% Mean C.I.: 67.	75 to 75.38		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 4	1,543,638									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46					
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02/	/2007 20:35:52	
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	
1637	1	63.43	63.43	63.43			63.43	63.43	N/A	169,600	107,576	
1639	1	87.22	87.22	87.22			87.22	87.22	N/A	595,700	519,553	
1693	1	84.53	84.53	84.53			84.53	84.53	N/A	257,827	217,954	
1975	1	94.66	94.66	94.66			94.66	94.66	N/A	85,300	80,741	
2201	1	67.70	67.70	67.70			67.70	67.70	N/A	158,957	107,613	
2207	1	46.09	46.09	46.09			46.09	46.09	N/A	225,000	103,705	
2259	2	69.40	69.40	69.03	1.0	9 100.52	68.64	70.15	N/A	131,347	90,673	
2261	1	88.16	88.16	88.16			88.16	88.16	N/A	21,600	19,042	
2263	1	64.34	64.34	64.34			64.34	64.34	N/A	250,000	160,849	
2491	3	71.32	70.73	68.86	3.2	2 102.73	67.00	73.88	N/A	98,143	67,578	
2493	5	74.26	62.67	62.03	18.0	6 101.04	36.79	78.50	N/A	94,833	58,821	
2495	2	81.57	81.57	76.38	7.2	9 106.79	75.62	87.51	N/A	157,012	119,927	
2551	13	75.01	75.75	73.48	8.0	6 103.09	60.14	103.46	69.47 to 79.47	92,693	68,110	
2553	1	65.02	65.02	65.02			65.02	65.02	N/A	165,677	107,719	
2555	1	12.55	12.55	12.55			12.55	12.55	N/A	101,000	12,680	
2557	3	48.44	52.70	54.06	20.8	6 97.48	39.68	69.99	N/A	67,333	36,402	
2783	1	76.01	76.01	76.01			76.01	76.01	N/A	33,417	25,400	
2785	7	75.44	76.79	73.65	9.2	3 104.26	62.50	99.58	62.50 to 99.58	85,597	63,045	
2787	5	71.26	71.77	72.85	5.9	5 98.52	65.66	80.28	N/A	54,664	39,822	
2789	3	76.97	78.45	80.64	4.3	0 97.28	74.22	84.16	N/A	136,566	110,128	
2791	3	77.81	75.76	75.85	6.0	7 99.89	67.66	81.82	N/A	86,712	65,768	
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712	
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	
(blank)	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712	
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712	
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	& IOL	ь							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712	
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712	

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics 35 - GARDEN COUNTY

PAGE:3 of 4

AGRICULI	URAL UNIMP	ROVED		Type: Qualified Query: 6046										
						• •	eu ge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	06 Posted 1	Before: 01/19	/2007	٠ ،			
	NIIMRI	ER of Sales	:	57	MEDIAN:	`								
(AgLand)		Sales Price		5,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	74 71	COV:	20.53		Median C.I.: 69.99		(A. I. A. N. 1. N.		
(AgLand)		Sales Price		5,358,745	MEAN:	72	STD:	14.69	_	. Mean C.I.: 66.73		(!: land+NAT=0)		
(AgLand)	_	essed Value		1,543,638	PILEAIN •	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.45	95	% Mean C.I.: 67.	75 to 75.38			
(rigidalid)		Sales Price		111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46						
	_	essed Value		79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02/	/2007 20:35:52		
SCHOOL	DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)														
25-0025		2	79.82	79.82	78.77	2.51	101.32	77.81	81.82	N/A	95,818	75,479		
25-0095														
35-0001		55	74.13	71.26	71.23	12.93	3 100.05	12.55	103.46	69.47 to 75.62	112,129	79,866		
NonValid														
ALL														
		57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.74	100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
ACRES I	N SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	00 00	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
10.01		1	39.68	39.68	39.68	0.05	102.00	39.68	39.68	N/A	18,000	7,143		
30.01		2	95.49	95.49	91.97	8.35		87.51	103.46	N/A	13,891	12,776		
50.01		11 16	73.88 74.18	66.99 73.07	54.48 72.80	21.68 6.23		12.55 60.14	99.58 81.82	48.44 to 88.16 69.99 to 77.27	44,459 61,985	24,221 45,125		
180.01		7	74.16	69.53	67.92	11.28		36.79	80.08	36.79 to 80.08	110,620	75,131		
330.01		14	71.43	71.32	70.01	11.31		46.09	94.66	64.34 to 77.81	168,807	118,179		
650.01		6	74.94	76.21	79.20	8.33		67.00	87.22	67.00 to 87.22	282,416	223,679		
ALL		-							*		,			
		57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.74	100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE	> 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
DRY		22	74.19	74.12	74.89	5.91	l 98.96	62.50	84.16	70.15 to 77.81	83,020	62,176		
DRY-N/A		10	77.12	77.77	74.06	11.35	5 105.01	60.14	99.58	66.67 to 88.16	69,237	51,275		
GRASS		11	73.88	73.60	73.58	16.32	100.03	36.79	103.46	63.43 to 94.66	159,399	117,288		
GRASS-N/	A	11	75.01	66.09	69.90	15.37	7 94.55	12.55	84.53	49.22 to 78.50	156,321	109,264		
IRRGTD		1	48.44	48.44	48.44			48.44	48.44	N/A	124,000	60,070		
IRRGTD-N		2	42.89	42.89	45.62	7.47	7 94.01	39.68	46.09	N/A	121,500	55,424		
ALL														
		57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.74	100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
	Y LAND USE		MEDIAN	MELAN	MOD MEAN	COL	מתת	MIN	147.37	OF Wadian C T	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.				
DRY DRY-N/A		25 7	76.01 71.32	75.81 73.28	75.41 71.93	7.20 9.63		62.50 60.14	99.58 87.51	71.73 to 77.81 60.14 to 87.51	79,100 77,330	59,650 55,624		
GRASS		16	74.07	72.56	74.19	14.99		36.79	103.46	65.02 to 84.53	162,458	120,529		
GRASS-N/	A	6	72.39	62.60	64.52	19.08		12.55	78.50	12.55 to 78.50	145,597	93,933		
IRRGTD	· ·	3	46.09	44.74	46.57	6.34		39.68	48.44	N/A	122,333	56,972		
ALL		3	10.00	11.,1	10.07	3.3.	_		10.11	21, 22	122,333	30,272		
		 57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.74	100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
		<i>5.</i>		, 1, 50		,	_ 50.25	55			111,000	, , , , , , , ,		

