### **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., 2007). 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., 2007) 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 Revenue Property Assessment Division, hereinafter referred to as the Division, 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 Division 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 Division is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2007) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Division 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 Division prepares statistical analysis from a non-randomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

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

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

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

### **Table of Contents**

### **Commission Summary**

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

#### **Residential Reports Section**

Preliminary Statistical Reports
Residential Real Property, Qualified
Residential Assessment Actions
Residential Appraisal Information
R&O Statistical Reports
Residential Real Property, Qualified

#### **Residential Correlation Section**

Residential Real Property

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

Residential (What If) Recommendation Statistics if necessary

### **Commercial Reports Section**

Preliminary Statistical Reports
Commercial Real Property, Qualified
Commercial Assessment Actions
Commercial Appraisal Information
R&O Statistical Reports
Commercial Real Property, Qualified

### **Commercial Correlation Section**

Commercial Real Property

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
- III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratios
- IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

- V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
- VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
- VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Commercial (What If) Recommendation Statistics if necessary

### **Agricultural Reports Section**

Preliminary Statistical Reports
Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified
Agricultural Assessment Actions
Agricultural Appraisal Information
R&O Statistical Reports
Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified

#### **Agricultural Correlation Section**

Agricultural Land

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

Agricultural (What If) Recommendation Statistics if necessary

### **Special Valuation Section**

#### **County Reports Section**

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
2008 County Agricultural Land Detail
2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2007
Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report
County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
Assessment Survey – General Information

#### Certification

### **Map Section**

### **Valuation History Chart Section**

### **2008 Commission Summary**

### 23 Dawes

Number of Sales	289	COD	13.35
Total Sales Price	\$20,171,480	PRD	103.12
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$20,166,480	COV	24.21
Total Assessed Value	\$19,533,423	STD	24.19
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$69,780	Avg. Abs. Dev.	13.18
Avg. Assessed Value	\$67,590	Min	23.07
Median	98.71	Max	242.80
Wgt. Mean	96.86	95% Median C.I.	97.77 to 99.23
Mean	99.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	95.50 to 98.23
		95% Mean C.I.	97.10 to 102.67
% of Value of the Class of a	ll Real Property Value in	the County	32.05
% of Records Sold in the St	udy Period	<u> </u>	8.66
% of Value Sold in the Stud	y Period		11.27
Average Assessed Value of	the Base		51,940

Residential Rea	l Property - History			
Year	<b>Number of Sales</b>	Median	COD	PRD
2008	289	98.71	13.35	103.12
2007	324	100.28	17.24	107.38
2006		99.75	17.15	105.36
2005	275	98.27	15.44	103.65
2004	288	100.00	21.15	105.98
2003	317	96	25.11	109.45
2002	306	93	21.2	105.54
2001	298	96	24.36	107.82

### 2008 Commission Summary

### 23 Dawes

Commercial Real	Property - Current				
Number of Sales		35	COD		11.22
Total Sales Price	\$3,32	8,000	PRD		99.99
Total Adj. Sales Pri	ce \$3,34	6,000	COV		21.30
Total Assessed Valu	s \$3,09	9,649	STD		19.73
Avg. Adj. Sales Pric	ee \$9.	5,600	Avg. Abs	. Dev.	11.02
Avg. Assessed Valu	e \$8	8,561	Min		27.52
Median		98.18	Max		150.97
Wgt. Mean		92.64	95% Med	lian C.I.	94.75 to 98.86
Mean		92.62	95% Wg	t. Mean C.I.	86.89 to 98.38
			95% Mea	an C.I.	86.09 to 99.16
% of Records Sold % of Value Sold in Average Assessed V	the Study Period				7.23 5.15 124,357
Commercial Real	Property - History				
Year	<b>Number of Sales</b>		Median	COD	PRD
2008	35		98.18	11.22	99.99
2007	53		92.56	37.51	129.65
2006	46		96.44	29.07	125.06
2005	50		94.92	27.93	126.21
2004	53		92.63	28.50	118.35
2003	58		98	39.77	116.97
2002	60		99	39.23	121.47
2001	66		92	35.01	127.6

# 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Dawes 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 Dawes County is 99% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Dawes 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 Dawes County is 98% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Dawes County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.

Ruth A. Sorensen

Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Qualified **Base Stat** PAGE:1 of 5 23 - DAWES COUNTY State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL

19,891,658

TOTAL Assessed Value:

		•	Date Range:	07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007	Posted I	Before: 01/18/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	301	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	25.19	95% Median C.I.:	97.36 to 99.16	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	20,696,330	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	24.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.73 to 97.54	(** * *****,
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	20,691,330	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.48	95% Mean C.I.:	96.34 to 101.98	

AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 68,741 COD: 13.71 MAX Sales Ratio: 242.80 AVG. Assessed Value: 66,085 PRD: 103.14 MIN Sales Ratio: 23.07 Printed: 02/09/2008 12:04:24

1100. 110000	Dod vara		00,005	2102	100.11	Baics Racio	23.07			Printea: 02/09/2	000 12.04.24
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	57	99.50	102.59	99.16	13.34	103.45	32.41	200.00	98.16 to 99.99	68,141	67,571
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	31	99.44	105.15	97.52	13.41	107.83	76.30	184.13	97.26 to 100.50	76,770	74,863
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	22	98.05	103.71	100.44	11.00	103.26	63.92	212.62	95.81 to 100.28	55,732	55,978
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	46	99.44	102.30	100.00	13.67	102.30	23.07	242.80	98.25 to 100.16	58,844	58,844
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	41	96.97	98.58	96.81	8.89	101.83	63.09	164.38	93.91 to 99.22	71,199	68,928
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	32	97.61	95.39	95.85	4.25	99.52	59.00	103.36	94.19 to 99.19	84,111	80,619
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	29	87.20	87.49	88.81	22.14	98.51	25.09	154.05	73.22 to 99.03	68,315	60,673
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	43	90.53	95.81	90.11	21.59	106.32	32.64	216.88	82.50 to 98.10	67,500	60,826
Study Years											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	156	99.41	103.17	99.15	13.14	104.05	23.07	242.80	98.73 to 99.73	65,364	64,812
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	145	95.82	94.84	93.20	14.15	101.75	25.09	216.88	93.54 to 97.77	72,375	67,454
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	141	98.45	99.87	97.91	9.80	102.00	23.07	242.80	97.56 to 99.19	67,686	66,271
ALL											
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.71	103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
CHADRON #1	43	99.17	98.39	96.29	11.32	102.18	32.64	154.05	97.29 to 99.89	47,799	46,027
CHADRON #2	40	99.22	98.64	97.53	10.62	101.14	51.02	163.15	97.26 to 99.89	52,456	51,161
CHADRON #3	32	99.26	100.07	98.87	7.44	101.21	63.33	126.07	96.61 to 102.43	69,336	68,555
CHADRON #4	42	98.71	98.41	98.11	3.68	100.30	63.45	113.54	97.77 to 99.52	73,005	71,627
CHADRON #5	49	98.73	96.64	95.95	10.31	100.72	65.63	192.83	96.97 to 99.43	112,997	108,420
CRAWFORD #1	13	93.91	89.38	84.51	30.94	105.76	23.07	164.38	59.00 to 105.91	14,696	12,419
CRAWFORD #2	21	94.73	104.38	94.70	20.02	110.22	63.09	242.80	88.98 to 106.32	32,457	30,737
CRAWFORD #3	17	91.82	96.80	94.17	18.35	102.79	32.41	176.38	83.27 to 105.58	38,544	36,298
MARSLAND	2	105.53	105.53	100.51	10.99	104.99	93.93	117.12	N/A	50,250	50,504
RURAL	23	94.66	104.22	96.24	26.80	108.28	53.41	212.62	87.21 to 106.05	97,184	93,535
SUBURBAN	14	87.86	92.30	89.75	20.34	102.83	63.47	184.13	71.56 to 99.89	120,685	108,321
WHITNEY	5	95.42	139.93	97.50	48.11	143.52	92.97	216.88	N/A	32,500	31,686
ALL											
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.71	103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085

Base Stat **PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics** PAGE:2 of 5 23 - DAWES COUNTY

RESIDENTIAL		-			Type: Qualifi	ed				State Stat Run	
						cu nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008		
NUMB.	ER of Sales	:	301	MEDIAN:	98				Median C.I.: 97.30	C += 00 1C	(!: AVTot=0)
	Sales Price		696,330	WGT. MEAN:	96	COV:	25.19 24.98		. Mean C.I.: 94.7		(!: Derived)
	Sales Price		691,330	MEAN:	99	STD:		_			
•	essed Value		891,658	1111111		AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.48	95	6 Medii C.1 96.3	34 to 101.98	
	Sales Price		68,741	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	essed Value		66,085	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 02/09/2	0000 12:01:21
LOCATIONS: URBAN,										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	262	98.72	99.03	96.74	12.1		23.07	242.80	97.84 to 99.24	63,610	61,537
2	14	87.86	92.30	89.75	20.3		63.47	184.13	71.56 to 99.89	120,685	108,321
3	25	94.66	104.32	96.43	25.6		53.41	212.62	88.18 to 106.05	93,429	90,092
ALL	23	71.00	101.02	70.15	23.0	100.12	33.11	222.02	00.10 00 100.00	33,123	30,032
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
STATUS: IMPROVED,	UNIMPROVE	D & IOLL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	276	98.57	99.81	96.36	11.0	6 103.58	32.64	242.80	97.84 to 99.21	73,460	70,784
2	24	77.17	92.98	86.42	49.6	0 107.60	23.07	200.00	63.47 to 112.00	16,341	14,121
3	1	67.31	67.31	67.31			67.31	67.31	N/A	24,000	16,155
ALL											
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	300	98.31	99.26	96.17	13.6	5 103.22	23.07	242.80	97.45 to 99.16	68,891	66,251
06											
07	1	67.31	67.31	67.31			67.31	67.31	N/A	24,000	16,155
ALL											
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
07-0010	2	85.27	85.27	90.85	37.3	6 93.85	53.41	117.12	N/A	24,250	22,031
23-0002	239	98.73	99.17	96.60	10.9	9 102.66	32.64	216.88	98.13 to 99.25	76,263	73,668
23-0071	59	93.12	98.77	92.55	23.3	4 106.73	23.07	242.80	90.91 to 96.93	40,794	37,754
81-0003	1	147.52	147.52	147.52			147.52	147.52	N/A	9,000	13,277
83-0500											
NonValid School											
ALL											
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085

Base Stat PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Type: Qualified PAGE:3 of 5 23 - DAWES COUNTY State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL

				ı ype: Quanın	ea			
				Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007	Posted 1	Before: 01/18/2008	(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:	301	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	25.19	95% Median C.I.: 97.36 to 99.16	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	20,696,330	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	24.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 94.73 to 97.54	(** = **** ****)
TOT	CAL Adj.Sales Price:	20,691,330	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.48	95% Mean C.I.: 96.34 to 101.98	
TO	TAL Assessed Value:	19,891,658						
AVG	G. Adj. Sales Price:	68,741	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80		

	AVG. Asses	sed Value	e:	66,085	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 02/09/2	008 12:04:24
YEAR BUILT	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Bla	ank	40	86.44	92.72	89.57	34.35	103.52	23.07	200.00	71.56 to 97.29	44,123	39,520
Prior TO 186	50											
1860 TO 189	99	9	97.09	96.13	93.59	8.03	102.72	63.45	116.30	92.96 to 104.03	45,044	42,157
1900 TO 191	19	69	99.21	103.15	98.36	10.54	104.87	59.00	242.80	97.56 to 100.04	50,460	49,635
1920 TO 193	39	63	98.30	96.82	95.50	8.52	101.38	59.38	163.15	95.42 to 99.23	59,603	56,923
1940 TO 194	49	15	99.25	102.22	98.83	18.65	103.43	32.41	154.05	90.76 to 103.36	43,740	43,227
1950 TO 195	59	23	98.78	96.06	95.61	5.96	100.47	73.22	111.51	95.82 to 100.04	104,256	99,680
1960 TO 196	59	23	98.71	101.54	97.58	15.08	104.06	68.56	216.88	88.74 to 100.82	87,913	85,789
1970 TO 197	79	37	99.22	101.67	96.25	10.82	105.63	65.80	176.38	97.14 to 99.88	99,787	96,047
1980 TO 198	39	7	99.54	109.75	103.78	23.79	105.75	67.31	212.62	67.31 to 212.62	77,000	79,910
1990 TO 199	94	1	84.93	84.93	84.93			84.93	84.93	N/A	22,500	19,110
1995 TO 199	99	9	98.73	99.61	98.81	10.26	100.81	77.64	133.75	87.20 to 110.72	123,388	121,923
2000 TO Pre	esent	5	92.97	93.06	92.01	4.49	101.14	87.21	98.31	N/A	168,799	155,320
ALL												
		301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.71	103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
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	5	104.12	143.05	133.77	42.76	106.94	94.43	216.88	N/A	3,050	4,080
5000 TO	9999	15	93.91	109.36	105.82	50.27	103.35	23.07	242.80	63.09 to 151.67	6,976	7,382
Total \$	\$											
1 TO	9999	20	101.98	117.78	109.38	46.14	107.69	23.07	242.80	82.50 to 151.67	5,995	6,557
10000 TO	29999	55	99.44	104.39	102.68	24.09	101.66	25.09	184.13	92.39 to 106.32	17,920	18,401
30000 TO	59999	78	98.05	97.19	96.63	12.30	100.58	32.64	212.62	95.15 to 99.62	43,668	42,199
60000 TO	99999	81	98.29	96.35	96.60	6.06	99.74	59.38	133.86	96.97 to 99.03	78,010	75,358
100000 TO	149999	44	98.72	95.39	95.23	5.25	100.17	70.69	106.05	97.14 to 99.41	122,248	116,413
150000 TO	249999	20	94.33	94.16	94.46	5.99	99.67	76.57	109.73	88.52 to 99.87	184,088	173,899
250000 TO	499999	3	98.10	94.54	94.08	3.77	100.49	87.21	98.31	N/A	266,666	250,879
ALL	_											
		301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.71	103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085

Base Stat PAGE:4 of 5

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Qualified 23 - DAWES COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL					7	Type: Qualifi					State Stat Kun	
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
		of Sales		301	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	25.19	95%	Median C.I.: 97.36	5 to 99.16	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 20	,696,330	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	24.98	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 94.73	3 to 97.54	, ,
TO	FAL Adj.Sa	les Price		,691,330	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.48	95	% Mean C.I.: 96.3	4 to 101.98	
TO	OTAL Asses	sed Value	: 19	,891,658								
	G. Adj. Sa			68,741	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	66,085	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 02/09/2	
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	9	63.09	77.01	49.15	64.6		23.07	200.00	25.09 to 104.12	6,177	3,036
5000 TO	9999	12	91.13	103.98	94.67	28.2	2 109.82	65.63	216.88	80.27 to 112.00	8,066	7,637
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	21	88.35	92.42	78.07	37.7		23.07	216.88	65.63 to 104.12	7,257	5,665
10000 TO	29999	57	98.25	105.57	94.09	28.4		32.64	242.80	88.92 to 105.19	19,504	18,351
30000 TO	59999	85	98.01	97.80	95.15	10.7		59.38	164.38	95.07 to 99.61	46,869	44,598
60000 TO	99999	75	98.64	100.13	98.15	6.7		70.69	212.62	98.13 to 99.23	80,433	78,948
100000 TO	149999	43	98.71	96.25	95.60	5.7		73.22	133.75	96.99 to 99.41	125,894	120,350
150000 TO	249999	19	98.10	96.77	96.77	4.8	4 100.00	84.18	109.73	92.87 to 100.27	194,593	188,313
250000 TO	499999	1	87.21	87.21	87.21			87.21	87.21	N/A	299,999	261,622
ALL	_			00.15	0.5.1.4				0.4.0		60 544	
		301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741 Avg. Adj.	66,085
QUALITY		COLINIE	MEDIAN	MELANT	MOD MEAN	ao	ממת מ	MIN	MAN	OF Wadian C T	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE		COUNT 40	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN 89.57	CO 34.3		MIN 23.07	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank) 10		14	86.44 99.69	92.72 100.63	89.80	16.1		59.00	200.00 154.05	71.56 to 97.29 88.35 to 106.32	44,123 15,950	39,520
15		7	99.53	128.27	116.81	32.7		90.96	242.80	90.96 to 242.80	27,342	14,323 31,940
20		74	98.53	101.37	96.88	14.3		32.41	242.80	96.61 to 99.88	38,863	37,650
25		1	114.79	101.37	114.79	14.3	2 104.64	114.79	114.79	N/A	30,500	35,010
30		142	98.62	98.70	96.82	8.1	7 101.94	65.80	212.62	N/A 97.77 to 99.23	81,787	79,185
35		8	98.02	93.66	93.25	6.2		76.57	100.67	76.57 to 100.67	156,125	145,583
40		15	98.31	96.68	96.86	4.6		87.21	100.07	91.45 to 100.27	182,833	177,100
40 ALL		13	90.31	90.00	90.80	4.0	0 99.01	07.21	109.73	91.45 (0 100.27	102,033	177,100
		301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
STYLE		301		77.10	70.11	13.7	103.11	23.07	212.00	77.30 00 77.10	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		44	88.17	93.03	90.16	31.4		23.07	200.00	74.07 to 97.55	44,169	39,822
100		16	101.83	117.09	112.84	35.1		65.80	216.88	81.47 to 163.15	23,728	26,773
101		190	98.79	99.24	96.47	9.6		32.41	242.80	98.15 to 99.38	72,270	69,718
102		13	99.03	98.28	95.79	11.0		59.00	151.67	88.41 to 100.04	88,115	84,409
103		2	97.62	97.62	98.35	2.3		95.36	99.87	N/A	170,500	167,687
104		32	97.77	99.53	97.28	6.2		78.05	138.93	96.78 to 99.57	84,950	82,641
301		2	89.16	89.16	86.80	16.7		74.22	104.11	N/A	118,750	103,077
304		2	94.14	94.14	93.15	5.7		88.74	99.54	N/A	97,250	90,592
ALL				7 1	,,,,,	5.7		00.71	22.51	/	5,7250	20,322
		301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	1 103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085
		301	,,,,,	,,	, , , , , ,	13.7		23.07	212.00	3 20 33.10	00,711	50,000

