## Preface

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Residential Real Property - Current |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  | 414 | COD |  | 5.32 |
| Total Sales Price | \$ | 34457414 | PRD |  | 100.73 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | Price \$ | 34434214 | COV |  | 8.64 |
| Total Assessed Value | ue \$ | 33702306 | STD |  | 8.52 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 83174.43 | Avg. |  | 5.27 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | e \$ | 81406.54 | Min |  | 62.83 |
| Median |  | 98.94 | Max |  | 149.04 |
| Wgt. Mean |  | 97.87 | 95\% |  | 98.48 to 99.26 |
| Mean |  | 98.59 | 95\% |  | 97.09 to 98.65 |
|  |  |  | 95\% |  | 97.77 to 99.41 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  |  | 31.72 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  |  | 8.12 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  |  | 9.15 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  |  | 72,171 |
| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Number of Sa |  | Median | COD | PRD |
| 2007 | 414 |  | 98.94 | 5.32 | 100.73 |
| 2006 | 371 |  | 99.38 | 6.03 | 101.84 |
| 2005 | 390 |  | 99.30 | 6.41 | 101.97 |
| 2004 | 354 |  | 98.90 | 7.43 | 102.01 |
| 2003 | 388 |  | 99 | 10.63 | 104.88 |
| 2002 | 399 |  | 99 | 7.22 | 102.09 |
| 2001 | 413 |  | 98 | 6.7 | 100.17 |

## 2007 Commission Summary



## 2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for York 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 York County is $99 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in York 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 York County is $99 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for York County

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the 2007 Residential statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the residential property in York County has been achieved. The percentage of qualified residential sales stayed relatively the same as last year. The measures of central tendency as well as the qualitative measures are all within the acceptable range indicating that York County has achieved a general level of good assessment uniformity for the residential property class as a whole.

The York County Assessor does a good job with their sales review as well as their physical inspections of property in the county. The assessor and staff leave the office to review property and determine land usage in a cyclical manner. The Assessor and her staff have increased their technical knowledge in order to take advantage of the tools available from their computer vendor. The York County Assessor has done a good job with cross-training her staff as the deputy and assessment clerks are all knowledgeable in all facets of the assessment cycle with the exception of actual appraisal of property. Appraisals are all completed by the Assessor. The Assessor has a good working relationship with her County Board. She also strives to keep the public educated about the valuation process. 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.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{6 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5 4}$ |
| 2006 | 599 | 371 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 9 4}$ |
| 2005 | 551 | 390 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 7 8}$ |
| 2004 | 493 | 354 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 8 1}$ |
| 2003 | 489 | 388 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 3 5}$ |
| 2002 | 529 | 399 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 4 3}$ |
| 2001 | 564 | 413 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2 3}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The percentage of qualified residential sales indicates little change when compared to the previous year. Table II illustrates York County determined $62.54 \%$ of the total residential sales to be qualified for use in setting values. This is a slight increase from 2006. The sales verification process in this county has been in place for a number of years and it appears that York County has not excessively trimmed the sales file.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for York County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ 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 $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 98.70 | 4.31 | 102.96 | 98.94 |
| 2006 | 98.73 | 2.05 | 100.75 | 99.38 |
| 2005 | 98.11 | 2.6 | 100.66 | 99.30 |
| 2004 | 98.17 | 3.99 | 102.09 | 98.90 |
| 2003 | 99 | 2.33 | 101.31 | 99 |
| 2002 | 98 | 1.96 | 99.92 | 99 |
| 2001 | 96 | 3.41 | 99.27 | 98 |

RESIDENTIAL: Table III indicates a difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ ratio of just over 4 percentage points. This difference can be attributed to the changes in value to the rural residential properties which make up, according to the history charts, around $20 \%$ of the residential base value. Only approximately six and a half percent of the sales file can be attributed to the assessed values of the sales located in the rural sector. Tthe 2007 assessment actions detail the revaluation of rural residential property. This would cause a disproportionate movement between the sales file and the residential base of property.

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.05 | 2007 | 4.31 |
| 1.66 | 2006 | 2.05 |
| 2.8 | 2005 | 2.6 |
| 2.94 | 2004 | 3.99 |
| 1.04 | 2003 | 2.33 |
| 2.58 | 2002 | 1.96 |
| 4.26 | 2001 | 3.41 |

RESIDENTIAL: As explained in Table III there was disproportionate movement between the assessed values in the sales file and the residential assessment base values. Table IV illustrates the same unequal movement between the sales file and the 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.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for York County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 8 . 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 . 5 9}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of central tendency shown in table V reflect that the median, weighted mean and mean for the qualified residential sales file are all within the acceptable level of value. This is another indication 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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 5.32 | 100.73 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price-related differential are both within the range. These qualitative measures strongly support each other to indicate that York County has achieved a general level of good assessment uniformity for the residential property class as a whole.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 415 | 414 | -1 |
| Median | 98.70 | 98.94 | 0.24 |
| Wgt. Mean | 96.35 | 97.87 | 1.52 |
| Mean | 97.36 | 98.59 | 1.23 |
| COD | 6.34 | 5.32 | -1.02 |
| PRD | 101.05 | 100.73 | -0.32 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 57.28 | 62.83 | 5.55 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 138.46 | 149.04 | 10.58 |

RESIDENTIAL: A review of Table VII indicates one sale was removed from the qualified residential roster. This sale was a substantially changed sale and the value could not be recreated. After reviewing the Preliminary Statistical Report, the reported assessment actions and the 2007 R \& O Statistical Report for residential real property, the statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment action taken in York County.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for York County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the 2007 Commercial statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the commercial property in York County has been achieved. The percentage of qualified commercial sales stayed relatively the same as last year. The measures of central tendency as well as the qualitative measures are all within the acceptable range indicating that York County has achieved a general level of good assessment uniformity for the commercial property class as a whole.

The York County Assessor does a good job with their sales review as well as their physical inspections of property in the county. The assessor and staff leave the office to review property and determine land usage in a cyclical manner. The Assessor and her staff have increased their technical knowledge in order to take advantage of the tools available from their computer vendor. The York County Assessor has done a good job with cross-training her staff as the deputy and assessment clerks are all knowledgeable in all facets of the assessment cycle with the exception of actual appraisal of property. Appraisals are all completed by the Assessor. The Assessor has a good working relationship with her County Board. She also strives to keep the public educated about the valuation process. 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.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 131 | 60 | 45.8 |
| 2006 | 120 | 55 | 45.83 |
| 2005 | 110 | 62 | 56.36 |
| 2004 | 95 | 56 | 58.95 |
| 2003 | 94 | 51 | 54.26 |
| 2002 | 105 | 60 | 57.14 |
| 2001 | 130 | 82 | 63.08 |

COMMERCIAL: The percentage of qualified commercial sales indicates little change when compared to the previous year. Table II illustrates York County determined $45.8 \%$ of the total commercial sales to be qualified for use in setting values. This is a consistent with the 2006 percentage of sales used.The sales verification process in this county has been in place for a number of years and it appears that York County has not excessively trimmed the sales file.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for York County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ 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 $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 98.78 | -0.99 | 97.8 | 98.79 |
| 2006 | 97.61 | -3.39 | 94.3 | 97.92 |
| 2005 | 97.83 | 4.03 | 101.78 | 98.12 |
| 2004 | 98.60 | 0.02 | 98.62 | 98.63 |
| 2003 | 99 | 1.9 | 100.88 | 100 |
| 2002 | 96 | 19.89 | 115.09 | 100 |
| 2001 | 97 | 0.62 | 97.6 | 97 |

COMMERCIAL: The minor difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the R \& O median is only approximately $1 \%$ and not a cause for concern. These statistics are also supported by the reported assessment actions and offer their own confirmation that the R \& O median is indicative of the level of value for commercial property in York County.

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.04 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 9}$ |
| 4.88 | 2006 | -3.39 |
| 0.84 | 2005 | 4.03 |
| 0.44 | 2004 | 0.02 |
| 3.88 | 2003 | 1.9 |
| 35.53 | 2002 | 19.89 |
| 13.8 | 2001 | 0.62 |

COMMERCIAL: As with table III the percentage change in the assessed valuation of the commercial sales file and the percentage change in the commercial property base in York County are very similar and offer support of each other as well as the median in determining the level of value in York County.

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

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

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

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

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

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.
for York County
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 8 . 7 9}$ | 97.44 | 98.16 |

COMMERCIAL: The measures of central tendency shown in table V reflect that the median, weighted mean and mean for the qualified commercial sales file are all within the acceptable level of value. This is another indication 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 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 5.48 | 100.74 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price-related differential are both within the range. These qualitative measures strongly support each other to indicate that York County has achieved a general level of good assessment uniformity for the commercial property class as a whole.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 62 | 60 | -2 |
| Median | 98.78 | 98.79 | 0.01 |
| Wgt. Mean | 99.09 | 97.44 | -1.65 |
| Mean | 98.65 | 98.16 | -0.49 |
| COD | 4.86 | 5.48 | 0.62 |
| PRD | 99.56 | 100.74 | 1.18 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 75.65 | 58.68 | -16.97 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 133.95 | 133.95 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: A review of Table VII indicates two sales were removed from the qualified commercial roster. One sale was removed following sales verification identifying it as a partial interest sale and one sale was removed as a substantially changed property After reviewing the Preliminary Statistical Report, the reported assessment actions and the 2007 R \& O Statistical Report for commercial real property, the statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment action taken in York County.

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

|  | 2006 CTL <br> County Total | 2007 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2007 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 345,031,498 | 367,267,885 | 22,236,387 | 6.44 | 7,418,377 | 4.29 |
| 2. Recreational | 772,384 | 874,307 | 101,923 | 13.2 | 0 | 13.2 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 43,175,460 | 44,215,455 | 1,039,995 | 2.41 | *---------- | 2.41 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 388,979,342 | 412,357,647 | 23,378,305 | 6.01 | 7,418,377 | 4.1 |
| 5. Commercial | 131,438,783 | 135,653,571 | 4,214,788 | 3.21 | 5,841,642 | -1.24 |
| 6. Industrial | 31,749,979 | 31,759,780 | 9,801 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.03 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 24,486,913 | 26,520,472 | 2,033,559 | 8.3 | 594,376 | 5.88 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 187,675,675 | 193,933,823 | 6,258,148 | 3.33 | 5,841,642 | 0.22 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 576,655,017 | 606,291,470 | 29,636,453 | 5.14 | 13,854,395 | 2.74 |
| 11. Irrigated | 494,222,611 | 518,646,503 | 24,423,892 | 4.94 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 77,871,848 | 71,226,585 | -6,645,263 | -8.53 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 8,016,960 | 8,902,313 | 885,353 | 11.04 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 792680 | 864,525 | 71,845 | 9.06 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 54,720 | 90,738 | 36,018 | 65.82 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 580,958,819 | 599,730,664 | 18,771,845 | 3.23 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,157,613,836 | 1,206,022,134 | 48,408,298 | 4.18 | 13,854,395 | 2.98 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 outbuildings is shown in line 7.

