### **Preface**

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that "taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution." Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1 (1) (1998). The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2006). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2006) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual value.

To ensure that the classes of real property are assessed at these required levels of actual value, the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, hereinafter referred to as the Department, under the direction of the Property Tax Administrator, is annually responsible for analyzing and measuring the assessment performance of each county. This responsibility includes requiring the Property Tax Administrator to prepare statistical and narrative reports for the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and the county assessors. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R.S. Supp., 2005):

- (2) ... the Property Tax Administrator shall prepare and deliver to the commission and to each county assessor his or her annual reports and opinions.
- (3) The annual reports and opinions of the Property Tax Administrator shall contain statistical and narrative reports informing the commission of the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property within the county and a certification of the opinion of the Property Tax

Administrator regarding the level of value and quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in the county.

(4) In addition to an opinion of level of value and quality of assessment in the county, the Property Tax Administrator may make nonbinding recommendations for consideration by the commission.

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Table of Contents**

#### **Commission Summary**

#### **Property Tax Administrator's Opinions and Recommendations**

#### **Correlation Section**

#### Residential Real Property

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

#### Commercial Real Property

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

#### Agricultural Land

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

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

#### **Statistical Reports Section**

**R&O** Statistical Reports

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

**Preliminary Statistical Reports** 

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

#### **Assessment Survey Section**

#### **County Reports Section**

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

### **Special Valuation Section**

Certification

**Map Section** 

**Valuation History Chart Section** 

### **2007 Commission Summary**

### 75 Rock

Residential Real Property	- Currei	nt		
Number of Sales		37	COD	10.80
Total Sales Price	\$	1472600	PRD	102.37
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	1476600	COV	19.05
Total Assessed Value	\$	1443680	STD	19.07
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	39908.11	Avg. Abs. Dev.	10.51
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	39018.38	Min	54.00
Median		97.32	Max	171.33
Wgt. Mean		97.77	95% Median C.I.	95.98 to 99.88
Mean		100.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	94.15 to 101.39
			95% Mean C.I.	93.95 to 106.24
% of Value of the Class of al	l Real Pro	operty Value in	the County	10.03
% of Records Sold in the Stu	ıdy Perio	d		5.04
% of Value Sold in the Study	/ Period			6.57
Average Assessed Value of	the Base			29,959

Residential Rea	al Property - History			
Year	<b>Number of Sales</b>	Median	COD	PRD
2007	37	97.32	10.80	102.37
2006	48	98.46	7.42	100.81
2005	51	97.65	19.90	103.47
2004	49	100.76	27.11	115.87
2003	53	99	20.93	111.55
2002	55	99	12.85	103.75
2001	63	95	49.59	129.83

### **2007 Commission Summary**

### 75 Rock

Commercial Real Prop	erty - (	Current		
<b>Number of Sales</b>		10	COD	5.21
Total Sales Price	\$	980062	PRD	101.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	887062	COV	7.41
Total Assessed Value	\$	841105	STD	7.12
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	88706.20	Avg. Abs. Dev.	5.02
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	84110.50	Min	84.43
Median		96.43	Max	111.00
Wgt. Mean		94.82	95% Median C.I.	89.88 to 100.00
Mean		96.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	91.86 to 97.78
			95% Mean C.I.	90.94 to 101.12
% of Value of the Class	of all R	eal Property Value in	the County	2.93
% of Records Sold in the	Study	Period		7.14
% of Value Sold in the S	tudy P	eriod		13.09
Average Assessed Value	of the	Base		45,881

Commercial Re	eal Property - History			
Year	<b>Number of Sales</b>	Median	COD	PRD
2007	10	96.43	5.21	101.27
2006	14	97.37	5.24	100.99
2005	21	97.15	18.65	101.57
2004	20	99.90	19.88	104.58
2003	13	99	24.85	113.89
2002	11	93	25.17	100.79
2001	16	95	25.53	100.52

### **2007 Commission Summary**

### 75 Rock

Number of Sales		38	COD	20.69
Total Sales Price	\$	10112663	PRD	100.38
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$	9492161	COV	26.69
Total Assessed Value	\$	7092640	STD	20.02
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$	249793.71	Avg. Abs. Dev.	14.73
Avg. Assessed Value	\$	186648.42	Min	39.75
Median		71.21	Max	123.05
Wgt. Mean		74.72	95% Median C.I.	62.52 to 79.85
Mean		75.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	67.10 to 82.35
			95% Mean C.I.	68.64 to 81.37
% of Value of the Class of	f all Real	Property Value in	n the County	87.23
% of Records Sold in the	Study Pe	eriod		1.71
% of Value Sold in the St	udy Peri	od		9.7
Average Assessed Value	of the Ba	nse		86,160

Agricultural La	and - History			
Year	<b>Number of Sales</b>	Median	COD	PRD
2007	38	71.21	20.69	100.38
2006	35	78.51	17.90	103.37
2005	38	77.59	14.63	104.48
2004	39	76.88	12.96	102.21
2003	42	74	16.1	106.46
2002	39	75	26.88	118.28
2001	46	80	28.49	114.48

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

#### **Commercial Real Property**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Rock County is 96% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Rock County is 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 Rock County is 71% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Rock County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Catherine D. Lang

Property Tax Administrator

#### **Residential Real Property**

#### I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the 2007 Residential statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the residential property in Rock County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range indicating the required level of value has been met. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both within the acceptable range indicating uniform and proportionate assessment for 2007. The six tables that follow along with the reported assessment actions all demonstrate a level of value within the acceptable range. There is no information available that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the residential property class.

#### 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
2007	60	37	61.67
2006	75	48	64
2005	73	51	69.86
2004	67	49	73.13
2003	68	53	77.94
2002	71	55	77.46
2001	73	63	86.3

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized an acceptable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

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

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

#### Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is  $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$ . This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2007	97.17	2.09	99.2	97.32
2006	96.74	3.44	100.06	98.46
2005	99.79	5.4	105.18	97.65
2004	101.87	-6.28	95.48	100.76
2003	99	-0.77	98.24	99
2002	92.88	20.89	112.28	99
2001	91	2.66	93.42	95

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio 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 Asse Value in the Sales Fi		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
3.63	2007	2.09
8.35	2006	3.44
0.48	2005	5.4
1.32	2004	-6.28
0	2003	-0.77
15.27	2002	20.89
2.4	2001	2.66

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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean	
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	97.32	97.77	100.09	

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that all three measures for the qualified residential sales file are within the acceptable level of value. The measures being sufficiently in support of each other indicate that the median is a reliable measure of the level of assessment 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
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	10.80	102.37
Difference	0	0

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the 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.

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	37	37	0
Median	97.17	97.32	0.15
Wgt. Mean	95.99	97.77	1.78
Mean	96.78	100.09	3.31
COD	9.70	10.80	1.1
PRD	100.83	102.37	1.54
Min Sales Ratio	54.00	54.00	0
Max Sales Ratio	150.00	171.33	21.33

RESIDENTIAL: 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.

#### **Commerical Real Property**

#### I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the 2007 Commercial statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the commercial property in Rock County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range indicating the required level of value has been met. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both within the acceptable range indicating uniform and proportionate assessment for 2007. The sales utilization grid indicates the total sales for the commercial class of property has slowly been on the decline the past few years. The assessor believes the market has been slowing down as well. There is no information available that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the commercial property class.

#### 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
2007	18	10	55.56
2006	24	14	58.33
2005	29	21	72.41
2004	26	20	76.92
2003	21	13	61.9
2002	20	11	55
2001	23	16	69.57

COMMERCIAL: A review of table II indicates the total number of sales as well as the qualified sales has been decreasing for the past three years. Indications are the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

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

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

#### Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is  $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$ . This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2007	94.89	-0.41	94.5	96.43
2006	95.90	13.86	109.19	97.37
2005	98.75	-0.68	98.08	97.15
2004	99.45	3.01	102.44	99.90
2003	99	0.01	99.01	99
2002	89.37	-0.68	88.76	93
2001	93	2.29	95.13	92

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio 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 Asse Value in the Sales Fil	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	
3.49	2007	-0.41
-4.04	2006	13.86
-9.84	2005	-0.68
0.14	2004	3.01
0	2003	0.01
2.54	2002	-0.68
39.29	2001	2.29

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in the sale base and the percent change in the assessed base are slightly different, but not unreasonable. The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an affect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base.

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

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

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

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

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

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	96.43	94.82	96.03

COMMERCIAL: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that all three measures for the qualified commercial sales file are within the acceptable level of value. The measures being sufficiently in support of each other indicate that the median is a reliable measure of the level of assessment 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
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	5.21	101.27
Difference	0	0

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the 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	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	10	10	0
Median	94.89	96.43	1.54
Wgt. Mean	93.28	94.82	1.54
Mean	93.04	96.03	2.99
COD	7.34	5.21	-2.13
PRD	99.75	101.27	1.52
Min Sales Ratio	63.12	84.43	21.31
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	111.00	111.00	0

COMMERCIAL: 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.

#### **Agricultural Land**

#### I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the 2007 Agricultural Unimproved statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the agricultural unimproved property in Rock County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range indicating the required level of value has been met. The price related differential is within the acceptable range while the coefficient of dispersion is just slightly above, but not unreasonable. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is consistent suggesting that sold and unsold parcels were appraised similarly. The reported assessment actions for 2007 support the statistics from the preliminary to the final analysis. There is no information available that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the agricultural unimproved property class.

#### 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
2007	70	38	54.29
2006	64	35	54.69
2005	80	38	47.5
2004	83	39	46.99
2003	78	42	53.85
2002	69	39	56.52
2001	70	46	65.71

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the table indicates that the county has stayed fairly consistent with the previous years indicating stability in the sales review procedures implemented and that the county has not excessively trimmed the sample.

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

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

#### Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is  $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$ . This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2007	67.06	9.65	73.53	71.21
2006	71.87	7.92	77.56	78.51
2005	73.82	5.35	77.77	77.59
2004	74.18	6.22	78.79	76.88
2003	74	9.87	81.3	74
2002	72.57	6.85	77.54	75
2001	73	12.23	81.93	75

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: After review of the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the Reports and Opinion Median, it is believed that the two statistics are similar and support a level of value within the acceptable range.

### 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 Assesse Value in the Sales File	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	
8.26	2007	9.65
8.96	2006	7.92
1.29	2005	5.35
12.36	2004	6.22
4	2003	9.87
12.19	2002	6.85
6.46	2001	12.23

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: After review of the percent change report it appears that both sold and unsold properties were treated 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 Rock County

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean	
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	71.21	74.72	75.00	

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and support each other. The median is a reliable measure of the level of assessment in this class of property.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Rock County

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

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

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

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

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

	COD	PRD
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	20.69	100.38
Difference	0.69	0

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The price related differential is within the acceptable range and the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the range at 20.69. The indication is this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

# 2007 Correlation Section for Rock County

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	38	38	0
Median	67.06	71.21	4.15
Wgt. Mean	68.95	74.72	5.77
Mean	69.03	75.00	5.97
COD	21.53	20.69	-0.84
PRD	100.11	100.38	0.27
Min Sales Ratio	32.43	39.75	7.32
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	115.18	123.05	7.87

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is reflective of the actions of the assessor in making valuation changes to the various land capability groups within each market area of Rock County. The statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment actions taken for unimproved agricultural land in Rock County.