23 - DAW	VES COUNTY			PAD 2008	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:5 of 5
RESIDENT	'IAL	_			Type: Qualifi	v				State Stat Run	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	007 Posted I	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:		301	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	25.19	95%	Median C.I.: 97.36	5 to 99.16	(!: Av 101=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	20,	696,330	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	24.98	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 94.73	3 to 97.54	(112011104)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	20,	691,330	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.48	95	% Mean C.I.: 96.3	4 to 101.98	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,	891,658								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		68,741	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	AVG. Assessed Value:		66,085	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 02/09/2	008 12:04:24
CONDITION	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	40	86.44	92.72	89.57	34.3	103.52	23.07	200.00	71.56 to 97.29	44,123	39,520
10	8	99.14	92.73	88.01	7.8	105.36	59.00	101.60	59.00 to 101.60	12,725	11,199
15	7	99.53	128.27	116.81	32.7	79 109.81	90.96	242.80	90.96 to 242.80	27,342	31,940
20	71	98.25	103.07	96.89	16.3	106.38	32.41	216.88	95.42 to 102.43	35,621	34,513
25	1	114.79	114.79	114.79			114.79	114.79	N/A	30,500	35,010
30	146	98.68	98.48	96.95	7.8	101.57	65.80	212.62	97.84 to 99.23	78,322	75,936
35	7	99.27	93.20	92.62	6.7	100.63	76.57	100.67	76.57 to 100.67	152,000	140,781
40	21	98.31	96.91	96.24	7.5	100.69	73.22	133.75	89.78 to 100.27	170,209	163,806
ALL											
	301	98.30	99.16	96.14	13.7	103.14	23.07	242.80	97.36 to 99.16	68,741	66,085

# Dawes County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

### Residential

For assessment year 2008 the County completed pickup work and reviewed residential sales and market figures in order to make adjustments. Established new Assessor Location neighborhoods: Five in Chadron (numbered 1,2,3,4 and 5); three in Crawford (1,2 and 3); ensured that the suburban and rural residential were properly classified by location. All suburban land and improvements received a 5% increase to bring these within acceptable range. The County retained the Marsland and Whitney Assessor Locations.

### 2008 Assessment Survey for Dawes County

### **Residential Appraisal Information**

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor's Office
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor's Office
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor's Office
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are
	used to value this property class?
	2001
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Chadron-2003, Rural Residential-2004, Crawford-2006
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?
	Not used as a separate approach. Used primarily during protests.
7.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:
	12
8.	How are these defined?
	Chadron #1, Chadron #2, Chadron #3, Chadron #4, Chadron #5, Crawford #1, Crawford #2, Crawford #3, Marsland, Rural, Suburban, Whitney
9.	Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?
	Yes
10.	Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural
	residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
	Yes
11.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the
	limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	Properties located outside the city limits but within 2 miles of the city limits.

12.	Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified
	and valued in the same manner?
	Yes

### **Residential Permit Numbers:**

Permits	<b>Information Statements</b>	Other	Total
64	13	20	97

PAGE:1 of 5

PAGE:1 of 5

23 - DAWES COUNTY			PAD 2008 R&O Statistics  Base Stat						tat	PAGE: 1 Of 5		
RESIDENTIAL		,			Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run		
						nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	07 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(1 AT/T ( 0)	
NUMBER	of Sales	:	289	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	99	COV:	24.21	95%	Median C.I.: 97.7	7 to 99 23	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)	
TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 20	,171,480	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	24.19		. Mean C.I.: 95.5		(I. Deriveu)	
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 20	,166,480	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.18	_	% Mean C.I.: 97.1			
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 19	,533,423			1100.1120.221	13.10		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10 00 102.07		
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	69,780	COD:	13.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80					
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	67,589	PRD:	103.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 03/31/	2008 19:13:21	
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Qrtrs												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	56	99.62	103.17	100.06	13.6	103.11	32.41	200.00	99.23 to 100.58	67,483	67,522	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	30	99.53	106.56	98.46	13.2	108.23	76.30	193.33	97.26 to 100.50	78,496	77,284	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	21	98.08	104.26	100.67	11.2	103.56	68.23	212.62	95.81 to 100.28	56,815	57,198	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	44	99.57	105.32	101.24	13.7	78 104.03	23.07	242.80	98.73 to 104.03	61,125	61,883	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	41	96.97	98.58	96.81	8.8	39 101.83	63.09	164.38	93.91 to 99.22	71,199	68,928	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	29	97.77	95.94	96.33	4.2	99.60	59.00	110.55	94.46 to 99.19	87,071	83,876	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	27	88.41	88.94	89.61	21.3	33 99.25	47.72	154.05	71.37 to 99.25	69,579	62,348	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	41	90.53	93.75	90.83	19.0	103.22	32.64	192.83	80.73 to 100.00	68,951	62,627	
Study Years												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	151	99.50	104.62	100.07	13.2	104.54	23.07	242.80	98.82 to 99.88	66,334	66,383	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	138	96.29	94.70	93.69	13.2	101.08	32.64	192.83	93.54 to 98.10	73,550	68,910	
Calendar Yrs												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	135	98.64	101.09	98.45	9.9	102.68	23.07	242.80	98.01 to 99.21	69,087	68,018	
ALL												
	289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	35 103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589	
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
CHADRON #1	42	99.00	98.59	96.22	11.4		32.64	154.05	97.29 to 100.28	48,699	46,859	
CHADRON #2	38	99.31	100.01	97.82	9.5		67.51	163.15	97.26 to 99.95	52,682	51,533	
CHADRON #3	32	99.26	100.76	99.25	8.1		63.33	126.07	96.61 to 105.18	69,336	68,816	
CHADRON #4	41	98.64	98.28	98.03	3.6		63.45	113.54	97.45 to 99.52	73,689	72,240	
CHADRON #5	47	98.94	96.79	96.01	10.4		65.63	192.83	96.97 to 99.54	114,040	109,492	
CRAWFORD #1	13	93.91	94.80	87.15	33.0		23.07	164.38	59.00 to 147.67	14,696	12,808	
CRAWFORD #2	19	97.09	106.07	96.13	21.1		63.09	242.80	88.04 to 110.65	30,189	29,019	
CRAWFORD #3	15	91.82	98.32	95.40	19.6	103.06	32.41	176.38	90.76 to 105.58	40,350	38,494	

10.99

27.58

18.96

23.61

13.35

104.99

108.41

104.13

123.18

103.12

117.12

212.62

193.33

200.00

242.80

93.93

53.41

68.07

92.97

23.07

N/A

84.85 to 133.75

79.85 to 104.88

N/A

97.77 to 99.23

50,504

97,236

30,751

67,589

123,664

50,250

100,465

128,930

32,500

69,780

105.53

94.25

96.03

95.42

98.71

2

22

13

289

5

MARSLAND

SUBURBAN

\_\_ALL\_

WHITNEY

RURAL

100.51

96.79

95.92

94.62

96.86

105.53

104.92

99.88

99.89

116.55

Rase Stat DACE . 2 of 5

23 - DAW	ES COUNTY			PAD 2	008 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:2 of 5
RESIDENTIAL		'		Type: Qualified State Sta							
					• •	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER of Sales	;:	289	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	24.21	059	Median C.I.: 97.7	7 +0 00 22	(!: AVTot=0)
	TOTAL Sales Price	20	,171,480	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	24.21		. Mean C.I.: 95.5		(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price		,166,480	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.18	_	% Mean C.I.: 93.3		
	TOTAL Assessed Value		,533,423			AVG.ABS.DEV.	13.10	) )	• Mean C.1 9/.1	10 10 102.67	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	69,780	COD:	13.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	67,589	PRD:	103.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 03/31/2	2008 19:13:21
LOCATIO	NS: URBAN, SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	252	98.79	99.40	96.95	11.8	6 102.53	23.07	242.80	98.08 to 99.28	64,204	62,244
2	13	96.03	99.88	95.92	18.9	6 104.13	68.07	193.33	79.85 to 104.88	128,930	123,664
3	24	94.30	104.97	96.95	26.3	0 108.28	53.41	212.62	87.21 to 117.12	96,281	93,341
ALL											
	289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	5 103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI	<u></u>							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	268	98.75	100.12	96.99	10.7		32.64	242.80	98.08 to 99.27	73,879	71,658
2	20	74.38	98.32	91.20	56.5	107.82	23.07	200.00	65.63 to 123.20	17,142	15,633
3	1	67.31	67.31	67.31			67.31	67.31	N/A	24,000	16,155
ALL											
	289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	5 103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589
-	Y TYPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	288	98.72	100.00	96.90	13.2	8 103.20	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.24	69,939	67,768
06		6E 04		<b>65.04</b>			6T 04	<b>6</b> 5.04	/-	0.4.000	46 455
07	1	67.31	67.31	67.31			67.31	67.31	N/A	24,000	16,155
ALL		00 71	00.00	06.06	10.0	F 102.10	02 07	040.00	07 77 +- 00 00	60 500	67 500
	289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	5 103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780 Avg. Adj.	67,589 Avg.
RANGE	DISTRICT *  COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val

(blank)											
07-0010	2	85.27	85.27	90.85	37.36	93.85	53.41	117.12	N/A	24,250	22,031
23-0002	231	98.82	99.50	97.19	10.40	102.38	32.64	212.62	98.25 to 99.28	77,316	75,143
23-0071	55	93.91	101.18	94.18	24.64	107.43	23.07	242.80	91.14 to 99.82	40,889	38,508
81-0003	1	147.52	147.52	147.52			147.52	147.52	N/A	9,000	13,277
83-0500											
NonValid School											
ALL											
	289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.35	103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589

Base Stat PAD 2008 R&O Statistics
Type: Onalified PAGE:3 of 5 23 - DAWES COUNTY State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL

e: Qualified		State Stat Kan
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007	Posted Before: 01/18/2008	

RESIDENT	TIAL				7	Гуре: Qualifi	ed				State Stat Kun	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	2007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
	N	NUMBER of Sales	3:	289	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	99	COV:	24.21	95%	Median C.I.: 97.7	7 to 99.23	(!: Av 101=0) (!: Derived)
	TOT	TAL Sales Price	e: 20	,171,480	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	24.19		. Mean C.I.: 95.50		( Deriveu)
	TOTAL A	Adj.Sales Price	e: 20	,166,480	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.18	_	% Mean C.I.: 97.1		
	TOTAL	Assessed Value	e: 19	,533,423			11.011201221	13.10			10 00 102.07	
	AVG. Ad	dj. Sales Price	e:	69,780	COD:	13.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	AVG.	Assessed Value	e:	67,589	PRD:	103.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 03/31/2	008 19:13:21
YEAR BU	ILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR	Blank	36	86.44	95.77	90.87	35.2	26 105.39	23.07	200.00	68.67 to 98.10	47,655	43,305
Prior TO	1860											
1860 TO	1899	9	97.09	96.13	93.59	8.0	102.72	63.45	116.30	92.96 to 104.03	45,044	42,157
1900 TO	1919	68	99.19	103.35	98.27	10.8	105.16	59.00	242.80	97.56 to 100.16	50,717	49,842
1920 TO	1939	59	98.64	98.24	95.93	9.2	102.41	67.51	163.15	96.97 to 99.49	59,958	57,519
1940 TO	1949	14	98.69	102.14	98.50	19.8	103.70	32.41	154.05	88.92 to 137.79	43,650	42,993
1950 TO	1959	23	98.78	96.06	95.61	5.9	100.47	73.22	111.51	95.82 to 100.04	104,256	99,680
1960 TO	1969	22	98.99	96.40	97.33	10.3	99.05	68.56	144.54	86.81 to 100.82	87,136	84,811
1970 TO	1979	36	99.40	103.11	98.03	10.3	105.18	65.80	176.38	97.14 to 100.67	100,476	98,501
1980 TO	1989	7	99.54	109.75	103.78	23.7	105.75	67.31	212.62	67.31 to 212.62	77,000	79,910
1990 TO	1994	1	84.93	84.93	84.93			84.93	84.93	N/A	22,500	19,110
1995 TO	1999	9	98.73	102.71	100.86	8.3	101.83	92.88	133.75	93.83 to 116.26	123,388	124,452
2000 TO	Present	. 5	98.29	96.09	95.63	4.4	100.49	87.21	103.22	N/A	168,799	161,417
ALL												
		289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589
SALE PR	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$											
1 '	TO	4999 4	125.90	137.95	117.91	28.5	116.99	100.00	200.00	N/A	2,937	3,463
5000 T	0 9	999 14	99.03	113.53	109.96	47.9	103.24	23.07	242.80	63.09 to 176.38	6,950	7,642
Tot	al \$											
1 '	TO	9999 18	104.13	118.96	110.82	43.1	.5 107.34	23.07	242.80	82.50 to 151.67	6,058	6,713
10000	TO 2	9999 52	101.24	106.24	104.01	24.2	102.14	47.72	193.33	94.73 to 110.55	18,022	18,745
30000	TO 5	9999 75	98.25	97.65	97.07	12.2	100.60	32.64	212.62	95.81 to 99.82	43,755	42,474
60000	TO 9	9999 78	98.43	96.97	97.18	6.0	99.79	63.45	133.86	96.97 to 99.22	77,985	75,783
100000	TO 14	9999 43	98.71	95.43	95.32	5.1	.9 100.12	73.22	106.05	96.99 to 99.28	122,650	116,906
150000	TO 24	9999 20	95.73	96.09	96.40	4.8	99.67	85.43	109.73	92.88 to 99.87	184,088	177,461
250000	TO 49	9999 3	98.10	96.18	95.62	5.4	14 100.59	87.21	103.22	N/A	266,666	254,975
ALL												
		289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589

23 - DAWES COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL	L				7	Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Kun	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	2007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of	f Sales	:	289	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	99	COV:	24.21	95%	Median C.I.: 97.77	7 to 99.23	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sale	s Price:	- ,	171,480	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	24.19	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 95.50	) to 98.23	( =)
TC	TAL Adj.Sale	s Price:	: 20,	166,480	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.18	95	% Mean C.I.: 97.1	0 to 102.67	
Т	OTAL Assessed	d Value	: 19,	533,423								
AV	G. Adj. Sale	s Price:	:	69,780	COD:	13.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	AVG. Assessed	d Value	:	67,589	PRD:	103.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 03/31/2	2008 19:13:21
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO	4999	7	100.00	95.77	66.24	47.6	144.56	23.07	200.00	23.07 to 200.00	4,678	3,099
5000 TO	9999	10	84.66	89.07	80.87	24.3	110.13	47.72	151.67	65.63 to 112.00	8,880	7,181
Total	\$											
1 TO	9999	17	86.81	91.82	76.93	37.4	119.36	23.07	200.00	63.09 to 112.00	7,150	5,500
10000 TO	29999	56	98.77	106.69	94.80	28.6	112.54	32.64	242.80	90.96 to 105.91	19,343	18,338
30000 TO	59999	81	98.25	98.49	95.93	10.2	102.67	63.33	164.38	95.81 to 99.62	46,702	44,801
60000 TO	99999	72	98.80	100.94	99.11	6.8	101.85	75.23	212.62	98.15 to 99.25	79,625	78,917
100000 TO	149999	43	98.60	95.92	95.31	6.0	100.64	73.22	133.75	95.36 to 99.28	126,708	120,766
150000 TO	249999	18	98.44	98.34	98.32	4.0	100.02	88.39	109.73	94.80 to 100.50	191,515	188,295
250000 TO	499999	2	95.22	95.22	94.49	8.4	100.77	87.21	103.22	N/A	274,999	259,840
ALL												
		289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		36	86.44	95.77	90.87	35.2	105.39	23.07	200.00	68.67 to 98.10	47,655	43,305
10		13	101.60	106.10	91.06	20.3	116.52	59.00	154.05	88.92 to 147.67	16,407	14,940
15		7	99.53	128.27	116.81	32.7	9 109.81	90.96	242.80	90.96 to 242.80	27,342	31,940
20		72	99.22	100.33	97.34	12.4	103.07	32.41	154.05	96.61 to 99.89	38,859	37,824
25		1	114.79	114.79	114.79			114.79	114.79	N/A	30,500	35,010
30		137	98.71	99.03	97.15	8.2	101.93	65.80	212.62	97.77 to 99.24	81,943	79,608
35		8	98.07	95.91	95.76	5.2	100.16	85.43	104.88	85.43 to 104.88	156,125	149,506
40		15	99.19	98.00	98.30	3.8	99.69	87.21	109.73	95.36 to 100.50	182,833	179,724
ALL												
		289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589
STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		40	88.17	96.03	91.59	32.2	104.84	23.07	200.00	79.85 to 99.21	47,352	43,371
100		16	99.77	111.18	114.23	27.8	97.32	65.80	212.62	82.50 to 133.61	23,728	27,105
101		184	99.05	100.13	97.34	9.8	102.86	32.41	242.80	98.40 to 99.44	72,770	70,838
102		13	99.03	98.28	95.79	11.0	102.59	59.00	151.67	88.41 to 100.04	88,115	84,409
103		2	97.62	97.62	98.35	2.3	99.25	95.36	99.87	N/A	170,500	167,687
104		30	97.66	99.44	97.14	6.4	102.37	78.05	138.93	96.78 to 99.50	86,147	83,684
301		2	89.16	89.16	86.80	16.7	102.72	74.22	104.11	N/A	118,750	103,077
304		2	94.14	94.14	93.15	5.7	101.06	88.74	99.54	N/A	97,250	90,592
ALL												
		289	98.71	99.89	96.86	13.3	103.12	23.07	242.80	97.77 to 99.23	69,780	67,589