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


99
98
COV:
STD:
8.64
-
95\% Median C.I.: 98.48 to 99.26
(!: Derived)

AVG.ABS.DEV: 5.27 .
MEAN:
99 AVG.ABS.DEV:
95\% Mean C.I.: 97.77 to 99.41

MAX Sales Ratio:
PRD: 100.73
Printed: 03/30/2007 14:59:39

\section*{| DATE |
| :--- |
| RANGE |}


| 07/01/0 |
| :--- |
| 10/01/04 |
| $01 / 01 / 0$ |
| $04 / 01 / 05$ |
| $07 / 01 / 0$ |
| $10 / 01 / 05$ |
| $01 / 01 / 06$ |
| $04 / 01 / 06$ |
| $07 / 01$ | Qrtrs $\qquad$ 07/01/04 TO 09/30/04 10/01/04 тO 12/31/04 1/05 то 03/31/05 01/05 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 04/01/06 03/31/06

$\qquad$ Study Years $\qquad$ 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06
$\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ _ ALI
ASSESSOR LOCATION

BENEDICT
BRADSHAW
GRESHAM
HENDERSON
MCCOOL JUNCTION
RURAL BENEDICT
RURAL HENDERSON
RURAL MCCOOL JCT RURAL WACO

RURAL YORK SPRING LAKE EST
THAYER
WACO
YORK
YORK SUB
$\qquad$

COUNT MEDIAN

|  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 46 | 100.32 | 100.74 | 100.27 |
| 57 | 99.82 | 100.63 | 99.99 |
| 29 | 98.73 | 98.80 | 97.91 |
| 51 | 99.09 | 98.73 | 98.10 |
| 74 | 97.50 | 97.16 | 96.85 |
| 54 | 99.02 | 99.65 | 98.77 |
| 41 | 98.01 | 97.42 | 94.48 |
| 62 | 97.99 | 96.46 | 96.62 |
| 183 | 99.56 | 99.84 | 99.21 |
| 231 | 98.32 | 97.60 | 96.77 |
| 208 | 98.82 | 98.42 | 97.76 |

98.82

| 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 10 | 98.63 | 99.44 | 98.61 | 8.45 | 100.84 | 83.22 | 117.49 | 90.00 to 116.22 | 39,818 | 39,265 |
| 11 | 99.66 | 100.67 | 99.18 | 11.55 | 101.50 | 69.75 | 125.25 | 86.33 to 124.23 | 33,281 | 33,008 |
| 15 | 99.21 | 100.25 | 97.90 | 6.88 | 102.40 | 80.07 | 117.60 | 95.20 to 105.49 | 33,460 | 32,758 |
| 32 | 98.04 | 98.51 | 96.00 | 5.47 | 102.61 | 73.08 | 120.40 | 96.18 to 99.28 | 79,914 | 76,715 |
| 19 | 93.92 | 92.47 | 93.66 | 9.12 | 98.73 | 62.83 | 108.80 | 84.96 to 101.69 | 60,223 | 56,403 |
| 3 | 98.67 | 89.89 | 88.53 | 9.44 | 101.53 | 71.52 | 99.47 | N/A | 124,166 | 109,925 |
| 2 | 102.54 | 102.54 | 102.67 | 5.18 | 99.87 | 97.23 | 107.85 | N/A | 89,750 | 92,149 |
| 6 | 97.99 | 97.47 | 97.67 | 1.59 | 99.80 | 93.99 | 99.43 | 93.99 to 99.43 | 102,250 | 99,864 |
| 4 | 93.23 | 92.87 | 91.50 | 4.23 | 101.50 | 86.08 | 98.93 | N/A | 100,750 | 92,181 |
| 6 | 97.99 | 97.36 | 97.76 | 2.61 | 99.59 | 92.50 | 100.29 | 92.50 to 100.29 | 122,916 | 120,159 |
| 2 | 100.84 | 100.84 | 100.68 | 9.62 | 100.16 | 91.14 | 110.54 | N/A | 153,500 | 154,542 |
| 1 | 83.80 | 83.80 | 83.80 |  |  | 83.80 | 83.80 | N/A | 6,000 | 5,028 |
| 8 | 93.93 | 94.41 | 95.42 | 6.40 | 98.93 | 73.99 | 109.19 | 73.99 to 109.19 | 79,585 | 75,942 |
| 290 | 99.22 | 99.20 | 98.55 | 4.54 | 100.66 | 65.15 | 149.04 | 98.70 to 99.55 | 87,716 | 86,445 |
| 5 | 99.23 | 95.74 | 95.07 | 4.03 | 100.70 | 86.96 | 99.91 | N/A | 154,600 | 146,981 |
| 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |

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

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

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

| 414 | MEDIAN: |
| ---: | ---: |
| $34,457,414$ | WGT. MEAN : |
| $34,434,214$ | MEAN : |
| $33,702,306$ |  |
| 83,174 | COD : |
| 81,406 | PRD : |


| 99 | COV: | 8.64 | 95\% Median C.I.: | 98.48 to 99.26 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 98 | STD: | 8.52 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 97.09 to 98.65 |
| 99 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 5.27 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I.: | 97.77 to 99.41 |


| AVG. Assessed Value: |  |  | 81,406 | PRD : | 100.73 | MIN Sales Ratio: |  | 62.83 |  | Printed: 03/30/2007 14:59:39 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATIONS: URBAN | SUBURBAN | \& RURAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 386 | 98.99 | 98.76 | 98.09 | 5.37 |  | 100.68 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.58 to 99.31 | 80,435 | 78,899 |
| 2 | 12 | 98.97 | 98.59 | 97.80 | 4.39 |  | 100.82 | 86.96 | 110.54 | 92.77 to 100.29 | 127,416 | 124,608 |
| 3 | 16 | 96.53 | 94.53 | 94.33 | 4.39 |  | 100.21 | 71.52 | 100.08 | 92.50 to 99.39 | 116,062 | 109,476 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 |  | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |
| STATUS: IMPROVED | UNIMPROVE | D \& IOLL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 392 | 99.07 | 98.89 | 97.96 | 5.05 |  | 100.95 | 65.15 | 149.04 | 98.67 to 99.31 | 84,776 | 83,045 |
| 2 | 15 | 91.20 | 90.79 | 90.20 | 11.12 |  | 100.66 | 62.83 | 117.60 | 86.33 to 97.27 | 20,345 | 18,351 |
| 3 | 7 | 98.70 | 98.54 | 97.39 | 4.29 |  | 101.18 | 87.55 | 105.54 | 87.55 to 105.54 | 128,085 | 124,748 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 |  | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 01 | 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 |  | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |

$\qquad$ ALL___

|  | 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-0002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30-0001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41-0091 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 72-0015 | 13 | 98.67 | 97.23 | 93.74 | 8.68 | 103.73 | 71.52 | 117.49 | 90.00 to 102.76 | 59,283 | 55,571 |
| 72-0075 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80-0567 | 28 | 98.53 | 96.94 | 95.16 | 7.28 | 101.87 | 73.99 | 117.60 | 93.55 to 99.31 | 55,270 | 52,595 |
| 93-0012 | 303 | 99.23 | 99.17 | 98.53 | 4.47 | 100.65 | 65.15 | 149.04 | 98.73 to 99.51 | 89,652 | 88,336 |
| 93-0083 | 26 | 95.27 | 93.57 | 94.74 | 7.48 | 98.77 | 62.83 | 108.80 | 92.44 to 99.43 | 73,605 | 69,731 |
| 93-0096 | 44 | 98.04 | 99.02 | 96.41 | 7.40 | 102.71 | 69.75 | 125.25 | 96.18 to 99.72 | 69,031 | 66,552 |
| NonValid School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| __ALL__ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 414 | 98.94 | 98.59 | 97.87 | 5.32 | 100.73 | 62.83 | 149.04 | 98.48 to 99.26 | 83,174 | 81,406 |

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

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
414
$34,457,414$
$34,434,214$
$33,702,306$
83,174
, 17

81,406

## MEDIAN:

GT. MEAN:
MEAN
$\begin{array}{rc}99 & \text { COV: } \\ 98 & \text { CTD }\end{array}$
STD:
8.64
. 54
95\% Median C.I.: 98.48 to 99.26
(!: Derived)

AVG.ABS.DEV: 5.27 95\% Mean C.I.: 97.77 to 99.41

COD:
5.32 MAX Sales Ratio: 149.04 $\begin{array}{lllr} & 5.32 & \text { MAX Sales Ratio: } & 149.04 \\ \text { PRD: } & 100.73 & \text { MIN Sales Ratio: } & 62.83\end{array}$
RD:
-
COD MRD

Printed: 03/30/2007 14:59:39


| SALE PRICE * | 414 |
| :--- | :---: |
| RANGE |  |


MEDIAN
89.91
97.78
98.71
98.98
100.04
100.81
99.24
98.78
98.80
99.16
98.69
98.96
99.30
MEAN WGT.
89.34

| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 89.34 | 88.32 |
| 97.78 | 98.07 |
| 100.24 | 99.83 |

$98.94998 .59 \quad 97.87$

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

## Type: Qualified

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


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

State Stat Run

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

| 414 | MEDIAN: |
| ---: | ---: |
| $34,457,414$ | WGT. MEAN : |
| $34,434,214$ |  |
| $33,702,306$ |  |
| 83,174 |  |
| 81,406 | MEAN : |
| PRD : |  |


| $\mathbf{9 9}$ | COV: | 8.64 | $95 \%$ Median C.I.: | 98.48 to 99.26 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 98 | STD: | 8.52 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 97.09 to 98.65 |
| 99 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 5.27 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I.: | 97.77 to 99.41 |

95\% Median C.I.: 98.48 to 99.26
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

| STYLE |
| :--- |
| RANGE |
| (blank) |
| 100 |
| 101 |
| 102 |
| 103 |
| 104 |
| 111 |
| 301 |
| 302 |
| 304 |

COUNT
21
11
232
34
13
78
7
6
1
11
EDIAN
90.00
96.58
99.11
99.43
97.63
99.65
93.69
96.41
100.05
99.51
MEAN WGT.


