## 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 nonrandomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

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

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

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp., 2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.
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## 2007 Commission Summary

| Residential Real Property - Current |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  | 1273 | COD | 17.53 |
| Total Sales Price | \$ | 126165991 | PRD | 105.89 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 126179491 | COV | 30.63 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$ | 118034018 | STD | 30.34 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 99119.79 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 16.44 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$ | 92721.15 | Min | 16.19 |
| Median |  | 93.81 | Max | 371.04 |
| Wgt. Mean |  | 93.54 | 95\% Median C.I | 92.58 to 95.12 |
| Mean |  | 99.06 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 92.63 to 94.46 |
|  |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. | 97.39 to 100.73 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  | 50.25 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 10.49 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 12.14 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  | 80,126 |


| Residential Real Property - History <br> Year <br> Number of Sales |  | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5 . 8 9}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 1318 | 94.63 | 16.50 | 105.20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 1435 | 93.36 | 18.37 | 105.38 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 1379 | 92.92 | 16.65 | 104.58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 1,178 | 93 | 11.94 | 102.23 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 1,251 | 94 | 15.52 | 104.27 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 1,254 | 92 | 12.67 | 101.1 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales |  | 174 | COD | 26.21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | \$ | 46947374 | PRD | 101.57 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 46847374 | COV | 37.83 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$ | 45767690 | STD | 37.54 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 269237.78 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 24.95 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$ | 263032.70 | Min | 22.86 |
| Median |  | 95.18 | Max | 313.19 |
| Wgt. Mean |  | 97.70 | 95\% Median C.I. | 89.99 to 99.44 |
| Mean |  | 99.23 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 88.21 to 107.18 |
|  |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. | 93.65 to 104.81 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  | 24.4 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 9.11 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 9.69 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  | 247,274 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 5 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 163 | 93.06 | 28.03 | 101.31 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 132 | 95.88 | 27.37 | 105.84 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 112 | 97.01 | 22.76 | 104.15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 127 | 93 | 29.37 | 115.09 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 170 | 95 | 50.52 | 109.82 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 191 | 95 | 35.44 | 90.64 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | COD | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 16236722 | PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 6 9}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 16236722 | COV | 20.85 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 11920758 | STD | 15.57 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 253698.78 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 10.79 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 186261.84 | Min | 25.88 |
| Median |  | $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 4}$ | Max | 127.07 |
| Wgt. Mean | 73.42 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 69.02 to 76.06 |  |
| Mean |  | 74.66 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 70.26 to 76.58 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 28.53
\% of Records Sold in the Study Period 1.9
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period 3.37

Average Assessed Value of the Base 164,206

Agricultural Land - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 6 9}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 55 | 71.36 | 25.80 | 108.03 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 61 | 78.13 | 22.46 | 106.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 75 | 76.56 | 21.58 | 104.34 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 74 | 77 | 26.16 | 106.12 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 81 | 76 | 23.47 | 110.56 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 77 | 18.59 | 102.66 |

## 2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Madison County

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

## Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Madison County is $94 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Madison 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 Madison County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Madison County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Madison County is $72 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Madison County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


Property Tax Administrator

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable range. The quality statistics changed minimally after the percentage adjustments were implemented by the County for 2007. The quality statistics indicate assessment uniformity or proportionality has not been achieved in the residential class.

The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The presented statistics support an acceptable level of value that is best indicated by the median measure of central tendency.

2007 Correlation Section<br>for Madison 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 | 1644 | 1273 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 4 3}$ |
| 2006 | 1667 | 1318 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 0 6}$ |
| 2005 | 1625 | 1435 | 88.31 |
| 2004 | 1574 | 1379 | $\mathbf{8 7 . 6 1}$ |
| 2003 | 1480 | 1240 | 83.78 |
| 2002 | 1442 | 1189 | $\mathbf{8 2 . 4 5}$ |
| 2001 | 1530 | 1320 | 86.27 |

RESIDENTIAL: The percent of sales used is similar to the historical percentages. Table II indicates that Madison County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the residential class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Madison County

## 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 <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 90.73 | 3.13 | 93.57 | 93.81 |
| 2006 | 90.74 | 4.01 | 94.38 | 94.63 |
| 2005 | 89.64 | 4.78 | 93.92 | 93.36 |
| 2004 | 90.67 | 3.59 | 93.92 | 92.92 |
| 2003 | 92 | 0.55 | 92.51 | 93 |
| 2002 | 90.56 | 2.59 | 92.91 | 94 |
| 2001 | 89 | 3.54 | 92.15 | 92 |

RESIDENTIAL: The profile of the trended preliminary median and final Reports and Opinion median indicates a minimal difference of the two. The relationship between the two ratios suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.85 | 2007 | 3.13 |
| 7.95 | 2006 | 4.01 |
| 8.71 | 2005 | 4.78 |
| 4.14 | 2004 | 3.59 |
| 3 | 2003 | 1 |
| 4.58 | 2002 | 2.59 |
| 4.12 | 2001 | 3.54 |

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

## 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.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Madison County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 3 . 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 0 6}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, suggesting the level of value in the residential class of real property is within the acceptable range.

## 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 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5 . 8 9}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{2 . 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8 9}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics changed minimally with the assessment actions of the County after analyzing the preliminary statistics. The quality statistics indicate assessment uniformity or proportionality has not been achieved.

## 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 | 1331 | 1273 | -58 |
| Median | 90.73 | 93.81 | 3.08 |
| Wgt. Mean | 89.75 | 93.54 | 3.79 |
| Mean | 94.72 | 99.06 | 4.34 |
| COD | 17.89 | 17.53 | -0.36 |
| PRD | 105.54 | 105.89 | 0.35 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 9.89 | 16.19 | 6.3 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 371.04 | 371.04 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the difference between the preliminary statistics and the final Reports and Opinion statistics reveals that the statistical differences correlate with the assessment actions reported by the County. The preliminary statistics were studied and percentage adjustments were made to subclasses that were out of the acceptable range to bring them within range. The 58 sales removed after the preliminary statistics were primarily sales that had undergone substantial changes after the sale.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Madison County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Of the two qualitative statistics, the price related differential is within the parameters of the acceptable range and the coefficient of dispersion is above the range. The COD improved slightly after the preliminary statistics; however this statistic continues to indicate that the assessments are not uniform in the commercial class of property.

The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

2007 Correlation Section<br>for Madison 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 | 272 | 174 | 63.97 |
| 2006 | 256 | 163 | 63.67 |
| 2005 | 207 | 132 | 63.77 |
| 2004 | 198 | 112 | 56.57 |
| 2003 | 209 | 127 | 60.77 |
| 2002 | 275 | 170 | 61.82 |
| 2001 | 314 | 191 | 60.83 |

COMMERCIAL: The percent of sales used is especially similar to the historical percentages. Table II indicates that Madison County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the commercial class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Madison County

## 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 <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 92.31 | 1.94 | 94.1 | 95.18 |
| 2006 | 91.67 | -0.27 | 91.42 | 93.06 |
| 2005 | 90.59 | 3.93 | 94.15 | 95.88 |
| 2004 | 93.67 | 1.87 | 95.42 | 97.01 |
| 2003 | 92 | 4 | 92.04 | 93 |
| 2002 | 82.29 | 11.8 | 92 | 95 |
| 2001 | 90 | 4.39 | 93.95 | 95 |

COMMERCIAL: The profile of the trended preliminary median and final Reports and Opinion median indicates a minimal difference of the two. The relationship between the two ratios suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.05 | 2007 | 1.94 |
| 4.87 | 2006 | $-\mathbf{0 . 2 7}$ |
| 8.32 | 2005 | 3.93 |
| 3.12 | 2004 | 1.87 |
| 1 | 2003 | 4 |
| 22.42 | 2002 | 11.8 |
| 29.39 | 2001 | 4.39 |

COMMERCIAL: A brief review of the above table suggests that the percent change between sold properties and unsold properties is significant. The trended preliminary median however, suggests that sold and unsold properties are treated equally. Further analysis indicates that the ten sales that were substantially changed after the sale and removed from the qualified sales file contributed to the sales file percent change reflected in this table. It is concluded that the assessment actions consisting of percentage adjustments to subclasses were applied to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner.