23 - DAI	WES COUNTY			PAD 2	008 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:5 of 5
RESIDENTIAL			Type: Qualified							State Stat Run	
						nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	07 Posted B	Sefore: 01/18	/2008		(I. AVTat-0)
	NUMBER of Sales	:	289	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	99	COV:	24.21	95%	Median C.I.: 97.77	7 to 99.23	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: 20	,171,480	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	24.19	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 95.50	) to 98.23	(112011104)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 20	,166,480	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.18	95	% Mean C.I.: 97.1	0 to 102.67	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 19	,533,423								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	69,780	COD:	13.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.80				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	67,589	PRD:	103.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.07			Printed: 03/31/2	008 19:13:21
CONDITI	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	36	86.44	95.77	90.87	35.2	105.39	23.07	200.00	68.67 to 98.10	47,655	43,305
10	7	100.88	101.76	90.74	15.3	112.15	59.00	147.67	59.00 to 147.67	13,114	11,899
15	7	99.53	128.27	116.81	32.7	109.81	90.96	242.80	90.96 to 242.80	27,342	31,940
20	69	99.22	101.78	97.13	14.7	104.79	32.41	154.05	95.42 to 102.43	35,523	34,504
25	1	114.79	114.79	114.79			114.79	114.79	N/A	30,500	35,010
30	141	98.73	98.87	97.24	7.7	101.67	65.80	212.62	98.08 to 99.25	78,351	76,190
35	7	99.27	95.78	95.57	5.5	100.22	85.43	104.88	85.43 to 104.88	152,000	145,264
40	21	99.19	98.12	97.70	6.6	100.43	73.22	133.75	93.83 to 100.50	170,209	166,288
ALI	<u> </u>										

103.12

23.07 242.80 97.77 to 99.23

69,780

67,589

13.35

98.71 99.89 96.86

289

### **Residential Real Property**

#### I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The subsequent tables and the accompanying narratives will show that all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could be used as a point estimate for the overall residential level of value. Further, there is strong corresponding support between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median. Therefore, for purposes of direct equalization and because the coefficient of dispersion is well within range, the median will be used to describe the overall level of value for this property class.

Regarding the qualitative statistics, both are within the respective parameters, and indicate overall good quality of assessment for the residential property class.

Further review of the statistical profile indicates under the heading, "Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL," under the range "2" Unimproved a total of twenty sales with a median of 74.38, a mean of 98.32, a weighted mean of 91.20, a COD of 56.51 and a PRD of 107.82. Trimming the file of extreme outliers would leave twelve sales, an unchanged median of 74.38, a mean of 86.68, a weighted mean of 89.20, and would reduce the COD to 27.02 and the PRD to 97.17. The twenty unimproved or vacant residential sales are comprised of nine Chadron sales (2-Chadron #1 at 80% and 112%, 1-Chadron #3 at 123%, and 6-Chadron #5 at 68%, 66%, 155%, 66%, 83% and 193% respectively); four Crawford sales (2-Crawford #1 at 23% and 48%, respectively, 1-Crawford #2 at 63%, and 1-Crawford #3 at 32%); three Rural sales (60%, 88% and 177%); three Suburban sales (two at 68% and one at 193%)and one Whitney sale (at 200%).

Although the median for these twenty unimproved sales could be brought to the mid-point within acceptable range (by an increase to land of 29.06), it could reasonably be argued that this would merely produce an in-range mid-point only. In fact, this adjustment would bring none of the aforementioned ratios within the 92 to 100% acceptable range. They would be as follows:

# Assessor Location		Current A/S Ratio	What-if Adj. Ratio
1	Chadron #1	80.27	103.59
2	Chadron #1	112.00	144.55
3	Chadron #3	123.20	159.00
4	Chadron #5	68.49	88.39
5	Chadron #5	65.63	84.70
6	Chadron #5	154.50	199.40
7	Chadron #5	66.00	85.18
8	Chadron #5	82.50	106.47
9	Chadron #5	192.83	248.87
10	Crawford #1	23.07	29.78
11	Crawford #1	47.72	61.59
12	Crawford #2	63.09	81.43
13	Crawford #3	32.41	41.83
14	Rural	176.70	228.05

15	Rural	88.18	113.81
16	Rural	60.23	77.73
17	Suburban	68.07	87.85
18	Suburban	193.33	249.52
19	Suburban	68.23	88.06
20	Whitney	200.00	258.12

Because of the broad variety of Assessor Locations found within the "Unimproved" sample, and due to the fact that all of the adjusted sales would fail to fall within acceptable range, a non-binding recommendation will not be made for this subclass.

### 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(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) 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 Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
2008	377	289	76.66
2007	399	324	81.2
2006	351	291	82.91
2005	328	275	83.84
2004	361	288	79.78
2003	395	317	80.25
2002	370	306	82.7
2001	365	298	81.64

RESIDENTIAL: According to Table II, Dawes County has consistently utilized more than 75% of the total available residential sales, and indicates that the Assessor does not excessively trim the sales file.

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

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

### Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	98.30	1.03	99.31	98.71
2007	96.69	0.54	97.21	100.28
2006	94.35	6.26	100.26	99.75
2005	97.07	-0.28	96.8	98.27
2004	90.23	17.51	106.03	100.00
2003	89	7.21	95.42	96
2002	92	3.29	95.03	93
2001	94	2.91	96.74	96

RESIDENTIAL: According to the data in Table III, there is little statistical difference between the Trended Preliminary ratio and the R&O Median. Therefore, there is strong corresponding support between the two statistical figures.

### 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 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 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 sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

### Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales	ł	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0.53	2008	1.03
13.62	2007	2.22
7.71	2006	6.26
4.56	2005	-0.28
11.31	2004	17.51
6.25	2003	7.21
3.07	2002	3.29
3.21	2001	2.91

RESIDENTIAL: As indicated in Table IV, the absolute difference between the percent change in the sales file compared with the percent change in assessed is less than one point (0.50), and this is statistically insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between the valuation applied to the sold versus the unsold residential property.

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has 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. Since 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 the 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, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	98.71	96.86	99.89

RESIDENTIAL: Table V reveals that all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could be used as a point estimate for the overall residential level of value. However, for purposes of direct equalization and because the coefficient of dispersion is well within range, the median will be used to describe the overall level of value for this property class.

### 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. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. 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. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

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

	COD	PRD
<b>R&amp;O</b> Statistics	13.35	103.12
Difference	0	0.12

RESIDENTIAL: Regarding the qualitative statistics, both are within the respective parameters, and indicate overall good quality of assessment for the residential property class.

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	301	289	-12
Median	98.30	98.71	0.41
Wgt. Mean	96.14	96.86	0.72
Mean	99.16	99.89	0.73
COD	13.71	13.35	-0.36
PRD	103.14	103.12	-0.02
Min Sales Ratio	23.07	23.07	0
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	242.80	242.80	0

RESIDENTIAL: The twelve-sale difference between the Preliminary and the R&O Statistics is due to these sales being "substantially changed" (remodeling, additions, etc.) and removed from the sales file. Assessment actions for 2008 taken to address the residential property class included: the completion of pickup work and review of residential sales and market figures in order to make adjustments. The County Assessor established new Assessor Location neighborhoods: Five in Chadron (numbered 1,2,3,4 and 5); three in Crawford (1,2 and 3); ensured that the suburban and rural residential were properly classified by location. All suburban land and improvements received a 5% increase to bring these within acceptable range.

Base Stat PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Qualified PAGE:1 of 5 23 - DAWES COUNTY COMMERCIAL

State Stat Run

			Type: Quamieu									
						nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	e: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008					
NUMBER	of Sales	;:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	87	COV:	42.38	95%	Median C.I.: 72.90	to 97.08	(!: AVTot=0)	
TOTAL Sal	les Price	3	,383,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	34.17	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 63.92	to 87.35		
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	3	,401,000	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.99	95	% Mean C.I.: 69.3	31 to 91.95		
TOTAL Assess	sed Value	2 :	,572,240									
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	<b>:</b>	97,171	COD:	30.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97					
AVG. Assess	sed Value	<b>:</b>	73,492	PRD:	106.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.64			Printed: 02/09/2	008 12:04:33	
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Qrtrs												
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	97.81	97.81	97.81			97.81	97.81	N/A	220,000	215,190	
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	3	119.50	99.17	66.21	18.6	149.77	55.65	122.35	N/A	104,333	69,083	
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	101.38	101.38	101.38			101.38	101.38	N/A	65,000	65,900	
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	91.32	91.32	95.02	8.0	96.10	84.00	98.64	N/A	81,000	76,970	
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	119.55	114.49	89.37	21.7	75 128.11	72.95	150.97	N/A	106,666	95,325	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	76.16	69.48	65.68	32.2	105.79	30.12	95.50	N/A	98,625	64,773	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	87.47	79.17	69.89	15.2	24 113.28	34.38	96.33	N/A	123,200	86,099	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	89.46	79.50	86.13	31.6	92.29	23.42	115.65	N/A	100,000	86,135	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	72.90	82.08	63.12	46.7	75 130.03	35.55	137.79	N/A	85,666	54,076	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	34.77	51.89	59.80	65.2	86.77	27.14	110.88	N/A	87,500	52,325	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	94.80	94.80	95.03	2.4	99.75	92.52	97.08	N/A	72,500	68,900	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	63.71	54.73	63.42	28.8	86.29	22.64	77.83	N/A	52,833	33,508	
Study Years												
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	7	98.64	97.05	84.51	15.3	114.83	55.65	122.35	55.65 to 122.35	108,571	91,754	
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	89.33	83.45	76.28	27.1	109.40	23.42	150.97	59.75 to 99.96	108,156	82,506	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	68.31	67.30	66.98	45.1	.9 100.47	22.64	137.79	31.28 to 97.08	75,875	50,821	
Calendar Yrs												
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	94.03	90.54	81.24	24.1	111.44	30.12	150.97	59.75 to 119.55	94,150	76,491	
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	82.72	72.98	70.64	36.5	103.30	23.42	137.79	34.38 to 99.96	101,437	71,660	
ALL												
	35	87.47	80.63	75.63	30.8	106.61	22.64	150.97	72.90 to 97.08	97,171	73,492	
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
CHADRON #2	13	96.33	97.31	99.42	19.6	97.88	22.64	137.79	84.00 to 119.50	78,038	77,585	
CHADRON #3	3	35.55	39.45	44.13	26.7	73 89.39	27.14	55.65	N/A	176,000	77,670	
CHADRON #4	4	94.13	103.05	89.11	22.2	115.64	72.95	150.97	N/A	112,500	100,251	
CHADRON #5	3	86.47	85.73	92.17	9.6	93.01	72.90	97.81	N/A	130,000	119,823	
CRAWFORD #1	3	92.52	84.08	90.76	14.4	92.63	59.75	99.96	N/A	46,666	42,356	
CRAWFORD #2	4	34.19	52.84	38.80	76.2	136.16	23.42	119.55	N/A	91,000	35,312	
RURAL	1	63.71	63.71	63.71			63.71	63.71	N/A	118,750	75,660	
SUBURBAN	4	56.11	60.53	57.15	49.3	105.92	31.28	98.64	N/A	98,937	56,541	
ALL												
	35	87.47	80.63	75.63	30.8	106.61	22.64	150.97	72.90 to 97.08	97,171	73,492	

**Base Stat** PAGE: 2 of 5 23 - DAWES COUNTY **PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics** State Stat Run COMMERCIAL Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008 (!: AVTot=0) NUMBER of Sales: 35 **MEDIAN:** 87 95% Median C.I.: 72.90 to 97.08 COV: 42.38 TOTAL Sales Price: 3,383,000 WGT. MEAN: 76 STD: 34.17 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 63.92 to 87.35 TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 3,401,000 MEAN: 81 26.99 95% Mean C.I.: 69.31 to 91.95 AVG.ABS.DEV: TOTAL Assessed Value: 2,572,240 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 97,171 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 150.97 30.86 AVG. Assessed Value: 73,492 MIN Sales Ratio: PRD: 106.61 22.64 Printed: 02/09/2008 12:04:33 Avg. Avg. Adj. LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN 95% Median C.I. MEAN MAX 1 30 91.85 83.88 78.66 28.43 106.64 22.64 150.97 72.95 to 97.81 96,216 75,680 2 4 56.11 60.53 57.15 49.38 105.92 31.28 98.64 N/A 98,937 56,541 3 1 63.71 63.71 63.71 63.71 63.71 N/A 118,750 75,660 ALL 35 87.47 75.63 80.63 30.86 106.61 22.64 150.97 72.90 to 97.08 97,171 73,492 Avg. Adj. Avg. STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 1 30 91.85 83.57 76.44 27.24 109.33 23.42 150.97 72.95 to 97.81 106,916 81,731 2 5 63.71 62.99 62.17 45.02 101.33 22.64 119.50 N/A 38,700 24,059 ALL 35 87.47 80.63 75.63 30.86 106.61 22.64 150.97 72.90 to 97.08 97,171 73,492 Avg. Adj. PROPERTY TYPE \* Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 02 3 119.55 122.28 117.82 15.23 103.79 96.33 150.97 N/A 52,833 62,246 32 03 85.24 76.73 73.57 30.73 104.29 22.64 137.79 59.75 to 97.08 101,328 74,546 ALL 35 87.47 80.63 75.63 30.86 106.61 22.64 150.97 72.90 to 97.08 97,171 73,492 SCHOOL DISTRICT \* Avg. Adj. Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. MEAN WGT. MEAN (blank) 07-0010 23-0002 25 92.56 87.43 80.68 25.69 108.37 22.64 150.97 78.96 to 98.64 108,980 87,922 23-0071 10 61.73 63.64 55.31 43.86 115.06 23.42 119.55 30.12 to 99.96 67,650 37,417

30.86

106.61

22.64

150.97

72.90 to 97.08

97,171

73,492

81-0003 83-0500

NonValid School
\_\_\_\_ALL\_

35

87.47

80.63

75.63

23 - DAWES	COUNTY				PAD 2008	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE: 3 of
COMMERCIAL						Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	07 Posted	<b>Before: 01/18</b>	/2008		(!: AVTot=0
	NUMBER	of Sales:	:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	87	COV:	42.38	95%	Median C.I.: 72.90	0 to 97.08	(217101-0
	TOTAL Sal	les Price:	:	3,383,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	34.17	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 63.92	2 to 87.35	
TO	TAL Adj.Sal	les Price:	:	3,401,000	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.99	95	% Mean C.I.: 69.	31 to 91.95	
	OTAL Assess			2,572,240								
	G. Adj. Sal			97,171	COD:	30.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:	: 	73,492	PRD:	106.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.64			Printed: 02/09/2	2008 12:04:3
YEAR BUILT	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blar		9	72.90	73.59	71.91	45.7	0 102.33	22.64	150.97	27.14 to 119.50	48,111	34,597
Prior TO 186												
1860 TO 189		4	94.50		91.50	7.6		78.96	101.38	N/A	131,000	119,86
1900 TO 191		3	84.00		54.65	22.7		30.12	87.47	N/A	97,500	53,280
1920 TO 193		7	97.08		94.54	26.7		23.42	122.35	23.42 to 122.35	63,357	59,89
1940 TO 194		3	99.96		87.46	12.6	108.16	72.95	110.88	N/A	138,666	121,28
1950 TO 195	59	1	95.50	95.50	95.50			95.50	95.50	N/A	120,000	114,60
1960 TO 196		5	86.47		67.28	36.2		35.55	137.79	N/A	113,400	76,29
1970 TO 197		2	66.51	66.51	57.30	48.3	1 116.07	34.38	98.64	N/A	171,000	97,98
1980 TO 198												
1990 TO 199												
1995 TO 199		1	55.65	55.65	55.65			55.65	55.65	N/A	263,000	146,36
2000 TO Pre	esent											
ALL	_											
		35	87.47	80.63	75.63	30.8	106.61	22.64	150.97	72.90 to 97.08	97,171	73,49
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
Total \$			70.00	71 00	72 62	20.0	07.60	22.64	110 55	22 64 55 110 55	20 525	1 - 11
10000 TO 30000 TO	29999 59999	7	72.90		73.62 94.12	39.8		22.64	119.55 150.97	22.64 to 119.55	20,535	15,11: 45,17
		5	99.96			33.1				N/A	48,000	
60000 TO	99999	9 6	92.56		89.11	16.1		27.14	137.79	87.47 to 101.38	77,500	69,06
100000 TO	149999		97.07		87.91	21.9		38.26	115.65	38.26 to 115.65	120,958	106,33
150000 TO	249999	7 1	72.95		62.70	31.9	99.39	30.12	97.81	30.12 to 97.81	190,142	119,22
250000 TO	499999	1	55.65	55.65	55.65			55.65	55.65	N/A	263,000	146,36
ALL	_	2.5	07 45	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	75 62	20.0	100.01	22 64	150 07	72 00 +- 07 00	07 171	72 40
		35	87.47	80.63	75.63	30.8	6 106.61	22.64	150.97	72.90 to 97.08	97,171	73,492