Base Stat PA&T 2007 R&O Agricultural Statistics PAGE:4 of 4 35 - GARDEN COUNTY

Ouerv: 6046

AGRICULT	URAL (NIMPROV	VED				Type: Qualific	Query: 6046					
								nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
		NUMBER	of Sales	:	57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95%	Median C.I.: 69.9	9 to 76.01	
(AgLand)	T	OTAL Sal	es Price	: 6	,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	14.69		. Mean C.I.: 66.7		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL	Adj.Sal	es Price	: 6	,358,745	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.45			75 to 75.38	(unu+11/11-0)
(AgLand)	TOTA	L Assess	ed Value	: 4	,543,638			1100.1125.22	J. 13			75 60 75.50	
-	AVG.	Adj. Sal	es Price	:	111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46				
	AVG	. Assess	ed Value	:	79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02/	/2007 20:35:52
MAJORIT	Y LAND	USE >	50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY			32	75.12	75.26	74.66	7.8	100.80	60.14	99.58	71.26 to 77.81	78,713	58,770
GRASS			22	74.07	69.85	71.76	15.9	97.34	12.55	103.46	65.02 to 75.62	157,860	113,276
IRRGTD			3	46.09	44.74	46.57	6.3	96.06	39.68	48.44	N/A	122,333	56,972
ALL_													
			57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	14 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712
SALE PR	ICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	XAM	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$												
5000 T	0	9999	1	103.46	103.46	103.46			103.46	103.46	N/A	7,782	8,051
Tota	al \$												
1 5	ТО	9999	1	103.46	103.46	103.46			103.46	103.46	N/A	7,782	8,051
10000 5	ТО	29999	5	87.51	77.76	78.89	16.9	98.57	39.68	99.58	N/A	19,906	15,703
30000	TO	59999	10	75.30	70.81	70.93	9.8	99.84	49.22	81.82	60.14 to 79.27	39,450	27,980
60000	TO	99999	16	74.18	74.67	74.86	6.5	99.75	62.50	94.66	70.15 to 78.50	71,850	53,788
100000	TO 1	49999	10	69.17	61.18	61.48	20.9	99.51	12.55	80.08	36.79 to 77.81	121,308	74,584
150000 5	TO 2	149999	10	68.17	68.71	68.54	10.0	100.24	46.09	84.16	63.43 to 75.44	182,768	125,266
250000 5	TO 4	99999	4	74.51	74.47	74.57	7.5	99.86	64.34	84.53	N/A	267,713	199,646
500000 -	+		1	87.22	87.22	87.22			87.22	87.22	N/A	595,700	519,553
ALL													
			57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712
ASSESSEI	D VALU	E *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lot													
5000 T		9999	2	71.57	71.57	58.93	44.5	121.44	39.68	103.46	N/A	12,891	7,597
	al \$												
1 :		9999	2	71.57	71.57	58.93	44.5		39.68	103.46	N/A	12,891	7,597
10000		29999	12	75.30	70.88	59.69	18.1		12.55	99.58	65.66 to 87.51	35,421	21,141
30000		59999	16	72.93	70.71	68.02	9.5		36.79	81.82	67.66 to 77.27	68,454	46,560
60000 5		99999	11	74.16	73.10	72.11	9.8		48.44	94.66	66.67 to 80.08	106,635	76,893
100000 7		.49999	10	68.17	68.07	67.21	9.1		46.09	77.81	63.43 to 75.44	173,851	116,837
150000 5		149999	5	75.62	76.41	76.30	8.1	.9 100.14	64.34	84.53	N/A	261,087	199,203
500000 -			1	87.22	87.22	87.22			87.22	87.22	N/A	595,700	519,553
ALL													
			57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712

SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION For Garden County

II. Special Value Correlation

Only a small portion of Garden County is affected by special value (and primarily the area bordering the North Platte 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 Garden County is equal to uninfluenced agricultural level of value.

PAGE: 1 of 4

PAGE: 1 of 4

DEN COUNTY			F	PA&L 2007 Special value Statistics								
URAL UNIMPRO	OVED	,	_					<u>,</u>		Query: 6046		
							06 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007			
NUMBER	of Sales	:	57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95%	Median C.I.: 69.9	9 to 76.01		
TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 6	,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71						(!: land+NAT=0)	
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 6	5,358,745	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.45				(** ***********************************	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 4	1,543,638									
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46					
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02/	′2007 20:05:29	
SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
rs												
TO 09/30/03	2	73.44	73.44	74.78	2.9	7 98.20	71.26	75.62	N/A	182,012	136,117	
TO 12/31/03	9	74.58	72.17	72.98	9.3	0 98.90	49.22	88.16	65.66 to 76.98	43,456	31,714	
TO 03/31/04	7	71.73	73.97	72.71	5.5	8 101.73	67.70	80.28	67.70 to 80.28	79,876	58,078	
TO 06/30/04	6	72.14	64.85	63.24	22.3	7 102.53	12.55	94.66	12.55 to 94.66	100,286	63,425	
TO 09/30/04	4	72.24	68.25	68.49	14.8	0 99.65	48.44	80.08	N/A	132,243	90,571	
TO 12/31/04	2	90.70	90.70	87.32	9.7	9 103.87	81.82	99.58	N/A	33,487	29,241	
TO 03/31/05	2	95.34	95.34	87.43	8.5	2 109.05	87.22	103.46	N/A	301,741	263,802	
TO 06/30/05	3	78.50	77.22	77.83	6.7	5 99.23	68.64	84.53	N/A	179,395	139,615	
TO 09/30/05	3	68.87	60.22	56.71	18.5	0 106.19	36.79	75.01	N/A	112,249	63,661	
TO 12/31/05	4	69.21	63.38	70.70	15.9	4 89.65	39.68	75.44	N/A	154,000	108,874	
TO 03/31/06	7	74.26	73.10	73.58	6.8	0 99.36	62.50	84.16	62.50 to 84.16	147,140	108,258	
TO 06/30/06	8	68.57	69.14	61.93	13.0	1 111.66	46.09	87.51	46.09 to 87.51	90,302	55,920	
dy Years												
TO 06/30/04	24	74.01	70.97	70.19	10.9	5 101.12	12.55	94.66	69.99 to 76.97	79,832	56,031	
TO 06/30/05	11	80.08	79.70	78.68	13.2	3 101.30	48.44	103.46	66.67 to 99.58	157,965	124,292	
TO 06/30/06	22	71.43	68.14	67.71	12.9	8 100.63	36.79	87.51	64.34 to 75.44	122,961	83,257	
endar Yrs												
TO 12/31/04	19	74.13	71.64	68.75	14.4	2 104.20	12.55	99.58	67.70 to 80.08	92,463	63,572	
TO 12/31/05	12	74.20	71.38	75.10	17.0	5 95.04	36.79	103.46	65.02 to 84.53	174,534	131,077	