## 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.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Madison County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95.18 | 97.70 | 99.23 |

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

## 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 | 26.21 | 101.57 |
| Difference | $\mathbf{6 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

COMMERCIAL: Of the two qualitative statistics, the price related differential is within the parameters of the acceptable range and the coefficient of dispersion is above the range. The COD improved slightly after the preliminary statistics; however this statistic continues to indicate that the assessments are not uniform in the commercial class of property.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{1 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0}$ |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 2 . 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8 7}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{9 4 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 6}$ |
| Mean | $\mathbf{9 4 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 7 8}$ |
| COD | 27.52 | 26.21 | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 1}$ |
| PRD | 100.37 | 101.57 | 1.2 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 20.25 | 22.86 | 2.61 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 274.72 | $\mathbf{3 1 3 . 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 4 7}$ |

COMMERCIAL: A review of the difference between the preliminary statistics and the final Reports and Opinion statistics reveals that the statistical differences correlate with the assessment actions reported by the County. The preliminary statistics were studied and percentage adjustments were made to subclasses that were out of the acceptable range to bring them within range. The 10 sales removed after the preliminary statistics were primarily sales that had undergone substantial changes after the sale.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Madison County

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

2007 Correlation Section<br>for Madison 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 | 151 | 64 | 42.38 |
| 2006 | 147 | 55 | 37.41 |
| 2005 | 159 | 61 | 38.36 |
| 2004 | 155 | 75 | 48.39 |
| 2003 | 152 | 74 | 48.68 |
| 2002 | 141 | 82 | 58.16 |
| 2001 | 165 | 106 | 64.24 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Madison County

## 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 <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 4}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 3 6}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{6 9 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 1 3}$ |
| 2004 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 5 6}$ |
| 2003 | 75 | $\mathbf{5 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |
| 2002 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ |
| 2001 | 76 | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The profile of the trended preliminary median and final Reports and Opinion median indicates a minimal difference of the two. The relationship between the two ratios suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.43 | 2007 | 3.8 |
| 22.26 | 2006 | 16.56 |
| 21.74 | 2005 | 8.26 |
| 8.33 | 2004 | 9.23 |
| 8 | 2003 | 6 |
| 3.19 | 2002 | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 5}$ |
| -0.73 | 2001 | -1.37 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

## 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.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Madison County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 6 6}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.
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 | 14.90 | 101.69 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 70 | 64 | -6 |
| Median | 72.28 | 72.44 | 0.16 |
| Wgt. Mean | 70.50 | 73.42 | 2.92 |
| Mean | 74.70 | 74.66 | -0.04 |
| COD | 18.23 | 14.90 | -3.33 |
| PRD | 105.95 | 101.69 | -4.26 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 25.88 | 25.88 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 220.54 | 127.07 | -93.47 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property.

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

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \text { CTL } \\ & \text { County Total } \end{aligned}$ | 2007 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2007 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 925,352,079 | 972,500,241 | 47,148,162 | 5.1 | 18,193,255 | 3.13 |
| 2. Recreational | 74,869 | 74,869 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 52,084,637 | 55,334,860 | 3,250,223 | 6.24 | *---------- | 6.24 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 977,511,585 | 1,027,909,970 | 50,398,385 | 5.16 | 18,193,255 | 3.29 |
| 5. Commercial | 410,808,056 | 424,252,362 | 13,444,306 | 3.27 | 4,606,035 | 2.15 |
| 6. Industrial | 46,928,400 | 48,040,154 | 1,111,754 | 2.37 | 1,070,801 | 0.09 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 28,416,247 | 29,230,418 | 814,171 | 2.87 | 2,323,689 | -5.31 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 486,152,703 | 501,522,934 | 15,370,231 | 3.16 | 5,676,836 | 1.99 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 1,463,664,288 | 1,529,434,223 | 65,769,935 | 4.49 | 26,193,780 | 2.7 |
| 11. Irrigated | 185,613,069 | 193,480,470 | 7,867,401 | 4.24 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 249,094,490 | 259,288,867 | 10,194,377 | 4.09 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 35,421,732 | 35,276,124 | -145,608 | -0.41 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 377969 | 416,175 | 38,206 | 10.11 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 523,942 | 491,940 | -32,002 | -6.11 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 471,031,202 | 488,953,576 | 17,922,374 | 3.8 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,934,695,490 | 2,018,387,799 | 83,692,309 | 4.33 | 26,193,780 | 2.97 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run





## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics <br> Base Stat <br> Type: Qualified

PAGE:1 of 6
State Stat Run


## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified


## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run


## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run


## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run


## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

## State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
174
$46,947,374$
$46,847,374$
$45,767,690$
269,237
263,032 MEDIAN:

COV
37.83

95\% Median C.I.: 89.99 to 99.44
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 88.21 to 107.18
95\% Mean C.I.: 93.65 to 104.81
269.237 COD: 26.21 MAX Sales Ratio: 313.19

263, 032
88.65
$0.57 \quad 88.6$
37.58
99.2
97.70

|  | 174 | 95.18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |


| 02 | 33 | 89.44 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 03 | 139 | 96.68 |
| 04 | 2 | 103.19 |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$174 \quad 95.18$
MEAN WGT. MEAN
93.1
100.6
WGT. MEA
92.65
-

| 26.21 | 101.57 | 22.86 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| COD | PRD | MIN |

13.19
95\% Median C.
MAX 95\% Median C.

Printed: 04/03/2007 16:28:28 2,400,000 2,127,602
116,500 43,784
98.9
100.57
$\begin{array}{lll}101.67 & 22.86 & 313.19\end{array}$
90.02 to 101

N/A
438
103.19
99.23
97.70
26.21
101.57
22.86
313.19
89.99 to 99.44

269,237
263,032

## 59 - MADISON COUNTY

 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVEDPA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run


|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 64 |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $16,236,722$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $16,236,722$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $11,920,758$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 253,698 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 186,261 |

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run

## MEDIAN:

72 COV: 20.85

95\% Median C.I.: 69.02 to 76.06



| SCHOOL DISTRICT * |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE |  |  |
| (blank) | COUNT | MEDIAN |
| $59-0001$ |  |  |
| $59-0002$ | 23 | 72.41 |
| $59-0005$ | 5 | 83.80 |
| $59-0013$ | 21 | 72.44 |
| $59-0080$ | 9 | 70.84 |
| $71-0067$ | 6 | 74.06 |


| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | ---: |
|  |  |
| 74.10 | 72.92 |
| 79.92 | 78.60 |
| 73.44 | 71.76 |
| 74.42 | 77.25 |
| 77.07 | 76.03 |