23 - DAWES	COUNTY				PAD 2008	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:4 of 5
COMMERCIAL						Гуре: Qualifi	•				State Stat Run	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	07 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008		(!: AVTot=0
	NUMBER	of Sales	;:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	87	COV:	42.38	95% 1	Median C.I.: 72.90	) to 97.08	(!: AV10t=0
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	<b>:</b>	3,383,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	34.17		. Mean C.I.: 63.92		
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	<b>:</b>	3,401,000	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.99			31 to 91.95	
T	OTAL Asses	sed Value	<b>:</b>	2,572,240								
AV	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	<b>:</b>	97,171	COD:	30.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	<b>:</b>	73,492	PRD:	106.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.64			Printed: 02/09/2	2008 12:04:3
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	22.64	22.64	22.64			22.64	22.64	N/A	11,000	2,49
5000 TO	9999	1	31.28	31.28	31.28			31.28	31.28	N/A	25,000	7,82
Total \$	<b>5</b>											
1 TO	9999	2	26.96	26.96	28.64	16.0	94.14	22.64	31.28	N/A	18,000	5,15
10000 TO	29999	6	66.33	63.42	43.87	40.1	.9 144.56	23.42	119.50	23.42 to 119.50	37,291	16,360
30000 TO	59999	6	91.98	82.37	59.89	34.3	137.55	30.12	122.35	30.12 to 122.35	74,000	44,31
60000 TO	99999	12	92.54	90.08	75.66	24.4	119.06	34.38	150.97	63.71 to 101.38	97,604	73,84
100000 TO	149999	6	90.99	87.68	82.39	15.3	106.42	55.65	110.88	55.65 to 110.88	155,833	128,396
150000 TO	249999	3	97.81	95.47	91.60	14.5	104.22	72.95	115.65	N/A	197,000	180,453
ALL	_											
		35	87.47	80.63	75.63	30.8	106.61	22.64	150.97	72.90 to 97.08	97,171	73,492
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		9	72.90		71.91	45.7		22.64	150.97	27.14 to 119.50	48,111	34,59
10		7	92.56	74.97	76.17	24.2		23.42	101.38	23.42 to 101.38	107,785	82,10
20		18	91.85	87.74	78.94	24.7	76 111.15	34.38	137.79	72.95 to 110.88	108,361	85,54
30		1	55.65	55.65	55.65			55.65	55.65	N/A	263,000	146,360
ALL												

106.61 22.64 150.97 72.90 to 97.08

97,171

73,492

35

87.47 80.63 75.63

	WES COUNTY					inary Statistics	5	Base St	tat	State Stat Run	PAGE:5 of 5
COMMERC	IAL			ר	Гуре: Qualifi					Siate Siat Kun	
					Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales		35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	87	COV:	42.38	95%	Median C.I.: 72.9	0 to 97.08	(,
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	3,383,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	34.17	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 63.9	2 to 87.35	
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	3,401,000	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.99	95	% Mean C.I.: 69.	31 to 91.95	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	2,572,240								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	97,171	COD:	30.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	73,492	PRD:	106.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.64			Printed: 02/09/2	008 12:04:33
OCCUPAN	ICY CODE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	72.90	73.59	71.91	45.7	0 102.33	22.64	150.97	27.14 to 119.50	48,111	34,597
300	4	93.35	94.80	84.68	13.6	111.95	72.95	119.55	N/A	117,250	99,282
306	2	62.36	62.36	65.55	38.6	5 95.15	38.26	86.47	N/A	132,500	86,850
323	1	115.65	115.65	115.65			115.65	115.65	N/A	130,000	150,350
343	1	92.56	92.56	92.56			92.56	92.56	N/A	89,500	82,845
344	2	92.28	92.28	92.06	5.2	100.23	87.47	97.08	N/A	83,750	77,100
350	2	29.49	29.49	32.65	20.5	7 90.30	23.42	35.55	N/A	115,000	37,550
352	1	97.81	97.81	97.81			97.81	97.81	N/A	220,000	215,190
353	4	100.67	100.66	92.55	11.1	3 108.77	78.96	122.35	N/A	80,000	74,037
405	1	137.79	137.79	137.79			137.79	137.79	N/A	62,000	85,430
406	4	91.32	88.32	98.99	18.0	1 89.22	59.75	110.88	N/A	75,500	74,735
436	1	55.65	55.65	55.65			55.65	55.65	N/A	263,000	146,360
442	1	30.12	30.12	30.12			30.12	30.12	N/A	165,000	49,700
95	1	34.38	34.38	34.38			34.38	34.38	N/A	220,000	75,630
98	1	92.52	92.52	92.52			92.52	92.52	N/A	65,000	60,140
ALI	<u> </u>										

106.61

22.64 150.97 72.90 to 97.08

97,171

73,492

35

87.47

80.63

75.63

# Dawes County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

#### Commercial

Assessment actions taken to address commercial property for 2008 included the complete reappraisal & reassessment of commercial property. All commercial properties were reviewed and updated.

### **2008** Assessment Survey for Dawes County

### **Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information**

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor's Office & Contracted Appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor's Office
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor's Office
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2007
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2002
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?
	2008
7.	When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
	2008
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
	12
9.	How are these defined?
	Chadron #1, Chadron #2, Chadron #3, Chadron #4, Chadron #5, Crawford #1,
	Crawford #2, Crawford #3, Marsland, Rural, Suburban, Whitney
10.	Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?
	Yes
11.	Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural
	commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
	Yes

12. What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)

Properties located outside the city limits but within 2 miles of the city limits.

#### **Commercial Permit Numbers:**

Permits	<b>Information Statements</b>	Other	Total
16	0	0	16

**Base Stat** PAGE:1 of 5 PAD 2008 R&O Statistics 23 - DAWES COUNTY COMMERCIAL

		T	ype: Qualified		State Stat Run		
			Date Range: 07	/01/2004 to 06/30/2007	Posted I	Before: 01/18/2008	(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	cov:	21.30	95% Median C.I.: 94.75 to 98.86	(:: AV101=0)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,328,000	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	19.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 86.89 to 98.38	

TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 3,346,000 93 MEAN: 95% Mean C.I.: 86.09 to 99.16 AVG.ABS.DEV: 11.02 TOTAL Assessed Value: 3,099,649 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 95,600 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 150.97 11.22 AVG. Assessed Value: 88,561 PRD: 99.99 MIN Sales Ratio: 27.52 Printed: 03/31/2008 19:13:26 Avg. Adj. Avg. DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	98.49	98.49	98.49			98.49	98.49	N/A	220,000	216,681
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	3	98.86	98.74	98.70	0.89	100.03	97.35	100.00	N/A	104,333	102,980
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	98.31	98.31	98.31			98.31	98.31	N/A	65,000	63,900
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	95.46	95.46	96.96	3.10	98.45	92.50	98.42	N/A	81,000	78,537
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	114.05	121.07	107.87	15.43	112.23	98.18	150.97	N/A	106,666	115,061
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	99.04	98.17	99.19	1.44	98.98	94.75	99.86	N/A	98,625	97,821
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	93.91	91.11	87.62	6.32	103.98	73.95	99.31	N/A	123,200	107,948
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	90.06	86.02	87.33	14.52	98.51	64.50	99.46	N/A	100,000	87,325
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	99.06	100.58	99.14	2.69	101.46	97.35	105.33	N/A	85,666	84,926
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	74.69	70.42	75.15	40.58	93.70	27.52	104.79	N/A	73,750	55,423
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	99.41	99.41	99.57	1.53	99.84	97.89	100.94	N/A	72,500	72,190
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	77.83	73.39	67.31	6.39	109.04	63.71	78.64	N/A	52,833	35,561
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	7	98.42	97.70	98.24	1.33	99.46	92.50	100.00	92.50 to 100.00	108,571	106,656
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	98.46	97.22	93.93	10.50	103.50	64.50	150.97	92.03 to 99.46	108,156	101,594
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	97.01	83.54	85.04	17.89	98.23	27.52	105.33	63.71 to 100.94	71,291	60,628
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	98.58	104.51	101.69	8.20	102.77	92.50	150.97	94.75 to 114.05	94,150	95,744
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	96.50	86.44	87.09	14.14	99.26	27.52	105.33	73.95 to 99.31	98,000	85,344
ALL											
	35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.22	99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
CHADRON #2	13	98.31	95.65	96.12	4.54	99.51	78.64	104.79	92.50 to 99.46	78,038	75,013
CHADRON #3	3	98.86	75.15	86.77	24.12	86.61	27.52	99.06	N/A	176,000	152,709
CHADRON #4	4	99.56	110.53	103.46	15.49	106.84	92.03	150.97	N/A	112,500	116,390
CHADRON #5	3	98.49	99.24	97.08	3.87	102.23	93.91	105.33	N/A	130,000	126,203
CRAWFORD #1	3	97.89	97.12	97.77	1.36	99.34	94.75	98.73	N/A	46,666	45,626
CRAWFORD #2	4	98.27	93.77	94.28	13.42	99.46	64.50	114.05	N/A	77,250	72,827
RURAL	1	63.71	63.71	63.71			63.71	63.71	N/A	118,750	75,660
SUBURBAN	4	75.89	75.73	80.43	16.34	94.14	52.70	98.42	N/A	98,937	79,580
ALL											
	35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.22	99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561

23 - DA COMMERC

NonValid School \_\_\_\_ALL\_\_\_\_

35

98.18

92.62

92.64

23 - DAWES COUNTY	<u>r</u>		PAD 2008 R&O Statistics  Base Stat								
COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
NUM	MBER of Sales	:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	21.30	952	Median C.I.: 94.7	E + 0 00 06	(!: AVTot=0)
TOTAL	Sales Price	: 3	,328,000	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	19.73		Median C.I.: 94.7		
	j.Sales Price		,346,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.73	_		9 to 98.38 09 to 99.16	
_	ssessed Value		,099,649	112121	, ,	AVG.ABS.DEV.	11.02	93	6 Mean C.I 80.	09 10 99.16	
	. Sales Price		95,600	COD:	11.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97				
•	ssessed Value		88,561	PRD:	99.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.52			Printed: 03/31/	2008 19:13:26
LOCATIONS: URBAN	. SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	30	98.40	95.84	95.56	8.8	100.30	27.52	150.97	96.67 to 99.31	94,383	90,188
2	4	75.89	75.73	80.43	16.3	94.14	52.70	98.42	N/A	98,937	79,580
3	1	63.71	63.71	63.71			63.71	63.71	N/A	118,750	75,660
ALL											
	35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.2	99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561
STATUS: IMPROVED	, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI	<u>.                                    </u>							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	31	98.31	95.08	94.15	9.3	100.99	27.52	150.97	96.33 to 99.06	102,048	96,078
2	4	70.77	73.56	66.42	21.7	70 110.76	52.70	100.00	N/A	45,625	30,302
ALL											
	35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.2	99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02	2	123.65	123.65	117.43	22.0		96.33	150.97	N/A	64,750	76,035
03	33	98.18	90.74	91.64	10.2	99.02	27.52	114.05	93.91 to 98.86	97,469	89,320
04											
ALL											
	35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.2	99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561
SCHOOL DISTRICT										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
07-0010	0.5	00 40	05.05	02.07	2	101 26	07 50	150 05	06 22 5- 00 24	100 000	100 400
23-0002	25	98.42	95.25	93.97	9.2		27.52	150.97	96.33 to 99.31	108,980	102,409
23-0071	10	95.71	86.07	86.79	16.0	99.17	52.70	114.05	63.71 to 99.86	62,150	53,940
81-0003											
83-0500											

11.22

99.99

27.52

150.97

94.75 to 98.86

95,600

88,561

23 - DAWES	S COUNT	ΓY			PAD 2	2008 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat	~ ~ -	PAGE:3 of 5
COMMERCIAI	L					Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	07 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(!: AVTot=0)
	N	UMBER of Sales	:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	21.30	95%	Median C.I.: 94.7	5 to 98.86	(:. AV101=0)
	TOTA	AL Sales Price	:	3,328,000	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	19.73	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 86.89	9 to 98.38	
T	TOTAL A	dj.Sales Price	:	3,346,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.02	95	% Mean C.I.: 86.	09 to 99.16	
	TOTAL A	Assessed Value	:	3,099,649								
P	AVG. Ad	j. Sales Price	:	95,600	COD:	11.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97				
	AVG. A	Assessed Value	:	88,561	PRD:	99.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.52			Printed: 03/31/.	2008 19:13:26
YEAR BUIL	л *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Bl	.ank	9	78.64	83.67	75.70	32.6	2 110.53	27.52	150.97	52.70 to 105.33	48,111	36,418
Prior TO 1	.860											
1860 TO 1	.899	4	95.17	92.56	92.27	6.1	4 100.31	81.39	98.49	N/A	131,000	120,876
1900 TO 1	.919	3	99.31	97.22	98.69	2.4	7 98.52	92.50	99.86	N/A	97,500	96,220
1920 TO 1	.939	7	98.74	95.68	95.80	8.3	7 99.88	64.50	114.05	64.50 to 114.05	63,357	60,695
1940 TO 1	.949	3	98.73	100.57	100.16	2.2	3 100.40	98.18	104.79	N/A	138,666	138,891
1950 TO 1	.959	1	99.33	99.33	99.33			99.33	99.33	N/A	120,000	119,200
1960 TO 1	.969	5	97.35	96.98	96.92	1.3	1 100.06	93.91	99.06	N/A	102,400	99,241
1970 TO 1	.979	2	86.19	86.19	82.68	14.2	0 104.24	73.95	98.42	N/A	171,000	141,385
1980 TO 1	.989											
1990 TO 1	.994											
1995 TO 1	.999	1	98.86	98.86	98.86			98.86	98.86	N/A	263,000	260,000
2000 TO P	resent											
ALL												
		35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.2	2 99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561
SALE PRIC	E *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low		<u> </u>										
Total												
10000 TO		999 7	94.75		88.55	16.6		52.70	114.05	52.70 to 114.05	20,535	18,184
30000 TO		999 5	97.35		100.50	19.0		64.50	150.97	N/A	48,000	48,240
60000 TO		999 10	97.62		89.24	8.7		27.52	100.94	92.03 to 99.31	75,750	67,596
100000 TO		999 5	99.33		93.33	8.4		63.71	104.79	N/A	122,150	113,997
150000 TO		999 7	98.18		92.05	7.0	1 100.07	73.95	99.86	73.95 to 99.86	190,142	175,029
250000 TO	499	999 1	98.86	98.86	98.86			98.86	98.86	N/A	263,000	260,000

99.99

27.52

150.97

94.75 to 98.86

95,600

88,561

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

35

98.18

92.62

92.64

23 - DAWES	COUNTY			PAD 2008 R&O Statistics  Base Stat										
COMMERCIAL	1					Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run			
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	07 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(!: AVTot=0)		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	21.30	95%	Median C.I.: 94.75	5 to 98.86	(!: AVIOL=0)		
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	3,328,000	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	19.73		. Mean C.I.: 86.89				
Т	OTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	3,346,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.02	_		09 to 99.16			
	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	:	3,099,649										
A	VG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	95,600	COD:	11.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97						
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	88,561	PRD:	99.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.52			Printed: 03/31/2	2008 19:13:26		
ASSESSED V	VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
Low \$	<b>5</b>													
5000 TO	9999	1	78.64	78.64	78.64			78.64	78.64	N/A	11,000	8,650		
Total	\$													
1 TO	9999	1	78.64	78.64	78.64			78.64	78.64	N/A	11,000	8,650		
10000 TO	29999	6	86.29	76.36	56.95	27.4	3 134.08	27.52	105.33	27.52 to 105.33	32,291	18,389		
30000 TO	59999	6	97.01	93.97	92.04	9.7	0 102.09	64.50	114.05	64.50 to 114.05	46,500	42,798		
60000 TO	99999	10	98.10	99.56	95.89	10.2	9 103.83	63.71	150.97	92.03 to 100.94	77,625	74,434		
100000 TO	149999	6	98.88	96.22	95.44	5.0	3 100.82	81.39	104.79	81.39 to 104.79	133,666	127,569		
150000 TO	249999	5	98.49	93.91	93.45	5.4	4 100.49	73.95	99.86	N/A	204,200	190,824		
250000 TO	499999	1	98.86	98.86	98.86			98.86	98.86	N/A	263,000	260,000		
ALL														
		35	98.18	92.62	92.64	11.2	2 99.99	27.52	150.97	94.75 to 98.86	95,600	88,561		
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)		9	78.64	83.67	75.70	32.6	2 110.53	27.52	150.97	52.70 to 105.33	48,111	36,418		
10		7	98.49	93.10	96.14	6.1	8 96.84	64.50	99.86	64.50 to 99.86	107,785	103,627		
20		18	98.04	96.57	94.25	4.9	7 102.46	73.95	114.05	94.75 to 99.31	105,305	99,249		
30		1	98.86	98.86	98.86			98.86	98.86	N/A	263,000	260,000		
ALL														