	NUMBER TOTAL Sa TOTAL Adj.Sa TOTAL Asses AVG. Adj. Sa AVG. Asses SALE * TO 09/30/03 TO 12/31/03 TO 03/31/04 TO 06/30/04 TO 09/30/05 TO 09/30/05 TO 09/30/05 TO 09/30/05 TO 03/31/06 TO 06/30/06 dy Years TO 06/30/06 endar Yrs TO 12/31/04	NUMBER of Sales TOTAL Sales Price TOTAL Adj.Sales Price TOTAL Assessed Value AVG. Adj. Sales Price AVG. Assessed Value SALE * COUNT TO 09/30/03 2 TO 12/31/03 9 TO 03/31/04 7 TO 06/30/04 6 TO 09/30/05 3 TO 12/31/05 2 TO 09/30/05 3 TO 09/30/05 3 TO 09/30/05 3 TO 09/30/06 8 TO 03/31/06 7 TO 06/30/06 8 TO 06/30/06 8 TO 06/30/06 22	NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value: SALE * COUNT MEDIAN TO 09/30/03 2 73.44 TO 12/31/03 9 74.58 TO 03/31/04 7 71.73 TO 06/30/04 6 72.14 TO 09/30/05 2 95.34 TO 12/31/05 2 95.34 TO 03/31/05 2 95.34 TO 03/31/05 2 95.34 TO 06/30/05 3 78.50 TO 09/30/05 3 68.87 TO 12/31/05 4 69.21 TO 03/31/06 7 74.26 TO 06/30/06 8 68.57 TO 12/31/05 11 80.08 TO 06/30/06 22 71.43 TO 06/30/06 22 71.43	NUMBER of Sales: 57 TOTAL Sales Price: 6,436,905 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 6,358,745 TOTAL Assessed Value: 4,543,638 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 111,556 AVG. Assessed Value: 79,712 SALE * COUNT MEDIAN MEAN TO 09/30/03 2 73.44 73.44 TO 12/31/03 9 74.58 72.17 TO 03/31/04 7 71.73 73.97 TO 06/30/04 6 72.14 64.85 TO 09/30/04 4 72.24 68.25 TO 12/31/04 2 90.70 90.70 TO 03/31/05 2 95.34 95.34 TO 06/30/05 3 78.50 77.22 TO 09/30/05 3 68.87 60.22 TO 12/31/05 4 69.21 63.38 TO 03/31/06 7 74.26 73.10 TO 03/31/06 7 74.26 73.10 TO 06/30/06 8 68.57 69.14 dry Years TO 06/30/06 11 80.08 79.70 TO 06/30/06 22 71.43 68.14 endar Yrs TO 12/31/04 19 74.13 71.64	NUMBER of Sales: 57 MEDIAN: TOTAL Sales Price: 6,436,905 MEAN: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 6,358,745 MEAN: TOTAL Assessed Value: 4,543,638 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 111,556 COD: AVG. Assessed Value: 79,712 PRD: SALE * COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN TO 09/30/03 2 73.44 73.44 74.78 TO 12/31/03 9 74.58 72.17 72.98 TO 03/31/04 7 71.73 73.97 72.71 TO 06/30/04 6 72.14 64.85 63.24 TO 09/30/04 4 72.24 68.25 68.49 TO 12/31/04 2 90.70 90.70 87.32 TO 03/31/05 2 95.34 95.34 87.43 TO 06/30/05 3 78.50 77.22 77.83 TO 09/30/05 3 68.87 60.22 56.71 TO 12/31/05 4 69.21 63.38 70.70 TO 03/31/06 7 74.26 73.10 73.58 TO 09/30/06 8 68.57 69.14 61.93 day Years TO 06/30/06 1 80.08 79.70 70.19 TO 06/30/05 11 80.08 79.70 78.68 TO 06/30/06 22 71.43 68.14 67.71 endar Yrs TO 12/31/04 19 74.13 71.64 68.75	NUMBER of Sales 57 MEDIAN 74 TOTAL Sales Price 6,436,905 WGT MEAN 71 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price 6,358,745 MEAN 72 TOTAL Assessed Value 4,543,638 AVG. Adj. Sales Price 111,556 COD 12.74 AVG. Assessed Value 79,712 PRD 100.15 SALE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT MEAN CO TO 09/30/03 2 73.44 73.44 74.78 2.9 TO 12/31/03 9 74.58 72.17 72.98 9.3 TO 09/30/04 6 72.14 64.85 63.24 22.3 TO 09/30/05 3 78.50 77.22 77.83 6.7 TO 09/30/05 3 78.50 77.22 77.83 6.7 TO 09/30/05 3 68.87 60.22 56.71 18.5 TO 09/30/06 8 68.57 69.14 61.93 13.0 TO 03/31/06 7 74.26 73.10 73.58 6.8 TO 03/31/06 7 74.26 73.10 73.58 6.8 TO 06/30/06 8 68.57 69.14 61.93 13.0 TO 06/30/06 22 71.43 68.14 67.71 12.9 Endar Yrs TO 06/30/06 22 71.43 68.14 67.71 12.9 TO 12/31/04 19 74.13 71.64 68.75 14.4	NUMBER of Sales: 57 MEDIAN: 74 COV:	NUMBER of Sales	Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Refere: 01/19	NUMBER of Sal=s 57	The proper The proper The proper The proper The property The property	