|  | 127.07 |
| :--- | ---: |
| MIN Sales Ratio: | 25.88 |

Printed: 04/03/2007 16:28:59

NonValid School
$\qquad$ ALL_

| ALL |  | [ 64 | 72.44 | 74.66 | 73.42 | 14.90 | 101.69 | 25.88 | 127.07 | 69.02 to 76.06 | $\begin{gathered} 253,698 \\ \hline \text { Avg. Adj. } \end{gathered}$ | 186,261 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACRES IN | ALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 10.01 TO | 30.00 | 1 | 89.88 | 89.88 | 89.88 |  |  | 89.88 | 89.88 | N/A | 40,000 | 35,950 |
| 30.01 то | 50.00 | 5 | 72.41 | 67.99 | 61.72 | 21.01 | 110.15 | 25.88 | 98.21 | N/A | 72,560 | 44,786 |
| 50.01 TO | 100.00 | 21 | 76.94 | 74.49 | 71.58 | 18.26 | 104.06 | 46.35 | 117.34 | 63.99 to 83.86 | 122,887 | 87,967 |
| 100.01 TO | 180.00 | 29 | 71.96 | 75.49 | 73.55 | 11.61 | 102.64 | 55.63 | 127.07 | 68.58 to 79.75 | 305,450 | 224,656 |
| 180.01 TO | 330.00 | 6 | 75.29 | 71.26 | 70.89 | 5.87 | 100.51 | 58.62 | 76.06 | 58.62 to 76.06 | 535,168 | 379,405 |
| 330.01 TO | 650.00 | 2 | 83.76 | 83.76 | 86.31 | 10.23 | 97.05 | 75.19 | 92.33 | N/A | 592,104 | 511,035 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 64 | 72.44 | 74.66 | 73.42 | 14.90 | 101.69 | 25.88 | 127.07 | 69.02 to 76.06 | 253,698 | 186,261 |
| MAJORITY LAND USE > 95\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| DRY |  | 13 | 76.94 | 78.95 | 74.83 | 11.95 | 105.50 | 63.99 | 100.20 | 67.24 to 92.05 | 195,208 | 146,074 |
| DRY-N/A |  | 20 | 72.57 | 76.96 | 75.33 | 14.92 | 102.17 | 56.25 | 127.07 | 66.61 to 83.86 | 239,658 | 180,531 |
| GRASS |  | 5 | 64.93 | 65.49 | 62.33 | 29.19 | 105.07 | 25.88 | 98.21 | N/A | 99,548 | 62,049 |
| GRASS-N/A |  | 5 | 64.62 | 66.67 | 62.93 | 16.84 | 105.93 | 46.35 | 83.80 | N/A | 84,462 | 53,155 |
| IRRGTD |  | 4 | 65.29 | 62.65 | 63.33 | 14.25 | 98.94 | 48.08 | 71.96 | N/A | 420,396 | 266,227 |
| IRRGTD-N/A |  | 17 | 72.44 | 76.55 | 75.67 | 11.30 | 101.17 | 55.63 | 117.34 | 69.02 to 84.26 | 370,836 | 280,601 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 64 | 72.44 | 74.66 | 73.42 | 14.90 | 101.69 | 25.88 | 127.07 | 69.02 to 76.06 | 253,698 | 186,261 |



59 - MADISON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

## ype: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


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

## MEDIAN:

9
90
95

$$
127,959,544
$$

$$
127,973,044
$$

$$
114,859,318
$$

86,295

COV: 29.99
STD: 28.41
AVG.ABS.DEV: 16.23
95\% Median C.I.: 89.69 to 91.87
(!: Derived)

95\% Mean C.I.: 93.20 to 96.25
MEAN: 95 AVG.ABS.DEV: $16.23 \quad 95 \%$ Mean C.I.: 93.20 to 96.25

$$
96,148
$$


RANGE
Qrtrs___

07/01/04 то 09/30/04 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 10/01/05 тО 12/31/05 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06
$\qquad$ Study Years $\qquad$ 07/01/04 то 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ _AL ALL $\qquad$

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

## BATTLE CREEK

MADISON
MEADOW GROVE NEWMAN GROVE NORFOLK
RURAL TILDEN $\qquad$

|  | 1331 | 90.73 | 94.72 | 89.75 | 17.89 | 105.54 | 9.89 | 371.04 | 89.69 to 91.87 | 96,148 | 86,295 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATIONS: URBAN, | SUBURBAN | \& RURAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 1209 | 90.96 | 95.11 | 90.11 | 17.63 | 105.54 | 9.89 | 371.04 | 89.78 to 92.06 | 93,568 | 84,318 |
| 2 | 75 | 88.57 | 91.11 | 89.16 | 17.91 | 102.18 | 37.43 | 185.85 | 82.71 to 93.30 | 131,269 | 117,042 |
| 3 | 47 | 83.61 | 90.52 | 82.74 | 25.39 | 109.40 | 46.33 | 217.00 | 77.14 to 92.52 | 106,470 | 88,090 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1331 | 90.73 | 94.72 | 89.75 | 17.89 | 105.54 | 9.89 | 371.04 | 89.69 to 91.87 | 96,148 | 86,295 |

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

AVG. Assessed Value:


NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
1331
$127,959,544$
$127,973,044$
$114,859,318$
96,148
86,295

MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN:
MEAN :

COV:
29.99

95\% Median C.I.: 89.69 to 91.87
(!: Derived)


90
90
AVG.ABS.DEV:
16.23

COD: 17.89 MAX Sales Ratio: 371.04
PRD: 105.54 MIN Sales Ratio: $\quad 9.89$

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| O OR Blank | 108 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 1 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 44 |
| 1900 TO 1919 | 211 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 168 |
| 1940 TO 1949 | 41 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 117 |
| 1960 TO 1969 | 145 |
| 1970 TO 1979 | 181 |
| 1980 TO 1989 | 84 |
| 1990 TO 1994 | 41 |
| 1995 TO 1999 | 65 |
| 2000 TO Present | 125 |
| ALL |  |

MEDIAN
92.04
108.66
94.69
93.88
87.55
96.50
89.11
89.75
89.68
90.85
91.57
88.90
91.01
MEAN WGT
1331

| SALE PRICE * COUN |
| :--- | :--- |
| RANGE |



| COUNT |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 10 | 1 |
| 18 |  |
| 28 | 10 |
| 127 | 10 |
| 272 |  |
| 384 |  |
| 293 |  |
| 187 |  |
| 39 |  |
| 1 |  |

MEDIAN

| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 92.52 | 80.35 |
| 108.66 | 108.66 |
| 109.30 | 94.37 |
| 101.55 | 92.95 |
| 92.86 | 85.47 |
| 100.66 | 96.12 |
| 94.48 | 91.63 |
| 93.53 | 90.62 |
| 91.88 | 88.98 |
| 92.44 | 90.30 |
| 90.88 | 90.26 |
| 91.03 | 89.64 |
| 90.87 | 90.16 |


| COD | PRD |
| ---: | ---: |
| 30.64 | 115.15 |


|  |  |  | Avg. |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIN | MAX | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | Sale |
| 9.89 | 363.00 | 82.80 to 97.17 |  |
| 108.66 | 108.66 | N/A | 1 |
| 56.21 | 355.36 | 84.38 to 110.22 |  |


| e Price | Assd |
| ---: | ---: |
| 42,228 | 3 |
| 114,900 | 12 |
| 42,828 |  |

Wgt. Mean C.I.: 88.85 to 90.66
95\% Mean C.I.: 93.20 to 96.25

## .


$\qquad$

1331
90.73
94.72
89.75
17.89
105.54
9.89
371.04
89.69 to 91.87

96,148
86,295

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
1331
$127,959,544$
$127,973,044$
$114,859,318$
96,148
86,295

MEDIAN:
GT. MEAN : MEAN :

COV:
29.99

95\% Median C.I.: 89.69 to
5\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 88.85 to 90.66
95\% Mean C.I.: 93.20 to 96.25
AVG.ABS.DEV: 16.23
16.23

COD: 17.89 MAX Sales Ratio: 371.04
PRD: 105.54 MIN Sales Ratio: 9.89
-

| RANGE |  | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ | ( |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 15 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 15 |
| Total \$ |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 30 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 129 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 345 |
| 60000 то | 99999 | 413 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 250 |
| 150000 то | 249999 | 141 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 22 |
| 500000 + |  | 1 |