27.52 150.97 94.75 to 98.86

95,600

88,561

11.22

35

98.18 92.62 92.64

23 - DA	WES COUNTY	[		PAD 2	tat		PAGE:5 of 5				
COMMERC	IAL				Type: Qualifie					State Stat Run	
					Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	07 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		(1 AT/T ( 0)
	NUMBER of Sales:	:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	21.30	95%	Median C.I.: 94.7	5 to 98.86	(!: AVTot=0)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	3	,328,000	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	19.73			9 to 98.38	
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	: 3	,346,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.02	_		09 to 99.16	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	: 3	,099,649								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	:	95,600	COD:	11.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.97				
	AVG. Assessed Value:	:	88,561	PRD:	99.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.52			Printed: 03/31/2	008 19:13:26
OCCUPAN	CY CODE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	78.64	83.67	75.70	32.6	2 110.53	27.52	150.97	52.70 to 105.33	48,111	36,418
300	4	98.76	100.90	98.42	5.8	7 102.52	92.03	114.05	N/A	117,250	115,400
306	2	95.29	95.29	94.70	1.4	5 100.63	93.91	96.67	N/A	105,000	99,432
323	1	99.46	99.46	99.46			99.46	99.46	N/A	130,000	129,300
343	1	98.74	98.74	98.74			98.74	98.74	N/A	89,500	88,375
344	2	100.13	100.13	100.09	0.8	1 100.04	99.31	100.94	N/A	83,750	83,825
350	2	81.78	81.78	90.80	21.1	3 90.07	64.50	99.06	N/A	115,000	104,416
352	1	98.49	98.49	98.49			98.49	98.49	N/A	220,000	216,681
353	4	97.83	93.95	89.80	4.6	8 104.61	81.39	98.73	N/A	80,000	71,841
405	1	97.35	97.35	97.35			97.35	97.35	N/A	62,000	60,355
406	4	96.59	97.62	99.93	4.1	3 97.69	92.50	104.79	N/A	75,500	75,443
436	1	98.86	98.86	98.86			98.86	98.86	N/A	263,000	260,000
442	1	99.86	99.86	99.86			99.86	99.86	N/A	165,000	164,761
95	1	73.95	73.95	73.95			73.95	73.95	N/A	220,000	162,695
98	1	97.89	97.89	97.89			97.89	97.89	N/A	65,000	63,630
AL1	L										

99.99

27.52 150.97 94.75 to 98.86

95,600

88,561

35

98.18 92.62 92.64

#### **Commerical Real Property**

#### I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The following tables and their narratives will show that all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any of these could be used to designate the overall level of value for the commercial property class. Since the difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median is less than two points (1.32), and thus both figures strongly support each other, for purposes of direct equalization and with the support of an exceptional coefficient of dispersion, the median will be used as the point estimate for the commercial overall level of value.

It will further be shown that the quality of assessment for the commercial property class is well within compliance, as indicated by an overall COD of 11.22 and a PRD of 99.99. These overall qualitative statistics are the result of the 2008 assessment actions taken to address the commercial property class that included the complete reappraisal & reassessment of commercial property.

### 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(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) 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 Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
2008	81	35	43.21
2007	82	53	64.63
2006	80	46	57.5
2005	79	50	63.29
2004	89	53	59.55
2003	94	58	61.7
2002	93	60	64.52
2001	89	66	74.16

COMMERCIAL: The percentage of sales used for assessment year 2008 appears to be the lowest figure historically. However, a review of the total commercial sales file reveals that twenty-seven sales were coded as substantially changed (due to additions, remodeling, etc.), and these were removed from the sales file. This leaves fifty-four sales, and thirty-five used would be a percentage of 64.81%.

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

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

#### Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	87.47	10.73	96.86	98.18
2007	87.78	9.69	96.28	92.56
2006	92.97	6.14	98.68	96.44
2005	84.17	7.71	90.66	94.92
2004	92.63	0.56	93.15	92.63
2003	97	0.27	97.26	98
2002	75	34.9	101.18	99
2001	92	1.6	93.47	92

COMMERCIAL: As Table III reveals, the difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median is less than two points (1.32), and thus both figures strongly support each other.

### 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 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 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 sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

#### Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
26.96	2008	10.73
6.01	2007	9.82
0.89	2006	6.14
3.03	2005	7.71
0	2004	0.56
0	2003	0.27
30.5	2002	34.9
0	2001	1.6

COMMERCIAL: As shown in the above table, the difference between the percent change in the sales file compared with the percent change to the commercial base is 16.23 points, and appears to be significant. Assessment actions taken to address commercial property for 2008 included the complete reappraisal & reassessment of commercial property. All commercial properties were reviewed and updated. If all commercial property was reappraised, there is no reason why there should be such a significant difference between the two figures. Conversation with the Dawes County Assessor revealed that some unique commercial property is over-represented in the small sample representing the sales file: 1 mobile home park, 2 bars/restaurants, 1 carwash. With a small sample size of thirty-five sales, it may be appropriate to question whether or not the sample is truly representative of the 484 total commercial parcels in Dawes County. However, based on the liaison's knowledge of the County, the liaison feels comfortable with the assessment practices of the Assessor regarding the reappraisal of commercial property within the County, and does not believe that there is a difference in the assessment of the sold versus the unsold property.

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has 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. Since 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 the 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, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	98.18	92.64	92.62

COMMERCIAL: As shown in Table V above, all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any of these could be used to designate the overall level of value for the commercial property class. For purposes of direct equalization and with the support of an exceptional coefficient of dispersion, the median will be used as the point estimate for the commercial overall level of value.

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

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. 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. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

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

	COD	PRD	
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	11.22	99.99	
Difference	0	0	

COMMERCIAL: The quality of assessment for the commercial property class is well within compliance, as indicated by an overall COD of 11.22 and a PRD of 99.99. These overall qualitative statistics are the result of the 2008 assessment actions taken to address the commercial property class that included the complete reappraisal & reassessment of commercial property.

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
Number of Sales	35	35	0
Median	87.47	98.18	10.71
Wgt. Mean	75.63	92.64	17.01
Mean	80.63	92.62	11.99
COD	30.86	11.22	-19.64
PRD	106.61	99.99	-6.62
Min Sales Ratio	22.64	27.52	4.88
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	150.97	150.97	0

COMMERCIAL: Assessment actions taken to address commercial property for 2008 included the complete reappraisal & reassessment of commercial property. All commercial properties were reviewed and updated. Table VII appears to reflect these actions.

# Dawes County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

### Agricultural

The County completed pickup work and made a review of the agriculture sales and market figures in order to make adjustments. The County also reviewed completed NRD records to update irrigated land. The adjustments made to agricultural land were in Market Area One as follows: All subclasses of Irrigated, Dry and Grass land were increased to more closely match 75% of the market. Waste land remained unchanged.

### **2008** Assessment Survey for Dawes County

### **Agricultural Appraisal Information**

	Data collection done by:
	Assessor's Office
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor's Office
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor's Office
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically
	define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Agriculture land and horticulture land shall mean land which is primarily used for the production of agriculture or horticulture products. This includes wasteland lying in or adjacent to and in common ownership or management with land used for the production of agriculture or horticulture products. Agriculture land and horticulture land also includes land retained or protected for future agriculture or horticulture uses under a conservation easement as provided in the Conservation and Preservation Easements Act and land enrolled in a federal or state program in which payments are received for removing such land from agriculture or horticulture production.
	Land that is zoned predominantly for purposes other than agriculture or horticulture use shall not be assessed as agriculture or horticulture land.
	Agriculture or Horticulture use includes the production of agriculture or horticulture products including:  • Grains and feed crops  • Forages and sod crops  • Animal production: breeding, feeding, grazing of cattle, horses, swine,
	<ul> <li>sheep, goats, bees or poultry</li> <li>Fruits, vegetables, flowers, seeds, grasses, trees, timber and other horticulture crops.</li> </ul>
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The Income Approach has not been utilized.
6.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?

1976						
What date was the last countywide land use study completed?						
Last completed 1976. Have begun new study using GIS Software						
By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)						
GIS						
By whom?						
Part time employee in charge of GIS						
What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?						
85% complete						
Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:						
Three						
How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class?						
Geographically						
Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?						
Yes						

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:** 

	- 10		
Permits	<b>Information Statements</b>	Other	Total
0	5	0	5

### 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Dawes 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 Dawes County is 72% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Dawes County is not 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 Dawes County is 72% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Dawes County is not 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 Dawes County is 69% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Dawes County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.

Ruth A. Sorensen

Kuth a. Sorense

Property Tax Administrator

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for Dawes County

#### I. Agricultural Land Value Correlation

The "Dawes County Agricultural Land Sales Criteria Special Agriculture Value" document that was submitted by the assessor for assessment year 2008 (included in the Reports and Opinions), states, "Market Areas 1 and 2, the north and south parts of the county, are primarily used for agriculture purposes and the land values are not influenced by non-agriculture market factors." Further, Market Area 3, the Pine Ridge area "includes trees and bluffs and has a market demand that exceeds agriculture use."

The assessor includes other criteria used to "select the sales that are utilized in the analysis to estimate the accurate agriculture value." These would be unimproved sales and not further excluded by the following: a) sales of less than 80 acres; b) sales within market area 3; c) sales immediately in the Chadron and Crawford area; d) sales with the following market influences: location within 2-3 miles of Market Area 3 that have similar characteristics of area 3; and "sales for recreational use." This would be confirmed by a sale that has a recapture amount that is different from the agricultural value applied to land in Market Areas 1 and 2.

For assessment year 2008, the agricultural unimproved sales file reveals that twenty sales occurred during the three-year period of the sales study that were qualified by the County and coded as existing geographically within Market Area 1. One of these sales was less than eighty acres (39) and was "excluded from analysis." Five qualified sales occurring during the same timeframe were coded as existing in Market Area 2. Of these, two were less than eighty acres (1.88, and 55.96 acres), and the remaining three indicated a recapture value different from the value applied to agricultural land, and were thus viewed by the assessor as having non-agricultural influence. Thus, 19 qualified sales (all from Market Area 1) matched the criteria noted by the assessor in the aforementioned document as representing agricultural land value within Dawes County.

A review of the three measures of central tendency indicates an overall median of 71.70%, a weighted mean of 66.16% and a mean of 68.04%. Only the median is within acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is 26.47 and the price-related differential is 102.83. The removal of the two extreme outliers would fail to bring the remaining two measures of central tendency within acceptable range, nor would this action bring the coefficient of dispersion into compliance. Based on these figures, and the overall assessment practices of the County, it is believed that the county has met the required level of value for agricultural land, but is not in compliance with the standards for uniform and proportionate assessment.

23 - DAWES COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED			PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics  Type: Qualified  Base Stat							Query: 6609	PAGE:1 of 4	
					,		nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	7 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	19	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41.83	3 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	les Price	: 3	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.96		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 3	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98			46 to 79.62	( <i>unu</i> 114211 =0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value	: 2	2,242,120			11,0,1120,121,	20.70		30.	10 00 75.02	
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:13:50
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtr	rs											
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04	2	64.50	64.50	65.23	35.1	4 98.88	41.83	87.16	N/A	155,000	101,100
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A	130,000	117,100
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	3	63.98	55.09	62.92	24.8	6 87.56	26.79	74.50	N/A	147,500	92,800
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	2	63.84	63.84	59.86	51.1	3 106.66	31.20	96.48	N/A	311,939	186,712
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	2	83.10	83.10	76.41	17.1	8 108.76	68.82	97.37	N/A	228,800	174,815
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	2	55.17	55.17	48.59	30.1	1 113.53	38.56	71.78	N/A	165,500	80,422
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06	1	66.17	66.17	66.17			66.17	66.17	N/A	26,000	17,205
01/01/07	TO 03/31/07	1	87.16	87.16	87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
04/01/07	TO 06/30/07	4	66.47	66.72	45.15	30.5	3 147.78	31.62	102.34	N/A	101,953	46,033
Stud	ly Years											
07/01/04	TO 06/30/05	6	69.24	64.06	67.73	28.6	8 94.58	26.79	90.08	26.79 to 90.08	147,083	99,616
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	6	70.30	67.37	62.58	30.1	2 107.66	31.20	97.37	31.20 to 97.37	235,413	147,316
07/01/06	TO 06/30/07	7	71.70	72.03	69.53	22.8	0 103.59	31.62	102.34	31.62 to 102.34	156,258	108,645
Cale	endar Yrs											
01/01/05	TO 12/31/05	6	69.24	63.84	64.27	33.4	8 99.33	26.79	96.48	26.79 to 96.48	199,396	128,154
01/01/06	TO 12/31/06	6	70.30	71.11	72.07	18.8	6 98.67	38.56	97.37	38.56 to 97.37	219,100	157,901
ALL_												

19

71.70

68.04

66.16

26.47

102.83

26.79

102.34

41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

PAGE: 2 of 4

PAGE: 2 of 4

23 - DAI	WES COUNTY			PAD 2008	Special	Value Statisti	CS	Dase 5	ıaı		FAGE.2 OL 4
AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				7	Query: 6609						
					Type: Qualifi Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/	2007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER of Sales	ş:	19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41	83 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	:	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:			. Mean C.I.: 51		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:				56.46 to 79.62	( w. 11111 - 0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	2,242,120			1100.1100.010	10.70			70.10 00 77.02	
,	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:13:5C
GEO COD	DE / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
109	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
113	2	93.28	93.28	94.42	3.4	13 98.80	90.08	96.48	N/A	201,939	190,665
301	2	40.20	40.20	39.85	4.0	100.87	38.56	41.83	N/A	190,500	75,907
327	2	87.16	87.16	87.16	0.0	100.00	87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
329	1	61.24	61.24	61.24			61.24	61.24	N/A	68,000	41,640
331	1	26.79		26.79			26.79	26.79	N/A	65,000	17,415
589	2	68.94	68.94	69.66	4.0	98.96	66.17	71.70	N/A	35,206	24,525
77	1	71.78		71.78			71.78	71.78	N/A	100,000	71,780
79	1	97.37		97.37			97.37	97.37	N/A	121,600	118,400
81	1	102.34	102.34	102.34			102.34	102.34	N/A	24,400	24,970
817	1	68.82		68.82			68.82	68.82	N/A	336,000	231,230
819	1	31.20		31.20			31.20	31.20	N/A	350,000	109,195
821	1	63.98		63.98			63.98	63.98	N/A	192,500	123,165
823	2	53.06	53.06	49.01	40.4	108.26	31.62	74.50	N/A	228,000	111,750
ALI	<u></u>										
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	17 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.1	.6 178,357	118,006
AREA (M	IARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
1	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.1	.6 178,357	118,006
ALI	<u></u>										
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.1	.6 178,357	118,006
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOI	LL							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
2	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.1	.6 178,357	118,006
ALI											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.1	.6 178,357	118,006
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A	2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8	101.68	61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS	12	73.14	71.83	72.39	23.2	20 99.22	26.79	97.37	63.98 to 90.0	168,414	121,910
GRASS-N/	'A 4	61.26	64.01	58.17	47.5	110.05	31.20	102.34	N/A	276,350	160,740
IRRGTD-N	I/A 1	41.83	41.83	41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750
ALI	<u></u>										

102.83

26.79

102.34 41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

26.47

71.70

68.04

66.16

19

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 4 **PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics** 23 - DAWES COUNTY