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

State Stat Run

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

## 99

99 COV: 9.87

95\% Median C.I.: 98.09 to 100.15
(!: Derived)
COV:
9.87

97
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
60
$10,409,915$
$10,099,828$
$9,841,455$
168,330
164,024

MEDIAN:
GT. MEAN
AVG.ABS.DEV
5.42

95\% Mean C.I.: 95.71 to 100.61
DATE
RANGE
RANGE
$\qquad$












$\qquad$ NGE
Qrtrs
/01/03
TO
01/03 TO $12 / 30 / 03$
$\qquad$



$\qquad$ NGE
Qrtrs
/01/03
TO
01/03 TO $12 / 30 / 03$
$\qquad$ NGE
Qrtrs
/01/03
TO
01/03 TO $12 / 30 / 03$
 COUNT
EDIAN

| 4 |
| ---: |
| 7 |
| 6 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 2 |
| 4 |
| 6 |
| 1 |
| 14 |
| 20 |
| 15 |
| 25 |
| 17 |
| 17 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 98.87 | 100.16 | 105.95 |
| 98.63 | 97.10 | 97.31 |
| 99.68 | 102.24 | 103.29 |
| 98.45 | 97.52 | 98.30 |
| 96.83 | 88.45 | 84.15 |
| 101.39 | 100.90 | 99.62 |
| 98.75 | 97.53 | 98.88 |
| 103.35 | 103.35 | 103.38 |
| 92.02 | 89.88 | 92.17 |
| 99.95 | 105.44 | 101.78 |
| 103.60 | 103.60 | 103.60 |
| 97.56 | 96.85 | 97.21 |
|  |  |  |
| 98.78 | 99.32 | 99.69 |
| 98.97 | 96.78 | 93.70 |
| 98.69 | 98.07 | 97.27 |
|  |  |  |
| 98.82 | 97.85 | 95.22 |
| 99.05 | 99.21 | 97.61 |

$\qquad$ ALL
ASSESSOR LOCATION

BENEDIC
GRESHAM
HENDERSON
MCCOOL JUNCTION
RURAL HENDERSON
THAYER
YORK
$\qquad$

| 60 |
| ---: |
| COUNT |
| 1 |
| 1 |
| 8 |
| 2 |
| 1 |
| 1 |
| 46 |


|  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
|  | 93.90 | 93.90 | 93.90 |
| 8 | 84.37 | 84.37 | 84.37 |
| 2 | 102.54 | 101.10 | 101.35 |
| 1 | 98.19 | 101.63 | 100.62 |
| 1 | 97.34 | 98.19 | 98.19 |
| 46 | 98.72 | 97.34 | 97.34 |
|  |  | 98.79 | 98.16 |

97.44
5.48
10.89
4.36
4.08
2.38
12.56
3.64
2.09
0.08
7.04
6.63
3.79
5.32
5.57
5.55
5.67
5.81
9
es Ratio:
133.95
Avg. Adj. Avg.
都
PRD -
$-$

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



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



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


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

State Stat Run


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

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007
-
95\% Median C.I.: 97.88 to 99.12
(!: Derived)
9.57

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 95.40 to 97.30

## 34,604,414

34,581,214
33,319,363
83,328
99 COV: 9.83

## MEDIAN:

WGT. MEAN: MEAN

96
97
AVG.ABS. STD
AVG.ABS.DEV
6.26 95\% Mean C.I.: 96.44 to 98.28
6.34 MAX Sales Ratio: 138.46

PRD: 101.05 MIN Sales Ratio: 57.28

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


| Qrtrs |
| ---: |
| $07 / 01 / 04$ TO 09/30/04 |
| $10 / 01 / 04$ TO $12 / 31 / 04$ |
| $01 / 01 / 05$ TO $03 / 31 / 05$ |
| $04 / 01 / 05$ TO $06 / 30 / 05$ |
| $07 / 01 / 05$ TO $09 / 30 / 05$ |
| $10 / 01 / 05$ TO $12 / 31 / 05$ |
| $01 / 01 / 06$ TO $03 / 31 / 06$ |
| $04 / 01 / 06$ TO $06 / 30 / 06$ |
| Study Years |
| $07 / 01 / 04$ TO $06 / 30 / 05$ |
| $07 / 01 / 05$ TO $06 / 30 / 06$ |
| Calendar Yrs |
| $01 / 01 / 05$ TO $12 / 31 / 05$ |

$\qquad$ ALI $\qquad$

| COUNT |
| :--- |


| 46 |
| ---: |
| 57 |
| 29 |
| 51 |
| 74 |
| 54 |
| 42 |
| 62 |
| 183 |
| 232 |
| 208 |


| 99.73 | 97.08 | 96.47 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 99.30 | 99.46 | 98.59 |
| 98.58 | 98.73 | 97.76 |
| 98.61 | 97.07 | 95.86 |
| 96.90 | 95.52 | 95.25 |
| 98.89 | 98.45 | 97.45 |
| 97.49 | 97.68 | 94.85 |
| 97.71 | 96.29 | 95.72 |
|  | 98.08 | 97.07 |
| 99.19 | 96.80 | 95.76 |
| 97.71 | 97.11 | 96.22 |
| 98.32 |  |  |


| 5.81 | 100.63 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5.19 | 100.89 |
| 5.79 | 100.98 |
| 6.52 | 101.27 |
| 7.66 | 100.28 |
| 4.96 | 101.02 |
| 8.41 | 102.98 |
| 5.81 | 100.59 |
|  |  |
| 5.84 | 101.04 |
| 6.71 | 101.08 |
|  |  |
| 6.45 | 100.92 |

69.73
70.00
81.20
62.37
57.28
67.24
65.15
62.83
62.37
57.28
57.28
113.9596.
Avg.
.
C
415
$98.70 \quad 97.36$

| 415 | 98.70 | 97.36 | 96.35 | 6.34 | 101.05 | 57.28 | 138.46 | 97.88 to 99.12 | 83,328 | 80,287 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 10 | 95.26 | 96.02 | 95.02 | 7.10 | 101.06 | 83.22 | 116.22 | 87.42 to 103.54 | 39,818 | 37,834 |
| 11 | 99.66 | 101.97 | 100.40 | 12.86 | 101.56 | 69.75 | 125.25 | 86.33 to 124.23 | 33,281 | 33,415 |
| 15 | 99.21 | 99.66 | 96.91 | 7.48 | 102.83 | 80.07 | 117.60 | 95.20 to 105.49 | 33,460 | 32,426 |
| 32 | 98.04 | 98.65 | 95.79 | 5.98 | 102.99 | 73.08 | 120.40 | 96.18 to 99.72 | 79,914 | 76,550 |
| 19 | 93.66 | 91.64 | 92.28 | 9.05 | 99.31 | 62.83 | 108.80 | 84.96 to 101.69 | 60,223 | 55,576 |
| 3 | 98.32 | 89.17 | 87.74 | 10.08 | 101.64 | 69.73 | 99.47 | N/A | 124,166 | 108,938 |
| 2 | 103.63 | 103.63 | 103.97 | 13.40 | 99.67 | 89.74 | 117.51 | N/A | 89,750 | 93,313 |
| 6 | 96.87 | 95.15 | 95.71 | 3.19 | 99.41 | 87.71 | 98.75 | 87.71 to 98.75 | 102,250 | 97,867 |
| 4 | 90.38 | 89.10 | 87.06 | 8.54 | 102.34 | 76.70 | 98.93 | N/A | 100,750 | 87,711 |
| 6 | 95.95 | 88.92 | 91.20 | 8.49 | 97.50 | 71.21 | 97.65 | 71.21 to 97.65 | 122,916 | 112,101 |
| 2 | 98.10 | 98.10 | 97.99 | 7.10 | 100.12 | 91.14 | 105.07 | N/A | 153,500 | 150,413 |
| 1 | 83.80 | 83.80 | 83.80 |  |  | 83.80 | 83.80 | N/A | 6,000 | 5,028 |
| 8 | 96.35 | 91.11 | 89.27 | 11.00 | 102.06 | 62.37 | 109.19 | 62.37 to 109.19 | 79,585 | 71,044 |
| 291 | 98.98 | 97.94 | 97.09 | 5.45 | 100.88 | 57.28 | 138.46 | 98.32 to 99.38 | 87,920 | 85,360 |
| 5 | 99.24 | 97.03 | 96.16 | 2.73 | 100.91 | 86.96 | 99.91 | N/A | 154,600 | 148,665 |
| 415 | 98.70 | 97.36 | 96.35 | 6.34 | 101.05 | 57.28 | 138.46 | 97.88 to 99.12 | 83,328 | 80,287 |

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

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007
99 COV
cov:
9.83

95\% Median C.I.: 97.88 to 99.12
(!: Derived)
415

## MEDIAN:

34,604,414 WGT. MEAN:
MEAN: 96 STD:
AVG.ABS.DEV: $\quad 6.26$
6.26
6.34 MAX Sales Ratio: 138.46
101.05 MIN Sales Ratio:

$$
\text { 95\% Mean C.I.: } 96.44 \text { to } 98.28
$$

80,287

Printed: 02/17/2007 13:33:45

| AVG. Assessed Value: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| 1 | 387 |
| 2 | 12 |
| 3 | 16 |
|  |  |

57.28
$\overline{\text { STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED }}$


06
$\qquad$ ALL___


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

## MEDIAN:

34, 604, 414
34,581,214
33,319,363
83,328
80,287
T. MEAN:

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007
99 COV : 96.83

95\% Median C.I.: 97.88 to 99.12
(!: Derived)
OV
9.83

95\% Mean C.I.: 96.44 to 98.28
AVG.ABS.DEV: 6.26
6.26
138.46
38.46
57.28

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| O OR Blank | 20 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 2 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 12 |
| 1900 TO 1919 | 85 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 66 |
| 1940 TO 1949 | 14 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 30 |
| 1960 TO 1969 | 48 |
| 1970 TO 1979 | 67 |
| 1980 TO 1989 | 32 |
| 1990 TO 1994 | 9 |
| 1995 TO 1999 | 16 |
| 2000 TO Present | 14 |
| ALL_ |  |


|  |  | 415 | 98.70 | 97.36 | 96.35 | 6.34 | 101.05 | 57.28 | 138.46 | 97.88 to 99.12 | 83,328 | 80,287 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SALE PRICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 8 | 89.90 | 92.99 | 90.36 | 15.60 | 102.91 | 69.75 | 125.25 | 69.75 to 125.25 | 2,200 | 1,988 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 6 | 99.31 | 100.46 | 101.60 | 18.04 | 98.87 | 73.99 | 128.49 | 73.99 to 128.49 | 7,696 | 7,820 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 14 | 89.91 | 96.19 | 98.50 | 17.45 | 97.66 | 69.75 | 128.49 | 73.99 to 117.83 | 4,555 | 4,487 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 56 | 99.71 | 101.36 | 100.31 | 8.34 | 101.04 | 62.83 | 138.46 | 98.19 to 103.21 | 20,317 | 20,380 |
| 30000 тO | 59999 | 74 | 98.80 | 98.12 | 97.80 | 6.46 | 100.32 | 57.28 | 120.40 | 96.94 to 100.48 | 45,586 | 44,584 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 145 | 98.58 | 97.30 | 97.09 | 4.62 | 100.21 | 65.15 | 119.09 | 97.37 to 99.21 | 78,773 | 76,484 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 86 | 98.78 | 95.33 | 95.39 | 6.21 | 99.93 | 62.37 | 115.16 | 96.56 to 99.45 | 123,083 | 117,412 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 37 | 97.17 | 95.24 | 95.11 | 5.62 | 100.14 | 72.42 | 112.51 | 96.76 to 98.75 | 190,025 | 180,728 |
| 250000 то | 499999 | 3 | 97.70 | 97.42 | 97.24 | 1.86 | 100.19 | 94.56 | 100.00 | N/A | 322,666 | 313,751 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 415 | 98.70 | 97.36 | 96.35 | 6.34 | 101.05 | 57.28 | 138.46 | 97.88 to 99.12 | 83,328 | 80,287 |

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


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


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

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007
95\% Median C.I.: 97.39 to 100.15

## 10,574,915

MEDIAN:
COV:
8.18

AVG.ABS.DEV: $4.80 \quad 95 \%$ Mean C.I.: 96.65 to 100.66
10,181,185
165,723
164,212

| 4.86 |
| ---: |
| 99.56 |

Avg. Adj. Avg.


|  |
| :--- |
| $07 / 01$ |
| $10 / 01$ |
| $01 / 01$ |
| $04 / 01$ |
| $07 / 01$ |
| $10 / 01$ |
| $01 / 01$ |
| $04 / 01$ |
| $07 / 01$ |
| $10 / 01$ |
| $01 / 01$ |
| $04 / 0$ |

$\qquad$
01/03 то 09/30/03 10/01/03 тO 12/31/03 01/01/04 TO 03/31/04 04/01/04 TO 06/30/04 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 01/01/05 TO 03/31/05 04/01/05 тO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 12/31/05 $01 / 01 / 06$ T0 06/30/06
$\qquad$ tudy 06/30/06
07/01/03 TO 06/30/04
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06
$\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ /04 TO 12/31/04 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05
$\qquad$ ALI
ASSESSOR LOCATION
RANGE
BENEDICT
GRESHAM

HENDERSON MCCOOL JUNCTION
THAYER
YORK
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

COUNT MEDIAN

| 5 |
| ---: |
| 7 |
| 6 |
| 3 |
| 5 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 2 |
| 4 |
| 6 |
| 1 |
| 14 |
| 21 |
| 16 |
| 25 |
| 18 |
| 17 |
| 62 |


| 98.15 | 99.10 | 102.79 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 100.15 | 98.77 | 104.02 |
| 98.78 | 100.35 | 100.35 |
| 98.45 | 97.52 | 98.30 |
| 99.77 | 98.96 | 99.09 |
| 101.39 | 100.90 | 99.62 |
| 96.10 | 97.00 | 98.04 |
| 103.35 | 103.35 | 103.38 |
| 92.02 | 89.88 | 92.17 |
| 99.95 | 105.44 | 101.78 |
| 103.60 | 103.60 | 103.60 |
| 96.87 | 96.37 | 97.15 |
|  |  |  |
| 98.74 | 99.12 | 102.64 |
| 99.37 | 99.38 | 99.26 |
| 98.19 | 97.80 | 97.23 |
|  |  |  |
| 98.78 | 99.61 | 99.45 |
| 99.05 | 99.05 | 97.38 |


| 9.44 | 96.41 | 80.63 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 4.90 | 94.95 | 82.47 |
| 2.30 | 100.00 | 96.95 |
| 2.38 | 99.21 | 93.53 |
| 2.50 | 99.87 | 93.89 |
| 3.64 | 101.29 | 95.93 |
| 2.14 | 98.94 | 93.90 |
| 0.08 | 99.97 | 103.26 |
| 7.04 | 97.52 | 75.65 |
| 6.63 | 103.60 | 98.09 |
|  |  | 103.60 |
| 4.05 | 99.20 | 84.37 |
|  |  |  |
| 5.00 | 96.57 | 80.63 |
| 3.14 | 100.12 | 93.89 |
| 5.83 | 100.59 | 75.65 |
|  |  |  |
| 2.77 | 100.17 | 93.5 |
| 5.97 | 101.72 | 75.6 |

- 


## 

| 62 | 98.78 | 98.65 | 99.09 | 4.86 | 99.56 | 75.65 | 133.95 | 97.39 to 100.15 | 165,723 | 164,212 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| 1 | 93.90 | 93.90 | 93.90 |  |  | 93.90 | 93.90 | N/A | 12,000 | 11,268 |
| 1 | 84.37 | 84.37 | 84.37 |  |  | 84.37 | 84.37 | N/A | 55,000 | 46,402 |
| 10 | 102.27 | 100.93 | 99.80 | 2.13 | 101.13 | 95.40 | 103.78 | 98.19 to 103.43 | 79,350 | 79,188 |
| 2 | 101.63 | 101.63 | 100.62 | 2.62 | 101.00 | 98.97 | 104.29 | N/A | 101,500 | 102,134 |
| 1 | 97.34 | 97.34 | 97.34 |  |  | 97.34 | 97.34 | N/A | 37,000 | 36,016 |
| 47 | 98.54 | 98.48 | 99.10 | 5.21 | 99.38 | 75.65 | 133.95 | 96.93 to 99.84 | 195,198 | 193,432 |
| 62 | 98.78 | 98.65 | 99.09 | 4.86 | 99.56 | 75.65 | 133.95 | 97.39 to 100.15 | 165,723 | 164,212 |

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


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


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

State Stat Run


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


## 2007 Assessment Survey for York County

## I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1. Deputy(ies) on staff: 1
2. Appraiser(s) on staff: 0
3. Other full-time employees: 2
4. Other part-time employees: 0
5. Number of shared employees: 0
6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: $\$ 195,906.00$
7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system: $\$ 7,490.00$ for maintenance.
8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: 0
9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: $\$ 1,000.00$ for reappraisal
10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: $\$ 1,000.00$
11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget: 0
12. Other miscellaneous funds:
13. Total budget: $\$ 195,906.00$
a. Was any of last year's budget not used? No
B. Residential Appraisal Information
(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)
14. Data collection done by: Assessor
15. Valuation done by: Assessor
16. Pickup work done by: Assessor

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 300 | 73 |  | 160 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? June 2006
5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 2007
6. What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? The sales comparison approach is not utilized by the York County Assessor.
7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: There are 23 market areas. There are 14 neighborhoods within city limits of York, as well as York Suburban and Rural Residential.
8. How are these defined? These are defined by location.
9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
10. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? Yes. Suburban is a two mile radius outside of York.
11. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner? Yes
C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information
12. Data collection done by: Assessor
13. Valuation done by: Assessor
14. Pickup work done by whom: Assessor

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 10 | 10 |  | 10 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? June 2006
5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information? 2006
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? In 2002, a contract appraiser utilized the income approach.
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 York County Assessor does not utilize the sales comparison approach.
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? 5 - York has two market areas, the interstate area and downtown York. All villages are combined for one market area, with the exception of Henderson. There is also a rural commercial area.
9. How are these defined? These are defined by location.
10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
11. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? No
D. Agricultural Appraisal Information
12. Data collection done by: Assessor
13. Valuation done by: Assessor
14. Pickup work done by whom: Assessor

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural | 30 | 0 | 30 | 60 |

(The 'Other' we done via phone or in person at the office)
4. Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? Yes

How is your agricultural land defined? Ag land is defined by location and use.
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 is not used for properties in this class.
6. What is the date of the soil survey currently used? 1977
7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed? 2006
a. By what method? GIS and FSA maps and physical inspection by the assessor are used to complete the land use study.
b. By whom? Assessor
c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? $100 \%$
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 6
9. How are these defined? Topography, location to available water and distance from urban areas helps to define market area for the agricultural property class.
10. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? Yes. Special valuation exists in areas near York, specifically in areas near the interstate and new bypass as well as a few areas of potential residential growth.

## 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? The assessor's office
4. Does the county have GIS software? Yes
a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps? Assessor
5. 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? Benedict, Bradshaw, Gresham, Henderson, McCool Junction, Waco and York
c. When was zoning implemented? 2001

## G. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services: None
2. Other Services: Terra Scan - York County contracts through Terra Scan for administrative and CAMA packages, as well as GIS.

## 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-The York County Assessor rechecked five market areas within the city of York. In Gresham with properties over $\$ 40,000.00$ in value were equalized because of sales in the market area. The rest of Gresham is composed of properties that are deteriorating and not selling. Land values were changes on rural residential properties with values determined for properties less than 10 acres, 10 acres to 20 acres and acres over 20 . Rural residential properties in the York Suburban were revalued and land value changed to be closer to market. Properties in rural subdivisions, Cedars, Wessels Subdivision and Lockridge Acres were checked for equalization of land and construction. All pick up work is completed.
2. Commercial-The York County Assessor checked commercial properties only if a building permit was issued. The cooperatives were checked for buildings and equalization of buildings and other improvements such as anhydrous tanks and other unique properties. All pick up work was completed.
3. Agricultural- The York County Assessor checks property every year in ag for any land use changes and possible new construction taken place without a permit. Market areas are checked to make sure that any sales in that area would require a possible change in the area because that land could no longer reflect the criteria developed for that market area. With the certification of irrigated acres and new wells being dug, this is an on-going process. All pickup work was completed in a timely manner.