__ALL____

57

74.16

71.56

71.45

12.74

100.15

12.55

103.46 69.99 to 76.01

111,556

79,712

Base Stat PAGE:2 of 4 PA &T 2007 Special Value Statistics 35 - GARDEN COUNTY

35 - GAR	RDEN COUNTY		PA&T 2007 Special Value Statistics										
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifi				Query: 6046				
						age: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007				
	NUMBER of Sales	:	57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95% 1	Median C.I.: 69.9	9 to 76.01			
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	:	6,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	14.69		. Mean C.I.: 66.7		(!: land+NAT=0)		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	6,358,745	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.45			75 to 75.38	(<i>unu</i> 111211 =0)		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	4,543,638			1100.1100.011	J. 13		07.	75 60 75.50			
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46						
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:05:29		
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		
1637	1	63.43	63.43	63.43			63.43	63.43	N/A	169,600	107,576		
1639	1	87.22	87.22	87.22			87.22	87.22	N/A	595,700	519,553		
1693	1	84.53	84.53	84.53			84.53	84.53	N/A	257,827	217,954		
1975	1	94.66	94.66	94.66			94.66	94.66	N/A	85,300	80,741		
2201	1	67.70		67.70			67.70	67.70	N/A	158,957	107,613		
2207	1	46.09	46.09	46.09			46.09	46.09	N/A	225,000	103,705		
2259	2	69.40	69.40	69.03	1.0	9 100.52	68.64	70.15	N/A	131,347	90,673		
2261	1	88.16	88.16	88.16			88.16	88.16	N/A	21,600	19,042		
2263	1	64.34		64.34			64.34	64.34	N/A	250,000	160,849		
2491	3	71.32		68.86	3.2	2 102.73	67.00	73.88	N/A	98,143	67,578		
2493	5	74.26		62.03	18.0		36.79	78.50	N/A	94,833	58,821		
2495	2	81.57		76.38	7.2		75.62	87.51	N/A	157,012	119,927		
2551	13	75.01		73.48	8.0		60.14	103.46	69.47 to 79.47	92,693	68,110		
2553	1	65.02	65.02	65.02			65.02	65.02	N/A	165,677	107,719		
2555	1	12.55	12.55	12.55			12.55	12.55	N/A	101,000	12,680		
2557	3	48.44		54.06	20.8	6 97.48	39.68	69.99	N/A	67,333	36,402		
2783	1	76.01		76.01			76.01	76.01	N/A	33,417	25,400		
2785	7	75.44	76.79	73.65	9.2	3 104.26	62.50	99.58	62.50 to 99.58	85,597	63,045		
2787	5	71.26		72.85	5.9		65.66	80.28	N/A	54,664	39,822		
2789	3	76.97		80.64	4.3		74.22	84.16	N/A	136,566	110,128		
2791	3	77.81		75.85	6.0		67.66	81.82	N/A	86,712	65,768		
ALL													
	 57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
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		
(blank)	57	74.16		71.45	12.7		12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
ALL										•			
	 57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	D & IOI	LL							Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
2	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76.01	111,556	79,712		
ALL													

100.15

12.55

103.46 69.99 to 76.01

12.74

79,712

111,556

74.16

57

71.56

71.45

35 - GARDEN COUNTY PA&T 2007 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