QUALITY
RANGE
(blank)
0
10
15
20
25
30
35
40
45
50
60

| 1331 | 90.73 | 94.72 | 89.75 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| 88 | 90.24 | 97.10 | 85.54 |
| 23 | 82.33 | 71.55 | 50.67 |
| 7 | 101.37 | 94.58 | 94.86 |
| 1 | 233.71 | 233.71 | 233.71 |
| 114 | 93.29 | 106.27 | 93.55 |
| 27 | 86.70 | 87.88 | 83.54 |
| 962 | 90.60 | 94.14 | 90.02 |
| 30 | 92.41 | 92.19 | 91.70 |
| 72 | 89.71 | 90.66 | 90.09 |
| 2 | 99.24 | 99.24 | 99.24 |
| 4 | 92.16 | 92.09 | 92.14 |
| 1 | 76.97 | 76.97 | 76.97 |
| 1331 | 90.73 | 94.72 | 89.75 |

COD
9.89

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
1331
$127,959,544$
$127,973,044$
$114,859,318$
96,148
86,295

MEDIAN:
GT. MEAN:
MEAN

COV:
29.99

95\% Median C.I.: 89.69 to 91.87
(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
$5 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: 88.85 to 90.66
95\% Mean C.I.: 93.20 to 96.25

| STYLE |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| (blank) | 82 |
| 0 | 22 |
| 100 | 11 |
| 101 | 942 |
| 102 | 55 |
| 103 | 7 |
| 104 | 127 |
| 106 | 11 |
| 111 | 40 |
| 301 | 29 |
| 302 | 2 |
| 305 | 1 |
| 307 | 1 |
| 308 | 1 |

CONDITION
RANGE
(blank)
0
10
20
25
30
35
40
60
_ALI $\qquad$

| STYLE | COUNT |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | 82 |
| (blank) | 22 |
| 0 | 11 |
| 100 | 942 |
| 101 | 55 |
| 102 | 7 |
| 103 | 127 |
| 104 | 11 |
| 106 | 40 |
| 111 | 29 |
| 301 | 2 |
| 302 | 1 |
| 305 | 1 |
| 307 | 1 |


|  |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| T | MEDIAN |
| 2 | 86.69 |
| 2 | 87.99 |
| 1 | 91.71 |
| 2 | 90.97 |
| 5 | 89.36 |
| 7 | 85.98 |
| 7 | 88.28 |
| 1 | 103.91 |
| 0 | 93.66 |
| 9 | 90.73 |
| 2 | 91.67 |
| 1 | 96.11 |
| 1 | 79.45 |
| 1 | 100.23 |

MEAN WGI
PRD:

| 105.54 MIN Sales Ratio: | 971.04 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |

Printed: 02/17/2007 13:21:28

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


$$
94
$$

$$
94
$$

$$
94
$$

COV
39.36

AVG.ABS.DEV: 25.40 49, 853,231 46,910,948 270,941
254,950

95\% Median C.I.: 85.87 to 96.42
(!: Derived)

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 85.09 to 103.11
95\% Mean C.I.: 89.08 to 99.82

Printed: 02/17/2007 13:21:33

| DATE |
| :--- |
| RANGE |


| ANGE |
| :---: |
|  |  |


| RANGE | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/03 TO 09/30/03 | 11 |
| 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 | 14 |
| 01/01/04 TO 03/31/04 | 17 |
| 04/01/04 TO 06/30/04 | 16 |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 15 |
| 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 9 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 19 |
| 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 | 30 |
| 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 | 15 |
| 10/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 8 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 14 |
| 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 | 16 |
| ___Study Years___ |  |
| 07/01/03 TO 06/30/04 | 58 |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 73 |
| 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 | 53 |
| $\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ <br> 01/01/04 тO 12/31/04 |  |
|  | 57 |
| 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 72 |

MEDIAN

|  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 93.95 | 106.86 | 93.49 |
| 91.38 | 94.92 | 99.90 |
| 94.52 | 102.74 | 95.46 |
| 96.42 | 94.25 | 94.05 |
| 93.06 | 91.93 | 85.87 |
| 70.18 | 74.86 | 78.19 |
| 80.85 | 85.86 | 80.57 |
| 96.59 | 103.65 | 100.61 |
| 86.58 | 87.68 | 85.62 |
| 73.28 | 70.77 | 99.19 |
| 91.13 | 100.91 | 95.85 |
| 100.00 | 95.77 | 75.46 |
|  |  |  |
| 96.26 | 99.29 | 96.86 |
| 90.02 | 93.06 | 94.11 |
| 89.94 | 91.06 | 90.35 |
| 93.06 | 93.11 | 91.47 |
| 90.49 | 91.97 | 95.59 |

31


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007
State Stat Run

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


92 COV: 39.36

## Cov:

STD:
AVG.ABS.DEV:
37.18
25.40

5\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 85.09 to 103.11
95\% Mean C.I.: 89.08 to 99.82
910,948
270,941
254,950
MEDIA
91.8

| 93.0 |
| :---: |
| 195.9 |
| 77.9 |
| 97.3 |
| 105.0 |
| 73.0 |
| 103.2 |
| 100.0 |
| 58.1 |
| 99.2 |
| 100.0 |
| 92.3 |
| 79.4 |

MEAN WGT
( MRD

| ale Price | Assd Val |
| ---: | ---: |
| 141,029 | 121,448 |
| 308,670 | 283,848 |
| 450,000 | 881,740 |
| 116,500 | 77,602 |
| 21,833 | 17,727 |
| $4,690,887$ | $4,925,431$ |
| 345,000 | 251,939 |
| 713,333 | 673,866 |
| 22,410 | 22,410 |
| $2,860,000$ | $1,663,491$ |
| 415,000 | 533,049 |
| 410,666 | 426,242 |
| 216,171 | 213,577 |
| 223,479 | 197,894 |
| 345,010 | 358,738 |
| 79,000 | 35,870 |
| 118,266 | 110,783 |
| 214,923 | 325,528 |
| 10,000 | 12,390 |
| 67,000 | 54,585 |
| 250,000 | 247,075 |
| 180,000 | 146,104 |
| 119,850 | 121,466 |
| $1,525,000$ | $1,602,825$ |
| 243,750 | 128,820 |
| 129,000 | 127,868 |
| $1,186,000$ | 707,726 |
| 59,197 | 84,586 |
| 21,955 | 23,900 |
| 250,000 | 160,342 |
| 275,000 | 197,432 |
| 66,250 | 61,548 |
| 300,000 | 167,281 |
| 45,000 | 28,839 |
| 52,000 | 33,538 |
| 110,899 | 110,899 |
| 450,000 | 297,991 |
| 25,000 | 21,423 |
|  |  |
| 10 |  |



Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


NonValid School
_ALL___


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


PA\&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


## 2007 Assessment Survey for Madison County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

1. Deputy(ies) on staff: 1
2. Appraiser(s) on staff: 0
3. Other full-time employees: 3
4. Other part-time employees: 1
5. Number of shared employees: 0
6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: $\$ 395,362$
7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system: $\$ 33,000$
8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: $\$ 388,400$
9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: $\$ 22,000$
10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: $\$ 2,500$
11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
12. Other miscellaneous funds: None
13. Total budget: $\$ 395,362$
a. Was any of last year's budget not used? Yes
B. Residential Appraisal Information
(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)
14. Data collection done by: Assessor and part time lister
15. Valuation done by: Assessor
16. Pickup work done by: Assessor and part time lister

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 278 |  |  | 278 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 1990
5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 1991
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? N/A
7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 7
8. How are these defined? Areas are defined by towns and similar property characteristics. All parcels outside of the towns are included in the rural assessor location. Suburban area around Norfolk is included in Assessor location Norfolk
9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
10. Does the location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
11. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner? Yes
C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information
12. Data collection done by: Assessor and part time lister
13. Valuation done by: Assessor
14. Pickup work done by whom: Assessor and part time lister

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 80 |  |  | 80 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 1989 for commercial and 1993 for industrial
5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information? 1989 for commercial and 1993 for industrial
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? 1997 for commercial
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? 2004
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? 7
9. How are these defined? Areas are defined by location and include all towns. Any parcels outside the city limits are included in the rural market area. Except for Norfolk
10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
11. Does the location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) No