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

75 Rock

	2006 CTL County Total	2007 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)	Percent Change	2007 Growth (New Construction Value)	% Change excl. Growth
1. Residential	21,209,075	21,846,155	637,080	3	197,791	2.07
2. Recreational	137,530	143,780	6,250	4.54	0	4.54
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	9,185,865	9,328,445	142,580	1.55	*	1.55
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	30,532,470	31,318,380	785,910	2.57	197,791	1.93
5. Commercial	6,449,845	6,423,340	-26,505	-0.41	0	-0.41
6. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,666,900	7,156,410	1,489,510	26.28	313,023	20.76
8. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	12,116,745	13,579,750	1,463,005	12.07	0	12.07
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	42,649,215	44,898,130	2,248,915	5.27	510,814	4.08
11. Irrigated	37,320,230	40,318,555	2,998,325	8.03		
12. Dryland	1,348,220	1,528,905	180,685	13.4		
13. Grassland	136,601,200	149,328,220	12,727,020	9.32		
14. Wasteland	569050	1,158,850	589,800	103.65		
15. Other Agland	364,215	863,200	498,985	137		
16. Total Agricultural Land	176,202,915	193,197,730	16,994,815	9.65		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	218,852,130	238,095,860	19,243,730	8.79	510,814	8.56

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

Type: Qualified

111010111111111111111111111111111111111					Type: Qualifie	ed					
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
NUMBE	R of Sales	s:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	cov:	19.05	95%	Median C.I.: 95.98	to 99.88	
TOTAL S	Sales Price	e: 1	,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	19.07	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 94.15	to 101.39	
TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	e: 1	,476,600	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.51	95	% Mean C.I.: 93.9	5 to 106.24	
TOTAL Asse	ssed Value	e: 1	,443,680								
AVG. Adj. S	ales Price	e:	39,908	COD:	10.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.33				
AVG. Asse	ssed Value	e:	39,018	PRD:	102.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 03/28/.	2007 11:21:33
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	5	99.92	101.65	100.85	6.4	3 100.80	90.55	118.70	N/A	73,270	73,892
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	112.99	121.53	107.92	24.0	6 112.61	88.82	171.33	N/A	7,762	8,377
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	3	97.17	97.11	97.04	0.4	8 100.07	96.38	97.78	N/A	21,100	20,475
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	9	96.99	97.47	97.61	1.8	1 99.86	93.54	102.89	95.98 to 98.60	41,488	40,496
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	7	94.77	90.72	98.62	13.2	0 91.99	54.00	108.99	54.00 to 108.99	50,285	49,592
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	109.79	109.79	109.23	0.5	6 100.51	109.17	110.40	N/A	23,750	25,942
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	94.89	94.89	95.48	0.8	9 99.38	94.04	95.73	N/A	47,000	44,875
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	88.13	99.20	84.59	21.1	1 117.27	76.54	150.00	N/A	29,800	25,208
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	21	97.78	103.00	99.37	8.0	7 103.65	88.82	171.33	96.38 to 99.92	39,719	39,469
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	95.25	96.27	95.69	14.3	7 100.61	54.00	150.00	80.88 to 108.99	40,156	38,426
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	21	97.17	96.34	98.65	6.5	0 97.66	54.00	110.40	95.98 to 98.60	39,819	39,281
ALL											
	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.8	0 102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BASSETT	21	97.17	96.46	97.03	4.7	5 99.40	76.54	108.99	95.98 to 99.88	40,961	39,746
NEWPORT	6	109.79	118.76	108.53	15.6	5 109.43	94.04	171.33	94.04 to 171.33	12,875	13,973
NEWPORT SUB	1	95.73	95.73	95.73			95.73	95.73	N/A	80,000	76,585
RURAL	1	77.75	77.75	77.75			77.75	77.75	N/A	30,000	23,325
SUBURBAN	5	97.32	99.78	99.27	6.3	6 100.51	90.55	118.70	N/A	84,270	83,654
SUBURBAN V	3	88.82	97.61	89.42	36.0	3 109.15	54.00	150.00	N/A	2,600	2,325
ALL											
	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.8	0 102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
LOCATIONS: URBAN,	SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	27	98.21	101.41	97.98	8.6		76.54	171.33	96.13 to 101.53	34,720	34,019
2	8	96.04	98.97	99.09	17.6	3 99.87	54.00	150.00	54.00 to 150.00	53,643	53,155
3	2	86.74	86.74	90.83	10.3	6 95.50	77.75	95.73	N/A	55,000	49,955
ALL											
	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.8	0 102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018

PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics

Type: Qualified RESIDENTIAL

State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL					Type: Qualifie		006 D ( 11	D 6 01/10	/200 <b>=</b>	State Stat Kun	
				A SERVINA		ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I				
	NUMBER of Sales		37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	COV:	19.05	95%	Median C.I.: 95.98	3 to 99.88	
	OTAL Sales Price		,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	19.07	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 94.15	to 101.39	
	Adj.Sales Price		,476,600	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.51	95	% Mean C.I.: 93.9	5 to 106.24	
	AL Assessed Value		,443,680								
	Adj. Sales Price		39,908	COD:	10.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.33				
	G. Assessed Value		39,018	PRD:	102.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 03/28/	2007 11:21:33
	OVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	34	97.44	100.31	97.81	8.58		76.54	171.33	95.98 to 99.92	43,200	42,256
2	3	88.82	97.61	89.42	36.03	3 109.15	54.00	150.00	N/A	2,600	2,325
ALL											
-	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.80	102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
PROPERTY TYPE	₹ *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.80	102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
06											
07											
ALL											
	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.80	102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
SCHOOL DISTRI	CT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.80	102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
NonValid Schoo	1										
ALL											
	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.80	102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	4	83.29	92.64	80.16	32.14	4 115.57	54.00	150.00	N/A	9,450	7,575
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	96.38	96.38	96.38			96.38	96.38	N/A	25,800	24,865
1920 TO 1939	4	96.16	114.43	97.19	20.32	2 117.73	94.04	171.33	N/A	26,562	25,816
1940 TO 1949	6	98.05	97.14	96.32	2.83	3 100.85	88.13	101.53	88.13 to 101.53	21,083	20,307
1950 TO 1959	6	98.29	99.84	101.05	4.34	98.80	94.60	108.99	94.60 to 108.99	36,916	37,305
1960 TO 1969	1	98.21	98.21	98.21			98.21	98.21	N/A	29,000	28,480
1970 TO 1979	9	97.56	97.81	98.48	7.62	99.32	76.54	118.70	90.55 to 107.60	74,972	73,832
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	2	111.55	111.55	98.48	13.05	5 113.26	96.99	126.10	N/A	48,750	48,010
1995 TO 1999	2	109.79	109.79	109.23	0.56	5 100.51	109.17	110.40	N/A	23,750	25,942
2000 TO Prese	nt 2	87.82	87.82	89.72	7.93	1 97.89	80.88	94.77	N/A	55,000	49,345
ALL											
	37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.80	102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018

**Base Stat** PAGE:3 of 4 PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics 75 - ROCK COUNTY State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL

Type: Qualified

						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	cov:	19.05	95%	Median C.I.: 95.98	to 99.88	
	TOTAL Sal	es Price	: 1	,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	19.07		. Mean C.I.: 94.15		
TO	TAL Adj.Sal	es Price	: 1	,476,600	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.51	95	% Mean C.I.: 93.9	5 to 106.24	
T	OTAL Assess	ed Value	: 1	,443,680								
AV	G. Adj. Sal	es Price	:	39,908	COD:	10.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.33				
	AVG. Assess	ed Value	:	39,018	PRD:	102.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 03/28/	2007 11:21:33
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO:	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	5	110.40	114.91	108.29	32.3	4 106.12	54.00	171.33	N/A	2,510	2,718
5000 TO	9999	2	113.82	113.82	110.63	10.7	9 102.88	101.53	126.10	N/A	6,750	7,467
Total :	\$											
1 TO	9999	7	110.40	114.60	109.50	26.2	8 104.65	54.00	171.33	54.00 to 171.33	3,721	4,075
10000 TO	29999	11	96.60	96.31	96.19	2.2	8 100.12	88.13	100.44	94.04 to 99.88	21,027	20,225
30000 TO	59999	10	97.15	94.27	94.91	9.6	0 99.32	76.54	109.17	77.75 to 108.99	45,090	42,794
60000 TO	99999	8	97.44	101.07	101.03	5.0	0 100.04	94.77	118.70	94.77 to 118.70	82,293	83,141
100000 TO	149999	1	90.55	90.55	90.55			90.55	90.55	N/A	110,000	99,600
ALL												
		37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.8	0 102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	5	110.40	114.91	108.29	32.3	4 106.12	54.00	171.33	N/A	2,510	2,718
5000 TO	9999	3	101.53	108.08	104.66	9.6	9 103.26	96.60	126.10	N/A	7,833	8,198
Total :												
1 TO	9999	8	105.97	112.35	105.92	25.5	8 106.07	54.00	171.33	54.00 to 171.33	4,506	4,773
10000 TO	29999	11	96.38	94.59	93.97	4.0		77.75	100.44	88.13 to 99.88	22,845	21,468
30000 TO	59999	9	98.32	96.10	96.13	8.2	2 99.97	76.54	109.17	80.88 to 108.99	46,766	44,957
60000 TO	99999	9	97.32	99.90	99.53	5.2	2 100.38	90.55	118.70	94.77 to 107.60	85,372	84,970
ALL												
		37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.8	0 102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		4	83.29	92.64	80.16	32.1		54.00	150.00	N/A	9,450	7,575
10		8	100.71	111.85	104.50	15.0		94.04	171.33	94.04 to 171.33	14,968	15,641
20		13	97.17	97.98	99.66	3.5		88.13	118.70	94.60 to 98.32	41,665	41,524
30		12	97.96	97.02	96.27	7.8	8 100.77	76.54	110.40	90.55 to 107.60	64,783	62,369
ALL					_							_
		37	97.32	100.09	97.77	10.8	0 102.37	54.00	171.33	95.98 to 99.88	39,908	39,018

75 - ROCK COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics	Base Stat	PAGE:4 of 4
			State Stat Dun

RESIDENTIAL State Stat Run **Type: Qualified MEDIAN:** 37 97 NUMBER of Sales: 95% Median C.I.: 95.98 to 99.88 cov: 19.05 TOTAL Sales Price: 1,472,600 WGT. MEAN: 98 19.07 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 94.15 to 101.39 STD: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 1,476,600 MEAN: 100 95% Mean C.I.: 93.95 to 106.24 AVG.ABS.DEV: 10.51 TOTAL Assessed Value: 1,443,680 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 39,908 COD: 10.80 MAX Sales Ratio: 171.33 39,018 AVG. Assessed Value: PRD: 102.37 MIN Sales Ratio: 54.00 Printed: 03/28/2007 11:21:33 STYLE Avg. Adj. Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN WGT. MEAN 95% Median C.I. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 91.79 95.96 54.00 to 150.00 16,566 (blank) 6 90.12 24.44 106.48 54.00 150.00 18,383 1 126.10 100 126.10 126.10 126.10 126.10 N/A 5,000 6,305 101 21 97.78 97.87 99.20 6.26 98.66 76.54 118.70 94.60 to 100.44 44,788 44,430 102 3 95.98 121.01 97.11 26.26 124.61 95.73 171.33 N/A 44,083 42,810 104 6 97.37 97.18 95.84 2.47 101.40 90.55 102.89 90.55 to 102.89 48,083 46,082 ALL\_ 37 97.32 100.09 97.77 10.80 102.37 54.00 171.33 95.98 to 99.88 39,908 39,018 CONDITION Avg. Adj. Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 83.29 N/A 9,450 7,575 (blank) 4 92.64 80.16 32.14 115.57 54.00 150.00 10 1 171.33 171.33 2,250 3,855 171.33 171.33 171.33 N/A 20 6 98.00 102.03 97.82 6.34 104.31 93.54 126.10 93.54 to 126.10 23,166 22,660 30 24 97.44 98.55 98.47 6.07 100.08 76.54 118.70 95.73 to 101.53 50,835 50,055 40 2 92.06 92.06 93.19 4.26 98.78 88.13 95.98 N/A 38,750 36,112 \_ALL\_\_

102.37

54.00

171.33

95.98 to 99.88

39,908

39,018

10.80

37

97.32

100.09

75 - ROCK COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics  Base Stat	PAGE:1 of 4
	TACT 2007 RCO Statistics	C4 4 C4 4 D
COMMERCIAL	Type: Qualified	State Stat Run
	Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007	

					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		
NUMBER	of Sales	s:	10	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	96	COV:	7.41	95%	Median C.I.: 89.88	to 100.00	
TOTAL Sa	les Price	e:	980,062	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:			. Mean C.I.: 91.86		
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	e:	887,062	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.02		% Mean C.I.: 90.94		
TOTAL Assess	sed Value	e:	841,105								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	e:	88,706	COD:	5.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.00				
AVG. Assess	sed Value	e:	84,110	PRD:	101.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	84.43			Printed: 03/28/.	2007 11:21:40
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/03 TO 09/30/03	1	111.00	111.00	111.00			111.00	111.00	N/A	25,000	27,750
10/01/03 TO 12/31/03	4	97.59	96.04	96.98	2.4	4 99.03	89.88	99.09	N/A	80,500	78,067
01/01/04 TO 03/31/04											
04/01/04 TO 06/30/04	1	95.43	95.43	95.43			95.43	95.43	N/A	15,000	14,315
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	50,000	42,215
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	19,000	19,000
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
Study Years											
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04	6	97.59	98.43	97.88	4.2	9 100.56	89.88	111.00	89.88 to 111.00	60,333	59,055
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	94.35	92.93	93.35	5.5	0 99.55	84.43	100.00	N/A	128,666	120,106
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	95.43	95.43	95.43			95.43	95.43	N/A	15,000	14,315
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	87.68	87.68	89.21	3.7	1 98.28	84.43	90.93	N/A	94,531	84,332
ALL											
	10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	1 101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BASSETT	6	94.89	96.56	94.03	5.1		89.88	111.00	89.88 to 111.00	88,010	82,756
RURAL	3	97.42	93.65	95.75	5.0	2 97.80	84.43	99.09	N/A	113,333	108,521
RURAL V	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	19,000	19,000
ALL											
	10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	1 101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110
LOCATIONS: URBAN, ST									050 11 0 5	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	6	94.89	96.56	94.03	5.1		89.88	111.00	89.88 to 111.00	88,010	82,756
3	4	98.26	95.24	95.98	4.3	9 99.22	84.43	100.00	N/A	89,750	86,141
ALL	1.0	06.42	06.03	04.82	F 0	1 101 27	04 42	111 00	00 00 +- 100 00	00 706	04 110
	10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	1 101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110

75 - ROCK COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics	Base Stat	PAGE:2 of 4
G010770GT1T			Ctate Ctat Dun