35 - GARDEN COUNTY			I	PA&T 2007	⁷ Specia	l Value Statisti	Base S	tat		PAGE:3 OF 4		
AGRICULTURAL UNIMP	ROVED				Type: Qualifi			Query: 6046				
				Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007								
NUMB.	ER of Sales	:	57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95%	Median C.I.:	69.99 to 76.01		
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Pric		:	6,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	14.69			66.73 to 76.18	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.	Sales Price	:	6,358,745 MEAN:		72	ПО.			% Mean C.I.:	67.75 to 75.38	(:. tana+11A1=0)	
-	essed Value	:	4,543,638			1100.1100.000	9.45			07.75 60 75.50		
_	Sales Price	:	111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46					
AVG. Ass	essed Value	:	79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02	/2007 20:05:29	
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
25-0025	2	79.82	79.82	78.77	2.5	101.32	77.81	81.82	N/A	95,818	75,479	
25-0095												
35-0001	55	74.13	71.26	71.23	12.9	3 100.05	12.55	103.46	69.47 to 75	.62 112,129	79,866	
NonValid School												
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76	.01 111,556	79,712	
ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
10.01 TO 30.00	1	39.68	39.68	39.68			39.68	39.68	N/A	18,000	7,143	
30.01 TO 50.00	2	95.49	95.49	91.97	8.3	103.82	87.51	103.46	N/A	13,891	12,776	
50.01 TO 100.00	11	73.88	66.99	54.48	21.6	122.96	12.55	99.58	48.44 to 88	.16 44,459	24,221	
100.01 TO 180.00	16	74.18	73.07	72.80	6.2	100.37	60.14	81.82	69.99 to 77	.27 61,985	45,125	
180.01 TO 330.00	7	74.16	69.53	67.92	11.2	102.37	36.79	80.08	36.79 to 80		75,131	
330.01 TO 650.00	14	71.43	71.32	70.01	11.3	101.88	46.09	94.66	64.34 to 77	.81 168,807	118,179	
650.01 +	6	74.94	76.21	79.20	8.3	96.22	67.00	87.22	67.00 to 87	.22 282,416	223,679	
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76	.01 111,556	79,712	
MAJORITY LAND USE	> 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	22	74.19	74.12	74.89	5.9	98.96	62.50	84.16	70.15 to 77	.81 83,020	62,176	
DRY-N/A	10	77.12	77.77	74.06	11.3	105.01	60.14	99.58	66.67 to 88	.16 69,237	51,275	
GRASS	11	73.88	73.60	73.58	16.3	100.03	36.79	103.46	63.43 to 94	.66 159,399	117,288	
GRASS-N/A	11	75.01	66.09	69.90	15.3	94.55	12.55	84.53	49.22 to 78	.50 156,321	109,264	
IRRGTD	1	48.44	48.44	48.44			48.44	48.44	N/A	124,000	60,070	
IRRGTD-N/A	2	42.89	42.89	45.62	7.4	94.01	39.68	46.09	N/A	121,500	55,424	
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76	.01 111,556	79,712	
MAJORITY LAND USE	> 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	25	76.01	75.81	75.41	7.2	100.53	62.50	99.58	71.73 to 77	.81 79,100	59,650	
DRY-N/A	7	71.32	73.28	71.93	9.6	101.88	60.14	87.51	60.14 to 87		55,624	
GRASS	16	74.07	72.56	74.19	14.9	97.81	36.79	103.46	65.02 to 84	.53 162,458	120,529	
GRASS-N/A	6	72.39	62.60	64.52	19.0		12.55	78.50	12.55 to 78		93,933	
IRRGTD	3	46.09	44.74	46.57	6.3		39.68	48.44	N/A	122,333	56,972	
ALL												
	57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	4 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76	.01 111,556	79,712	

Base Stat PAGE:4 of 4 GARDEN COUNTY

57

74.16

71.56

71.45

35 - GAR	DEN COUNTY			PA&T 2007 Special Value Statistics Base Stat									
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPR	OVED			Query: 6046								
						Type: Qualifi Date Raı	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007			
	NUMBE.	R of Sales	3:	57	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	20.53	95%	Median C.I.:	69.99 to 76.01		
(AgLand)	TOTAL S	ales Price	e:	6,436,905	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:				66.73 to 76.18	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.S	ales Price	e:	6,358,745	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:			% Mean C.I.:	67.75 to 75.38	(<i>unu</i> 114211 =0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asse	ssed Value	e:	4,543,638			11,01120121	,,,,			07.75 00 75.50		
	AVG. Adj. S	ales Price	e:	111,556	COD:	12.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.46					
	AVG. Asse	ssed Value	:	79,712	PRD:	100.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.55			Printed: 04/02/	2007 20:05:29	
MAJORITY	LAND USE :	> 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY		32	75.12	75.26	74.66	7.8	38 100.80	60.14	99.58	71.26 to 77	.81 78,713	58,770	
GRASS		22	74.07	69.85	71.76	15.9	99 97.34	12.55	103.46	65.02 to 75	.62 157,860	113,276	
IRRGTD		3	46.09	44.74	46.57	6.3	96.06	39.68	48.44	N/A	122,333	56,972	
ALL_													
		57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	74 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76	.01 111,556	79,712	
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
Lov	v \$												
5000 TC	9999	1	103.46	103.46	103.46			103.46	103.46	N/A	7,782	8,051	
Tota	al \$												
1 7	0 9999	1	103.46	103.46	103.46			103.46	103.46	N/A	7,782	8,051	
10000 7	ro 29999	5	87.51	77.76	78.89	16.9	98.57	39.68	99.58	N/A	19,906	15,703	
30000	59999	10	75.30	70.81	70.93	9.8	99.84	49.22	81.82	60.14 to 79	.27 39,450	27,980	
60000 1	0 99999	16	74.18	74.67	74.86	6.5	99.75	62.50	94.66	70.15 to 78	.50 71,850	53,788	
100000 7	ro 149999	10	69.17	61.18	61.48	20.9	99.51	12.55	80.08	36.79 to 77	.81 121,308	74,584	
150000 T	ro 249999	10	68.17	68.71	68.54	10.0	100.24	46.09	84.16	63.43 to 75	.44 182,768	125,266	
250000 1	ro 499999	4	74.51	74.47	74.57	7.5	99.86	64.34	84.53	N/A	267,713	199,646	
500000 +	+	1	87.22	87.22	87.22			87.22	87.22	N/A	595,700	519,553	
ALL_													
		57	74.16	71.56	71.45	12.7	74 100.15	12.55	103.46	69.99 to 76	.01 111,556	79,712	
ASSESSEI	VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low	v \$												
5000 TC	9999	2	71.57	71.57	58.93	44.5	121.44	39.68	103.46	N/A	12,891	7,597	
Tota	al \$												
1 7	0 9999	2	71.57	71.57	58.93	44.5	121.44	39.68	103.46	N/A	12,891	7,597	
10000 7	29999	12	75.30	70.88	59.69	18.1	118.75	12.55	99.58	65.66 to 87	.51 35,421	21,141	
30000	ro 59999	16	72.93	70.71	68.02	9.5	103.95	36.79	81.82	67.66 to 77	.27 68,454	46,560	
60000 T	0 99999	11	74.16	73.10	72.11	9.8	36 101.38	48.44	94.66	66.67 to 80	.08 106,635	76,893	
100000 T	ro 149999	10	68.17	68.07	67.21	9.1	101.29	46.09	77.81	63.43 to 75	.44 173,851	116,837	
150000 T	ro 249999	5	75.62	76.41	76.30	8.1	100.14	64.34	84.53	N/A	261,087	199,203	
500000 +	+	1	87.22	87.22	87.22			87.22	87.22	N/A	595,700	519,553	
ALL_													
_													