ACRICIILT	IIDAI. IINIMPROVED					<u>value Stausuc</u>	28			Query: 6609		
AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED					Type: Qualifi		D. C 01/16					
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	72008			
	NUMBER of Sale		19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41.8	3 to 87.16	(!: Derived)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Pric		3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 51.9	6 to 80.37	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pric		3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98	95	% Mean C.I.: 56.	46 to 79.62		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Valu	ıe:	2,242,120									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Pric	ce:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34					
	AVG. Assessed Valu	ıe:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:13:50	
MAJORITY	Y LAND USE > 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8	101.68	61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742	
GRASS	14	73.14	69.79	69.38	25.0	100.59	26.79	97.37	31.62 to 90.08	205,069	142,275	
GRASS-N/A	A 2	70.45	70.45	44.65	45.2	157.78	38.56	102.34	N/A	127,700	57,017	
IRRGTD	1	41.83	41.83	41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750	
ALL												
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	17 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006	
MAJORITY	Y LAND USE > 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	2			65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742	
GRASS	16			67.36	27.3		26.79	102.34	38.56 to 90.08	195,398	131,617	
IRRGTD	1			41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750	
ALL										,	,	
		71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	17 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006	
SCHOOL I	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
07-0010	5	66.17	60.93	56.78	14.5	107.32	31.20	74.50	N/A	217,900	123,723	
23-0002	9			69.37	33.7		26.79	102.34	38.56 to 97.37	129,319	89,705	
23-0071	3			69.27	22.0		31.62	87.16	N/A	310,333	214,953	
81-0003	1			71.70			71.70	71.70	N/A	44,412	31,845	
83-0500	1			87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450	
NonValid		07.11	07.110	07.10			07.120	07.110	21,722	100,000	100,100	
ALL												
ADD_		71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006	
ACRES IN		71.70	00.04	00.10	20.3	102.03	20.75	102.54	41.03 00 07.10	Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	J MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
	ro 100.00 2			38.04	42.3		26.79	66.17	N/A	45,500	17,310	
100.01				56.21	26.6		41.83	102.34	N/A N/A	71,703	40,301	
330.01				59.50	27.2		31.20	97.37	31.62 to 90.08	190,110	113,110	
650.01		83.95	83.08	82.46	10.9	98 100.76	68.82	96.48	N/A	369,959	305,063	
ALL_				CC 15	0.5	100.00	06 80	100 24	41 02 : 05 15	150 055	110 000	
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006	

23 - DAWES COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics  Base Stat								PAGE:4 of 4
				Type: Qualified					Posted Before: 01/18/2008		Query: 6609	
	NUME	ER of Sales	:	19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	35.32	95% 1	Median C.I.: 41.	83 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	Land) TOTAL Sales Price:		:	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03			96 to 80.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	Land) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:		:	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98	_		5.46 to 79.62	(
(AgLand)	AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:		:	2,242,120						-		
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34					
AVG. Assessed Value:		:	118,006	PRD: 102.83 MIN Sales Ratio:		26.79			Printed: 04/02/2008 17:13:50			
SALE PR	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000 '	TO 2999	9 2	84.26	84.26	83.68	21.4	6 100.69	66.17	102.34	N/A	25,200	21,087
30000	TO 5999	9 1	71.70	71.70	71.70			71.70	71.70	N/A	44,412	31,845
60000 '	TO 9999	9 2	44.02	44.02	44.40	39.1	3 99.13	26.79	61.24	N/A	66,500	29,527
100000 '	TO 14999	9 3	90.08	86.41	87.39	9.4	7 98.87	71.78	97.37	N/A	117,200	102,426
150000 '	TO 24999	9 6	69.24	65.53	64.14	25.1	4 102.18	38.56	87.16	38.56 to 87.16	179,750	115,283
250000 '	TO 49999	9 4	50.22	57.03	56.08	51.0	2 101.69	31.20	96.48	N/A	307,719	172,583
500000	+	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
ALL												
		19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000 '	TO 2999	9 3	66.17	65.10	51.64	38.0	6 126.07	26.79	102.34	N/A	38,466	19,863
30000	TO 5999	9 2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8	7 101.68	61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
60000 '	TO 9999	9 4	40.20	45.95	41.13	27.0	1 111.72	31.62	71.78	N/A	188,000	77,318
100000 '	TO 14999	9 7	87.16	75.92	68.09	17.2	0 111.50	31.20	97.37	31.20 to 97.37	185,585	126,368
150000 '	TO 24999	9 1	68.82	68.82	68.82			68.82	68.82	N/A	336,000	231,230
250000 '	TO 49999	9 2	90.22	90.22	88.38	6.9	4 102.08	83.95	96.48	N/A	386,939	341,980
ALL												

102.83

26.79 102.34 41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

19

71.70

68.04 66.16

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for Dawes County

#### **II. Special Value Correlation**

Special agriculture value in the influenced Market Area 3, equals the uninfluenced agriculture value in Market Areas 1 and 2, as described in The "Dawes County Agricultural Land Sales Criteria" document. Since the assessor also provided other criteria used to "select the sales that are utilized in the analysis to estimate the accurate agriculture value," and these were also delineated in the previous section of the Agricultural Land Value Correlation—the nineteen sales from Market Area 1 used to establish the level of value for agricultural land will be used as the point estimate for the level of value for Special Value within Dawes County.

As shown in the statistical profile for Special Value, only the median at 71.70% is within range. The weighted mean is at 66.16% and the mean is 68.04%. The coefficient of dispersion is 26.47 and the price-related differential is 102.83. The removal of the two extreme outliers would fail to bring the weighted mean and the mean within acceptable range, nor would this action bring the COD into compliance. Based on these figures, and the overall assessment practices of the County, it is believed that the county has met the required level of value for special value, but is not in compliance with the standards for uniform and proportionate assessment.

23 - DAWES	S COUNTY RAL UNIMPRO	VED				Special	Value Statistics		Base St	tat	Query: 6609	PAGE:1 of 4
					,		eu age: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	7 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008	~ .	
	NUMBER	of Sales:	:	19	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41.83	3 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	les Price:	: 3	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.96		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price:	: 3	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98			46 to 79.62	( unu+14A1=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value:	: 2	2,242,120			11,01120.22	10.70		30.	10 00 77.02	
I	AVG. Adj. Sal	les Price:	:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:	:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:06:38
DATE OF S	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs	S											
07/01/04 T	0 09/30/04											
10/01/04 T	0 12/31/04	2	64.50	64.50	65.23	35.1	4 98.88	41.83	87.16	N/A	155,000	101,100
01/01/05 T	0 03/31/05	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A	130,000	117,100
04/01/05 T	06/30/05	3	63.98	55.09	62.92	24.8	6 87.56	26.79	74.50	N/A	147,500	92,800
07/01/05 T	0 09/30/05	2	63.84	63.84	59.86	51.1	3 106.66	31.20	96.48	N/A	311,939	186,712
10/01/05 T	0 12/31/05											
01/01/06 T	0 03/31/06	2	83.10	83.10	76.41	17.1	8 108.76	68.82	97.37	N/A	228,800	174,815
04/01/06 T	06/30/06	2	55.17	55.17	48.59	30.1	1 113.53	38.56	71.78	N/A	165,500	80,422
07/01/06 T	0 09/30/06	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
10/01/06 T	0 12/31/06	1	66.17	66.17	66.17			66.17	66.17	N/A	26,000	17,205
01/01/07 T	0 03/31/07	1	87.16	87.16	87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
04/01/07 T	0 06/30/07	4	66.47	66.72	45.15	30.5	3 147.78	31.62	102.34	N/A	101,953	46,033
Study	Years											
07/01/04 T	0 06/30/05	6	69.24	64.06	67.73	28.6	8 94.58	26.79	90.08	26.79 to 90.08	147,083	99,616
07/01/05 T	06/30/06	6	70.30	67.37	62.58	30.1	2 107.66	31.20	97.37	31.20 to 97.37	235,413	147,316
07/01/06 T	0 06/30/07	7	71.70	72.03	69.53	22.8	0 103.59	31.62	102.34	31.62 to 102.34	156,258	108,645
Calen	ndar Yrs											
01/01/05 T	0 12/31/05	6	69.24	63.84	64.27	33.4	8 99.33	26.79	96.48	26.79 to 96.48	199,396	128,154
01/01/06 T	0 12/31/06	6	70.30	71.11	72.07	18.8	6 98.67	38.56	97.37	38.56 to 97.37	219,100	157,901
ALL												

19

71.70

68.04

66.16

26.47

102.83

26.79

102.34

41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

Base Stat PAGE:2 of 4 PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics
Type: Qualified 23 - DAWES COUNTY Query: 6609

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

				Date Range:	07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007	Posted I	Before: 01/18/2008		
	NUMBER of Sales:	19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	35.32	95% Median C.I.:	41.83 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.96 to 80.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98	95% Mean C.I.:	56.46 to 79.62	(** ***********************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,242,120							

(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	e: 3	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98	95	% Mean C.I.: 56	.46 to 79.62	` ′
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	e: 2	2,242,120								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	<b>:</b>	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assessed Value	<b>:</b>	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02/2	2008 17:06:38
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
109	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
113	2	93.28	93.28	94.42	3.4	98.80	90.08	96.48	N/A	201,939	190,665
301	2	40.20	40.20	39.85	4.0	100.87	38.56	41.83	N/A	190,500	75,907
327	2	87.16	87.16	87.16	0.0	100.00	87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
329	1	61.24	61.24	61.24			61.24	61.24	N/A	68,000	41,640
331	1	26.79	26.79	26.79			26.79	26.79	N/A	65,000	17,415
589	2	68.94	68.94	69.66	4.0	98.96	66.17	71.70	N/A	35,206	24,525
77	1	71.78	71.78	71.78			71.78	71.78	N/A	100,000	71,780
79	1	97.37	97.37	97.37			97.37	97.37	N/A	121,600	118,400
81	1	102.34	102.34	102.34			102.34	102.34	N/A	24,400	24,970
817	1	68.82	68.82	68.82			68.82	68.82	N/A	336,000	231,230
819	1	31.20	31.20	31.20			31.20	31.20	N/A	350,000	109,195
821	1	63.98	63.98	63.98			63.98	63.98	N/A	192,500	123,165
823	2	53.06	53.06	49.01	40.4	108.26	31.62	74.50	N/A	228,000	111,750
ALL											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
ALL											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	ED & IOL	ь							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
ALL											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A	2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS	12	73.14	71.83	72.39	23.2		26.79	97.37	63.98 to 90.08	168,414	121,910
GRASS-N/		61.26	64.01	58.17	47.5	110.05	31.20	102.34	N/A	276,350	160,740
IRRGTD-N	/A 1	41.83	41.83	41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750
ALL	<del></del>										
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 4 PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics 23 - DAWES COUNTY

	ES COUNTI			<u>PAD 2008</u>	<u>Special</u>	value Statistic	<u>S</u>			0	
AGRICULT	GRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifi	ed				Query: 6609	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER of Sa	les:	19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41.8	3 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Pr	ice:	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.9		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pr	ice:	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98	_	% Mean C.I.: 56.		( <i>unu</i> 111111-0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Va	lue:	2,242,120			1100.1120.224	10.50		50.	10 00 75.02	
( 0 )	AVG. Adj. Sales Pr	ice:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assessed Va	lue:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:06:39
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	IT MEDIA	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A		2 66.4		65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS	1	.4 73.1		69.38	25.0		26.79	97.37	31.62 to 90.08	205,069	142,275
GRASS-N/		2 70.4		44.65	45.2		38.56	102.34	N/A	127,700	57,017
IRRGTD		1 41.8			-5.2		41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750
ALL			_ 12.03	11.00			-1.00	11.00	,	200,000	02,730
		 .9 71.7	0 68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	IT MEDIA	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		2 66.4		65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS		.6 73.1			27.3		26.79	102.34	38.56 to 90.08	195,398	131,617
IRRGTD		1 41.8					41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750
ALL											,
		 .9 71.7	0 68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
SCHOOL I	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	IT MEDIA	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
07-0010		5 66.1	7 60.93	56.78	14.5	107.32	31.20	74.50	N/A	217,900	123,723
23-0002		9 71.7	8 69.61	69.37	33.7	100.35	26.79	102.34	38.56 to 97.37	129,319	89,705
23-0071		3 83.9	5 67.58	69.27	22.0	97.56	31.62	87.16	N/A	310,333	214,953
81-0003		1 71.7	0 71.70				71.70	71.70	N/A	44,412	31,845
83-0500		1 87.1	6 87.16				87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
NonValid	School										
ALL											
		 .9 71.7	0 68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
ACRES II	N SALE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	IT MEDIA	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
50.01	ro 100.00	2 46.4	8 46.48	38.04	42.3	122.17	26.79	66.17	N/A	45,500	17,310
		4 66.4			26.6		41.83	102.34	N/A	71,703	40,301
330.01		.0 73.1			27.2		31.20	97.37	31.62 to 90.08	190,110	113,110
650.01		3 83.9		82.46	10.9		68.82	96.48	N/A	369,959	305,063
ALL									,	,	, . , .
		— .9 71.7	0 68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
	_	,,	. 00.01	30.10	20.1	202.03	20.75		11.00 00 07.10	1,0,557	110,000

23 - DAWES COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED						Query: 6609	PAGE:4 of 4						
							Гуре: Qualifi Date Ran	ea .ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	7 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008	2 3	
	NUM	BER of	Sales:		19	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	35.32	95% 1	Median C.I.: 41.	83 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL	Sales	Price:	:	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.		(!: Derivea) (!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj	.Sales	Price:		3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98			.46 to 79.62	( unu+11/11-0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL As	sessed	Value:		2,242,120			1100.1120.224	10.50		50	.10 00 75.02	
	AVG. Adj.	Sales	Price:		178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. As	sessed	Value:		118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:06:39
SALE PR	ICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		C	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$	_											
Tota	al \$	_											
10000 '	TO 2999	99	2	84.26	84.26	83.68	21.4	6 100.69	66.17	102.34	N/A	25,200	21,087
30000	TO 5999	99	1	71.70	71.70	71.70			71.70	71.70	N/A	44,412	31,845
60000 '	TO 999	99	2	44.02	44.02	44.40	39.1	3 99.13	26.79	61.24	N/A	66,500	29,527
100000	TO 1499	99	3	90.08	86.41	87.39	9.4	7 98.87	71.78	97.37	N/A	117,200	102,426
150000 '	TO 2499	99	6	69.24	65.53	64.14	25.1	4 102.18	38.56	87.16	38.56 to 87.16	179,750	115,283
250000 '	TO 4999	99	4	50.22	57.03	56.08	51.0	2 101.69	31.20	96.48	N/A	307,719	172,583
500000	+		1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
ALL		_											
			19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
ASSESSE	D VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		C	'OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lo	w \$	_											
Tota	al \$	_											
10000	TO 299	99	3	66.17	65.10	51.64	38.0		26.79	102.34	N/A	38,466	19,863
30000 '	TO 5999	99	2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8	7 101.68	61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
60000 '		99	4	40.20	45.95	41.13	27.0	1 111.72	31.62	71.78	N/A	188,000	77,318
100000 '	TO 1499	99	7	87.16	75.92	68.09	17.2	0 111.50	31.20	97.37	31.20 to 97.37	185,585	126,368
150000 '			1	68.82	68.82	68.82			68.82	68.82	N/A	336,000	231,230
250000 '	TO 4999	99	2	90.22	90.22	88.38	6.9	4 102.08	83.95	96.48	N/A	386,939	341,980
ALL		_											

26.47

102.83

26.79 102.34 41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

19

71.70 68.04 66.16

	23 - DAWES COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED					Special	Value Statistics		Base S	tat	Query: 6609	PAGE:1 of 4
					,		nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	7 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	19	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41.83	3 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	les Price	: 3	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.96		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 3	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98			46 to 79.62	( <i>unu</i> 114211 =0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value	: 2	2,242,120			11,0,1120,121,	20.70		30.	10 00 75.02	
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:13:50
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtr	rs											
07/01/04	TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04	TO 12/31/04	2	64.50	64.50	65.23	35.1	4 98.88	41.83	87.16	N/A	155,000	101,100
01/01/05	TO 03/31/05	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A	130,000	117,100
04/01/05	TO 06/30/05	3	63.98	55.09	62.92	24.8	6 87.56	26.79	74.50	N/A	147,500	92,800
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	2	63.84	63.84	59.86	51.1	3 106.66	31.20	96.48	N/A	311,939	186,712
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	2	83.10	83.10	76.41	17.1	8 108.76	68.82	97.37	N/A	228,800	174,815
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	2	55.17	55.17	48.59	30.1	1 113.53	38.56	71.78	N/A	165,500	80,422
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06	1	66.17	66.17	66.17			66.17	66.17	N/A	26,000	17,205
01/01/07	TO 03/31/07	1	87.16	87.16	87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
04/01/07	TO 06/30/07	4	66.47	66.72	45.15	30.5	3 147.78	31.62	102.34	N/A	101,953	46,033
Stud	ly Years											
07/01/04	TO 06/30/05	6	69.24	64.06	67.73	28.6	8 94.58	26.79	90.08	26.79 to 90.08	147,083	99,616
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	6	70.30	67.37	62.58	30.1	2 107.66	31.20	97.37	31.20 to 97.37	235,413	147,316
07/01/06	TO 06/30/07	7	71.70	72.03	69.53	22.8	0 103.59	31.62	102.34	31.62 to 102.34	156,258	108,645
Cale	endar Yrs											
01/01/05	TO 12/31/05	6	69.24	63.84	64.27	33.4	8 99.33	26.79	96.48	26.79 to 96.48	199,396	128,154
01/01/06	TO 12/31/06	6	70.30	71.11	72.07	18.8	6 98.67	38.56	97.37	38.56 to 97.37	219,100	157,901
ALL_												