COMMERCIAL State Stat Run **Type: Qualified MEDIAN:** 96 NUMBER of Sales: 10 95% Median C.I.: 89.88 to 100.00 COV: 7.41 TOTAL Sales Price: 980,062 WGT. MEAN: 95 7.12 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 91.86 to 97.78 STD: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 887,062 MEAN: 96 5.02 95% Mean C.I.: 90.94 to 101.12 AVG.ABS.DEV: TOTAL Assessed Value: 841,105 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 88,706 COD: 5.21 MAX Sales Ratio: 111.00 AVG. Assessed Value: 84,110 PRD: 101.27 MIN Sales Ratio: 84.43 Printed: 03/28/2007 11:21:40 Avg. Adj. STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 1 95.43 95.59 94.71 5.32 91,345 9 100.93 84.43 111.00 89.88 to 99.09 96,451 2 1 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 N/A 19,000 19,000 ALL\_\_\_ 10 96.43 96.03 94.82 5.21 101.27 84.43 111.00 89.88 to 100.00 88,706 84,110 SCHOOL DISTRICT \* Avg. Adj. Avg. Assd Val Sale Price RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN 95% Median C.I. (blank) 09-0010 75-0100 10 96.43 96.03 94.82 5.21 101.27 84.43 111.00 89.88 to 100.00 88,706 84,110 NonValid School ALL\_ 10 96.43 96.03 94.82 5.21 101.27 84.43 111.00 89.88 to 100.00 88,706 84,110 YEAR BUILT \* Avg. Adj. Avg. 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX N/A 0 OR Blank 1 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 19,000 19,000 Prior TO 1860 1860 TO 1899 1900 TO 1919 7.54 95.43 1920 TO 1939 2 103.22 103.22 105.16 98.15 111.00 20,000 21,032 N/A 1940 TO 1949 1950 TO 1959 97.75 97.75 97.75 97.75 97.75 N/A 2,000 1,955 1960 TO 1969 1970 TO 1979 94.18 94.33 95.14 4.17 99.15 89.88 99.09 N/A 114,765 109,191 1980 TO 1989 1990 TO 1994 1 94.35 94.35 94.35 94.35 94.35 N/A 317,000 299,105 1995 TO 1999 2000 TO Present 84.43 84.43 84.43 84.43 84.43 N/A 50,000 42,215 \_\_ALL\_\_\_\_

5.21

101.27

84.43

111.00

89.88 to 100.00

88,706

84,110

10

96.43

96.03

75 - ROCK COUNTY	PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics	Base Stat			
COMMERCIAL	Type: Qualified	_	State Stat Run		

					IAGI	State State Dun						
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualifi	ied				State Stat Run	
						Date Ra	inge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30	/2006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER	of Sales	;:	10	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	96	COV	: 7.41	95%	Median C.I.: 89.88	R to 100 00	
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	e:	980,062	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD			. Mean C.I.: 91.8		
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	<b>:</b>	887,062	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV			% Mean C.I.: 90.		
Т	OTAL Asses	sed Value	<b>:</b>	841,105			AVG.ADD.DEV	3.02	, ,	o ricuit c.i yo	)1 CO 101.12	
AV	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	<b>:</b>	88,706	COD:	5.21	MAX Sales Ratio	: 111.00				
	AVG. Asses			84,110	PRD:	101.27	MIN Sales Ratio				Printed: 03/28/	/2007 11:21:40
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
Total S	\$											
1 TO	9999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
10000 TO	29999	3	100.00	102.14	103.50	5.1	19 98.69	95.43	111.00	N/A	19,666	20,355
30000 TO	59999	3	89.88	91.13	91.33	5.4	14 99.79	84.43	99.09	N/A	43,333	39,575
100000 TO	149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
150000 TO	249999	1	97.42	97.42	97.42			97.42	97.42	N/A	240,000	233,805
250000 TO	499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALL												
		10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
Total S	\$											
1 TO	9999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
10000 TO	29999	4	97.72	99.08	98.91	6.5	57 100.17	89.88	111.00	N/A	22,250	22,007
30000 TO	59999	2	91.76	91.76	91.76	7.9	99 100.00	84.43	99.09	N/A	50,000	45,880
100000 TO	149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
150000 TO	249999	1	97.42	97.42	97.42			97.42	97.42	N/A	240,000	233,805
250000 TO	499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALL												
		10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	21 101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	19,000	19,000
10		4	98.42	100.82	101.70	4.3		95.43	111.00	N/A	23,000	23,391
20		5	90.93	91.40	93.88	3.8	97.36	84.43	97.42	N/A	155,212	145,708
ALL												
		10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	21 101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110

75 - RO	CK COUNTY			PA&T	2007 R	&0	Statistics		Base	Stat		PAGE:4 of 4
COMMERC	IAL			111001	Type: Qualific		<u>Statistics</u>				State Stat Run	
							7/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Post	ed Before: 01/1	9/2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	3:	10	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	96		COV:	7.4	1 95%	Median C.I.: 89.8	3 to 100.00	
	TOTAL Sales Price	<b>:</b>	980,062	WGT. MEAN:	95		STD:	7.1		t. Mean C.I.: 91.8		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	<b>:</b>	887,062	MEAN:	96		AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.0	_	5% Mean C.I.: 90.		
	TOTAL Assessed Value	e:	841,105				11,0111201221	3.	-		71 00 101.12	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	e:	88,706	COD:	5.21	MAX	Sales Ratio:	111.0	0			
	AVG. Assessed Value	<b>:</b>	84,110	PRD:	101.27	MIN	Sales Ratio:	84.4	13		Printed: 03/28/	2007 11:21:40
OCCUPAN	CY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00	N/A	19,000	19,000
325	1	89.88	89.88	89.88				89.88	89.88	N/A	30,000	26,965
344	1	99.09	99.09	99.09				99.09	99.09	N/A	50,000	49,545
352	1	90.93	90.93	90.93				90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
353	1	95.43	95.43	95.43				95.43	95.43	N/A	15,000	14,315
395	1	97.42	97.42	97.42				97.42	97.42	N/A	240,000	233,805
404	1	97.75	97.75	97.75				97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
442	1	111.00	111.00	111.00				111.00	111.00	N/A	25,000	27,750
528	1	84.43	84.43	84.43				84.43	84.43	N/A	50,000	42,215
531	1	94.35	94.35	94.35				94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALI	·											
	10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	21	101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110
PROPERT	Y TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02												
03	10	96.43	96.03	94.82	5.2	21	101.27	84.43	111.00	89.88 to 100.00	88,706	84,110
04												
ALI												

101.27

84.43 111.00 89.88 to 100.00

88,706

84,110

10

96.43 96.03 94.82

**Base Stat** PAGE:1 of 4 PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics 75 - ROCK COUNTY State Stat Run

38

71.21

75.00

74.72

20.69

100.38

123.05 62.52 to 79.85

249,793

186,648

AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPRO	VED				Type: Qualific	ed					State Stat Run	
						Date Ra	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted l	Before: 01/19	/2007			
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	71	COV:	26.69	95%	Median C.I.:	62 52	+0 70 95	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	les Price	: 10	,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	20.09		. Mean C.I.:			(!: Derivea) (!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price		,492,161	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.73		% Mean C.I.:		54 to 81.37	(:: tana+NA1=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value		7,092,640			AVG.ABS.DEV.	14.73	95	% Mean C.I	00.0	04 10 01.37	
( &)	AVG. Adj. Sal			249,793	COD:	20.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05					
	AVG. Assess			186,648	PRD:	100.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.75				Printed: 03/28	/2007 11:22:02
DATE OF				,								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
	rs												
	TO 09/30/03	1	105.94	105.94	105.94			105.94	105.94	N/A		50,000	52,970
10/01/03	TO 12/31/03	5	79.75	78.53	75.92	6.7	103.43	70.91	86.31	N/A		362,800	275,452
01/01/04	TO 03/31/04	3	69.09	70.74	77.77	8.8	90.97	62.44	80.70	N/A		654,599	509,080
04/01/04	TO 06/30/04	1	39.75	39.75	39.75			39.75	39.75	N/A		145,000	57,640
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04	5	85.17	90.29	88.74	13.6	101.75	69.32	110.25	N/A		134,792	119,620
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04	1	79.85	79.85	79.85			79.85	79.85	N/A		144,000	114,980
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05	5	71.68	90.78	78.64	28.0	115.44	69.43	123.05	N/A		107,620	84,636
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	4	66.61	71.20	69.32	14.1	.4 102.71	61.03	90.54	N/A		281,500	195,126
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	3	59.84	72.36	98.89	39.0	73.17	43.57	113.67	N/A		319,533	315,993
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	3	60.44	57.92	57.93	5.2	21 100.00	51.94	61.39	N/A		72,000	41,706
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	5	59.26	63.94	59.14	10.5	108.11	55.58	74.22	N/A		313,820	185,605
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	2	59.53	59.53	54.37	10.3	109.48	53.37	65.69	N/A		146,800	79,820
Stu	dy Years												
07/01/03	TO 06/30/04	10	75.87	75.06	75.89	16.1	.1 98.90	39.75	105.94	62.44 to 86	6.31	397,279	301,511
	TO 06/30/05	15	79.85	84.67	77.22	19.8	109.64	61.03	123.05	69.43 to 10		165,470	127,784
	TO 06/30/06	13	59.84	63.82	71.14	15.9	89.70	43.57	113.67	53.37 to 73	1.67	233,638	166,212
	endar Yrs												
	TO 12/31/04	10	80.28	78.33	78.52	17.7		39.75	110.25	62.44 to 10		292,676	229,796
	TO 12/31/05	15	69.43	75.30	80.21	24.8	93.89	43.57	123.05	60.44 to 90	0.54	189,246	151,785
ALL													

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

AGRICULI	CURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifie					Sidie Sidi Kun	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sale	s:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	71	COV:	26.69	95%	Median C.I.: 62.52	to 79.85	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Pric	e: 10	0,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	20.02	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 67.10	to 82.35	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pric	e: 9	9,492,161	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.73			4 to 81.37	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Valu	e: 7	7,092,640								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Pric	e:	249,793	COD:	20.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05				
	AVG. Assessed Valu	e:	186,648	PRD:	100.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.75			Printed: 03/28	/2007 11:22:03
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1027	1	65.69	65.69	65.69			65.69	65.69	N/A	24,000	15,765
1187	2	41.66	41.66	41.00	4.5	8 101.62	39.75	43.57	N/A	107,500	44,070
1189	1	90.54	90.54	90.54			90.54	90.54	N/A	100,000	90,540
1191	1	70.69	70.69	70.69			70.69	70.69	N/A	624,000	441,090
1193	1	123.05	123.05	123.05			123.05	123.05	N/A	40,000	49,220
1305	1	118.26	118.26	118.26			118.26	118.26	N/A	40,000	47,305
1307	2	65.77	65.77	65.29	5.0	6 100.73	62.44	69.09	N/A	186,750	121,925
397	2	86.39	86.39	66.24	27.6	3 130.42	62.52	110.25	N/A	128,500	85,112
489	12	71.29	73.43	74.56	15.5	8 98.49	51.94	105.94	60.44 to 84.88	186,171	138,813
491	1	113.67	113.67	113.67			113.67	113.67	N/A	716,600	814,560
493	4	71.59	76.07	77.71	14.9	4 97.89	59.26	101.85	N/A	228,325	177,433
647	1	55.58	55.58	55.58			55.58	55.58	N/A	765,600	425,510
651	2	71.77	71.77	70.65	3.4	1 101.59	69.32	74.22	N/A	118,350	83,610
753	1	61.03	61.03	61.03			61.03	61.03	N/A	165,000	100,700
755	2	79.15	79.15	73.49	9.0	5 107.70	71.99	86.31	N/A	251,400	184,765
757	1	58.96	58.96	58.96			58.96	58.96	N/A	360,700	212,665
759	3	80.70	72.58	76.97	12.5	2 94.30	53.37	83.68	N/A	641,299	493,606
ALL											
	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
AREA (M	•									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	19	71.67	76.16	79.12	18.2	8 96.26	51.94	113.67	61.03 to 85.17	215,361	170,395
11	1	79.85	79.85	79.85			79.85	79.85	N/A	144,000	114,980
2	6	64.07	67.27	60.84	29.1		39.75	123.05	39.75 to 123.05	108,750	66,162
22	3	90.54	93.16	75.78	17.5		70.69	118.26	N/A	254,666	192,978
3	9	71.50	71.13	71.99	16.6	6 98.80	53.37	101.85	55.58 to 83.68	426,644	307,137
ALL											
<del></del>	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
	IMPROVED, UNIMPROV									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
ALL											
	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