100.15

12.55

103.46 69.99 to 76.01

111,556

79,712

12.74

SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION For Garden County

III. Recapture Value Correlation

There was 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.

35 - GARDEN COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				PA&T 2007 Recapture Value Statistics Base Stat								Query: 6046	PAGE:1 of	
AGRICOLIO	NAMI GIVINI KO	VED		Type: Qualified Query. 604 Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007										
	NIIMBED	of Sales	•	1	MEDIAN:	101	-8							
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal			222,346	WGT. MEAN:	101		COV:	0.00		Median C.I.:	N/A	// 1 1 N// TO	
	TOTAL Adj.Sal			222,346	MEAN:	101		STD:	0.00		. Mean C.I.:	N/A	(!: land+NAT=	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess			224,190	MEAN.	101		AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95	% Mean C.I.:	N/A		
	AVG. Adj. Sal				COD:	0.00	MAV	Sales Ratio:	100.83					
•	AVG. AGJ. Sal			222,346 224,190	COD: PRD:	100.00		Sales Ratio:	100.83			Deinter J. 04/00	10007 10 22 4	
DATE OF S		eu value	•	224,190	PRD:	100.00	MITIN	Sales Ratio:	100.83			Avg. Adj.	2/2007 19:23:4 Avg.	
RANGE	SALE "	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	ח	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
	s	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGI. MEAN	CO.	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	bare fried	noba vai	
	TO 09/30/03													
	TO 12/31/03													
	TO 03/31/04													
	TO 06/30/04													
	TO 09/30/04													
	TO 12/31/04													
	TO 03/31/05													
	TO 06/30/05													
	TO 09/30/05													
	TO 12/31/05													
	TO 03/31/06													
	TO 06/30/06	1	100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
	y Years	_	200.03	100.03	200.03				100.00	100.03	21, 22	222,313	221,25	
	TO 06/30/04													
	TO 06/30/05													
	TO 06/30/06	1	100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,19	
	ndar Yrs										,	,	,	
	TO 12/31/04													
	TO 12/31/05													
ALL	, , , , , , ,													
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
GEO CODE	/ TOWNSHIP										<u> </u>	Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2553		1	100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
ALL												•	•	
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
AREA (MAI	RKET)										<u> </u>	Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	-	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)			100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
ALL												•		
	_	1	100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
STATUS: 1	IMPROVED, UN											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2			100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	
ALL												•		
			100.83	100.83	100.83				100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190	

35 - GARDEN COUNTY				PA		PAGE:2 of 3								
AGRICULTU	JRAL UNIMPRO	VED		1 1.	&T 2007	Query: 6046								
				Type: Qualified Query. 0040 Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007										
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	1	MEDIAN:	101				Median C.I.:	27 / 2			
(AgLand)		les Price		222,346 WGT. MEAN: 101		COV:				N/A	(I. 1 I. MAT. 0)			
	TOTAL Adj.Sal			222,346	MEAN:	101	STD:	0.00		. Mean C.I.:	N/A	(!: land+NAT=0)		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess			224,190	PIEAN ·	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:		N/A			
	AVG. Adj. Sai			222,346	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.83						
						100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	100.83			Duinted 04/00	/2007 10, 22, 40		
CCHOOT D	AVG. Assessed Value: SCHOOL DISTRICT *		*	224,190	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio.	100.03			Avg. Adj.	/2007 19:23:40 Avg.		
RANGE	ISIRICI "	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGI. MEAN	CC	סט פאס	MIN	MAA	95% Median C.I.	baic filec	ABBQ VQI		
25-0025														
25-0025														
35-0001		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
NonValid	School	_	100.03	100.03	100.03			100.03	100.03	14/11	222,510	221,170		
ALL_	BCHOOL													
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
ACRES IN	SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
	O 180.00	1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
ALL_														
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
MAJORITY	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		
GRASS-N/A	L	1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	00.83 N/A	222,346	224,190		
ALL_														
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
GRASS-N/A	L	1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
ALL_														
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
MAJORITY	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		
GRASS-N/A	L	1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
ALL_														
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
	\$													
Tota														
150000 T		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		
ALL_		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			100.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190		