## D. Agricultural Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by: Assessor and part-time lister
2. Valuation done by: Assessor
3. Pickup work done by whom: Assessor and part-time lister

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural | 39 |  | 18 | 51 |

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 statute and regulations
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? 1984
7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed? 1998
a. By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) Physical Inspections
b. By whom? Lister
c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? $100 \%$
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 3
9. How are these defined? Market areas are defined by similar soil types and topography, and delineated by township lines.
10. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? No
E. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1. Administrative software: TerraScan
2. CAMA software: TerraScan
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? Yes
a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps? A full-time employee
5. Personal Property software: TerraScan
F. Zoning Information
6. Does the county have zoning? Yes
a. If so, is the zoning countywide? Yes
b. What municipalities in the county are zoned? All
c. When was zoning implemented? 1975

## G. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services: Industrial is contracted.

## 2. Other Services:

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

## II. Assessment Actions

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

## Residential

The 2007 preliminary statistics were studied by Madison County and it was determined that percentage adjustments and market trending to subclasses outside the acceptable median range was necessary to bring them within range. This resulted in percentage increases to the towns of Meadow Grove, 6\%, and Norfolk, 3\%, while the town of Tilden and the Rural Assessor Location increased $5 \%$. Pick-up work of new and omitted construction was also completed by the County.

## Commercial

The 2007 preliminary statistics were studied by Madison County and it was determined that percentage adjustments and market trending to subclasses outside the acceptable median range was necessary to bring them within range. This resulted in percentage increases to land values in the town of Norfolk.

## Agricultural

The county conducted a sales study of the unimproved agricultural sales by land classification grouping and made increases to values accordingly. Dry and Irrigated values in Market Area Two and Three were increased.

## County 59 - Madison
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## County 59 - Madison

| Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF) |  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 43 | 3,953 | 3,789,943 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 7 | 1,124,795 | 6,356,237 | 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 | 43 | 3,953 | 3,789,943 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1,124,795 | 6,356,237 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 50 | 1,128,748 | 10,146,180 |


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


|  | Total |  | Growth |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |


$\left.$| Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural |
| :--- |
| Urban |
| Records |$\quad$| SubUrban |
| :---: |
| Records |$\quad$| Rural |
| :---: |
| Records |$\quad$| Total |
| :---: |
| Records | \right\rvert\, | 26. Exempt | 751 | 99 | 171 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 2 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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## County 59 - Madison <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 88.260 | 195,407 | 6,170.090 | 13,592,375 | 6,258.350 | 13,787,782 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 19.800 | 42,768 | 18,018.170 | 38,855,461 | 18,037.970 | 38,898,229 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 233.680 | 479,165 | 6,492.600 | 13,245,579 | 6,726.280 | 13,724,744 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 156.760 | 313,207 | 4,931.710 | 9,807,756 | 5,088.470 | 10,120,963 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 82.900 | 152,205 | 13,305.550 | 24,354,930 | 13,388.450 | 24,507,135 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 86.860 | 153,003 | 22,717.090 | 40,357,685 | 22,803.950 | 40,510,688 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.700 | 13,095 | 3,603.500 | 4,862,216 | 3,613.200 | 4,875,311 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 3.900 | 4,633 | 516.940 | 614,125 | 520.840 | 618,758 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 681.860 | 1,353,483 | 75,755.650 | 145,690,127 | 76,437.510 | 147,043,610 |


| 54.1D1 | 51.830 | 95,160 | 90.710 | 166,456 | 5,768.180 | 10,551,044 | 5,910.720 | 10,812,660 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 112.960 | 200,487 | 25,199.910 | 44,802,184 | 25,312.870 | 45,002,671 |
| 56. 2D1 | 6.300 | 10,085 | 245.330 | 397,015 | 8,834.120 | 14,245,298 | 9,085.750 | 14,652,398 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 418.200 | 631,830 | 7,175.470 | 10,843,273 | 7,593.670 | 11,475,103 |
| 58. 3D1 | 10.400 | 15,164 | 288.440 | 420,546 | 16,765.940 | 24,370,189 | 17,064.780 | 24,805,899 |
| 59.3D | 33.630 | 47,216 | 389.840 | 547,337 | 34,199.720 | 47,882,011 | 34,623.190 | 48,476,564 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.900 | 54,529 | 6,893.600 | 8,174,463 | 6,939.500 | 8,228,992 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 11.200 | 12,096 | 589.500 | 636,575 | 600.700 | 648,671 |
| 62. Total | 102.160 | 167,625 | 1,602.580 | 2,430,296 | 105,426.440 | 161,505,037 | 107,131.180 | 164,102,958 |


| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.360 | 8,692 | 426.680 | 359,820 | 437.040 | 368,512 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 11.600 | 9,710 | 2,137.940 | 1,764,987 | 2,149.540 | 1,774,697 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 69.620 | 53,962 | 2,325.780 | 1,837,324 | 2,395.400 | 1,891,286 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 190.510 | 153,390 | 2,573.420 | 2,057,649 | 2,763.930 | 2,211,039 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 141.380 | 108,892 | 5,251.940 | 3,982,241 | 5,393.320 | 4,091,133 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 307.360 | 226,915 | 9,577.300 | 7,090,247 | 9,884.660 | 7,317,162 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 249.470 | 181,865 | 5,824.690 | 4,154,689 | 6,074.160 | 4,336,554 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 188.040 | 99,709 | 5,011.440 | 2,719,840 | 5,199.480 | 2,819,549 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,168.340 | 843,135 | 33,129.190 | 23,966,797 | 34,297.530 | 24,809,932 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 160.970 | 17,382 | 1,889.630 | 204,024 | 2,050.600 | 221,406 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 31.960 | 6,392 | 1,804.110 | 360,622 | 1,836.070 | 367,014 |
| 74. Exempt | 6.530 |  | 28.750 |  | 132.210 |  | 167.490 |  |
| 75. Total | 102.160 | 167,625 | 3,645.710 | 4,650,688 | 218,005.020 | 331,726,607 | 221,752.890 | 336,544,920 |

## County 59 - Madison <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,157.890 | 1,733,025 | 1,157.890 | 1,733,025 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,388.480 | 2,010,911 | 1,388.480 | 2,010,911 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 33.500 | 45,225 | 1,376.860 | 1,857,025 | 1,410.360 | 1,902,250 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 60.170 | 79,726 | 3,426.460 | 4,535,224 | 3,486.630 | 4,614,950 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,140.220 | 3,922,281 | 3,140.220 | 3,922,281 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 10.200 | 12,240 | 4,010.390 | 4,801,668 | 4,020.590 | 4,813,908 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 985.380 | 985,380 | 985.380 | 985,380 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 161.700 | 129,360 | 161.700 | 129,360 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 103.870 | 137,191 | 15,647.380 | 19,974,874 | 15,751.250 | 20,112,065 |


| 54.1D1 | 0.800 | 1,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 501.220 | 626,398 | 502.020 | 627,398 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.800 | 960 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,487.690 | 1,778,508 | 1,488.490 | 1,779,468 |
| 56. 2D1 | 10.100 | 11,315 | 13.230 | 15,215 | 1,151.960 | 1,290,941 | 1,175.290 | 1,317,471 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 22.330 | 24,563 | 3,133.590 | 3,436,599 | 3,155.920 | 3,461,162 |
| 58. 3D1 | 5.240 | 5,502 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,198.250 | 2,288,315 | 2,203.490 | 2,293,817 |
| 59.3D | 1.300 | 1,235 | 4.690 | 4,456 | 2,699.310 | 2,562,551 | 2,705.300 | 2,568,242 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 871.780 | 719,252 | 871.780 | 719,252 |
| 61.4D | 1.070 | 803 | 0.000 | 0 | 214.990 | 161,243 | 216.060 | 162,046 |
| 62. Total | 19.310 | 20,815 | 40.250 | 44,234 | 12,258.790 | 12,863,807 | 12,318.350 | 12,928,856 |