AGRICULIURAL UNIMPI	KOVED				Type: Qualifie	ed nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted l	Refore: 01/19	/2007	Sidic Sidi Kun	
NIIMBE	R of Sales	:	38	MEDIAN:	71						
	Sales Price		,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	7 <b>1</b> 75	COV: STD:	26.69 20.02		Median C.I.: 62.52 . Mean C.I.: 67.10		(!: Derived) (!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.S			,492,161	MEAN:	75	-	14.73				(:: tana+NA1=0)
	ssed Value		,092,640	112121	, 3	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14./3	95	6 Mean C.I 08.0	54 to 81.37	
AVG. Adj. S			249,793	COD:	20.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05				
<del>-</del>	ssed Value		186,648	PRD:	100.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.75			Printed: 03/28	/2007 11:22:03
SCHOOL DISTRICT *			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
NonValid School											
ALL											
	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	2	87.97	87.97	85.94	25.3	3 102.36	65.69	110.25	N/A	22,000	18,907
100.01 TO 180.00	15	69.43	71.39	65.93	21.3	0 108.28	43.57	118.26	59.26 to 83.68	112,753	74,341
180.01 TO 330.00	10	78.28	78.62	73.98	23.6	0 106.28	39.75	123.05	58.96 to 101.85	160,866	119,001
330.01 TO 650.00	6	65.81	66.73	63.56	9.9	6 104.99	55.58	79.85	55.58 to 79.85	329,683	209,550
650.01 +	5	79.75	83.36	83.75	12.9	6 99.54	70.69	113.67	N/A	834,019	698,477
ALL											
	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
MAJORITY LAND USE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
GRASS	21	71.67	78.99	72.90	20.0		51.94	123.05	65.69 to 85.17	140,955	102,754
GRASS-N/A	5	61.03	62.87	57.96	28.4		39.75	86.31	N/A	99,360	57,593
IRRGTD-N/A	12	71.21	73.09	76.99	18.8	7 94.93	53.37	113.67	58.96 to 80.70	502,941	387,235
ALL		71 01	75.00	74.70	20.6	0 100 20	20 75	102.05	60 50 1 50 05	0.40 7.03	106 640
MAJORITY LAND USE	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
RANGE		MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	COUNT 24	71.83	78.74	72.73	19.6		51.94	123.05	65.69 to 85.17	135,077	98,236
GRASS-N/A	2	41.66	41.66	41.00	4.5		39.75	43.57	N/A	107,500	44,070
IRRGTD	10	65.38	69.19	72.07	18.0		53.37	101.85	55.58 to 80.70	511,964	368,995
IRRGTD-N/A	2	92.59	92.59	104.50	22.7		71.50	113.67	N/A	457,825	478,437
ALL	2	72.37	22.33	101.50	22.7	, 00.00	71.50	113.07	14/21	137,023	170,137
ADD	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
MAJORITY LAND USE		71.21	73.00	71.72	20.0	3 100.30	33.73	123.03	02.32 00 73.03	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
GRASS	26	71.18	75.89	70.75	21.5		39.75	123.05	62.52 to 84.88	132,956	94,069
IRRGTD	12	71.21	73.09	76.99	18.8		53.37	113.67	58.96 to 80.70	502,941	387,235
ALL										2,	,
	38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	9 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
										.,	

**Base Stat** PAGE:4 of 4 PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics 75 - ROCK COUNTY

State Stat Run

AGRICULT	URAL UNIME	PROVED				Type: Qualifi	ied				State Stat Run	
						• • •	inge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	2007		
	NUMB	ER of Sales	3:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	71	COV:	26.69	95%	Median C.I.: 62.52	to 79 85	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL	Sales Price	e: 10	,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	20.02		. Mean C.I.: 67.10		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.	Sales Price	e: 9	9,492,161	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.73			54 to 81.37	(**************************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Ass	essed Value	e: 7	7,092,640			11,011120.22	11.73			.1 00 01.57	
	AVG. Adj.	Sales Price	e:	249,793	COD:	20.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05				
	AVG. Ass	essed Value	e:	186,648	PRD:	100.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.75			Printed: 03/28	/2007 11:22:03
SALE PR	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000	TO 2999	9 2	87.97	87.97	85.94	25.3	33 102.36	65.69	110.25	N/A	22,000	18,907
30000	TO 5999	9 4	112.10	108.39	106.71	10.9	101.57	86.31	123.05	N/A	45,700	48,766
60000	TO 9999	9 8	65.41	66.23	66.32	18.1	19 99.87	43.57	85.17	43.57 to 85.17	69,857	46,326
100000	TO 14999	9 5	79.85	73.34	71.62	16.0	102.40	39.75	90.54	N/A	129,800	92,964
150000	TO 24999	9 9	62.52	65.19	65.00	6.9	93 100.29	59.26	71.68	59.84 to 71.50	194,788	126,612
250000	TO 49999	9 5	70.91	71.42	70.98	17.3	35 100.62	53.37	101.85	N/A	363,740	258,176
500000 -	+	5	79.75	80.08	80.12	17.0	99.95	55.58	113.67	N/A	897,139	718,787
ALL_												
-		38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	59 100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648
	D VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
	w \$											
Tota	-											
10000			87.97	87.97	85.94	25.3		65.69	110.25	N/A	22,000	18,907
30000			71.83	76.50	68.73	30.7		39.75	123.05	51.94 to 105.94	66,816	45,920
60000			85.17	86.86	86.84	2.2		84.88	90.54	N/A	100,287	87,093
100000 7	го 14999	9 12	65.81	65.96	64.98	9.4	101.51	53.37	79.85	59.84 to 71.67	192,558	125,130
150000	TO 24999	9 1	58.96	58.96	58.96			58.96	58.96	N/A	360,700	212,665
250000	TO 49999	9 5	70.91	74.20	69.86	13.4		55.58	101.85	N/A	515,600	360,188
500000 -	+	3	80.70	91.37	88.09	14.0	103.73	79.75	113.67	N/A	1,032,032	909,111
ALL												
		38	71.21	75.00	74.72	20.6	100.38	39.75	123.05	62.52 to 79.85	249,793	186,648

Base Stat PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics PAGE:1 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY

75 - ROCK COUNTY				<u>PA&amp;1 200</u>	7 Prelin	<u>ninary Staustic</u>	<u>S</u>	Buse s		C. C. D	
RESIDENTIAL	SIDENTIAL				Type: Qualifie	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER	of Sales	:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	cov:	17.18	95%	Median C.I.: 94.77	to 98.32	(:: AV101=0)
TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 1	,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	16.63		. Mean C.I.: 91.94		
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 1	,476,600	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.42		% Mean C.I.: 91.4		
TOTAL Assess	sed Value	: 1	,417,330			1100.1100.000	7.12	, ,	5 Hodii 5.1. 51.1	3 00 102.11	
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	39,908	COD:	9.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00				
AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	38,306	PRD:	100.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 02/17/2	2007 13:26:40
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	5	98.53	100.70	100.39	5.8	3 100.31	90.55	116.93	N/A	73,270	73,556
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	95.44	94.90	97.81	4.8	1 97.02	88.82	99.88	N/A	7,762	7,592
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	3	97.17	97.11	97.04	0.4	8 100.07	96.38	97.78	N/A	21,100	20,475
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	9	96.99	97.47	97.61	1.8	1 99.86	93.54	102.89	95.98 to 98.60	41,488	40,496
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	7	94.77	90.72	98.62	13.2	0 91.99	54.00	108.99	54.00 to 108.99	50,285	49,592
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	122.10	122.10	99.99	20.2	3 122.11	97.39	146.80	N/A	23,750	23,747
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	77.06	77.06	77.24	0.3	5 99.76	76.79	77.33	N/A	47,000	36,305
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	88.13	99.20	84.59	21.1	1 117.27	76.54	150.00	N/A	29,800	25,208
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	21	97.56	97.70	98.79	3.2	3 98.89	88.82	116.93	96.13 to 98.60	39,719	39,240
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	94.69	95.58	92.34	18.3	0 103.51	54.00	150.00	77.33 to 107.60	40,156	37,080
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	21	97.17	97.51	98.13	7.7	0 99.38	54.00	146.80	95.98 to 98.32	39,819	39,072
ALL											
	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.7	0 100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BASSETT	21	97.17	96.46	97.03	4.7	5 99.40	76.54	108.99	95.98 to 99.88	40,961	39,746
NEWPORT	6	97.96	101.73	95.33	13.3	5 106.72	76.79	146.80	76.79 to 146.80	12,875	12,273
NEWPORT SUB	1	77.33	77.33	77.33			77.33	77.33	N/A	80,000	61,860
RURAL	1	77.75	77.75	77.75			77.75	77.75	N/A	30,000	23,325
SUBURBAN	5	97.32	99.43	98.93	5.9	9 100.50	90.55	116.93	N/A	84,270	83,369
SUBURBAN V	3	88.82	97.61	89.42	36.0	3 109.15	54.00	150.00	N/A	2,600	2,325
ALL											
	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.7	0 100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
LOCATIONS: URBAN, ST	UBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	27	97.39	97.63	96.89	6.6	8 100.76	76.54	146.80	95.98 to 99.10	34,720	33,641
2	8	96.04	98.74	98.76	17.4	0 99.99	54.00	150.00	54.00 to 150.00	53,643	52,977
3	2	77.54	77.54	77.44	0.2	7 100.13	77.33	77.75	N/A	55,000	42,592
ALL											

100.83

54.00

150.00

94.77 to 98.32

39,908

38,306

9.70

37

97.17

96.78

**Base Stat** PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Oualified PAGE:2 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY

RESIDENTIAL

State Stat Run

RESIDENTI	AL				Type: Qualifie					Siaie Siai Kun	
					Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sale	es:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	cov:	17.18	95%	Median C.I.: 94.77	' to 98.32	(1117107 0)
	TOTAL Sales Pric	ce: 1	,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	16.63		. Mean C.I.: 91.94		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pric	ce: 1	,476,600	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.42	95	% Mean C.I.: 91.4	3 to 102.14	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	ıe: 1	,417,330								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Prio	ce:	39,908	COD:	9.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00				
	AVG. Assessed Valu	ıe:	38,306	PRD:	100.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:26:40
STATUS: 1	IMPROVED, UNIMPROV	ED & IOLI	<b>.</b>							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	34	97.25	96.71	96.02	7.39	9 100.72	76.54	146.80	94.77 to 98.53	43,200	41,481
2	3	88.82	97.61	89.42	36.03	3 109.15	54.00	150.00	N/A	2,600	2,325
ALL											
	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.70	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
PROPERTY										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT		MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.70	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
06											
07											
ALL		•									
	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.70	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
SCHOOL DI										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010	2.5	05.15	06.50	05.00	0 5	100.00	F.4. 0.0	150.00	04 55	20.000	20.206
75-0100	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.70	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
NonValid S	2C11001										
ALL	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.70	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
YEAR BUII		97.17	90.76	93.99	9.70	100.63	34.00	130.00	94.77 (0 90.32	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR E			92.64	80.16	32.14		54.00	150.00	N/A	9,450	7,575
Prior TO 1		03.23	72.01	00.10	52.1	113.37	31.00	130.00	14/21	3,130	,,5,5
1860 TO 1											
1900 TO 1		96.38	96.38	96.38			96.38	96.38	N/A	25,800	24,865
1920 TO 1			85.63	79.37	10.13	3 107.88	76.79	96.60	N/A	26,562	21,083
1940 TO 1			96.64	96.12	2.32		88.13	99.88	88.13 to 99.88	21,083	20,265
1950 TO 1			99.84	101.05	4.34		94.60	108.99	94.60 to 108.99	36,916	37,305
1960 TO 1			98.21	98.21			98.21	98.21	N/A	29,000	28,480
1970 TO 1			97.62	98.27	7.41	L 99.34	76.54	116.93	90.55 to 107.60	74,972	73,674
1980 TO 1										•	•
1990 TO 1		98.04	98.04	97.10	1.08	3 100.98	96.99	99.10	N/A	48,750	47,335
1995 TO 1	1999 2	122.10	122.10	99.99	20.23	3 122.11	97.39	146.80	N/A	23,750	23,747
2000 TO E	Present 2	87.82	87.82	89.72	7.93	L 97.89	80.88	94.77	N/A	55,000	49,345
ALL											
	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.70	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306