	DEN COUNTY URAL UNIMPROV	ED		PA	&T 2007 I	Recaptu Type: Qualifi		Base S	tat	PAGE: 3 of 3 Query: 6046			
						2007							
	NUMBER o	of Sales	:	1	MEDIAN:	101		cov:	0.00	95% 1	Median C.I.:	N/A	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sale	es Price	:	222,346	WGT. MEAN:	101		STD:	0.00	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.:	N/A	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sale	es Price	:	222,346	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS		0.00		% Mean C.I.:	N/A	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assesse	ed Value	:	224,190								,	
	AVG. Adj. Sale	es Price	:	222,346	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales R	tio:	100.83				
	AVG. Assesse	ed Value	:	224,190	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales R	itio:	100.83			Printed: 04/02.	/2007 19:23:40
ASSESSED	VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PF	D	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$												
Tota	1 \$												
150000 T	'O 249999	1	100.83	100.83	100.83			1	00.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190
ALL													
		1	100.83	100.83	100.83			1	00.83	100.83	N/A	222,346	224,190

Janet L. Shaul GARDEN COUNTY ASSESSOR Oshkosh, NE 69154 308-772-4464 gcasr@earthlink.net

February 28, 2007

Catherine Lang NE Dept. of Property Assessment and Taxation 1033 O St., Suite 600 Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Ms Lang:

Below is information regarding the procedures and methodologies used in Garden County to implement special valuation on qualified parcels of agricultural and horticultural land (per PAT Regulation-11-005.04).

1. Methodology for determining special valuation of agricultural land (uninfluenced value).

The 2007 ag land valuations were determined by using the compilation and statistics received from the PAT of all ag sales deemed qualified in the required three-year sales period, the number of acres in each classification of land that sold, and the median of market value of each classification (at approximately 75%). Because the sales do not indicate any specific market areas, the value for each class (i.e., 3G1, 3G, etc.) will remain the same per class throughout the County.

Starting in 2007, the level of assessment for agricultural land is from 69% to 75%. Sales in the three-year sales period indicate no change in grass land value. Garden County had only three qualified sales of irrigated land; these showed a median in the 40% range, depending on the majority land use. However, so few sales make it difficult to determine any adjustments; therefore no change will be made to irrigated land. We had 32 dryland sales, and the median is in the low to mid 70s range. This again depends on the majority land use. Therefore, no change will be made in dryland value.

2. Methodology for determining recapture valuation of agricultural land (market value).

In each three-year sales period, we generally have a very small number of land sales along the North Platte River (most of which are not representative in the number of acres purchased). These sales are primarily for recreational purposes (goose hunting, etc.). Much of the land along the river, however, is used just for agricultural purposes. In an attempt to fairly and accurately value this land, we have implemented Special Valuation in Garden County. Most taxpayers who own land near the river, with adjoining accretion and river acres, file a Form 456 (Special Valuation Application). As a rule of thumb, the land owners that have hunting blinds, but that also use the land for agricultural purposes (usually cattle grazing) have completed these forms by considering each blind to be one acre of recreational land, and the rest as agricultural land. The acres with blinds are then valued as recreational at 100% of market or \$2,160 per acre, based on past sales of this real estate. The remaining land is valued as agricultural, if used as such, and based on approximately 75% of market per ag sales. One very important point to remember in Garden County is that a State Game Refuge lies along the river 110 yards out from the banks of the North Platte River, and landowners cannot hunt or have blinds on any of this land. They also have no control over who has access to use accretion land for walking, etc. (See attached copies of NE Statutes 37-706, 37-706.1, 37-707, 37-708, 37-712.) We have had only one qualified, unimproved sale of ag land including accretion in the three year sales period used for the current sales roster. Therefore, we have insufficient sales to indicate any change in the \$2,160 per acre, so this value will remain in effect for 2007.

Above are the methods Garden County uses to determine valuations for ag properties and recreational properties. The methods were decided on after much market analysis, deliberation and thought, and we feel it is the most equitable and uniform method of dealing with the above addressed land.

Sincerely,

Janet L. Shaul Garden County Assessor

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 Garden County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7005 1160 0001 1213 8334.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Property Assessment & Taxation