## County 59 - Madison <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,136.270 | 4,800,430 | 2,136.270 | 4,800,430 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 33.280 | 73,216 | 3,108.530 | 6,834,611 | 3,141.810 | 6,907,827 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,387.290 | 2,901,729 | 1,387.290 | 2,901,729 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 160.220 | 328,411 | 160.220 | 328,411 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 5,700 | 1,311.340 | 2,491,546 | 1,314.340 | 2,497,246 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 26.510 | 49,044 | 4,377.510 | 8,098,397 | 4,404.020 | 8,147,441 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 483.790 | 725,485 | 483.790 | 725,485 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.590 | 16,226 | 11.590 | 16,226 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 62.790 | 127,960 | 12,976.540 | 26,196,835 | 13,039.330 | 26,324,795 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 30,000 | 7,313.240 | 14,559,580 | 7,328.240 | 14,589,580 |
| 55.1D | 3.120 | 6,084 | 90.200 | 175,890 | 9,837.240 | 19,092,553 | 9,930.560 | 19,274,527 |
| 56. 2D1 | 4.800 | 8,761 | 97.510 | 177,956 | 4,431.690 | 8,015,804 | 4,534.000 | 8,202,521 |
| 57. 2D | 4.260 | 7,455 | 0.000 | 0 | 530.050 | 915,651 | 534.310 | 923,106 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.900 | 18,258 | 6,771.840 | 11,331,088 | 6,782.740 | 11,349,346 |
| 59.3D | 0.850 | 1,381 | 116.810 | 189,817 | 15,764.440 | 25,608,072 | 15,882.100 | 25,799,270 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 4,350 | 1,377.540 | 1,995,214 | 1,380.540 | 1,999,564 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 5.330 | 7,196 | 82.920 | 111,943 | 88.250 | 119,139 |
| 62. Total | 13.030 | 23,681 | 338.750 | 603,467 | 46,108.960 | 81,629,905 | 46,460.740 | 82,257,053 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 321.020 | 254,704 | 321.020 | 254,704 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.100 | 78 | 485.770 | 389,639 | 485.870 | 389,717 |
| 65. 2G1 | 1.600 | 1,200 | 1.800 | 720 | 1,300.960 | 956,159 | 1,304.360 | 958,079 |
| 66. 2G | 5.560 | 4,171 | 0.000 | 0 | 443.550 | 350,493 | 449.110 | 354,664 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 487.450 | 350,846 | 487.450 | 350,846 |
| 68.3G | 1.860 | 1,302 | 0.000 | 0 | 888.830 | 620,039 | 890.690 | 621,341 |
| 69.4G1 | 4.820 | 3,254 | 0.250 | 169 | 377.440 | 249,637 | 382.510 | 253,060 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 11,492 | 541.440 | 285,815 | 566.440 | 297,307 |
| 71. Total | 13.840 | 9,927 | 27.150 | 12,459 | 4,846.460 | 3,457,332 | 4,887.450 | 3,479,718 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 1.800 | 226 | 371.310 | 46,439 | 373.110 | 46,665 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 1.400 | 280 | 148.500 | 29,700 | 149.900 | 29,980 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 26.870 | 33,608 | 431.890 | 744,392 | 64,451.770 | 111,360,211 | 64,910.530 | 112,138,211 |

## County 59 - Madison

## 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 848.520 | 1,618,634 | 104,379.570 | 191,861,836 | 105,228.090 | 193,480,470 |
| 77.Dry Land | 134.500 | 212,121 | 1,981.580 | 3,077,997 | 163,794.190 | 255,998,749 | 165,910.270 | 259,288,867 |
| 78.Grass | 13.840 | 9,927 | 1,197.480 | 856,937 | 50,508.040 | 34,409,260 | 51,719.360 | 35,276,124 |
| 79.Waste | 0.230 | 29 | 162.770 | 17,608 | 3,446.390 | 398,538 | 3,609.390 | 416,175 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 33.360 | 6,672 | 2,427.340 | 485,268 | 2,460.700 | 491,940 |
| 81.Exempt | 6.530 | 0 | 28.750 | 0 | 132.210 | 0 | 167.490 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 148.570 | 222,077 | 4,223.710 | 5,577,848 | 324,555.530 | 483,153,651 | 328,927.810 | 488,953,576 |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 59 - Madison

Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 1,157.890 | 7.35\% | 1,733,025 | 8.62\% | 1,496.709 |
| 1A | 1,388.480 | 8.82\% | 2,010,911 | 10.00\% | 1,448.282 |
| 2A1 | 1,410.360 | 8.95\% | 1,902,250 | 9.46\% | 1,348.769 |
| 2A | 3,486.630 | 22.14\% | 4,614,950 | 22.95\% | 1,323.613 |
| 3A1 | 3,140.220 | 19.94\% | 3,922,281 | 19.50\% | 1,249.046 |
| 3A | 4,020.590 | 25.53\% | 4,813,908 | 23.94\% | 1,197.313 |
| 4A1 | 985.380 | 6.26\% | 985,380 | 4.90\% | 1,000.000 |
| 4A | 161.700 | 1.03\% | 129,360 | 0.64\% | 800.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 15,751.250 | 100.00\% | 20,112,065 | 100.00\% | 1,276.855 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 502.020 | 4.08\% | 627,398 | 4.85\% | 1,249.747 |
| 1D | 1,488.490 | 12.08\% | 1,779,468 | 13.76\% | 1,195.485 |
| 2D1 | 1,175.290 | 9.54\% | 1,317,471 | 10.19\% | 1,120.975 |
| 2D | 3,155.920 | 25.62\% | 3,461,162 | 26.77\% | 1,096.720 |
| 3D1 | 2,203.490 | 17.89\% | 2,293,817 | 17.74\% | 1,040.992 |
| 3D | 2,705.300 | 21.96\% | 2,568,242 | 19.86\% | 949.337 |
| 4D1 | 871.780 | 7.08\% | 719,252 | 5.56\% | 825.038 |
| 4D | 216.060 | 1.75\% | 162,046 | 1.25\% | 750.004 |
| Dry Total | 12,318.350 | 100.00\% | 12,928,856 | 100.00\% | 1,049.560 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 87.290 | $0.70 \%$ | 60,723 | $0.87 \%$ | 695.646 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 342.890 | $2.74 \%$ | 233,513 | $3.34 \%$ | 681.014 |
| 2G1 | 182.930 | $1.46 \%$ | 118,693 | $1.70 \%$ | 648.843 |
| 2G | $1,695.720$ | $13.53 \%$ | $1,130,901$ | $16.19 \%$ | 666.914 |
| 3G1 | $1,375.990$ | $10.98 \%$ | 862,296 | $12.34 \%$ | 626.673 |
| 3G | $3,464.010$ | $27.64 \%$ | $2,155,914$ | $30.86 \%$ | 622.375 |
| 4G1 | $2,947.220$ | $23.51 \%$ | $1,593,003$ | $22.80 \%$ | 540.510 |
| 4G | $2,438.330$ | $19.45 \%$ | 831,431 | $11.90 \%$ | 340.983 |
| Grass Total | $12,534.380$ | $100.00 \%$ | $6,986,474$ | $100.00 \%$ | 557.384 |
|  | $15,751.250$ | $37.27 \%$ | $20,112,065$ | $49.94 \%$ | $1,276.855$ |
| Irrigated Total | $12,318.350$ | $29.15 \%$ | $12,928,856$ | $32.11 \%$ | $1,049.560$ |
| Dry Total | $12,534.380$ | $29.66 \%$ | $6,986,474$ | $17.35 \%$ | 557.384 |
| Grass Total | $1,185.680$ | $2.81 \%$ | 148,104 | $0.37 \%$ | 124.910 |
| Waste | 474.730 | $1.12 \%$ | 94,946 | $0.24 \%$ | 200.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | $42,264.390$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $15,751.250$ | $14.97 \%$ | $20,112,065$ | $10.39 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $12,318.350$ | $7.42 \%$ | $12,928,856$ | $4.99 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $12,534.380$ | $24.24 \%$ | $6,986,474$ | $19.81 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,185.680$ | $32.85 \%$ | 148,104 | $35.59 \%$ |
| Other | 474.730 | $19.29 \%$ | 94,946 | $19.30 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $42,264.390$ | $12.85 \%$ | $40,270,445$ | $8.24 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 59 - Madison