## County 93 - York
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## County 93 - York



| Schedule V: Agricultural Records | Urban | Value | SubUrban Records | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Records |  |  |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 5 | 188,959 | 411 | 64,822,586 | 2,166 | 341,594,782 | 2,582 | 406,606,327 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 1 | 44,928 | 148 | 27,832,583 | 905 | 183,073,251 | 1,054 | 210,950,762 |
| 29. Ag-Improvements | 6 | 24,421 | 163 | 8,675,825 | 980 | 44,209,256 | 1,149 | 52,909,502 |
| 30. Ag-Total Taxable |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,731 | 670,466,591 |

## County 93 - York



## County 93 - York <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 18,700 | 11.000 | 18,700 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 39.500 | 65,175 | 39.500 | 65,175 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.000 | 39,150 | 29.000 | 39,150 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 36.000 | 45,000 | 36.000 | 45,000 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 7,000 | 7.000 | 7,000 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 9,100 | 14.000 | 9,100 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 136.500 | 184,125 | 136.500 | 184,125 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 4.600 | 5,520 | 272.000 | 326,400 | 276.600 | 331,920 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 287.920 | 316,712 | 287.920 | 316,712 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 11,700 | 13.000 | 11,700 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 106.500 | 85,200 | 106.500 | 85,200 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 337.030 | 235,921 | 337.030 | 235,921 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 6,500 | 13.000 | 6,500 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 66.110 | 26,444 | 66.110 | 26,444 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 4.600 | 5,520 | 1,095.560 | 1,008,877 | 1,100.160 | 1,014,397 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 18.570 | 8,357 | 18.570 | 8,357 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 1,200 | 4.000 | 1,200 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 43.000 | 12,900 | 43.000 | 12,900 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 84.000 | 25,200 | 84.000 | 25,200 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 16.000 | 4,000 | 16.000 | 4,000 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 413.030 | 103,258 | 413.030 | 103,258 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 578.600 | 154,915 | 578.600 | 154,915 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 82.230 | 16,833 | 82.230 | 16,833 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 3.070 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 3.070 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 4.600 | 5,520 | 1,892.890 | 1,364,750 | 1,897.490 | 1,370,270 |
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| County 93 - York |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 12,542.440 | 28,847,612 | 28,283.730 | 65,052,579 | 40,826.170 | 93,900,191 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,370.670 | 2,946,945 | 3,150.210 | 6,772,959 | 4,520.880 | 9,719,904 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,365.750 | 2,663,218 | 2,432.710 | 4,743,790 | 3,798.460 | 7,407,008 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 284.870 | 548,376 | 461.470 | 888,330 | 746.340 | 1,436,706 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 579.510 | 1,101,069 | 2,752.100 | 5,228,990 | 3,331.610 | 6,330,059 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 265.550 | 411,605 | 1,366.490 | 2,118,061 | 1,632.040 | 2,529,666 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 151.430 | 223,360 | 519.290 | 765,954 | 670.720 | 989,314 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 16,560.220 | 36,742,185 | 38,966.000 | 85,570,663 | 55,526.220 | 122,312,848 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 789.720 | 1,460,986 | 1,100.720 | 2,036,335 | 1,890.440 | 3,497,321 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 277.060 | 471,002 | 201.220 | 342,074 | 478.280 | 813,076 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 80.000 | 124,000 | 85.000 | 131,750 | 165.000 | 255,750 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 27.120 | 40,004 | 50.230 | 74,090 | 77.350 | 114,094 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 74.380 | 104,132 | 212.100 | 296,940 | 286.480 | 401,072 |
| 59. 3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 80.460 | 92,529 | 169.670 | 195,121 | 250.130 | 287,650 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 51.910 | 51,910 | 46.000 | 46,000 | 97.910 | 97,910 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,380.650 | 2,344,563 | 1,864.940 | 3,122,310 | 3,245.590 | 5,466,873 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 108.050 | 59,430 | 46.190 | 25,405 | 154.240 | 84,835 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 34.190 | 17,095 | 30.000 | 15,000 | 64.190 | 32,095 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 17.770 | 7,997 | 28.940 | 13,023 | 46.710 | 21,020 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 10.500 | 4,725 | 26.000 | 11,700 | 36.500 | 16,425 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 123.910 | 55,761 | 82.120 | 36,954 | 206.030 | 92,715 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 73.000 | 29,200 | 73.090 | 29,236 | 146.090 | 58,436 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 199.570 | 79,828 | 207.100 | 82,840 | 406.670 | 162,668 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 566.990 | 254,036 | 493.440 | 214,158 | 1,060.430 | 468,194 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 77.770 | 23,331 | 96.110 | 28,833 | 173.880 | 52,164 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 20.430 | 8,172 | 20.430 | 8,172 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 18,585.630 | 39,364,115 | 41,440.920 | 88,944,136 | 60,026.550 | 128,308,251 |

## County 93 - York <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3
R 2 Urban
Irrigated:
Acres

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 34.500 | 17,250 | 349.050 | 174,525 | 383.550 | 191,775 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 45.520 | 22,760 | 701.790 | 350,895 | 747.310 | 373,655 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 2,700 | 195.250 | 87,863 | 201.250 | 90,563 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 64.230 | 28,904 | 504.650 | 227,669 | 568.880 | 256,573 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 79.000 | 31,600 | 1,078.470 | 440,561 | 1,157.470 | 472,161 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 92.430 | 32,352 | 1,128.330 | 397,572 | 1,220.760 | 429,924 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 368.140 | 110,442 | 4,233.730 | 1,286,927 | 4,601.870 | 1,397,369 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 689.820 | 246,008 | 8,191.270 | 2,966,012 | 8,881.090 | 3,212,020 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 150.430 | 38,358 | 1,020.100 | 248,580 | 1,170.530 | 286,938 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 2,400 | 100.130 | 46,333 | 108.130 | 48,733 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 320.000 |  | 320.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 67.640 | 118,813 | 7,944.600 | 12,944,785 | 98,181.390 | 157,601,000 | 106,193.630 | 170,664,598 |
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| County 93 - York |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area:Rural |  |  |  |
| Urigated: Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |  | Acres ${ }^{\text {Tota }}$ | Value |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres Rural Value |  |  |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 59.290 | 106,722 | 183.050 | 329,490 | 3,314.040 | 5,965,272 | 3,556.380 | 6,401,484 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 392.070 | 686,123 | 7,776.990 | 13,609,738 | 8,169.060 | 14,295,861 |
| 47. 2A1 | 1.000 | 1,500 | 79.580 | 119,370 | 698.840 | 1,048,260 | 779.420 | 1,169,130 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 19.640 | 27,005 | 1,619.990 | 2,227,489 | 1,639.630 | 2,254,494 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 135.000 | 168,750 | 3,302.410 | 4,128,015 | 3,437.410 | 4,296,765 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 46.000 | 46,000 | 1,269.580 | 1,269,580 | 1,315.580 | 1,315,580 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 45.000 | 38,250 | 1,058.320 | 899,574 | 1,103.320 | 937,824 |
| 53. Total | 60.290 | 108,222 | 900.340 | 1,414,988 | 19,040.170 | 29,147,928 | 20,000.800 | 30,671,138 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 57.360 | 86,040 | 1,455.150 | 2,182,725 | 1,512.510 | 2,268,765 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 84.430 | 120,313 | 3,534.370 | 5,036,482 | 3,618.800 | 5,156,795 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 62.320 | 77,900 | 244.700 | 305,875 | 307.020 | 383,775 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 1,250 | 1,339.080 | 1,673,851 | 1,340.080 | 1,675,101 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 21.000 | 18,900 | 2,446.310 | 2,201,679 | 2,467.310 | 2,220,579 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 26.000 | 15,600 | 946.200 | 567,720 | 972.200 | 583,320 |
| 61.4 D | 0.000 | 0 | 30.000 | 15,000 | 530.250 | 265,125 | 560.250 | 280,125 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 282.110 | 335,003 | 10,496.060 | 12,233,457 | 10,778.170 | 12,568,460 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 1.160 | 522 | 3.000 | 1,350 | 98.000 | 44,100 | 102.160 | 45,972 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 29.290 | 11,716 | 563.180 | 225,272 | 592.470 | 236,988 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.010 | 2,404 | 96.500 | 38,600 | 102.510 | 41,004 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 2,450 | 471.520 | 165,034 | 478.520 | 167,484 |
| 67. 3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 39.000 | 13,650 | 972.580 | 343,204 | 1,011.580 | 356,854 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 2,100 | 894.830 | 313,191 | 900.830 | 315,291 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 380.550 | 114,165 | 5,088.490 | 1,532,047 | 5,469.040 | 1,646,212 |
| 71. Total | 1.160 | 522 | 470.850 | 147,835 | 8,185.100 | 2,661,448 | 8,657.110 | 2,809,805 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 4,800 | 1,129.040 | 225,731 | 1,153.040 | 230,531 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 5,175 | 15.000 | 5,175 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 72.310 |  | 72.310 |  |
| 75. Total | 61.450 | 108,744 | 1,677.300 | 1,902,626 | 38,865.370 | 44,273,739 | 40,604.120 | 46,285,109 |
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| County 93 - York |  |  | 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: | 21 |  |  |
| Irrigated: | $\begin{gathered} \quad \text { Url } \\ \text { Acres } \end{gathered}$ | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 94,411 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 94,411 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 94,411 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 94,411 |
| 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 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 94,411 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 94,411 |
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| County 93 - York 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: 22 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Subu |  |  |  | Total |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 69.550 | 156,488 | 0.000 | 0 | 69.550 | 156,488 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 3,900 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 3,900 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 71.550 | 160,388 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.550 | 160,388 |
| 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 |
| 56.2 D 1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 71.550 | 160,388 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.550 | 160,388 |
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| County 93 - York 2007 County Abstract of Asses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Tota <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 139.890 | 441,506 | 0.000 | 0 | 139.890 | 441,506 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 95.570 | 278,597 | 0.000 | 0 | 95.570 | 278,597 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4,000 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 39.000 | 115,150 | 0.000 | 0 | 39.000 | 115,150 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 44,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 44,000 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 7.800 | 31,200 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.800 | 31,200 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 294.260 | 914,453 | 0.000 | 0 | 294.260 | 914,453 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 130.300 | 450,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 130.300 | 450,000 |
| 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 | 3.910 | 15,640 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.910 | 15,640 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 7,350 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 7,350 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4,000 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 142.210 | 476,990 | 0.000 | 0 | 142.210 | 476,990 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 28,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 28,000 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 12,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 12,000 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.510 | 14,032 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.510 | 14,032 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 8.100 | 32,400 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.100 | 32,400 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 26.540 | 106,160 | 0.000 | 0 | 26.540 | 106,160 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 48.150 | 192,592 | 0.000 | 0 | 48.150 | 192,592 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 9,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 9,000 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 487.620 | 1,593,035 | 0.000 | 0 | 487.620 | 1,593,035 |
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| County 93 - York |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 51.500 | 174,825 | 0.000 | 0 | 51.500 | 174,825 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 37,600 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 37,600 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 30,750 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 30,750 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 55.000 | 103,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 55.000 | 103,000 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.160 | 27,084 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.160 | 27,084 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 5,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 5,000 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 147.660 | 378,259 | 0.000 | 0 | 147.660 | 378,259 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 9,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 9,000 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 27,900 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 27,900 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.700 | 6,165 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.700 | 6,165 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 33.960 | 78,930 | 0.000 | 0 | 33.960 | 78,930 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 61.660 | 121,995 | 0.000 | 0 | 61.660 | 121,995 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 5.500 | 1,100 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.500 | 1,100 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 214.820 | 501,354 | 0.000 | 0 | 214.820 | 501,354 |
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## County 93 - York