19

71.70

68.04

66.16

26.47

102.83

26.79

102.34

41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

PAGE: 2 of 4

PAGE: 2 of 4

23 - DAWES COUNTY				PAD 2008	Special	Value Statistic	Base Stat				PAGE:2 of 4
AGRICULI	URAL UNIMPROVED				Гуре: Qualifi		20			Query: 6609	
				•	• •	nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	2007 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008		
	NUMBER of Sales:	:	19	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	35.32	95% 1	Median C T :	41.83 to 87.16	(1 D : 1)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:	: 3	,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03			51.96 to 80.37	(!: Derived) (!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price		,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98	_	% Mean C.I.:	56.46 to 79.62	(:: tana+NA1=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value		,242,120			AVG.ABS.DEV.	10.90	73	o ricair c.i	30.40 (0 79.02	
( 8)	AVG. Adj. Sales Price		178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02/	2008 17:13:50
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
109	1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730
113	2	93.28	93.28	94.42	3.4	98.80	90.08	96.48	N/A	201,939	190,665
301	2	40.20	40.20	39.85	4.0	100.87	38.56	41.83	N/A	190,500	75,907
327	2	87.16	87.16	87.16	0.0	100.00	87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
329	1	61.24	61.24	61.24			61.24	61.24	N/A	68,000	41,640
331	1	26.79	26.79	26.79			26.79	26.79	N/A	65,000	17,415
589	2	68.94	68.94	69.66	4.0	98.96	66.17	71.70	N/A	35,206	24,525
77	1	71.78	71.78	71.78			71.78	71.78	N/A	100,000	71,780
79	1	97.37	97.37	97.37			97.37	97.37	N/A	121,600	118,400
81	1	102.34	102.34	102.34			102.34	102.34	N/A	24,400	24,970
817	1	68.82	68.82	68.82			68.82	68.82	N/A	336,000	231,230
819	1	31.20	31.20	31.20			31.20	31.20	N/A	350,000	109,195
821	1	63.98	63.98	63.98			63.98	63.98	N/A	192,500	123,165
823	2	53.06	53.06	49.01	40.4	108.26	31.62	74.50	N/A	228,000	111,750
ALL											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 8	7.16 178,357	118,006
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
1	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 8	7.16 178,357	118,006
ALL											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 8	·	118,006
	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median		Assd Val
2	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 8	7.16 178,357	118,006
ALL	<del></del>										
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	118,006
	Y LAND USE > 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median		Assd Val
DRY-N/A	2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS	12	73.14	71.83	72.39	23.2		26.79	97.37	63.98 to 9		121,910
GRASS-N/		61.26	64.01	58.17	47.5	110.05	31.20	102.34	N/A	276,350	160,740
IRRGTD-N	/A 1	41.83	41.83	41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750

102.83

26.79

102.34

41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

26.47

\_\_ALL\_

19

71.70

68.04

66.16

23 - DAWES COUNTY

PAGE: 3 of 4

PAGE: 3 of 4

23 - DAW	ES COUNTY			PAD 2008	Special	<u>Value Statistic</u>	S	Dasc 5	tut		
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVED			Type: Qualifi					Query: 6609		
						nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER of Sales	s:	19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	cov:	35.32	95%	Median C.I.: 41.8	3 to 87.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	e:	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.9		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	<b>:</b> :	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98			46 to 79.62	( unu+11A1=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	e:	2,242,120			AVG.ADD.DEV.	10.50	, ,	v	10 00 75.02	
( )	AVG. Adj. Sales Price		178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34				
	AVG. Assessed Value		118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02/	/2008 17:13:50
MAJORTTS	Y LAND USE > 80%		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A	2	66.47		65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS	14	73.14		69.38	25.0		26.79	97.37	31.62 to 90.08	205,069	142,275
GRASS-N/A		70.45		44.65	45.2		38.56	102.34	N/A	127,700	57,017
IRRGTD	1	41.83		41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750
ALL		12.00	11.00	11.00			11.00	11.03	21, 22	250,000	027730
		71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
MAJORITY	Y LAND USE > 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	2	66.47		65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742
GRASS	16	73.14		67.36	27.3		26.79	102.34	38.56 to 90.08	195,398	131,617
IRRGTD	1	41.83		41.83			41.83	41.83	N/A	150,000	62,750
ALL										,	•
		71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
SCHOOL I	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
07-0010	5	66.17	60.93	56.78	14.5	5 107.32	31.20	74.50	N/A	217,900	123,723
23-0002	9	71.78	69.61	69.37	33.7	2 100.35	26.79	102.34	38.56 to 97.37	129,319	89,705
23-0071	3	83.95	67.58	69.27	22.0	5 97.56	31.62	87.16	N/A	310,333	214,953
81-0003	1	71.70	71.70	71.70			71.70	71.70	N/A	44,412	31,845
83-0500	1	87.16	87.16	87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	160,000	139,450
NonValid	School										
ALL_											
	19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
ACRES IN	N SALE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
50.01	TO 100.00 2	46.48	46.48	38.04	42.3	6 122.17	26.79	66.17	N/A	45,500	17,310
100.01	TO 180.00 4	66.47	69.28	56.21	26.6	9 123.26	41.83	102.34	N/A	71,703	40,301
330.01	TO 650.00 10	73.14	67.34	59.50	27.2	3 113.18	31.20	97.37	31.62 to 90.08	190,110	113,110
650.01 -		83.95		82.46	10.9		68.82	96.48	N/A	369,959	305,063
ALL											
		71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006
				<del>-</del>				- · · <del>-</del>		-,	-,

23 - DAW	VES COUNTY				PAD 2008 Special Value Statistics  Base Stat									
	URAL UNIM						Type: Qualifi					Query: 6609		
								age: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/200	7 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008			
	NUM	BER of Sa	ales:		19	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	35.32	95% 1	Median C.I.: 41.8	33 to 87 16	(!: Derived)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL	Sales Pi	rice:	3	3,388,791	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	24.03		. Mean C.I.: 51.9		(!: Derivea) (!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj	.Sales Pi	rice:	3	3,388,791	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.98			.46 to 79.62	( unu+11A1=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL As	sessed Va	alue:	2	2,242,120			11,01120121	20.70			.10 00 77.02		
	AVG. Adj.	Sales Pi	rice:		178,357	COD:	26.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.34					
	AVG. As	sessed Va	alue:		118,006	PRD:	102.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.79			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:13:50	
SALE PR	ICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COU	INT I	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Lo	w \$													
Tot	al \$													
10000	TO 299	99	2	84.26	84.26	83.68	21.4	6 100.69	66.17	102.34	N/A	25,200	21,087	
30000	TO 599	99	1	71.70	71.70	71.70			71.70	71.70	N/A	44,412	31,845	
60000	TO 999	99	2	44.02	44.02	44.40	39.1		26.79	61.24	N/A	66,500	29,527	
100000	TO 1499	99	3	90.08	86.41	87.39	9.4		71.78	97.37	N/A	117,200	102,426	
150000	TO 2499	99	6	69.24	65.53	64.14	25.1	4 102.18	38.56	87.16	38.56 to 87.16	179,750	115,283	
250000		99	4	50.22	57.03	56.08	51.0		31.20	96.48	N/A	307,719	172,583	
500000	+		1	83.95	83.95	83.95			83.95	83.95	N/A	500,000	419,730	
ALL														
			19	71.70	68.04	66.16	26.4	7 102.83	26.79	102.34	41.83 to 87.16	178,357	118,006	
	D VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COU	INT I	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
	w \$													
	al \$								06 50	100.04	/-	20.455		
10000			3	66.17	65.10	51.64	38.0		26.79	102.34	N/A	38,466	19,863	
30000			2	66.47	66.47	65.37	7.8		61.24	71.70	N/A	56,206	36,742	
60000			4	40.20	45.95	41.13	27.0		31.62	71.78	N/A	188,000	77,318	
100000			7	87.16	75.92	68.09	17.2		31.20	97.37	31.20 to 97.37	185,585	126,368	
150000			1	68.82	68.82	68.82	<i>c</i>		68.82	68.82	N/A	336,000	231,230	
250000		19	2	90.22	90.22	88.38	6.9	4 102.08	83.95	96.48	N/A	386,939	341,980	
ALL														

26.47

102.83

26.79 102.34 41.83 to 87.16

178,357

118,006

19

71.70 68.04 66.16

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for Dawes County

#### **III. Recapture Value Correlation**

A total of forty-seven qualified agricultural unimproved sales occurred during the three-year timeframe of the sales study. Of these, twenty-five were used to measure recapture value within the County. All twenty-two sales in the influenced Market Area 3 were used, as well as three sales in Market Area Two that consisted of eighty acres or more, and had a recapture amount different than the value used to assess non-influenced agricultural land. The measurement of recapture value for Dawes County will be based on the statistical profile of these twenty-five sales.

The statistical profile reveals an overall median of 69.47, a mean of 73.78 and a weighted mean of 82.13. Both the median and the mean are within acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is 29.05 and the price-related differential is 89.84—indicating assessment progressivity. Removal of the extreme outliers would fail to bring the remaining two measures of central tendency within range, and would further fail to move either qualitative statistic within compliance. For purposes of direct equalization, the median will be used to describe the overall level of recapture value. It is believed that the County has met the standard for required level of value for Recapture, but is not in compliance with the standards for uniform and proportionate assessment.

Base Stat PAGE:1 of 4 23 - DAWES COUNTY

23 - DAWES COUNTY  AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED			PAD 2008 Recapture Value Statistics  Base Stat  Ougry: 6600								
AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				7	Гуре: Qualifie	ed				Query: 6609	
					Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
NUMBER	of Sales	:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	69	COV:	41.03	95%	Median C.I.: 55.56	5 to 77.42	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	5,784,716	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.27		. Mean C.I.: 67.77		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	5,784,716	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.18	95	% Mean C.I.: 61.2	28 to 86.28	,
(AgLand) TOTAL Assess	sed Value	:	4,750,812								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	231,388	COD:	29.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.81				
AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	190,032	PRD:	89.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.64			Printed: 04/02/	/2008 16:49:07
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	2	84.76	84.76	104.37	39.2	2 81.21	51.52	118.00	N/A	487,720	509,010
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	78.52	78.52	78.52			78.52	78.52	N/A	633,433	497,345
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	4	75.60	76.69	99.26	25.4	8 77.26	44.30	111.24	N/A	223,625	221,965
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	5	72.98	81.03	72.40	29.2	2 111.91	54.63	143.35	N/A	257,930	186,754
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	80,000	58,000
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	108.19	108.19	134.05	48.6	4 80.70	55.56	160.81	N/A	88,500	118,635
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	63.13	62.75	66.29	15.6	9 94.67	47.71	77.42	N/A	120,180	79,666
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	59.66	58.10	64.48	21.2	8 90.11	31.64	77.69	N/A	256,935	165,674
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	58.47	58.47	57.20	9.9	6 102.22	52.64	64.29	N/A	44,737	25,588
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	7	78.52	79.26	96.00	26.1	1 82.56	44.30	118.00	44.30 to 118.00	357,624	343,317
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	72.74	86.75	79.46	36.4	9 109.17	54.63	160.81	54.63 to 160.81	193,331	153,630
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	61.40	59.57	64.48	17.6	4 92.38	31.64	77.69	47.71 to 77.42	173,469	111,854
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	74.51	79.04	82.30	25.3	9 96.03	44.30	143.35	54.63 to 111.24	281,758	231,897
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	63.13	69.79	71.63	30.4	2 97.42	31.64	160.81	47.71 to 77.69	172,928	123,876
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP	#									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
297	3	55.56	84.51	74.47	53.2	3 113.48	54.63	143.35	N/A	77,084	57,406
299	1	47.71	47.71	47.71			47.71	47.71	N/A	60,540	28,885
335	1	70.55	70.55	70.55			70.55	70.55	N/A	27,500	19,400
337	1	78.52	78.52	78.52			78.52	78.52	N/A	633,433	497,345
551	6	68.06	72.79	80.47	21.3	2 90.46	52.05	111.24	52.05 to 111.24	435,452	350,402
557	5	64.29		78.50	50.0		31.64	160.81	N/A	112,900	88,623
559	3	77.42		73.88	12.0		52.64	80.66	N/A	98,158	72,524
581	3	69.47		102.64	28.7		58.14	118.00	N/A	360,100	369,610
583	1	51.52		51.52			51.52	51.52	N/A	200,000	103,030
585	1	72.50		72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	80,000	58,000
ALL	_	5 0	750						,	22,000	22,200

89.84

31.64 160.81 55.56 to 77.42

231,388

190,032

29.05

69.47

25

73.78

82.13

Base Stat **PAD 2008 Recapture Value Statistics** PAGE:2 of 4 23 - DAWES COUNTY

AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVED	F.		_	<u>e value Staust</u>		Query: 6609				
			<u>.</u>	Type: Qualific	ea 19e: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008	<b>E</b> y.		
	NUMBER of Sales		25	MEDIAN:							
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price		,784,716	WGT. MEAN:	<b>69</b> 82	COV:	41.03		Median C.I.: 55.		(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price		,784,716			STD:	30.27		. Mean C.I.: 67.		(!: land+NAT=0)
	TOTAL Assessed Value		,750,812	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.18	95	% Mean C.I.: 61	.28 to 86.28	
(AgLand)	AVG. Adj. Sales Price		231,388	COD:	29.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.81				
	AVG. Assessed Value		190,032	PRD:	89.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.64			D : 1 1 04/00	/2000 4 / 40 07
		•	190,032	PRD:	09.04	MIN Sales Racio:	31.04			Printea: 04/02/ Avg. Adj.	/2008 16:49:07 Avg.
AREA (M. RANGE	ARKET) COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Assd Val
2	3	76.03	98.83	89.22	44.3		59.66	160.81	N/A	179,660	160,288
3	22	66.88	70.36	81.40	26.9		31.64	143.35	52.64 to 77.69	238,442	194,088
ALL		00.00	70.30	01.40	20.9	7 00.44	31.04	143.33	52.04 (0 77.09	230,442	194,000
АББ		69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroe	s! 7	52.64	50.11	46.91	13.7	9 106.81	31.64	64.29	31.64 to 64.29	81,430	38,201
DRY	2	101.51	101.51	73.93	41.2	2 137.31	59.66	143.35	N/A	150,366	111,160
GRASS	11	72.50	73.34	81.38	13.4	9 90.13	52.05	111.24	58.14 to 78.52	265,820	216,313
GRASS-N/	A 5	80.66	96.79	94.56	38.2	6 102.37	51.52	160.81	N/A	397,988	376,327
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroe	s! 7	52.64	50.11	46.91	13.7	9 106.81	31.64	64.29	31.64 to 64.29	81,430	38,201
DRY	2	101.51	101.51	73.93	41.2	2 137.31	59.66	143.35	N/A	150,366	111,160
GRASS	13	72.98	80.04	82.38	20.6	5 97.16	52.05	160.81	63.13 to 78.52	295,656	243,571
GRASS-N/	A 3	80.66	83.39	102.26	27.4	7 81.55	51.52	118.00	N/A	356,813	364,883
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroe	s! 7	52.64	50.11	46.91	13.7	9 106.81	31.64	64.29	31.64 to 64.29	81,430	38,201
DRY	2	101.51	101.51	73.93	41.2	2 137.31	59.66	143.35	N/A	150,366	111,160
GRASS	15	72.98	78.18	80.85	20.5	5 96.70	51.52	160.81	63.13 to 78.52	275,901	223,072
GRASS-N/	A 1	118.00	118.00	118.00			118.00	118.00	N/A	775,440	914,990
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032

**Base Stat** PAGE: 3 of 4 23 - DAWES COUNTY **PAD 2008 Recapture Value Statistics** Ouery: 6609 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008 NUMBER of Sales: 25 **MEDIAN:** 69 95% Median C.I.: 55.56 to 77.42 COV: 41.03 (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: (AgLand) 5,784,716 WGT. MEAN: 82 STD: 30.27 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 67.77 to 96.48 (!: land+NAT=0)TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 5,784,716 (AgLand) MEAN: 74 95% Mean C.I.: 61.28 to 86.28 AVG.ABS.DEV: 20.18 TOTAL Assessed Value: 4,750,812 (AgLand) AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 231,388 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 160.81 29.05 AVG. Assessed Value: 190,032 PRD: 89.84 MIN Sales Ratio: 31.64 Printed: 04/02/2008 16:49:07 Avg. Avg. Adj. SCHOOL DISTRICT \* Sale Price Assd Val RANGE MEDIAN WGT. MEAN COD 95% Median C.I. COUNT MEAN PRD MIN MAX (blank) 07-0010 1 72.50 72.50 72.50 72.50 72.50 N/A 80,000 58,000 23-0002 12 66.84 73.92 79.10 27.63 93.45 47.71 143.35 54.63 to 78.52 297,120 235,022 23-0071 12 66.88 73.74 87.53 34.87 84.25 31.64 160.81 51.52 to 80.66 178,272 156,045 81-0003 83-0500 NonValid School ALL 25 69.47 73.78 82.13 29.05 89.84 31.64 160.81 55.56 to 77.42 231,388 190,032 Avg. Adj. Avg. ACRES IN SALE Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 10.01 TO 30.00 4 54.10 55.05 53.87 9.01 102.18 47.71 64.29 N/A 48,753 26,265 30.01 TO 50.00 1 70.55 70.55 70.55 70.55 70.55 N/A 27,500 19,400 50.01 TO 100.00 4 49.47 50.77 48.43 25.87 104.83 31.64 72.50 N/A 113,750 55,087 100.01 TO 180.00 6 66.30 77.80 67.96 30.21 114.49 52.05 143.35 52.05 to 143.35 132,352 89,940 180.01 TO 330.00 4 67.85 66.16 64.35 15.58 102.81 51.52 77.42 N/A 187,995 120,972 330.01 TO 650.00 1 160.81 160.81 160.81 160.81 160.81 N/A 132,000 212,270 650.01 + 5 78.52 91.69 92.45 20.01 99.17 72.98 118.00 N/A 685,821 634,040 ALL 25 69.47 73.78 82.13 29.05 89.84 31.64 160.81 55.56 to 77.42 231,388 190,032 SALE PRICE \* Avg. Adj. Avg.