**Base Stat** PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics

Type: Onalified PAGE:3 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL	L					Type: Qualific					State Stat Kun	
							nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	OO6 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	cov:	17.18	95%	Median C.I.: 94.77	to 98.32	
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 1	,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	16.63	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 91.94	to 100.04	
TC	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 1	,476,600	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.42	95	% Mean C.I.: 91.4	3 to 102.14	
T	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 1	,417,330								
AV	7G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	39,908	COD:	9.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	38,306	PRD:	100.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:26:40
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO	4999	5	91.78	106.28	101.27	33.5	5 104.94	54.00	150.00	N/A	2,510	2,542
5000 TO	9999	2	98.82	98.82	98.74	0.2	9 100.08	98.53	99.10	N/A	6,750	6,665
Total	\$											
1 TO	9999	7	98.53	104.15	99.96	23.3	9 104.19	54.00	150.00	54.00 to 150.00	3,721	3,720
10000 TO	29999	11	96.60	94.74	95.14	3.9	0 99.57	76.79	100.44	88.13 to 99.88	21,027	20,006
30000 TO	59999	10	96.69	93.09	93.73	8.4	3 99.31	76.54	108.99	77.75 to 102.89	45,090	42,264
60000 TO	99999	8	97.44	98.55	98.58	7.1	3 99.98	77.33	116.93	77.33 to 116.93	82,293	81,122
100000 TO	149999	1	90.55	90.55	90.55			90.55	90.55	N/A	110,000	99,600
ALL												
		37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.7	0 100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO	4999	6	95.44	105.08	100.66	28.1	7 104.40	54.00	150.00	54.00 to 150.00	2,925	2,944
5000 TO	9999	2	97.57	97.57	97.49	0.9	9 100.08	96.60	98.53	N/A	9,250	9,017
Total	\$											
1 TO	9999	8	97.57	103.20	99.03	20.9	1 104.22	54.00	150.00	54.00 to 150.00	4,506	4,462
10000 TO	29999	11	96.38	93.02	93.01	5.6	7 100.01	76.79	100.44	77.75 to 99.88	22,845	21,248
30000 TO	59999	9	97.39	94.79	94.87	7.0	6 99.92	76.54	108.99	80.88 to 102.89	46,766	44,368
60000 TO	99999	9	97.32	97.66	97.43	7.1	2 100.24	77.33	116.93	90.55 to 107.60	85,372	83,175
ALL												
		37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.7	0 100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		4	83.29	92.64	80.16	32.1	4 115.57	54.00	150.00	N/A	9,450	7,575
10		8	97.00	94.52	95.22	4.3	3 99.27	76.79	99.88	76.79 to 99.88	14,968	14,253
20		13	97.17	97.85	99.40	3.4	5 98.44	88.13	116.93	94.60 to 98.32	41,665	41,414
30		12	97.96	98.52	94.50	12.5	4 104.25	76.54	146.80	80.88 to 107.60	64,783	61,217
ALL												
		37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.7	0 100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306

75 - ROC	CK COUNTY			PA&T 200	7 Prelin	ninary Statistic	2S	Base S	tat	~ ~ -	PAGE:4 of 4
RESIDENT	TIAL				Type: Qualific	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Ra	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	2007		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:		37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	97	COV:	17.18	95% 1	Median C.I.: 94.77	to 98.32	(:. Av 101=0)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	: 1	1,472,600	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	16.63		. Mean C.I.: 91.94		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	: 1	L,476,600	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.42			3 to 102.14	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	. 1	1,417,330								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		39,908	COD:	9.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00				
	AVG. Assessed Value:		38,306	PRD:	100.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.00			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:26:40
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	91.79	102.02	90.94	31.0	112.18	54.00	150.00	54.00 to 150.00	18,383	16,718
100	1	99.10	99.10	99.10			99.10	99.10	N/A	5,000	4,955
101	21	97.39	96.27	98.20	6.3	98.03	76.54	116.93	94.60 to 99.88	44,788	43,983
102	3	91.78	88.36	84.62	6.7	104.42	77.33	95.98	N/A	44,083	37,305
104	6	97.37	97.18	95.84	2.4	101.40	90.55	102.89	90.55 to 102.89	48,083	46,082
ALL											
	37	97.17	96.78	95.99	9.7	100.83	54.00	150.00	94.77 to 98.32	39,908	38,306
CONDITI	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	4	83.29	92.64	80.16	32.1	.4 115.57	54.00	150.00	N/A	9,450	7,575
10	1	91.78	91.78	91.78			91.78	91.78	N/A	2,250	2,065
20	6	98.00	97.53	96.85	1.7		93.54	100.44	93.54 to 100.44	23,166	22,435
30	24	97.35	97.89	96.56	8.4		76.54	146.80	94.77 to 99.88	50,835	49,088
40	2	92.06	92.06	93.19	4.2	98.78	88.13	95.98	N/A	38,750	36,112

9.70

100.83

54.00

150.00

94.77 to 98.32

39,908

38,306

\_\_\_\_\_ALL\_\_\_\_

97.17

37

96.78

75 - ROCK COUNTY	PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics  Base Stat	PAGE:1 of 4
COMMERCIAL	Type: Qualified	State Stat Run
	Data Danga, 07/01/2002 to 06/20/2006 Dagted Defens, 01/10/2007	

COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualified	l ge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	2006 Dogtod I	Pofonos 01/10	/2007	State Stat Run	
NIIMDED	of Sales		10	MEDIAN:	95						
	or sales les Price		980,062	WGT. MEAN:	9 <b>5</b> 93	COV:	12.98		Median C.I.: 89.88		
TOTAL Adj.Sa			887,062	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	12.08		. Mean C.I.: 88.25		
TOTAL Asses			827,450	MEAN.	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	6.97	95	% Mean C.I.: 84.4	0 to 101.69	
AVG. Adj. Sa			88,706	COD:	7.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.00				
AVG. AGJ. Sa.			82,745	PRD:	99.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	63.12			5	2007.40.07.40
	seu value	•	02,745	PRD.	99.75	MIN Sales Racio.	63.12			Printed: 02/17/.	
DATE OF SALE *	~~~~~				go.,				050 ** 1'	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Pilce	ASSU VAI
Ortrs		111 00	111 00	111 00			111 00	111 00	27 / 2	05.000	05.550
07/01/03 TO 09/30/03	1	111.00	111.00	111.00			111.00	111.00	N/A	25,000	27,750
10/01/03 TO 12/31/03	4	97.27	95.88	96.51	2.61	99.34	89.88	99.09	N/A	80,500	77,692
01/01/04 TO 03/31/04											
04/01/04 TO 06/30/04	1	95.43	95.43	95.43			95.43	95.43	N/A	15,000	14,315
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	63.12	63.12	63.12			63.12	63.12	N/A	50,000	31,560
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	92.11	92.11	92.11			92.11	92.11	N/A	19,000	17,500
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
Study Years											
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04	6	97.27	98.32	97.47	4.41	100.88	89.88	111.00	89.88 to 111.00	60,333	58,805
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	92.11	83.19	90.20	11.30	92.23	63.12	94.35	N/A	128,666	116,055
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	95.43	95.43	95.43			95.43	95.43	N/A	15,000	14,315
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	77.03	77.03	83.58	18.05	92.16	63.12	90.93	N/A	94,531	79,005
ALL	-	,,,,,	, , , , , ,	03.30	20.03	72.10	00.12	,,,,	21,722	71,331	,,,,,,,,
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.34	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
ASSESSOR LOCATION		71.07	73.01	73.20	7.31	22.73	03.12	111.00	03.00 00 33.03	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BASSETT	6	94.89	96.56	94.03	5.10		89.88	111.00	89.88 to 111.00	88,010	82,756
RURAL	3	96.79	86.33	92.18	12.39		63.12	99.09	N/A	113,333	104,470
RURAL V	1		92.11		12.39	93.00			N/A N/A		•
	1	92.11	92.11	92.11			92.11	92.11	N/A	19,000	17,500
ALL		0.4.00	00.04	22.00		22 75	62 10	111 00	00 00 1 00 00	00 506	00 545
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.34	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
LOCATIONS: URBAN, ST										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	6	94.89	96.56	94.03	5.10		89.88	111.00	89.88 to 111.00	88,010	82,756
3	4	94.45	87.78	92.18	10.76	95.23	63.12	99.09	N/A	89,750	82,727
ALL											
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.34	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745

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

COMMERCIAL		•			Type: Qualific	ed		<del></del>		State Stat Run	
					• • •	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19	/2007		
NUMBE	ER of Sales	:	10	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	95	COV:	12.98	95%	Median C.I.: 89.88	to 99.09	
TOTAL S	Sales Price	:	980,062	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	12.08		. Mean C.I.: 88.25		
TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	:	887,062	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	6.97		% Mean C.I.: 84.4		
TOTAL Asse	essed Value	:	827,450								
AVG. Adj. S	Sales Price	:	88,706	COD:	7.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.00				
AVG. Asse	essed Value	:	82,745	PRD:	99.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	63.12			Printed: 02/17/.	2007 13:26:43
STATUS: IMPROVED,	UNIMPROVE	D & IOL	С							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	9	95.43	93.15	93.31	7.7	3 99.83	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	96,451	89,994
2	1	92.11	92.11	92.11			92.11	92.11	N/A	19,000	17,500
ALL											
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	4 99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	4 99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
NonValid School											
ALL											
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	4 99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	1	92.11	92.11	92.11			92.11	92.11	N/A	19,000	17,500
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919 1920 TO 1939	2	103.22	103.22	105.16	7.5	4 98.15	95.43	111.00	N/A	20,000	21,032
1940 TO 1949	2	103.22	103.22	105.10	7.5	90.13	93.43	111.00	N/A	20,000	21,032
1950 TO 1959	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
1960 TO 1969	_	91.13	91.13	91.13			91.13	91.13	N/A	2,000	1,955
1970 TO 1979	4	93.86	94.17	94.82	4.0	1 99.32	89.88	99.09	N/A	114,765	108,816
1980 TO 1989	-	,,,,,	71.17	71.02	1.0		03.00	,,,,,	21,722	111,700	100,010
1990 TO 1994	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
1995 TO 1999	_	- 1.00	, 1.33	21.00					/ **	22,,000	
2000 TO Present	1	63.12	63.12	63.12			63.12	63.12	N/A	50,000	31,560
ALL									•	,	,
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	4 99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745

75 - ROCK C	OUNTY			PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics  Base Stat								
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						Date Ra	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted l	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBER	of Sales	;:	10	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	95	COV:	12.98	95%	Median C.I.: 89.8	8 to 99.09	
	TOTAL Sal	les Price	:	980,062	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	12.08		. Mean C.I.: 88.2		
TO	TAL Adj.Sal	les Price	:	887,062	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	6.97		% Mean C.I.: 84.4		
TO	OTAL Assess	sed Value	:	827,450			11,0,1120,122,	0.57		01.	10 00 101.05	
AVO	G. Adj. Sal	les Price	:	88,706	COD:	7.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.00				
i	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	82,745	PRD:	99.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	63.12			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:26:4
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,95
Total \$	\$											
1 TO	9999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,95
10000 TO	29999	3	95.43	99.51	100.96	6.6	98.57	92.11	111.00	N/A	19,666	19,85
30000 TO	59999	3	89.88	84.03	83.13	13.3	101.08	63.12	99.09	N/A	43,333	36,02
100000 TO	149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,45
150000 TO	249999	1	96.79	96.79	96.79			96.79	96.79	N/A	240,000	232,30
250000 TO	499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,10
ALL												
		10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,74
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,95
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,95
10000 TO	29999	4	93.77	97.11	97.22	6.5		89.88	111.00	N/A	22,250	21,63
30000 TO	59999	2	81.11	81.11	81.11	22.1	7 100.00	63.12	99.09	N/A	50,000	40,55
100000 TO	149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,45
150000 TO	249999	1	96.79	96.79	96.79			96.79	96.79	N/A	240,000	232,30
250000 TO	499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,10
ALL	_		0.4.0-		00.00					00 00 / 00 -		
GOGE DANS		10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,74
COST RANK		COLLEGE	MEDITIC		MOD MON	~-				050 W. 1' C =	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)		1	92.11	92.11	92.11	4 -	00 12	92.11	92.11	N/A	19,000	17,50
10		4	98.42	100.82	101.70	4.3		95.43	111.00	N/A	23,000	23,39
20		5	90.93	87.01	92.31	8.3	94.26	63.12	96.79	N/A	155,212	143,27
ALL												

63.12 111.00 89.88 to 99.09

88,706

82,745

7.34

10

94.89

93.04

	CK COUNTY			PA&T 200'	<u> 7 Prelin</u>	nina	<u>ry Statistic</u>	S	Base S	เลเ	State Stat Dun	PAGE:4 of 4
COMMERC:	IAL			,	Гуре: Qualifi						State Stat Run	
					Date Ra	nge: 07	7/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted I	3efore: 01/19/	2007		
	NUMBER of Sales	;:	10	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	95		cov:	12.98	95% 1	Median C.I.: 89.88	to 99.09	
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	980,062	WGT. MEAN:	93		STD:	12.08	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 88.25		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	887,062	MEAN:	93		AVG.ABS.DEV:	6.97	95	% Mean C.I.: 84.4	0 to 101.69	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	827,450									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	88,706	COD:	7.34	MAX	Sales Ratio:	111.00				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	82,745	PRD:	99.75	MIN	Sales Ratio:	63.12			Printed: 02/17/	2007 13:26:43
OCCUPAN	CY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	92.11	92.11	92.11				92.11	92.11	N/A	19,000	17,500
325	1	89.88	89.88	89.88				89.88	89.88	N/A	30,000	26,965
344	1	99.09	99.09	99.09				99.09	99.09	N/A	50,000	49,545
352	1	90.93	90.93	90.93				90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,450
353	1	95.43	95.43	95.43				95.43	95.43	N/A	15,000	14,315
395	1	96.79	96.79	96.79				96.79	96.79	N/A	240,000	232,305
404	1	97.75	97.75	97.75				97.75	97.75	N/A	2,000	1,955
442	1	111.00	111.00	111.00				111.00	111.00	N/A	25,000	27,750
528	1	63.12	63.12	63.12				63.12	63.12	N/A	50,000	31,560
531	1	94.35	94.35	94.35				94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALI												
	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	4	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
-	Y TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02												
03	10	94.89	93.04	93.28	7.3	4	99.75	63.12	111.00	89.88 to 99.09	88,706	82,745
04												
ALI	·											