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

| Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 71.710 | 130,677 | 38,418.700 | 79,256,836 | 227,881.230 | 439,258,990 | 266,371.640 | 518,646,503 |
| 77.Dry Land | 56.220 | 96,358 | 5,563.890 | 9,440,432 | 41,876.610 | 61,689,795 | 47,496.720 | 71,226,585 |
| 78.Grass | 1.160 | 522 | 2,800.100 | 1,379,914 | 20,926.110 | 7,521,877 | 23,727.370 | 8,902,313 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 382.450 | 119,202 | 2,975.180 | 745,323 | 3,357.630 | 864,525 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 2,400 | 189.420 | 88,338 | 197.420 | 90,738 |
| 81.Exempt | 3.070 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 392.310 | 0 | 395.380 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 129.090 | 227,557 | 47,173.140 | 90,198,784 | 293,848.550 | 509,304,323 | 341,150.780 | 599,730,664 |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 11.000 | 8.06\% | 18,700 | 10.16\% | 1,700.000 |
| 1A | 39.500 | 28.94\% | 65,175 | 35.40\% | 1,650.000 |
| 2A1 | 29.000 | 21.25\% | 39,150 | 21.26\% | 1,350.000 |
| 2A | 36.000 | 26.37\% | 45,000 | 24.44\% | 1,250.000 |
| 3A1 | 7.000 | 5.13\% | 7,000 | 3.80\% | 1,000.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 14.000 | 10.26\% | 9,100 | 4.94\% | 650.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 136.500 | 100.00\% | 184,125 | 100.00\% | 1,348.901 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 276.600 | 25.14\% | 331,920 | 32.72\% | 1,200.000 |
| 1D | 287.920 | 26.17\% | 316,712 | 31.22\% | 1,100.000 |
| 2D1 | 13.000 | 1.18\% | 11,700 | 1.15\% | 900.000 |
| 2D | 106.500 | 9.68\% | 85,200 | 8.40\% | 800.000 |
| 3D1 | 337.030 | 30.63\% | 235,921 | 23.26\% | 700.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 13.000 | 1.18\% | 6,500 | 0.64\% | 500.000 |
| 4D | 66.110 | 6.01\% | 26,444 | 2.61\% | 400.000 |
| Dry Total | 1,100.160 | 100.00\% | 1,014,397 | 100.00\% | 922.044 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 18.570 | $3.21 \%$ | 8,357 | $5.39 \%$ | 450.026 |
| 2G1 | 4.000 | $0.69 \%$ | 1,200 | $0.77 \%$ | 300.000 |
| 2G | 43.000 | $7.43 \%$ | 12,900 | $8.33 \%$ | 300.000 |
| 3G1 | 84.000 | $14.52 \%$ | 25,200 | $16.27 \%$ | 300.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 16.000 | $2.77 \%$ | 4,000 | $2.58 \%$ | 250.000 |
| 4G | 413.030 | $71.38 \%$ | 103,258 | $66.65 \%$ | 250.001 |
| Grass Total | 578.600 | $100.00 \%$ | 154,915 | $100.00 \%$ | 267.741 |
|  | 136.500 | $7.19 \%$ | 184,125 | $13.44 \%$ | $1,348.901$ |
| Irrigated Total | $1,100.160$ | $57.98 \%$ | $1,014,397$ | $74.03 \%$ | 922.044 |
| Dry Total | 578.600 | $30.49 \%$ | 154,915 | $11.31 \%$ | 267.741 |
| Grass Total | 82.230 | $4.33 \%$ | 16,833 | $1.23 \%$ | 204.706 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Other | 3.070 | $0.16 \%$ |  |  | 7 |
| Exempt | $1,897.490$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,370,270$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 136.500 | $0.05 \%$ | 184,125 | $0.04 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,100.160$ | $2.32 \%$ | $1,014,397$ | $1.42 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 578.600 | $2.44 \%$ | 154,915 | $1.74 \%$ |
| Waste | 82.230 | $2.45 \%$ | 16,833 | $1.95 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 3.070 | $0.78 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $1,897.490$ | $0.56 \%$ | $1,370,270$ | $0.23 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 40,826.170 | 73.53\% | 93,900,191 | 76.77\% | 2,300.000 |
| 1A | 4,520.880 | 8.14\% | 9,719,904 | 7.95\% | 2,150.002 |
| 2A1 | 3,798.460 | 6.84\% | 7,407,008 | 6.06\% | 1,950.002 |
| 2 A | 746.340 | 1.34\% | 1,436,706 | 1.17\% | 1,925.002 |
| 3A1 | 3,331.610 | 6.00\% | 6,330,059 | 5.18\% | 1,900.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 1,632.040 | 2.94\% | 2,529,666 | 2.07\% | 1,550.002 |
| 4A | 670.720 | 1.21\% | 989,314 | 0.81\% | 1,475.002 |
| Irrigated Total | 55,526.220 | 100.00\% | 122,312,848 | 100.00\% | 2,202.794 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 1,890.440 | 58.25\% | 3,497,321 | 63.97\% | 1,850.003 |
| 1D | 478.280 | 14.74\% | 813,076 | 14.87\% | 1,700.000 |
| 2D1 | 165.000 | 5.08\% | 255,750 | 4.68\% | 1,550.000 |
| 2D | 77.350 | 2.38\% | 114,094 | 2.09\% | 1,475.035 |
| 3D1 | 286.480 | 8.83\% | 401,072 | 7.34\% | 1,400.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 250.130 | 7.71\% | 287,650 | 5.26\% | 1,150.002 |
| 4D | 97.910 | 3.02\% | 97,910 | 1.79\% | 1,000.000 |
| Dry Total | 3,245.590 | 100.00\% | 5,466,873 | 100.00\% | 1,684.400 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 154.240 | 14.55\% | 84,835 | 18.12\% | 550.019 |
| 1G | 64.190 | 6.05\% | 32,095 | 6.86\% | 500.000 |
| 2G1 | 46.710 | 4.40\% | 21,020 | 4.49\% | 450.010 |
| 2G | 36.500 | 3.44\% | 16,425 | 3.51\% | 450.000 |
| 3G1 | 206.030 | 19.43\% | 92,715 | 19.80\% | 450.007 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 146.090 | 13.78\% | 58,436 | 12.48\% | 400.000 |
| 4G | 406.670 | 38.35\% | 162,668 | 34.74\% | 400.000 |
| Grass Total | 1,060.430 | 100.00\% | 468,194 | 100.00\% | 441.513 |
| Irrigated Total | 55,526.220 | 92.50\% | 122,312,848 | 95.33\% | 2,202.794 |
| Dry Total | 3,245.590 | 5.41\% | 5,466,873 | 4.26\% | 1,684.400 |
| Grass Total | 1,060.430 | 1.77\% | 468,194 | 0.36\% | 441.513 |
| Waste | 173.880 | 0.29\% | 52,164 | 0.04\% | 300.000 |
| Other | 20.430 | 0.03\% | 8,172 | 0.01\% | 400.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 60,026.550 | 100.00\% | 128,308,251 | 100.00\% | 2,137.525 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $55,526.220$ | $20.85 \%$ | $122,312,848$ | $23.58 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $3,245.590$ | $6.83 \%$ | $5,466,873$ | $7.68 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $1,060.430$ | $4.47 \%$ | 468,194 | $5.26 \%$ |
| Waste | 173.880 | $5.18 \%$ | 52,164 | $6.03 \%$ |
| Other | 20.430 | $10.35 \%$ | 8,172 | $9.01 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $60,026.550$ | $17.60 \%$ | $128,308,251$ | $21.39 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 27,962.770 | 36.49\% | 55,226,500 | 40.49\% | 1,975.001 |
| 1A | 20,582.430 | 26.86\% | 39,621,196 | 29.05\% | 1,925.000 |
| 2A1 | 3,867.030 | 5.05\% | 6,767,306 | 4.96\% | 1,750.000 |
| 2A | 5,556.020 | 7.25\% | 9,028,540 | 6.62\% | 1,625.001 |
| 3A1 | 9,895.070 | 12.91\% | 14,100,488 | 10.34\% | 1,425.001 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 5,646.010 | 7.37\% | 7,904,414 | 5.80\% | 1,400.000 |
| 4A | 3,124.240 | 4.08\% | 3,749,088 | 2.75\% | 1,200.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 76,633.570 | 100.00\% | 136,397,532 | 100.00\% | 1,779.866 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 5,551.160 | 28.61\% | 10,269,657 | 33.43\% | 1,850.001 |
| 1D | 5,008.480 | 25.82\% | 8,764,847 | 28.53\% | 1,750.001 |
| 2D1 | 835.150 | 4.30\% | 1,336,240 | 4.35\% | 1,600.000 |
| 2D | 2,253.460 | 11.62\% | 3,380,190 | 11.00\% | 1,500.000 |
| 3D1 | 2,991.980 | 15.42\% | 3,739,978 | 12.17\% | 1,250.001 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 1,923.750 | 9.92\% | 2,308,500 | 7.51\% | 1,200.000 |
| 4D | 836.330 | 4.31\% | 919,963 | 2.99\% | 1,100.000 |
| Dry Total | 19,400.310 | 100.00\% | 30,719,375 | 100.00\% | 1,583.447 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 383.550 | 4.32\% | 191,775 | 5.97\% | 500.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1G | 747.310 | 8.41\% | 373,655 | 11.63\% | 500.000 |
| 2G1 | 201.250 | 2.27\% | 90,563 | 2.82\% | 450.002 |
| 2G | 568.880 | 6.41\% | 256,573 | 7.99\% | 451.014 |
| 3G1 | 1,157.470 | 13.03\% | 472,161 | 14.70\% | 407.925 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 1,220.760 | 13.75\% | 429,924 | 13.38\% | 352.177 |
| 4G | 4,601.870 | 51.82\% | 1,397,369 | 43.50\% | 303.652 |
| Grass Total | 8,881.090 | 100.00\% | 3,212,020 | 100.00\% | 361.669 |
| Irrigated Total | 76,633.570 | 72.16\% | 136,397,532 | 79.92\% | 1,779.866 |
| Dry Total | 19,400.310 | 18.27\% | 30,719,375 | 18.00\% | 1,583.447 |
| Grass Total | 8,881.090 | 8.36\% | 3,212,020 | 1.88\% | 361.669 |
| Waste | 1,170.530 | 1.10\% | 286,938 | 0.17\% | 245.135 |
| Other | 108.130 | 0.10\% | 48,733 | 0.03\% | 450.688 |
| Exempt | 320.000 | 0.30\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 106,193.630 | 100.00\% | 170,664,598 | 100.00\% | 1,607.107 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $76,633.570$ | $28.77 \%$ | $136,397,532$ | $26.30 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $19,400.310$ | $40.85 \%$ | $30,719,375$ | $43.13 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $8,881.090$ | $37.43 \%$ | $3,212,020$ | $36.08 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,170.530$ | $34.86 \%$ | 286,938 | $33.19 \%$ |
| Other | 108.130 | $54.77 \%$ | 48,733 | $53.71 \%$ |
| Exempt | 320.000 | $80.93 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $106,193.630$ | $31.13 \%$ | $170,664,598$ | $28.46 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:
Average Assessed Value*