Market Area: 3

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 2,136.270 | 16.38\% | 4,800,430 | 18.24\% | 2,247.108 |
| 1A | 3,141.810 | 24.09\% | 6,907,827 | 26.24\% | 2,198.677 |
| 2A1 | 1,387.290 | 10.64\% | 2,901,729 | 11.02\% | 2,091.652 |
| 2A | 160.220 | 1.23\% | 328,411 | 1.25\% | 2,049.750 |
| 3A1 | 1,314.340 | 10.08\% | 2,497,246 | 9.49\% | 1,900.000 |
| 3A | 4,404.020 | 33.77\% | 8,147,441 | 30.95\% | 1,850.000 |
| 4A1 | 483.790 | 3.71\% | 725,485 | 2.76\% | 1,499.586 |
| 4A | 11.590 | 0.09\% | 16,226 | 0.06\% | 1,400.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 13,039.330 | 100.00\% | 26,324,795 | 100.00\% | 2,018.876 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 7,328.240 | 15.77\% | 14,589,580 | 17.74\% | 1,990.870 |
| 1D | 9,930.560 | 21.37\% | 19,274,527 | 23.43\% | 1,940.930 |
| 2D1 | 4,534.000 | 9.76\% | 8,202,521 | 9.97\% | 1,809.113 |
| 2D | 534.310 | 1.15\% | 923,106 | 1.12\% | 1,727.659 |
| 3D1 | 6,782.740 | 14.60\% | 11,349,346 | 13.80\% | 1,673.268 |
| 3D | 15,882.100 | 34.18\% | 25,799,270 | 31.36\% | 1,624.424 |
| 4D1 | 1,380.540 | 2.97\% | 1,999,564 | 2.43\% | 1,448.392 |
| 4D | 88.250 | 0.19\% | 119,139 | 0.14\% | 1,350.017 |
| Dry Total | 46,460.740 | 100.00\% | 82,257,053 | 100.00\% | 1,770.463 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 321.020 | 6.57\% | 254,704 | 7.32\% | 793.420 |
| 1G | 485.870 | 9.94\% | 389,717 | 11.20\% | 802.101 |
| 2G1 | 1,304.360 | 26.69\% | 958,079 | 27.53\% | 734.520 |
| 2G | 449.110 | 9.19\% | 354,664 | 10.19\% | 789.704 |
| 3G1 | 487.450 | 9.97\% | 350,846 | 10.08\% | 719.757 |
| 3G | 890.690 | 18.22\% | 621,341 | 17.86\% | 697.595 |
| 4G1 | 382.510 | 7.83\% | 253,060 | 7.27\% | 661.577 |
| 4G | 566.440 | 11.59\% | 297,307 | 8.54\% | 524.869 |
| Grass Total | 4,887.450 | 100.00\% | 3,479,718 | 100.00\% | 711.970 |
| Irrigated Total | 13,039.330 | 20.09\% | 26,324,795 | 23.48\% | 2,018.876 |
| Dry Total | 46,460.740 | 71.58\% | 82,257,053 | 73.35\% | 1,770.463 |
| Grass Total | 4,887.450 | 7.53\% | 3,479,718 | 3.10\% | 711.970 |
| Waste | 373.110 | 0.57\% | 46,665 | 0.04\% | 125.070 |
| Other | 149.900 | 0.23\% | 29,980 | 0.03\% | 200.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 64,910.530 | 100.00\% | 112,138,211 | 100.00\% | 1,727.581 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $13,039.330$ | $12.39 \%$ | $26,324,795$ | $13.61 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $46,460.740$ | $28.00 \%$ | $82,257,053$ | $31.72 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $4,887.450$ | $9.45 \%$ | $3,479,718$ | $9.86 \%$ |
| Waste | 373.110 | $10.34 \%$ | 46,665 | $11.21 \%$ |
| Other | 149.900 | $6.09 \%$ | 29,980 | $6.09 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $64,910.530$ | $19.73 \%$ | $112,138,211$ | $22.93 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 59 - Madison


| Total | $328,927.810$ | $488,953,576$ | $328,927.810$ | $100.00 \%$ | $488,953,576$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,486.507$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates


# MADISON COUNTY THREE-YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT ASSESSMENT YEARS 2007, 2008, AND 2009 

15 - June - 2006

## Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year the Assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment. This plan shall describe the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two (2) 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." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land.
2) $75 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land
3) $75 \%$ of special value for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §771344 and $75 \%$ of its recapture value as defined in $\S 77-1343$ when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347.

## County Description:

Madison County has a total parcel count of 17,347 as certified on the 2006 Abstract of Assessment dated 18-May-2006. The Residential class of property accounts for $69.68 \%$, the Commercial / Industrial class contains $10.93 \%$, and the Agricultural class accounts for $19.39 \%$ of the total parcel count. The following chart provides a visual representation of the property classification breakdown.


The total Madison County real property valuation is $\$ 1,935,457,522$. The Residential class accounts for $47.77 \%$, the Commercial / Industrial class makes up $23.70 \%$, and the Agricultural class accounts for $28.53 \%$ of the total real property valuation.

Madison County has 2,546 personal property schedules with a total valuation of $\$ 117,255,053$, as certified on the 2006 Personal Property Abstract dated 15-June-2006.

As of this date, Madison County has 1,005 parcels with a Homestead Exemption.

For assessment year 2006, an estimated 527 building permits and information statements were received by the Madison County Assessor's Office.

For more information please refer to the 2006 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator, Abstract, and Assessor Survey for Madison County.

## Budget, Staffing \& Training:

## Budget:

The 2006 / 2007 Assessor’s Budget = \$219,312 The 2006 / 2007 Re-appraisal Budget $=$ \$176,050
Total Office Budget: \$395,362

## Staff:

For the last decade this office has been operated with a less than ideal number of staff members. In addition, many of these staff members have not been utilized in the most efficient manner. It is hoped that some staffing changes can be made in the near future. The most urgent need at this time is a full-time appraiser. It is also hoped that one other staff position may be added. The current lister needs to be replaced by a full-time position with more flexibility. As of today the Madison County Assessor's Office is comprised of 5.5 staff members broken down as follows:
(1) Assessor: This person is responsible for all real property valuation. The Assessor must also do approximately $1 / 2$ of the annual pickup work and sales reviews. At this time the Assessor is responsible for all data entry of property characteristics into TerraScan. In addition, the Assessor is responsible for all of the report generation. The Assessor is also responsible for all computer maintenance and updates.
(1) Deputy Assessor: This person is responsible for entering all agricultural land changes. In addition, the Deputy Assessor must also complete all splits and new additions. This person is also responsible for quality control and checking all data entry. Currently, this position is not utilized to the fullest extent. When a mapping program is obtained the Deputy and one other employee will spend a majority of their time building the data base.
(3) Full-time Clerks: These staff members are responsible for all aspects of both Personal Property and Homestead Exemption except report generation. In addition these members are also responsible for handling phone calls and waiting on the counter. Most walk-in taxpayer assistance is also handled by these members. These staff positions also make copies for customers, pull property record cards, and do all filing of property record cards. All building permits are processed through one of the staff members. In addition, Form 521 Transfer Statements are handled by these members. The sales are entered into TerraScan and green sheets are completed. These members also proof and correct all rosters as provided by D.P.A.T. An additional responsibility is attaching new value sheets to the property record card and writing new values on the outside of the record card. All no-contact letters are produced by these members.
(1) Part-time Lister: This person is responsible for data collection. This includes listing all new construction, additions, renovations, etc. In addition, this person conducts sales reviews. This person does not do any data entry into the computer system. This person works 3 day per week.