99.75

63.12 111.00 89.88 to 99.09

88,706

82,745

10

94.89 93.04

Base Stat PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics PAGE:1 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY

172,245

249,793

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualific		Ty Statistics		State Stat Run						
								/01/2003 to 06/30/20	06 Posted F	Sefore: 01/19/	2007			
	MIMDED	of Sales:		2.0	MEDIAN.		gev 0.7	01/2000 10 00/00/20						
(b I - A)				38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67		COV:	27.86		Median C.I.:			(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal			,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	69		STD:	19.23	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	61.89	to 76.02	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal			,492,161	MEAN:	69		AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.44	95	% Mean C.I.:	62.9	2 to 75.15	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess			,545,310										
	AVG. Adj. Sal			249,793	COD:	21.53		Sales Ratio:	115.18					
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:	•	172,245	PRD:	100.11	MIN	Sales Ratio:	32.43					/2007 17:25:34
DATE OF	SALE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrt	rs													
07/01/03	TO 09/30/03	1	98.84	98.84	98.84				98.84	98.84	N/A		50,000	49,420
10/01/03	TO 12/31/03	5	74.77	73.05	70.73	6.9	95	103.29	65.34	79.25	N/A		362,800	256,595
01/01/04	TO 03/31/04	3	58.88	62.45	70.56	10.9	90	88.52	54.61	73.87	N/A		654,599	461,855
04/01/04	TO 06/30/04	1	32.43	32.43	32.43				32.43	32.43	N/A		145,000	47,020
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04	5	79.82	83.23	81.09	14.5	50	102.64	60.72	103.78	N/A		134,792	109,306
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04	1	69.48	69.48	69.48				69.48	69.48	N/A		144,000	100,055
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05	5	68.15	84.24	73.34	25.1	-8	114.87	66.43	115.18	N/A		107,620	78,928
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	4	62.59	67.08	66.00	19.5	57	101.62	53.84	89.29	N/A		281,500	185,802
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	3	57.40	65.29	91.03	41.1	.9	71.72	33.77	104.70	N/A		319,533	290,886
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	3	56.69	54.25	54.25	5.4	14	100.00	48.40	57.65	N/A		72,000	39,058
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	5	56.60	59.74	54.77	11.4	10	109.07	50.33	69.76	N/A		313,820	171,888
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	2	53.42	53.42	49.94	7.7	79	106.97	49.26	57.58	N/A		146,800	73,310
Stu	dy Years													
07/01/03	TO 06/30/04	10	70.39	68.39	69.60	18.1	2	98.26	32.43	98.84	54.61 to 7	9.25	397,279	276,498
07/01/04	TO 06/30/05	15	69.48	78.34	71.89	21.3	36	108.97	53.84	115.18	66.43 to 9	3.33	165,470	118,962
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	13	56.69	58.78	65.71	16.4	19	89.45	33.77	104.70	49.26 to 6	7.42	233,638	153,530
Cal	endar Yrs													
01/01/04	TO 12/31/04	10	71.68	70.54	71.04	21.3	37	99.30	32.43	103.78	54.61 to 9	3.33	292,676	207,917
01/01/05	TO 12/31/05	15	66.43	69.87	74.95	25.5	55	93.22	33.77	115.18	55.81 to 8	9.29	189,246	141,845
ALL														

21.53

100.11

32.43 115.18 57.58 to 73.87

38

67.06

69.03

**Base Stat** PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Qualified PAGE:2 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

State Stat Run

AGRICULT	TURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifie					Sidie Sidi Kun	
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2	006 Posted I	Before: 01/19/	/2007		
	NUMBER of Sale:	s:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67	COV:	27.86	95%	Median C.I.: 57.58	to 73.87	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	e: 10	,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	19.23		. Mean C.I.: 61.89		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	e: 9	,492,161	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.44	95	% Mean C.I.: 62.9	2 to 75.15	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	e: 6	,545,310								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	e:	249,793	COD:	21.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.18				
	AVG. Assessed Value	e:	172,245	PRD:	100.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.43			Printed: 02/24	/2007 17:25:34
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1027	1	57.58	57.58	57.58			57.58	57.58	N/A	24,000	13,820
1187	2	33.10	33.10	32.87	2.0	2 100.71	32.43	33.77	N/A	107,500	35,330
1189	1	89.29	89.29	89.29			89.29	89.29	N/A	100,000	89,290
1191	1	69.36	69.36	69.36			69.36	69.36	N/A	624,000	432,820
1193	1	104.25	104.25	104.25			104.25	104.25	N/A	40,000	41,700
1305	1	115.18	115.18	115.18			115.18	115.18	N/A	40,000	46,070
1307	2	56.75	56.75	56.44	3.7		54.61	58.88	N/A	186,750	105,400
397	2	79.80	79.80	59.54	30.0	6 134.01	55.81	103.78	N/A	128,500	76,512
489	12	67.79	68.67	69.79	14.1	5 98.40	48.40	98.84	57.40 to 78.51	186,171	129,924
491	1	104.70	104.70	104.70			104.70	104.70	N/A	716,600	750,295
493	4	66.82	70.39	71.81	14.7	8 98.02	54.60	93.33	N/A	228,325	163,967
647	1	50.33	50.33	50.33			50.33	50.33	N/A	765,600	385,360
651	2	65.24	65.24	63.16	6.9	3 103.29	60.72	69.76	N/A	118,350	74,752
753	1	53.84	53.84	53.84			53.84	53.84	N/A	165,000	88,830
755	2	72.30	72.30	66.80	9.6	2 108.22	65.34	79.25	N/A	251,400	167,947
757	1	56.60	56.60	56.60			56.60	56.60	N/A	360,700	204,155
759	3	73.87	67.37	70.59	13.4	2 95.44	49.26	78.99	N/A	641,299	452,706
ALL											
	38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245
AREA (M	•									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	19	67.42	70.98	73.52	18.2	7 96.54	48.40	104.70	57.40 to 79.25	215,361	158,340
11	1	69.48	69.48	69.48			69.48	69.48	N/A	144,000	100,055
2	6	56.10	56.92	51.64	29.6		32.43	104.25	32.43 to 104.25	108,750	56,163
22	3	89.29	91.28	74.37	17.1		69.36	115.18	N/A	254,666	189,393
3	9	66.43	65.54	65.93	17.2	9 99.40	49.26	93.33	50.33 to 78.99	426,644	281,291
ALL											
	38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245
	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245
ALL					o						4=0 04=
	38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245

**Base Stat** PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Oualified PAGE:3 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

State Stat Run

AGRICULTU.	RAL UNIMPRO	VED				Type: Qualifie		006 D4-11	Docted Peferer 01/19/2007					
					AMEDIANI		nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	DOO POSTEG	Beiore: 01/19	/2007				
(A T D		of Sales:		38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67	COV:	27.86	95%	Median C.I.: 57.58	to 73.87	(!: Derived)		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal			,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	19.23	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 61.89	to 76.02	(!: land+NAT=0)		
` ` ` '	TOTAL Adj.Sal			,492,161	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.44	95	% Mean C.I.: 62.9	92 to 75.15			
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess			,545,310										
į	AVG. Adj. Sal			249,793	COD:	21.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.18						
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:	:	172,245	PRD:	100.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.43				/2007 17:25:34		
	ISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)														
09-0010														
75-0100		38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245		
NonValid S														
ALL														
		38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245		
ACRES IN	SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
	0 100.00	2	80.68	80.68	78.58	28.6		57.58	103.78	N/A	22,000	17,287		
100.01 TC		15	66.43	66.77	61.49	22.0		33.77	115.18	54.60 to 78.99	112,753	69,329		
180.01 TC		10	72.97	71.62	68.00	23.8		32.43	104.25	53.84 to 93.33	160,866	109,385		
330.01 TC	0 650.00	6	57.35	59.34	57.37	10.0		50.33	69.48	50.33 to 69.48	329,683	189,152		
650.01 +		5	73.87	77.61	77.74	12.1	2 99.82	65.34	104.70	N/A	834,019	648,405		
ALL			65.06	60.00	60.05	01 5	2 100 11	20.42	115 10	55 50 . 52 05	0.40 500	150 045		
MA TOD TIME	LAND USE >	38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793 Avg. Adj.	172,245		
	LAND USE >		MEDIAN	MELANT	WOR MEAN	001	D DDD	MIN	147.37	050 Madian C T	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO1		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.				
GRASS		21	68.15	72.83	67.39	20.6		48.40	115.18	57.65 to 79.82	140,955	94,996		
GRASS-N/A	_	5	53.84	55.66	50.70	34.1		32.43	79.25	N/A	99,360	50,378		
IRRGTD-N/A	A	12	66.67	67.95	71.22	18.2	7 95.41	49.26	104.70	54.60 to 74.77	502,941	358,207		
ALL		38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	F7 F0 +- 72 07	249,793	172,245		
MATORTTV	LAND USE >		67.06	69.03	00.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	113.10	57.58 to 73.87	Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	TAMD OSE >	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val		
GRASS		24	68.76	72.57	67.13			48.40	115.18	57.65 to 79.25				
						20.0					135,077	90,673		
GRASS-N/A		2 10	33.10	33.10	32.87	2.0		32.43	33.77	N/A	107,500	35,330		
IRRGTD	7		62.16	64.43	66.72	17.3		49.26	93.33	50.33 to 74.77	511,964	341,597		
IRRGTD-N/A		2	85.57	85.57	96.38	22.3	6 88.78	66.43	104.70	N/A	457,825	441,260		
ALL			67.06	60.00	60.05	01 5	2 100 11	20 42	115 10	F7 F0 + F2 07	040 502	150 045		
WA TOD TITY	TAND HEE >	38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793 Avg. Adj.	172,245 Avg.		
	LAND USE >		MEDIAN	MELANT	WOR MEAN	001	D DDD	MIN	147.37	050 Madian C T	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO1		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.				
GRASS		26	67.79	69.53	65.00	22.7		32.43	115.18	57.58 to 78.99	132,956	86,415		
IRRGTD		12	66.67	67.95	71.22	18.2	7 95.41	49.26	104.70	54.60 to 74.77	502,941	358,207		
ALL			67.06	CO 03	60.05	01 5	2 100 11	20 42	115 10	E7 E0 +- 72 07	240 702	170 045		
		38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245		

PA&T 2007 Preliminary Statistics **Base Stat** PAGE:4 of 4 75 - ROCK COUNTY

State Stat Run AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

AGRICULT	'URAL UNIMPI	ROVED				Type: Qualifie	ed				State Stat Kun	
							nge: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/20	006 Posted	Before: 01/19	/2007		
	NUMBE	ER of Sales	;:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67	COV:	27.86	95%	Median C.I.: 57.58	8 to 73.87	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL S	Sales Price	: 1	0,112,663	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	19.23		. Mean C.I.: 61.89		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	:	9,492,161	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.44			92 to 75.15	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asse	essed Value	::	6,545,310								
	AVG. Adj. S	Sales Price	:	249,793	COD:	21.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.18				
	AVG. Asse	essed Value	:	172,245	PRD:	100.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.43			Printed: 02/24	/2007 17:25:34
SALE PR	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000 '	TO 29999	2	80.68	80.68	78.58	28.6	3 102.67	57.58	103.78	N/A	22,000	17,287
30000 '	TO 59999	4	101.55	99.38	97.94	10.1	8 101.47	79.25	115.18	N/A	45,700	44,758
60000 '	TO 99999	8	62.90	61.49	61.47	19.6	5 100.03	33.77	78.99	33.77 to 78.99	69,857	42,941
100000 '	TO 149999	5	69.48	67.69	65.65	19.9	4 103.11	32.43	89.29	N/A	129,800	85,208
150000 '	TO 249999	9	57.40	58.83	58.73	6.6	5 100.17	53.84	67.20	54.60 to 66.43	194,788	114,407
250000 '	TO 499999	5	65.34	66.29	65.93	16.6	5 100.54	49.26	93.33	N/A	363,740	239,825
500000	+	5	73.87	74.61	74.31	16.1	9 100.40	50.33	104.70	N/A	897,139	666,667
ALL												
		38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245
ASSESSE	D VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
	w \$											
	al \$											
10000 '			57.58	65.04	51.07	40.5		33.77	103.78	N/A	38,000	19,405
30000 '		11	69.76	73.60	65.50	27.7		32.43	115.18	48.40 to 104.25	66,527	43,574
60000 '			67.42	69.31	66.61	16.4		53.84	89.29	53.84 to 89.29	134,554	89,624
100000 '			58.27	59.76	58.74	10.6	3 101.75	49.26	69.48	49.26 to 69.48	208,710	122,593
150000 '			56.60	56.60	56.60			56.60	56.60	N/A	360,700	204,155
250000 '			66.91	69.05	65.18	14.0		50.33	93.33	N/A	515,600	336,070
500000		3	74.77	84.45	81.24	13.7	4 103.95	73.87	104.70	N/A	1,032,032	838,385
ALL												
		38	67.06	69.03	68.95	21.5	3 100.11	32.43	115.18	57.58 to 73.87	249,793	172,245

### 2007 Assessment Survey for Rock County March 19, 2007

#### 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:

(Does not include anyone counted in 1 and 2 above)

0

4. Other part-time employees:

(Does not include anyone counted in 1 through 3 above)

0

5. Number of shared employees:

(Employees who are shared between the assessor's office and other county offices—will not include anyone counted in 1 through 4 above).