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |
| 2A1 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $105,719.510$ | $39.69 \%$ | $209,510,003$ | $40.40 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $11,738.640$ | $24.71 \%$ | $18,732,079$ | $26.30 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $4,348.450$ | $18.33 \%$ | $1,905,140$ | $21.40 \%$ |
| Waste | 742.450 | $22.11 \%$ | 259,859 | $30.06 \%$ |
| Other | 53.860 | $27.28 \%$ | 28,658 | $31.58 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $122,602.910$ | $35.94 \%$ | $230,435,739$ | $38.42 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | $3,556.380$ | $17.78 \%$ | $6,401,484$ | $20.87 \%$ | $1,800.000$ |
| 1A | $8,169.060$ | $40.84 \%$ | $14,295,861$ | $46.61 \%$ | $1,750.000$ |
| 2A1 | 779.420 | $3.90 \%$ | $1,169,130$ | $3.81 \%$ | $1,500.000$ |
| 2A | $1,639.630$ | $8.20 \%$ | $2,254,494$ | $7.35 \%$ | $1,375.001$ |
| 3A1 | $3,437.410$ | $17.19 \%$ | $4,296,765$ | $14.01 \%$ | $1,250.000$ |
| 3A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | $1,315.580$ | $6.58 \%$ | $1,315,580$ | $4.29 \%$ | $1,000.000$ |
| 4A | $1,103.320$ | $5.52 \%$ | 937,824 | $3.06 \%$ | 850.001 |
| Irrigated Total | $20,000.800$ | $100.00 \%$ | $30,671,138$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,533.495$ |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  | $1,500.000$ |
| 1D1 | $1,512.510$ | $14.03 \%$ | $2,268,765$ | $18.05 \%$ | $1,425.001$ |
| 1D | $3,618.800$ | $33.58 \%$ | $5,156,795$ | $41.03 \%$ | $1,250.000$ |
| 2D1 | 307.020 | $2.85 \%$ | 383,775 | $3.05 \%$ | $1,250.000$ |
| 2D | $1,340.080$ | $12.43 \%$ | $1,675,101$ | $13.33 \%$ | 900.000 |
| 3D1 | $2,467.310$ | $22.89 \%$ | $2,220,579$ | $17.67 \%$ | 0 |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 102.160 | $1.18 \%$ | 45,972 | $1.64 \%$ | 450.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 592.470 | $6.84 \%$ | 236,988 | $8.43 \%$ | 400.000 |
| 2G1 | 102.510 | $1.18 \%$ | 41,004 | $1.46 \%$ | 400.000 |
| 2G | 478.520 | $5.53 \%$ | 167,484 | $5.96 \%$ | 350.004 |
| 3G1 | $1,011.580$ | $11.68 \%$ | 356,854 | $12.70 \%$ | 352.768 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 900.830 | $10.41 \%$ | 315,291 | $11.22 \%$ | 350.000 |
| 4G | $5,469.040$ | $63.17 \%$ | $1,646,212$ | $58.59 \%$ | 301.005 |
| Grass Total | $8,657.110$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,809,805$ | $100.00 \%$ | 324.566 |
|  |  |  | $30,671,138$ | $66.27 \%$ | $1,533.495$ |
| Irrigated Total | $20,000.800$ | $49.26 \%$ | $12,568,460$ | $27.15 \%$ | $1,166.103$ |
| Dry Total | $10,778.170$ | $26.54 \%$ | $2,809,805$ | $6.07 \%$ | 324.566 |
| Grass Total | $8,657.110$ | $21.32 \%$ | 230,531 | $0.50 \%$ | 199.933 |
| Waste | $1,153.040$ | $2.84 \%$ | 5,175 | $0.01 \%$ | 345.000 |
| Other | 15.000 | $0.04 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | 72.310 | $0.18 \%$ |  |  | $1,139.911$ |
| Market Area Total | $40,604.120$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $20,000.800$ | $7.51 \%$ | $30,671,138$ | $5.91 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $10,778.170$ | $22.69 \%$ | $12,568,460$ | $17.65 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $8,657.110$ | $36.49 \%$ | $2,809,805$ | $31.56 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,153.040$ | $34.34 \%$ | 230,531 | $26.67 \%$ |
| Other | 15.000 | $7.60 \%$ | 5,175 | $5.70 \%$ |
| Exempt | 72.310 | $18.29 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $40,604.120$ | $11.90 \%$ | $46,285,109$ | $7.72 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 93 - York

Market Area:
Value $\quad$ \% of Value ${ }^{*}$

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

Grass:

| 1G1 | 2.000 | $2.18 \%$ | 1,100 | $2.92 \%$ | 550.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| IG | 1.000 | $1.09 \%$ | 500 | $1.33 \%$ | 500.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 79.880 | $86.94 \%$ | 31,952 | $84.86 \%$ | 400.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 9.000 | $9.80 \%$ | 4,100 | $10.89 \%$ | 455.555 |
| 4G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 91.880 | $100.00 \%$ | 37,652 | $100.00 \%$ | 409.795 |
| Irrigated Total | $7,947.270$ | $88.20 \%$ | $18,401,605$ | $90.57 \%$ | $2,315.462$ |
| Dry Total | 943.980 | $10.48 \%$ | $1,870,152$ | $9.20 \%$ | $1,981.135$ |
| Grass Total | 91.880 | $1.02 \%$ | 37,652 | $0.19 \%$ | 409.795 |
| Waste | 27.000 | $0.30 \%$ | 8,100 | $0.04 \%$ | 300.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 2 |
| Market Area Total | $9,010.130$ | $100.00 \%$ | $20,317,509$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $7,947.270$ | $2.98 \%$ | $18,401,605$ | $3.55 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 943.980 | $1.99 \%$ | $1,870,152$ | $2.63 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 91.880 | $0.39 \%$ | 37,652 | $0.42 \%$ |
| Waste | 27.000 | $0.80 \%$ | 8,100 | $0.94 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $9,010.130$ | $2.64 \%$ | $20,317,509$ | $3.39 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 41.960 | 100.00\% | 94,411 | 100.00\% | 2,250.023 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 41.960 | 100.00\% | 94,411 | 100.00\% | 2,250.023 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 41.960 | 100.00\% | 94,411 | 100.00\% | 2,250.023 |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 41.960 | 100.00\% | 94,411 | 100.00\% | 2,250.023 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 41.960 | $0.02 \%$ | 94,411 | $0.02 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 41.960 | $0.01 \%$ | 94,411 | $0.02 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 69.550 | 97.20\% | 156,488 | 97.57\% | 2,250.007 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 2.000 | 2.80\% | 3,900 | 2.43\% | 1,950.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 71.550 | 100.00\% | 160,388 | 100.00\% | 2,241.621 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 71.550 | 100.00\% | 160,388 | 100.00\% | 2,241.621 |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 71.550 | 100.00\% | 160,388 | 100.00\% | 2,241.621 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 71.550 | $0.03 \%$ | 160,388 | $0.03 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 71.550 | $0.02 \%$ | 160,388 | $0.03 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 139.890 | 47.54\% | 441,506 | 48.28\% | 3,156.094 |
| 1A | 95.570 | 32.48\% | 278,597 | 30.47\% | 2,915.109 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 1.000 | 0.34\% | 4,000 | 0.44\% | 4,000.000 |
| 3A1 | 39.000 | 13.25\% | 115,150 | 12.59\% | 2,952.564 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 11.000 | 3.74\% | 44,000 | 4.81\% | 4,000.000 |
| 4A | 7.800 | 2.65\% | 31,200 | 3.41\% | 4,000.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 294.260 | 100.00\% | 914,453 | 100.00\% | 3,107.636 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 130.300 | 91.63\% | 450,000 | 94.34\% | 3,453.568 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 3.910 | 2.75\% | 15,640 | 3.28\% | 4,000.000 |
| 3D1 | 7.000 | 4.92\% | 7,350 | 1.54\% | 1,050.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 1.000 | 0.70\% | 4,000 | 0.84\% | 4,000.000 |
| Dry Total | 142.210 | 100.00\% | 476,990 | 100.00\% | 3,354.124 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 7.000 | 14.54\% | 28,000 | 14.54\% | 4,000.000 |
| 1G | 3.000 | 6.23\% | 12,000 | 6.23\% | 4,000.000 |
| 2G1 | 3.510 | 7.29\% | 14,032 | 7.29\% | 3,997.720 |
| 2G | 8.100 | 16.82\% | 32,400 | 16.82\% | 4,000.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G | 26.540 | 55.12\% | 106,160 | 55.12\% | 4,000.000 |
| Grass Total | 48.150 | 100.00\% | 192,592 | 100.00\% | 3,999.833 |
| Irrigated Total | 294.260 | 60.35\% | 914,453 | 57.40\% | 3,107.636 |
| Dry Total | 142.210 | 29.16\% | 476,990 | 29.94\% | 3,354.124 |
| Grass Total | 48.150 | 9.87\% | 192,592 | 12.09\% | 3,999.833 |
| Waste | 3.000 | 0.62\% | 9,000 | 0.56\% | 3,000.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 487.620 | 100.00\% | 1,593,035 | 100.00\% | 3,266.959 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 294.260 | $0.11 \%$ | 914,453 | $0.18 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 142.210 | $0.30 \%$ | 476,990 | $0.67 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 48.150 | $0.20 \%$ | 192,592 | $2.16 \%$ |
| Waste | 3.000 | $0.09 \%$ | 9,000 | $1.04 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 487.620 | $0.14 \%$ | $1,593,035$ | $0.27 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:
24