## Contract Appraiser:

The Madison County Assessor’s Office contracts with Great Plains Appraisal, (Wayne Kubert), to appraise industrial properties and grain elevators on an as-needed basis. It is anticipated that this office may contract with an outside source to begin a re-appraisal process. This is in response to the unsuccessful attempt to recruit a qualified appraiser with reappraisal experience. I will be including a significant amount of money in the next fiscal years budget (2006 / 2007) to begin this re-appraisal process.

## Training:

The Madison County Assessor attends all required workshops provided by the D.P.A.T. In addition, the Assessor attends annual schooling in order to maintain both the Assessor's Certificate and the Appraisal License.

The Deputy Assessor attends schooling in order to maintain the Assessor's Certificate.

The Clerks have historically not received any training outside of the office. This will probably change as the responsibilities of certain members are increased.

The lister has not received any training outside of the office. When this position is replaced, the new lister will receive some training outside of the office.

## 2006 R \& O Statistics (or T.E.R.C. Statistics):

| Property Class | $\underline{\text { Median }}$ |  | C.O.D. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential: | 94.63 |  | 16.50 | 105.20 |
| Commercial/Industrial: | 93.06 |  | 28.03 | 101.31 |
| Agricultural Unimp.: | 76.94 |  | 24.97 | 108.08 |

For more information regarding statistical measures please refer to the 2006 Reports \& Opinions of the Property Tax administrator.

From the above statistical information, it is obvious that much work needs to be done in order to improve both the uniformity and quality of assessment in Madison County. It is the hope of the current Madison County Assessor that additional staff, more efficient utilization of current staff, and a disciplined approach to achieving defined goals, will reverse the stagnate trend as previously demonstrated by this office. The following plan will address the steps necessary to correct these measures.

## Three-Year Appraisal Plan:

## 2007:

Residential: An attempt will be made to contract the reappraisal of Newman Grove Residential property. This will entail entering all information into TerraScan. In addition, new costing and depreciation will be used. An exterior inspection will be conducted on all parcels. An interior inspection will be conducted when possible. Current information will be verified and / or updated based on this physical review. New digital pictures will be taken. In addition, it is hoped that a depreciation study can be done for other areas. This will lay the ground-work for the continuing reappraisal of residential property in future years. Currently there are approximately 398 residential parcels in Newman Grove. In addition, appraisal maintenance will continue to be completed on the balance of the residential property class. Attempts are still being made to recruit an experienced appraiser. In addition, all sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed county-wide.

Commercial / Industrial: A re-appraisal of Newman Grove Commercial property in planned. This will be done in conjunction with the residential re-appraisal mentioned above. This will entail entering all information into TerraScan. All new costing and depreciation will be used. All properties will be physically inspected. Current information will be verified and / or updated based on this physical review. An interior inspection will be conducted where possible. New digital pictures will be taken. Currently there are approximately 81 commercial parcels in Newman Grove. In addition, all sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed county-wide.

Agricultural: In May of 2005 a new server was purchased in anticipation of implementing GIS. In June of 2006 a GIS system was purchased. The development and implementation of this system is seen as a long-term process. However, once this is achieved, this will allow the use of digitized satellite imagery in order to more accurately calculate soil types and acreages. There will be an in-depth analysis of all agricultural sales in Madison County. The sales will be analyzed by L.C.G. as well as by market area. The Assessor will determine if adjustments are necessary in order to maintain statistical compliance. In addition, the Assessor will determine if the sales support the current market areas or if an adjustment to these areas is needed. All sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed countywide.

## 2008:

Residential: Depending on the outcome of the 2007 appraisal plan, it is hoped to continue to re-appraise other Assessor Locations. For 2008 the towns of Tilden, Meadow Grove and Battle Creek will be reappraised. This will entail entering all information and property characteristics into TerraScan. In addition, new costing and depreciation will be used. All properties will be physically inspected. Current information will be verified and / or updated based on this physical review. An attempt will be made to inspect the interior of these properties where possible. New digital pictures will be taken. Currently there are approximately 359 residential parcels in Tilden, 187 residential parcels in Meadow Grove and 514 residential parcels in Battle Creek. In addition, all sales and pick-up work will be completed county-wide. It is hoped time will allow the entering of all rural residential data into TerraScan in anticipation of a re-valuation for next year.

Commercial: Commercial properties in the towns of Tilden, Meadow Grove and Battle Creek will be re-appraised. This will entail entering all information and property characteristics into TerraScan. All new costing and depreciation will be used. All properties will be physically inspected. Current information will be verified and / or updated based on this physical review. An attempt will be made to inspect the interior of these properties where possible. New digital pictures will be taken. Currently there are approximately 55 commercial parcels in Tilden, 33 commercial parcels in Meadow Grove and 66 commercial parcels in Battle Creek. In addition, all sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed county-wide.

Agricultural: There will be an in-depth analysis of all agricultural sales in Madison County. The sales will be analyzed by L.C.G. as well as by market area. The Assessor will determine if adjustments are necessary in order to maintain statistical compliance. In addition, the Assessor will determine if the sales support the current market areas or if an adjustment to these areas is needed. All sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed county-wide.

## 2009:

Residential: For 2009 the city of Madison will be reappraised. It is also hoped that the rural residential properties will be addressed this year. This will entail entering all information and property characteristics into TerraScan. In addition, new costing and depreciation will be used. All properties will be physically inspected. Current information will be verified and / or updated based on this physical review. An attempt will be made to inspect the interior of these properties where possible. New digital pictures will be taken. Currently, there are approximately 892 residential parcels in Madison and 2,269 rural residential parcels. In addition, all sales and pick-up work will be completed countywide.

Commercial: Commercial properties in the city of Madison as well as all rural commercial properties will be re-appraised. This will entail entering all information and property characteristics into TerraScan. All new costing and depreciation will be used. All properties will be physically inspected. Current information will be verified and / or updated based on this physical review. An attempt will be made to inspect the interior of these properties where possible. New digital pictures will be taken. Currently there are approximately 124 commercial parcels in Madison and 288 rural commercial parcels. In addition, all sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed county-wide.

Agricultural: There will be an in-depth analysis of all agricultural sales in Madison County. The sales will be analyzed by L.C.G. as well as by market area. The Assessor will determine if adjustments are necessary in order to maintain statistical compliance. Agricultural improvements are to be re-appraised this year. This will entail approximately 1,708 parcels. In addition, the Assessor will determine if the sales support the current market areas or if an adjustment to these areas is needed. All sales reviews and pick-up work will be completed county-wide.

The following table will provide a visual representation of the proposed Three-Year Plan of Assessment.

| Prop. Class | Residential | Commercial | Agricultural |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Newman Grove (398), <br> Appraisal Maintenance | Newman Grove (81), <br> Appraisal <br> Maintenance | Re-valuation of Ag. Land <br> (if necessary) |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | Tilden (359), Meadow <br> Grove (187), \& Battle <br> Creek (514), Appraisal <br> Maintenance | Tilden (55), Meadow <br> Grove (33), \& Battle <br> Creek (66), Appraisal <br> Maintenance | Re-valuation of Ag. Land <br> (if necessary) |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ |  <br>  <br>  <br> Rural Residential <br> (2,269), Appraisal <br> Maintenance |  <br> Rural (288), Appraisal <br> Maintenance | Re-valuation of Ag. Land <br> (if necessary) \& Ag. <br> Improvements (1,715) |

Attest this, the $15^{\text {th }}$. day of June 2006.

Jeff Hackerott
Madison 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 Madison County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70051160000112139539.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.



[^0]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7 .