0

6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: \$65,611.

(This would be the "total budget" for the assessor's office)

- **7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system** (How much is particularly part of the assessor budget, versus the amount that is part of the county budget?): \$4,517.
- 8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: same as above.
- 9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: none.
- **10.** Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: \$0.
- 11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget: \$1,000.
- 12. Other miscellaneous funds: \$500.

(Any amount not included in any of the above for equipping, staffing and funding the appraisal/assessment function. This would include any County Board, or general fund monies set aside for reappraisal, etc. If the assessor is ex-officio, this can be an estimate.) This money is for education and workshops.

**13. Total budget:** \$65,611.

a. Was any of last year's budget not used?

No

**B.** Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and Deputy

2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and Deputy

3. Pickup work done by:

Assessor and Deputy

<b>Property Type</b>	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Residential	7	0	0	7

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

June 2004 Marshall-Swift

5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 2004

6. What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?

The assessor does not currently use the sales comparison approach.

- 7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:
  - 4 Bassett, Newport, Suburban and Rural
- 8. How are these defined?

These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town and rural. Suburban properties are everything outside the City limits up to a one mile radius.

9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?

Yes

10. Does the assessor 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
- 1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and Deputy

2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and Deputy

3. Pickup work done by whom:

Assessor and Deputy

<b>Property Type</b>	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Commercial	0	0	0	0

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

June 2004 Marshall-Swift

- 5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information? 2004
- 6. When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?

The income approach has not been utilized.

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?

The assessor does not currently use the sales comparison approach.

- 8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
  - 4 Bassett, Newport, Suburban and Rural
- 9. How are these defined?

These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town and rural. Suburban Properties are everything outside the City limits up to one mile radius.

10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?

Yes

11. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
Yes

#### D. Agricultural Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and Deputy

2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and Deputy

3. Pickup work done by whom:

Assessor and Deputy

<b>Property Type</b>	# of Permits	# of Info. Statements	Other	Total
Agricultural	2	0	0	2

4. Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?

At this time the County is in the process of developing a written policy to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages.

#### How is your agricultural land defined?

Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359.

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?

The income approach has never been utilized.

6. What is the date of the soil survey currently used?

7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed?

2001

a. By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)

FSA maps and aerial photos

b. By whom?

Assessor and Deputy

c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?

100% is completed and implemented of the 2001 study.

8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:

5

9. How are these defined?

By location, soil associations, topography and the market

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:

Terra Scan

2. CAMA software:

Terra Scan

3. Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?

Yes

a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?

Assessor and Deputy

4. Does the county have GIS software?

Nο

a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps?

N/A

4. Personal Property software:

Terra Scan

#### F. Zoning Information

#### 1. Does the county have zoning?

Yes

a. If so, is the zoning countywide?

Yes

b. What municipalities in the county are zoned?

Bassett

c. When was zoning implemented?

1999

#### **G.** Contracted Services

**1. Appraisal Services:** (are these contracted, or conducted "in-house?") None

2. Other Services:

None

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

#### **II. Assessment Actions**

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

#### 1. Residential

For the assessment year 2007 all improvements in Newport were revalued based on a physical review and market study by the assessor. New pictures of all improvements were also taken.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2007 assessment roll.

#### 2. Commercial

For the assessment year 2007 all improvements in Newport were revalued based on a physical review and market study by the assessor. New pictures of all improvements were also taken.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If

there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2007 assessment roll.

#### 3. Agricultural

For the assessment year 2007, the assessor completed a spreadsheet analysis of the unimproved agricultural sales and made valuation adjustments accordingly.

Changes in land valuation were made to land capability groups in all three market areas. In market areas 1, 2 and 3 Irrigated values were raised. In market areas 1 and 2 Grass Land values were raised and in market area 3 Dry Land values were raised. Home sites and shelterbelts were also raised based on the analysis.

Feedlots in the county were revalued on a per head acre basis.

All agricultural improvements are now updated to the June 2004 Marshall & Swift pricing.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the 2007 assessment roll.

#### County 75 - Rock

Total Real Property Value	Records	3,069	Value 238,095,860	Total Growth	510,814
(Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)		0,000	200,000,000	(Sum 17, 25, & 41)	0.0,0

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

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
1. Res UnImp Land	64	96,525	37	110,035	3	12,120	104	218,680	
2. Res Improv Land	458	902,230	94	442,610	48	459,505	600	1,804,345	
3. Res Improvements	468	11,734,445	94	5,626,170	62	2,462,515	624	19,823,130	
4. Res Total	532	12,733,200	131	6,178,815	65	2,934,140	728	21,846,155	197,791
% of Total	73.07	58.28	17.99	28.28	8.92	13.43	23.72	9.17	38.72
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	3	78,000	3	78,000	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	6	65,780	6	65,780	
8. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	6	143,780	6	143,780	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	** **	** **	0.19	0.06	0.00
Res+Rec Total	532	12,733,200	131	6,178,815	71	3,077,920	734	21,989,935	197,791
% of Total	72.47	57.90	17.84	28.09	9.67	13.99	23.91	9.23	38.72
				j		j		j	j

#### County 75 - Rock

Total Real Property Value	Records	3,069	Value 238,095,860	Total Growth	510,814
(Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)		0,000	200,000,000	(Sum 17, 25, & 41)	0.0,0

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

(	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	010"011
9. Comm UnImp Land	16	61,220	5	185,570	5	56,680	26	303,470	
10. Comm Improv Land	79	365,235	11	120,055	15	183,400	105	668,690	
11. Comm Improvements	80	3,560,390	12	433,360	22	1,457,430	114	5,451,180	
12. Comm Total	96	3,986,845	17	738,985	27	1,697,510	140	6,423,340	0
% of Total	68.57	62.06	12.14	11.50	19.28	26.42	4.56	2.69	0.00
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comm+Ind Total % of Total	96	3,986,845	17	738,985	27	1,697,510	140	6,423,340	0
	68.57	62.06	12.14	11.50	19.28	26.42	4.56	2.69	0.00
17. Taxable Total	628	16,720,045	148	6,917,800	98	4,775,430	874	28,413,275	197,791
% of Total	71.85	58.84	16.93	21.74	11.21	10.83	28.47	11.93	38.72

$C \cap$	un	ŧν	75 -	. R	ററ	k
CU	uu	LV	13		U	'n

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

Schedule II:Tax Increment	Financing (TIF)	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess		
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0		
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0		
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0		
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

	Total		Growth	
	Records	Value		
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0		0
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0		0
25. Mineral Interest Total	0	0		0

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	<b>Total</b> Records
26. Exempt	48	10	188	246

Schedule V: Agricultural Records Urban			SubUrban			ral	Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	24	1,353,720	1,803	153,658,460	1,827	155,012,180
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	10	523,205	356	41,274,715	366	41,797,920
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	10	218,550	358	12,653,935	368	12,872,485
30. Ag-Total Taxable							2.195	209.682.585

County 75 - Rock	200	07 County Absti	ract of Assessn	nent for Real	Property, Form	45	
Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:		Urban			SubUrban		
Non-Agricultural Detail	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	2	2.000	8,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	2		114,730	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	5	152.760	86,550	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	10	303.160	190,740	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	10		103,820	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			28.760		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
		Rural			Total		Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	6	6.000	24,000	6	6.000	24,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	260	315.000	1,257,000	262	317.000	1,265,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	265		7,924,715	267		8,039,445	313,023
34. HomeSite Total				273	323.000	9,328,445	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	12	107.000	57,500	17	259.760	144,050	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	322	1,103.580	1,988,580	332	1,406.740	2,179,320	
37. FarmSite Improv	330		4,729,220	340		4,833,040	0
38. FarmSite Total				357	1,666.500	7,156,410	
39. Road & Ditches		3,019.020			3,047.780		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		8.000	0		8.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				630	5,045.280	16,484,855	313,023
Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:					0.1111		
Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Records	<b>Urban</b> Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value	
42. Game & Parks	2	0.000	166,950	0	0.000	0	
		Rural			Total		
40.000.0.1	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
42. Game & Parks	10	897.000	210,665	12	897.000	377,615	
Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value	Records	<b>Urban</b> Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value	
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
44. Recapture Val			0			0	
•		Rural		_	Total	-	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
44. Recapture Val			0			0	

Schedule IX: Aç	gricultural Records	: AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area	: 1		
	Urban			1	Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	75.000	60,000	236.000	188,320	311.000	248,320
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	82.000	61,500	82.000	61,500
48. 2A	0.000	0	40.000	30,000	748.000	560,850	788.000	590,850
49. 3A1	0.000	0	89.000	64,525	2,348.000	1,706,940	2,437.000	1,771,465
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,767.000	2,011,005	2,767.000	2,011,005
51. 4A1	0.000	0	38.000	27,550	6,190.000	4,527,190	6,228.000	4,554,740
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	458.000	324,240	458.000	324,240
53. Total	0.000	0	242.000	182,075	12,829.000	9,380,045	13,071.000	9,562,120
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	78.000	31,200	78.000	31,200
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	164.000	63,960	164.000	63,960
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	62.000	22,940	62.000	22,940
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	436.000	161,320	436.000	161,320
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	163.000	57,050	163.000	57,050
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	48.000	16,800	48.000	16,800
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	951.000	353,270	951.000	353,270
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	622.000	248,800	18,122.000	7,247,340	18,744.000	7,496,140
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	181.000	67,530	181.000	67,530
66. 2G	0.000	0	216.000	75,600	11,302.780	3,956,485	11,518.780	4,032,085
67. 3G1	0.000	0	1,683.000	572,220	59,235.000	20,153,385	60,918.000	20,725,605
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	10,416.360	3,438,745	10,416.360	3,438,745
69. 4G1	0.000	0	263.000	63,120	37,596.100	9,180,995	37,859.100	9,244,115
70. 4G	0.000	0	33.000	7,590	17,832.000	4,114,810	17,865.000	4,122,400
71. Total	0.000	0	2,817.000	967,330	154,685.240	48,159,290	157,502.240	49,126,620
72. Waste	0.000	0	82.000	8,200	3,027.000	302,700	3,109.000	310,900
73. Other	0.000	0	18.000	8,100	611.000	275,150	629.000	283,250
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		928.710		928.710	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
75. Total	0.000	0	3,159.000	1,165,705	172,103.240	58,470,455	175,262.240	59,636,160

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail					Market Area: 2					
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total			
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value		
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	122.000	88,320	122.000	88,320		
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	628.000	436,200	628.000	436,200		
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,109.000	785,755	1,109.000	785,755		
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	611.000	442,975	611.000	442,975		
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,956.070	2,686,275	3,956.070	2,686,275		
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	534.500	368,485	534.500	368,485		
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,960.570	4,808,010	6,960.570	4,808,010		
Dryland:										
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	30.000	8,100	30.000	8,100		
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	19.000	4,940	19.000	4,940		
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	750	3.000	750		
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	44.000	10,120	44.000	10,120		
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	96.000	23,910	96.000	23,910		
Grass:										
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	14,259.000	4,277,700	14,259.000	4,277,700		
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0		
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	11,621.000	3,486,300	11,621.000	3,486,300		
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	50,480.000	14,195,460	50,480.000	14,195,460		
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,110.000	482,025	2,110.000	482,025		
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	90,725.530	19,738,255	90,725.530	19,738,255		
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	154,559.500	30,077,365	154,559.500	30,077,365		
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	323,755.030	72,257,105	323,755.030	72,257,105		
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,275.000	827,500	8,275.000	827,500		
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	895.000	412,100	895.000	412,100		
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		3,582.570		3,582.570			
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	339,981.600	78,328,625	339,981.600	78,328,625		