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4 A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 51.500 | 34.88\% | 174,825 | 46.22\% | 3,394.660 |
| 1D | 14.000 | 9.48\% | 37,600 | 9.94\% | 2,685.714 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 14.000 | 9.48\% | 30,750 | 8.13\% | 2,196.428 |
| 3D1 | 55.000 | 37.25\% | 103,000 | 27.23\% | 1,872.727 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 11.160 | 7.56\% | 27,084 | 7.16\% | 2,426.881 |
| 4D | 2.000 | 1.35\% | 5,000 | 1.32\% | 2,500.000 |
| Dry Total | 147.660 | 100.00\% | 378,259 | 100.00\% | 2,561.689 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 3.000 | $4.87 \%$ | 9,000 | $7.38 \%$ | $3,000.000$ |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 11.000 | $17.84 \%$ | 27,900 | $22.87 \%$ | $2,536.363$ |
| $3 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 13.700 | $22.22 \%$ | 6,165 | $5.05 \%$ | 450.000 |
| 4G | 33.960 | $55.08 \%$ | 78,930 | $64.70 \%$ | $2,324.204$ |
| Grass Total | 61.660 | $100.00 \%$ | 121,995 | $100.00 \%$ | $1,978.511$ |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 147.660 | $68.74 \%$ | 378,259 | $75.45 \%$ | $2,561.689$ |
| Grass Total | 61.660 | $28.70 \%$ | 121,995 | $24.33 \%$ | $1,978.511$ |
| Waste | 5.500 | $2.56 \%$ | 1,100 | $0.22 \%$ | 200.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $2,333.832$ |
| Market Area Total | 214.820 | $100.00 \%$ | 501,354 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 147.660 | $0.31 \%$ | 378,259 | $0.53 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 61.660 | $0.26 \%$ | 121,995 | $1.37 \%$ |
| Waste | 5.500 | $0.16 \%$ | 1,100 | $0.13 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 214.820 | $0.06 \%$ | 501,354 | $0.08 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 93 - York


| Total | $341,150.780$ | $599,730,664$ | $341,150.780$ | $100.00 \%$ | $599,730,664$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,757.963$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates

2006 Plan of Assessment for York County
Assessment years 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009
Filed with York County Board

Assessment levels for the year 2006 for York County are 99.3\% for Residential, Commercial and Industrial are $97.92 \%$ and Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land are $77.43 \%$.

Real property in the County of York as per the 2006 County Abstract total $\$ 1,160,512,301$ for 9757 parcels of taxable value.

| Residential | 5,080 parcels | $\$ 344,737,952$ value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 915 | $131,703,990$ |
| Industrial | 20 | $32,324,828$ |
| Recreational | 25 | 799,699 |
| TIF | 423 | $25,413,081$ |
| Exempt Parcels | 517 |  |
| Agricultural | 3717 | $650,945,832$ |
|  | $259,540.46$ irrigated acres |  |
|  | $53,629.72$ dry acres |  |
|  | $24,332.93$ grass acres |  |
|  | $3,379.83$ acres waste |  |
|  | 291 acres other use |  |

The Assessor's office has a staff of assessor, deputy assessor, real estate clerk and general clerk. All pickup work is done by the staff and no outside companies are used except for the ethanol plant update every two years. This plant is so unique that I , as the assessor do not feel comfortable placing a value on that property. This plant was updated for 2005 and therefore will not need to be done again until 2007 unless major construction occurs at the plant.

The cadastral maps are kept current by the real estate clerk as well as all transfers of ownership and splits in property descriptions.

I maintain a sales file for all property sold in the county and develop the depreciation study for each year of revaluation. A percentage factor is not generally used to determine value of property. Market value and comparison property is the method used to value property. The county uses Terra Scan computer service to develop the CAMA package. The county is in the process of getting our GIS up and running. We are in the process of drawing our land use and measuring ag use acres at the current time. We have $1 / 2$ of the county drawn and counted.

For 2006 all COD' and PRD's are within the guidelines developed and approved by IAAO and have been found to be satisfactory to meet the requirement of Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

For the year 2007, the commercial property in the City of York will be updated as new construction occurs. A trend is beginning to occur with the development of the bi-pass, causing some commercial properties to move to the interstate area.

With the by-pass on the west side of the City of York, highest and best use will be checked to determine if the value should be residential or stay agricultural.
Also the special use along the corridor of Highway 81 and the City of York will be watched.

For 2007, Commercial property in the county will be maintained with new properties being added and old property uses kept up to date. This may mean a revalue by occupancy codes as the market would require. Residential property for the villages, Benedict, Bradshaw, Gresham, McCool Jct. will be checked. Also in the City of York, market area 2 (North of the railroad tracks) 3 (west of Division and south of $12^{\text {th }}$ ) and market 7 which is Edison Addition, Fairview Addition, and Arbor Court will be revalued with new pictures and market study. Agricultural property will be viewed for use and market areas will be studied for possible changes. Special Value will be changed as the market warrants.

During 2007 some computer updates will be needed. Several printers are becoming outdated and causing some problems with some major printing projects. With all the copy work done in the office it will be time to update our copy maching also.

For the year 2008 all commercial property will be maintained with new properties being added and old property uses kept update. Residential property for the City of Henderson and the Village of Waco will be revalued. In the City of York, market areas 11 and 12 and 13 will be reassessed with any changes to the property recorded and new pictures. With the help of the ratio studies any market area in the city showing enough sales and also showing a problem will be checked. Agricultural property will be checked as it is every year for use changes and sales showing a need to change a market area.

During this three year period our GIS program should be up and running providing the County with various new and exciting information. With the help of the County Board our budget requirements will be met and all processes will go forward.

For 2009 the assessor's office will be maintaining all records and keeping our GIS system current and usable. The GIS maps should be ready to go the Web Page by that time.

This is the three year plan of assessment required by law to be submitted to the County Board pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263 Section 9.

# 2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for York County 

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

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in York County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Recapture Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION for York County 

## I. Agricultural Land Value Correlation

In York County there are 50 qualified unimproved agricultural sales that are valued as having non-influenced value. All three measures of central tendency (median 73.34, mean 73.57, and weighted mean 71.50) are within the prescribed parameter and for direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used in determining the overall level of value. Both of the qualitative measures, coefficient of dispersion (13.37) and price related differential (102.89) are suggesting that the assessment of the agricultural unimproved class has been done in a uniform and proportionate manner. A review of all available statistical data and administrative reports indicates that York County has achieved an acceptable level of value and that the quality of assessment has been met.

There will be no adjustment recommended to the agricultural class of land in York County.
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# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for York County 

## II. Special Value Correlation

The same 50 sales having no non-agricultural influence that were used to measure the agricultural unimproved land were used to measure the Special Value. Those measurements produced a Median of 73 percent which is within the acceptable range for the level of value. The qualitative statistics, including the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential are both within the acceptable range.

Only a small portion of York County is affected by special value, for purposes of valuation the value has been established from like uninfluenced agricultural sales that have occurred in the surrounding area and valued the same as other agricultural property in this market area.
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## SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for York County

## III. Recapture Value Correlation

In York County there are 3 qualified unimproved agricultural sales that have a recapture value. For assessment year 2007 the values were reported at one-hundred percent of value in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 and the Assessed Value Update. However, through the legislative process LB 166 was passed and signed into law by the Governor on March 7 with the emergency clause calling for special valuation to be recaptured at seventy-five percent.

As a practical manner of comparison the reported values have been adjusted by seventy-five percent and the statistical measures can then be viewed in the same context as other counties. However, for measurement purposes the sample is not sufficient and there is no other information available that would indicate that the recapture value of the agricultural class has not been met.

There will be no recommended adjustment to the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County.

## 93-York County Recapture Statistics

Agricultural Unimproved

$$
\mathrm{n}=3 \text { sales }
$$

Recapture at 100\%

| median | 117.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| mean | 106.18 |
| Wgtmean | $111.01 \%$ |
| AAD | 12.77 |
| COD | $10.87 \%$ |
| PRD | 95.65 |

Recapture at 75\%

| median | $88.12 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| mean | $79.64 \%$ |
| wgtmean | $83.26 \%$ |
| AAD | $9.57 \%$ |
| COD | $10.86 \%$ |
| PRD | $95.65 \%$ |


| cnty | book | page | saledate | saleamt | locationid | market | adj | nonag | adj sp |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 93 | 190 | 257 | $8 / 26 / 2005$ | 282000 | 930037413 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 282000 |
| 93 | 187 | 447 | 421 |  | 182400 | 930034589 | 23 | 0 | 182400 |
| 93 | 189 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 115000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| agland | recapamt | baseratio | ad | 75\% recap | reduce 25\% | ad |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 65363 | 331337 | 117.5 | 0 | 248503 | $88.12 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| 114597 | 218280 | 119.67 | 2.17 | 163710 | $89.75 \%$ | $1.63 \%$ |
| 23328 | 93580 | 81.37 | 36.13 | 70185 | $61.03 \%$ | $27.09 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 643197 |  |  | 482398 |  |  |
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PA\&T 2007 Recapture Value Statistics
Type: Qualified
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Data used to determine special value for York County Nebraska.

York County cuxrently has three areas where special value applications have been filed. One area is along the highway 81 corxidor from the interstate to the City proper. This area is almost non accessible for farming but would make an ideal residential area adjacent to the golf course. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ area is between the city limits west to the bi-pass being constructed. A potential residential area could be created on the east side of York along Maine Ave between Nobes Road and $6^{\text {th }}$ st.

Commercial sales in the first mile north of the Interstate and on the east side of 81 have been recorded at $\$ .85$ per square foot for 17 acres for the new Super Walmart and $\$ 120,000$ for lots approximately one acres in size for commercial development. In the second mile north of the interstate a tract of land 72.55 acres is size, is being offered for sale for commercial development.

In 2005 two tracts of land were sold on the west side of the 81 coxridor noxth of the interstate in the first mile. A 29 acre tract sold for $\$ 10,000$ + per acre and another 80 acre tract sold for $\$ 3620$. In 2006 two parcels already developed at the interstate sold for over $\$ 1,000,000$. Each parcel was frontage on the service road and may cause me to develop another value for that area.

On the east edge of the city another area is developing for possible residential use. There was a sale of 26 acres of grass for $\$ 4000$ per acre and another sale of 29 acres of alfalfa for a little more than $\$ 4000$.

These properties are all typical of Market Area \#2 as they are all flat, ixxigated and row crop except for the sales that would be highest and best use residential.

In 2004-2005-2006 agriculture sales have been $\$ 3600$ to 4100 an acre for irrigated land. With these sales I value that land within the special areas the same as if they were anywhere else in Market Area 2.

## 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 York County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70051160000112139881.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