Schedule IX: A	gricultural Records	s: AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area: 3				
	Urban		SubUrban				Total		
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	(	
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	314.000	321,850	314.000	321,850	
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	26.000	26,650	26.000	26,650	
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	334.000	342,350	334.000	342,350	
49. 3A1	0.000	0	22.000	22,550	3,386.000	3,470,650	3,408.000	3,493,200	
50. 3A	0.000	0	61.000	62,525	11,102.000	11,379,550	11,163.000	11,442,075	
51. 4A1	0.000	0	9.000	9,225	9,763.000	10,007,075	9,772.000	10,016,300	
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	306.000	306,000	306.000	306,000	
53. Total	0.000	0	92.000	94,300	25,231.000	25,854,125	25,323.000	25,948,425	
Dryland:									
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	(	
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	440.000	198,000	440.000	198,000	
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	1,350	3.000	1,350	
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	(	
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	466.000	209,700	466.000	209,700	
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	892.000	401,400	892.000	401,400	
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	566.000	240,550	566.000	240,550	
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	237.000	100,725	237.000	100,725	
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,604.000	1,151,725	2,604.000	1,151,725	
Grass:									
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	(	
64. 1G	0.000	0	306.000	137,700	751.000	329,550	1,057.000	467,250	
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	6.000	2,700	6.000	2,700	
66. 2G	0.000	0	99.000	44,550	455.000	204,750	554.000	249,300	
67. 3G1	0.000	0	218.000	79,570	6,048.000	2,202,385	6,266.000	2,281,955	
68. 3G	0.000	0	66.000	22,110	16,348.000	5,482,880	16,414.000	5,504,990	
69. 4G1	0.000	0	149.000	44,700	31,000.000	9,344,200	31,149.000	9,388,900	
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	33,478.000	10,049,400	33,478.000	10,049,400	
71. Total	0.000	0	838.000	328,630	88,086.000	27,615,865	88,924.000	27,944,495	
72. Waste	0.000	0	3.000	300	201.500	20,150	204.500	20,450	
73. Other	0.000	0	6.000	2,700	367.000	165,150	373.000	167,850	
74. Exempt	0.000		15.000		643.960		658.960		
. II =xompt									

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

	Urban		SubUrbar	SubUrban			Total	
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	334.000	276,375	45,020.570	40,042,180	45,354.570	40,318,555
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,651.000	1,528,905	3,651.000	1,528,905
78.Grass	0.000	0	3,655.000	1,295,960	566,526.270	148,032,260	570,181.270	149,328,220
79.Waste	0.000	0	85.000	8,500	11,503.500	1,150,350	11,588.500	1,158,850
80.Other	0.000	0	24.000	10,800	1,873.000	852,400	1,897.000	863,200
81.Exempt	0.000	0	19.000	0	5,155.240	0	5,174.240	0
82.Total	0.000	0	4,098.000	1,591,635	628,574.340	191,606,095	632,672.340	193,197,730

-					Market Area: 1
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	311.000	2.38%	248,320	2.60%	798.456
2A1	82.000	0.63%	61,500	0.64%	750.000
2A	788.000	6.03%	590,850	6.18%	749.809
3A1	2,437.000	18.64%	1,771,465	18.53%	726.903
3A	2,767.000	21.17%	2,011,005	21.03%	726.781
4A1	6,228.000	47.65%	4,554,740	47.63%	731.332
4A	458.000	3.50%	324,240	3.39%	707.947
Irrigated Total	13,071.000	100.00%	9,562,120	100.00%	731.552
Dry:					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	78.000	8.20%	31,200	8.83%	400.000
2D1	164.000	17.25%	63,960	18.11%	390.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	62.000	6.52%	22,940	6.49%	370.000
3D	436.000	45.85%	161,320	45.66%	370.000
4D1	163.000	17.14%	57,050	16.15%	350.000
4D	48.000	5.05%	16,800	4.76%	350.000
Dry Total	951.000	100.00%	353,270	100.00%	371.472
Grass:			,		-
1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	18,744.000	11.90%	7,496,140	15.26%	399.922
2G1	181.000	0.11%	67,530	0.14%	373.093
2G	11,518.780	7.31%	4,032,085	8.21%	350.044
3G1	60,918.000	38.68%	20,725,605	42.19%	340.221
3G	10,416.360	6.61%	3,438,745	7.00%	330.129
4G1	37,859.100	24.04%	9,244,115	18.82%	244.171
4G	17,865.000	11.34%	4,122,400	8.39%	230.752
Grass Total	157,502.240	100.00%	49,126,620	100.00%	311.910
	·				
Irrigated Total	13,071.000	7.46%	9,562,120	16.03%	731.552
Dry Total	951.000	0.54%	353,270	0.59%	371.472
Grass Total	157,502.240	89.87%	49,126,620	82.38%	311.910
Waste	3,109.000	1.77%	310,900	0.52%	100.000
Other	629.000	0.36%	283,250	0.47%	450.317
Exempt	928.710	0.53%			
Market Area Total	175,262.240	100.00%	59,636,160	100.00%	340.268
As Related to the C	County as a Whol	е			
Irrigated Total	13,071.000	28.82%	9,562,120	23.72%	
Dry Total	951.000	26.05%	353,270	23.11%	
Grass Total	157,502.240	27.62%	49,126,620	32.90%	
Waste	3,109.000	26.83%	310,900	26.83%	
Other	629.000	33.16%	283,250	32.81%	
Exempt	928.710	17.95%	, , ,		
Market Area Total	175,262.240	27.70%	59,636,160	30.87%	
	-, -=		,,-30		

located		% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Market Area: 2
Irrigated:	Acres 0.000	0.00%	Value 0	0.00%	Average Assessed Value* 0.000
1A	122.000	1.75%	88,320	1.84%	723.934
2A1	0.000	0.00%	00,320	0.00%	0.000
2A	628.000	9.02%	436,200	9.07%	694.585
3A1	1,109.000	15.93%	785,755	16.34%	708.525
3A	611.000	8.78%	442,975	9.21%	725.000
4A1	3,956.070	56.84%	2,686,275	55.87%	679.026
4A	534.500	7.68%	368,485	7.66%	689.401
Irrigated Total	6,960.570	100.00%	4,808,010	100.00%	690.749
Dry:	0,900.370	100.0076	4,000,010	100.00%	030.749
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D	30.000	31.25%	8,100	33.88%	270.000
3D1	19.000	19.79%	4,940	20.66%	260.000
3D	3.000		750		
4D1	44.000	3.13% 45.83%		3.14%	250.000 230.000
4D			10,120	42.33%	
Dry Total	96.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
•	96.000	100.00%	23,910	100.00%	249.062
Grass:	0.000	0.000/	•	0.000/	2.202
1G1 1G	0.000	0.00% 4.40%	4,277,700	0.00% 5.92%	0.000 300.000
2G1	0.000	0.00%	4,217,700	0.00%	0.000
2G	11,621.000	3.59%		4.82%	300.000
3G1	50,480.000	15.59%	3,486,300 14,195,460	19.65%	281.209
3G	·		482,025		
4G1	2,110.000 90,725.530	0.65% 28.02%	<u> </u>	0.67% 27.32%	228.447
4G	·		19,738,255		217.560 194.600
Grass Total	154,559.500	47.74%	30,077,365	41.63%	
Grass rotal	323,755.030	100.00%	72,257,105	100.00%	223.184
Irrigated Total	6,960.570	2.05%	4,808,010	6.14%	690.749
Dry Total	96.000	0.03%	23,910	0.03%	249.062
Grass Total	323,755.030	95.23%	72,257,105	92.25%	223.184
Waste	8,275.000	2.43%	827,500	1.06%	100.000
Other	895.000	0.26%	412,100	0.53%	460.446
Exempt	3,582.570	1.05%			
Market Area Total	339,981.600	100.00%	78,328,625	100.00%	230.390
As Deleted to the C	Soundy oo o Whol				
As Related to the C Irrigated Total			4 909 040	11 020/	
Dry Total	6,960.570	15.35%	4,808,010	11.93%	
•	96.000	2.63%	23,910	1.56%	
Grass Total	323,755.030	56.78%	72,257,105	48.39%	
Waste	8,275.000	71.41%	827,500	71.41%	
Other	895.000	47.18%	412,100	47.74%	
Exempt Market Area Tatal	3,582.570	69.24%	70.000.005	40 540/	
Market Area Total	339,981.600	53.74%	78,328,625	40.54%	

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Market Area: Average Assessed Valu
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	314.000	1.24%	321,850	1.24%	1,025.000
2A1	26.000	0.10%	26,650	0.10%	1,025.000
2A	334.000	1.32%	342,350	1.32%	1,025.000
3A1	3,408.000	13.46%	3,493,200	13.46%	1,025.000
3A	11,163.000	44.08%	11,442,075	44.10%	1,025.000
4A1	9,772.000	38.59%	10,016,300	38.60%	1,025.000
4A	306.000	1.21%	306,000	1.18%	1,000.000
Irrigated Total	25,323.000	100.00%	25,948,425	100.00%	1,024.697
Dry:					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	440.000	16.90%	198,000	17.19%	450.000
2D1	3.000	0.12%	1,350	0.12%	450.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	466.000	17.90%	209,700	18.21%	450.000
3D	892.000	34.25%	401,400	34.85%	450.000
4D1	566.000	21.74%	240,550	20.89%	425.000
4D	237.000	9.10%	100,725	8.75%	425.000
Dry Total	2,604.000	100.00%	1,151,725	100.00%	442.290
Grass:	, , , , , , , , , , ,		.,,		
1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	1,057.000	1.19%	467,250	1.67%	442.052
2G1	6.000	0.01%	2,700	0.01%	450.000
2G	554.000	0.62%	249,300	0.89%	450.000
3G1	6,266.000	7.05%	2,281,955	8.17%	364.180
3G	16,414.000	18.46%	5,504,990	19.70%	335.383
4G1	31,149.000	35.03%	9,388,900	33.60%	301.418
4G	33,478.000	37.65%	10,049,400	35.96%	300.179
Grass Total	88,924.000	100.00%	27,944,495	100.00%	314.251
Irrigated Total	25 222 000	24 560/	25.049.425	46.000/	1 024 607
Dry Total	25,323.000	21.56%	25,948,425	46.98%	1,024.697
	2,604.000	2.22%	1,151,725	2.09%	442.290
Grass Total	88,924.000	75.73%	27,944,495	50.59%	314.251
Waste	204.500	0.17%	20,450	0.04%	100.000
Other	373.000	0.32%	167,850	0.30%	450.000
Exempt  Market Area Total	658.960	0.56%	FF 200 045	100.000/	470.050
Market Area Total	117,428.500	100.00%	55,232,945	100.00%	470.353
As Related to the Co	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	25,323.000	55.83%	25,948,425	64.36%	
Dry Total	2,604.000	71.32%	1,151,725	75.33%	
Grass Total	88,924.000	15.60%	27,944,495	18.71%	
Waste	204.500	1.76%	20,450	1.76%	
Other	373.000	19.66%	167,850	19.45%	
Exempt	658.960	12.74%			
Market Area Total	117,428.500	18.56%	55,232,945	28.59%	

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	0.000	0	334.000	276,375	45,020.570	40,042,180
Dry	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,651.000	1,528,905
Grass	0.000	0	3,655.000	1,295,960	566,526.270	148,032,260
Waste	0.000	0	85.000	8,500	11,503.500	1,150,350
Other	0.000	0	24.000	10,800	1,873.000	852,400
Exempt	0.000	0	19.000	0	5,155.240	0
Total	0.000	0	4,098.000	1,591,635	628,574.340	191,606,095

	Tota	ı				% of	Average
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	Value*	Assessed Value*
Irrigated	45,354.570	40,318,555	45,354.570	7.17%	40,318,555	20.87%	888.963
Dry	3,651.000	1,528,905	3,651.000	0.58%	1,528,905	0.79%	418.763
Grass	570,181.270	149,328,220	570,181.270	90.12%	149,328,220	77.29%	261.896
Waste	11,588.500	1,158,850	11,588.500	1.83%	1,158,850	0.60%	100.000
Other	1,897.000	863,200	1,897.000	0.30%	863,200	0.45%	455.034
Exempt	5,174.240	0	5,174.240	0.82%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	632,672.340	193,197,730	632,672.340	100.00%	193,197,730	100.00%	305.367

<sup>\*</sup> Department of Property Assessment & Taxation Calculates

## 2006 Plan of Assessment for Rock County Assessment Years 2007, 2008, and 2009

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

### Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

#### General Description of Real Property in Rock County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Residential	735	23.5%	10%
Commercial	147	4.7%	2.9%
Industrial	-	-	-
Recreational	9	1%	0.1%
Agricultural	2215	70.8%	87%
Special Value	-	-	_

Agricultural land - taxable acres 633,188

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

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

Property Class	<u>Median</u>	COD*	PRD*
Residential	98.46	7.42	100.81
Commercial	97.37	5.24	100.99
Agricultural Land	78.51	17.90	103.37

<sup>\*</sup>COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2006 Reports & Opinions.

#### Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Years 2006, 2007 & 2008:

For the year 2006-07 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law. The village of Newport residential will be revalued, sketches drawn, pictures taken and new information will be added. All records will be updated to the June 2004 Marshall & Swift pricing within the Terra Scan system. We will do the pickup work in house.

For the year 2007-08 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law. Hopefully land use over the county will be reviewed.

For the year 2008-09 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law.

This information is provided to the best of my knowledge with the information I have at this time. If anything changes in the future we will address it in an appropriate manner.

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

- 1. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
- 2. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 357 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
- 3. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
- 4. Taxable Government Owned Property annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
- 5. Homestead Exemptions; administer 126 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
- 6. Centrally Assessed review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
- 7. Tax Increment Financing management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
- 8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
- 9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
- 10. Tax List Corrections prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

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

Respectfully submitted:

Gene Schaaf Rock 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 Rock County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7005 1160 0001 1213 9706.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Property Assessment & Taxation