COD

41.49

15.15

47.58

Exhibit 23-Page78

PRD

98.00

96.45

99.08

MIN

70.55

52.64

47.71

31.64

RANGE

\_\_Low \$\_\_ Total \$

29999

59999

99999

149999

249999

10000 TO

30000 TO

60000 TO

100000 TO

150000 TO

500000 +

ALL

COUNT

4

3

6

6

5

25

MEDIAN

70.55

59.93

72.50

62.05

58.90

78.52

69.47

MEAN

70.55

78.96

66.96

73.05

60.09

91.69

73.78

WGT. MEAN

70.55

80.57

69.42

73.72

59.49	10.50	101.00	51.52	76.03	51.52 to 76.03	184,730	109,902
92.45	20.01	99.17	72.98	118.00	N/A	685,821	634,040
82.13	29.05	89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032

MAX

70.55

80.66

143.35

160.81

95% Median C.I.

N/A

N/A

N/A

31.64 to 160.81

Sale Price

27,500

46,431

78,513

133,076

Assd Val

19,400

37,411

54,505

98,105

23 - DAW	ES COUNTY			P	AD 2008 R	ecaptur	e Value Statisti	cs	Base St	tat		PAGE:4 of 4
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPRO	OVED				ype: Qualific					Query: 6609	
							ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	07 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	69	COV:	41.03	95% 1	Median C.I.: 55.56	5 to 77.42	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 5	5,784,716	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.27	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 67.77	7 to 96.48	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	ales Price	: 5	5,784,716	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.18	95	% Mean C.I.: 61.2	28 to 86.28	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 4	1,750,812								
	AVG. Adj. Sa	ales Price	:	231,388	COD:	29.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.81				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	190,032	PRD:	89.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.64			Printed: 04/02/	2008 16:49:07
ASSESSEI	VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000	го 29999	5	55.56	58.15	55.93	12.4	2 103.96	47.71	70.55	N/A	44,503	24,892
30000	ro 59999	3	44.30	49.48	45.81	30.7	4 108.01	31.64	72.50	N/A	106,666	48,866
60000	го 99999	6	60.64	75.33	65.37	33.6	2 115.23	52.05	143.35	52.05 to 143.35	130,442	85,273
100000	го 149999	5	69.47	66.82	65.18	12.1	7 102.51	51.52	77.42	N/A	179,688	117,128
150000	го 249999	1	160.81	160.81	160.81			160.81	160.81	N/A	132,000	212,270
250000	го 499999	2	78.10	78.10	78.13	0.5	3 99.97	77.69	78.52	N/A	597,084	466,482
500000 -	+	3	111.24	100.74	100.10	13.4	9 100.64	72.98	118.00	N/A	744,980	745,745
ALL_												
		25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032

Base Stat PAD 2008 Pacantura Valua Statistics PAGE:1 of 4 23 - DAWES COUNTY

23 - DAWES	COUNTY		L	P	AD 2008 R	ecaptur	<u>re Value Statist</u>	ics	Dase S	iai		PAGE:I OI 4
AGRICULTUR	AL UNIMPRO	VED	_		7	Гуре: Qualific	ed				Query: 6609	
							nge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	/2008		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	69	COV:	41.03	95%	Median C.I.: 55.5	6 to 77 42	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	es Price	: 5	,784,716	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.27		. Mean C.I.: 67.7		(!: Derivea) (!: land+NAT=0)
. •	OTAL Adj.Sal	es Price	: 5	,784,716	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.18	_		28 to 86.28	(:: unu+NA1=0)
	TOTAL Assess	sed Value	: 4	,750,812			AVG.ADS.DEV.	20.10	, , ,	o ricair c.i oi.	20 00 00.20	
. •	VG. Adj. Sal	es Price	:	231,388	COD:	29.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.81				
	AVG. Assess			190,032	PRD:	89.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.64			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:11:42
DATE OF SA	ALE *			-							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs_												
07/01/04 TO	09/30/04											
10/01/04 TO	12/31/04	2	84.76	84.76	104.37	39.2	2 81.21	51.52	118.00	N/A	487,720	509,010
01/01/05 TO	03/31/05	1	78.52	78.52	78.52			78.52	78.52	N/A	633,433	497,345
04/01/05 TO	06/30/05	4	75.60	76.69	99.26	25.4	8 77.26	44.30	111.24	N/A	223,625	221,965
07/01/05 TO	09/30/05	5	72.98	81.03	72.40	29.2	2 111.91	54.63	143.35	N/A	257,930	186,754
10/01/05 TO	12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO	03/31/06	1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	80,000	58,000
04/01/06 TO	06/30/06	2	108.19	108.19	134.05	48.6	4 80.70	55.56	160.81	N/A	88,500	118,635
07/01/06 TO	09/30/06	3	63.13	62.75	66.29	15.6	9 94.67	47.71	77.42	N/A	120,180	79,666
10/01/06 TO	12/31/06	5	59.66	58.10	64.48	21.2	8 90.11	31.64	77.69	N/A	256,935	165,674
01/01/07 TO	03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO	06/30/07	2	58.47	58.47	57.20	9.9	6 102.22	52.64	64.29	N/A	44,737	25,588
Study	Years											
07/01/04 TO	06/30/05	7	78.52	79.26	96.00	26.1	1 82.56	44.30	118.00	44.30 to 118.00	357,624	343,317
07/01/05 TO	06/30/06	8	72.74	86.75	79.46	36.4	9 109.17	54.63	160.81	54.63 to 160.81	193,331	153,630
07/01/06 TO	06/30/07	10	61.40	59.57	64.48	17.6	4 92.38	31.64	77.69	47.71 to 77.42	173,469	111,854
Calend	lar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO	12/31/05	10	74.51	79.04	82.30	25.3	9 96.03	44.30	143.35	54.63 to 111.24	281,758	231,897
01/01/06 TO	12/31/06	11	63.13	69.79	71.63	30.4	2 97.42	31.64	160.81	47.71 to 77.69	172,928	123,876
ALL												
		25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
GEO CODE /	TOWNSHIP	#									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
297		3	55.56	84.51	74.47	53.2	3 113.48	54.63	143.35	N/A	77,084	57,406
299		1	47.71	47.71	47.71			47.71	47.71	N/A	60,540	28,885
335		1	70.55	70.55	70.55			70.55	70.55	N/A	27,500	19,400
337		1	78.52	78.52	78.52			78.52	78.52	N/A	633,433	497,345
551		6	68.06	72.79	80.47	21.3		52.05	111.24	52.05 to 111.24	435,452	350,402
557		5	64.29	75.41	78.50	50.0		31.64	160.81	N/A	112,900	88,623
559		3	77.42	70.24	73.88	12.0		52.64	80.66	N/A	98,158	72,524
581		3	69.47	81.87	102.64	28.7	2 79.76	58.14	118.00	N/A	360,100	369,610
583		1	51.52	51.52	51.52			51.52	51.52	N/A	200,000	103,030
585		1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	80,000	58,000
ALL												
		25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032

Base Stat PAD 2008 Recapture Value Statistics PAGE:2 of 4 23 - DAWES COUNTY

AGRICULI	URAL UNIMPROVED		1		Type: Qualifi	ed value Staust	102			Query: 6609	
						eu 19e: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/20	007 Posted	Before: 01/18	3/2008	~ .	
	NUMBER of Sales	:	25	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	41.03		Median C.I.: !	SE E6 +0 77 40	(1 P : 1)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price		5,784,716	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.27		. Mean C.I.:		(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price		5,784,716	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.18		% Mean C.I.: %		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value		4,750,812	1.22.21	, -	AVG.ABS.DEV.	20.18	93	Mean C.I	61.28 to 86.28	
(Figuria)	AVG. Adj. Sales Price		231,388	COD:	29.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.81				
	AVG. Assessed Value		190,032	PRD:	89.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.64			Printed: 01/02	/2008 17:11:43
AREA (M			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C		Assd Val
2	3	76.03		89.22	44.3	5 110.78	59.66	160.81	N/A	179,660	160,288
3	22	66.88	70.36	81.40	26.9		31.64	143.35	52.64 to 77.		194,088
ALL										,	•
		69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.	42 231,388	190,032
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
2	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.	42 231,388	190,032
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.	42 231,388	190,032
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroe	s! 7	52.64	50.11	46.91	13.7	9 106.81	31.64	64.29	31.64 to 64.	29 81,430	38,201
DRY	2	101.51	101.51	73.93	41.2	2 137.31	59.66	143.35	N/A	150,366	111,160
GRASS	11	72.50	73.34	81.38	13.4	9 90.13	52.05	111.24	58.14 to 78.	52 265,820	216,313
GRASS-N/	A 5	80.66	96.79	94.56	38.2	6 102.37	51.52	160.81	N/A	397,988	376,327
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.	42 231,388	190,032
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroe	s! 7	52.64	50.11	46.91	13.7	9 106.81	31.64	64.29	31.64 to 64.	29 81,430	38,201
DRY	2	101.51	101.51	73.93	41.2	2 137.31	59.66	143.35	N/A	150,366	111,160
GRASS	13	72.98	80.04	82.38	20.6	5 97.16	52.05	160.81	63.13 to 78.	52 295,656	243,571
GRASS-N/	A 3	80.66	83.39	102.26	27.4	7 81.55	51.52	118.00	N/A	356,813	364,883
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.	42 231,388	190,032
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroe	s! 7	52.64	50.11	46.91	13.7	9 106.81	31.64	64.29	31.64 to 64.	29 81,430	38,201
DRY	2	101.51	101.51	73.93	41.2	2 137.31	59.66	143.35	N/A	150,366	111,160
GRASS	15	72.98	78.18	80.85	20.5	5 96.70	51.52	160.81	63.13 to 78.	52 275,901	223,072
GRASS-N/	A 1	118.00	118.00	118.00			118.00	118.00	N/A	775,440	914,990
ALL											
	25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.	42 231,388	190,032

**Base Stat** PAGE: 3 of 4 23 - DAWES COUNTY **PAD 2008 Recapture Value Statistics Query:** 6609 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008 NUMBER of Sales: 25 **MEDIAN:** 69 95% Median C.I.: 55.56 to 77.42 COV: 41.03 (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: (AgLand) 5,784,716 WGT. MEAN: 82 STD: 30.27 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 67.77 to 96.48 (!: land+NAT=0)TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 5,784,716 (AgLand) MEAN: 74 95% Mean C.I.: 61.28 to 86.28 AVG.ABS.DEV: 20.18 TOTAL Assessed Value: (AgLand) 4,750,812 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 231,388 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 160.81 29.05 190,032 MIN Sales Ratio: AVG. Assessed Value: PRD: 89.84 31.64 Printed: 04/02/2008 17:11:43 Avg. Adj. Avg. SCHOOL DISTRICT \* Sale Price Assd Val RANGE MEDIAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. COUNT MEAN (blank) 07-0010 1 72.50 72.50 72.50 72.50 72.50 N/A 80,000 58,000 23-0002 12 66.84 73.92 79.10 27.63 93.45 47.71 143.35 54.63 to 78.52 297,120 235,022 23-0071 12 66.88 73.74 87.53 34.87 84.25 31.64 160.81 51.52 to 80.66 178,272 156,045 81-0003 83-0500 NonValid School ALL 25 69.47 73.78 82.13 29.05 89.84 31.64 160.81 55.56 to 77.42 231,388 190,032 Avg. Adj. Avg. ACRES IN SALE Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 10.01 TO 30.00 4 54.10 55.05 53.87 9.01 102.18 47.71 64.29 N/A 48,753 26,265 30.01 TO 50.00 1 70.55 70.55 70.55 70.55 70.55 N/A 27,500 19,400 50.01 TO 100.00 4 49.47 50.77 48.43 25.87 104.83 31.64 72.50 N/A 113,750 55,087 100.01 TO 180.00 6 66.30 77.80 67.96 30.21 114.49 52.05 143.35 52.05 to 143.35 132,352 89,940 187,995 180.01 TO 330.00 4 67.85 66.16 64.35 15.58 102.81 51.52 77.42 N/A 120,972 330.01 TO 650.00 1 160.81 160.81 160.81 160.81 160.81 N/A 132,000 212,270 650.01 + 78.52 91.69 92.45 20.01 99.17 72.98 118.00 N/A 685,821 634,040

050.01 +		5	70.54	91.09	92.45	20.01	99.17	12.90	110.00	N/A	003,021	034,040
ALL	_											
		25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.05	89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
Total \$	S											
10000 TO	29999	1	70.55	70.55	70.55			70.55	70.55	N/A	27,500	19,400
30000 TO	59999	4	59.93	78.96	80.57	41.49	98.00	52.64	143.35	N/A	46,431	37,411
60000 TO	99999	3	72.50	66.96	69.42	15.15	96.45	47.71	80.66	N/A	78,513	54,505
100000 TO	149999	6	62.05	73.05	73.72	47.58	99.08	31.64	160.81	31.64 to 160.81	133,076	98,105
150000 TO	249999	6	58.90	60.09	59.49	10.50	101.00	51.52	76.03	51.52 to 76.03	184,730	109,902
500000 +		5	78.52	91.69	92.45	20.01	99.17	72.98	118.00	N/A	685,821	634,040
ALL	_											
		25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.05	89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032

23 - DAW	ES COUNTY			P	AD 2008 R	ecaptur	e Value Statist	ics	Base S	tat		PAGE:4 of 4
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPR	OVED				ype: Qualifie	ed		<u>.</u>		Query: 6609	
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2	007 Posted	<b>Before: 01/18</b>	3/2008		
	NUMBE	R of Sales	;:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	69	COV:	41.03	95%	Median C.I.: 55.56	5 to 77.42	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	ales Price	: :	5,784,716	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.27	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 67.7	7 to 96.48	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	ales Price	:	5,784,716	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.18	95	% Mean C.I.: 61.:	28 to 86.28	(** ***********************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	ssed Value	:	4,750,812								
	AVG. Adj. Sa	ales Price	:	231,388	COD:	29.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.81				
	AVG. Asses	ssed Value	:	190,032	PRD:	89.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.64			Printed: 04/02	/2008 17:11:43
ASSESSEI	D VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lot	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000 5	TO 29999	5	55.56	58.15	55.93	12.4	2 103.96	47.71	70.55	N/A	44,503	24,892
30000	TO 59999	3	44.30	49.48	45.81	30.7	4 108.01	31.64	72.50	N/A	106,666	48,866
60000 5	TO 99999	6	60.64	75.33	65.37	33.6	2 115.23	52.05	143.35	52.05 to 143.35	130,442	85,273
100000	TO 149999	5	69.47	66.82	65.18	12.1	7 102.51	51.52	77.42	N/A	179,688	117,128
150000	TO 249999	1	160.81	160.81	160.81			160.81	160.81	N/A	132,000	212,270
250000 5	TO 499999	2	78.10	78.10	78.13	0.5	3 99.97	77.69	78.52	N/A	597,084	466,482
500000	+	3	111.24	100.74	100.10	13.4	9 100.64	72.98	118.00	N/A	744,980	745,745
ALL												
		25	69.47	73.78	82.13	29.0	5 89.84	31.64	160.81	55.56 to 77.42	231,388	190,032

### Dawes County Agriculture Land Sales Criteria Special Agriculture Value Tax Year 2008

Dawes County is using "Special value" for tax year 2008. The special agriculture value will be used on a county wide basis.

The county is divided into three agriculture market areas with each market area analyzed separately. Market areas 1 and 2, the north and south parts of the county, are primarily used for agriculture purposes and the land values are not influenced by non-agriculture market factors. Market area 3, the Pine Ridge area, includes trees and bluffs and has a market demand that exceeds agriculture use.

Following is the criteria used to select the sales that are utilized in the analysis to estimate the accurate agriculture value.

#### Included in analysis:

- A. Sales that do not include improvements.
- B. All other agriculture land sales not specifically excluded below.

#### Excluded from analysis:

- A. Sales less than 80 acres (valued on size basis)
- B. Non-Agriculture sales within market area 3.
- C. Sales immediately in the Chadron and Crawford area.
- D. Sales that include the following market influences:
  - 1. Location is within 2-3 miles of market area 3 and includes characteristics similar to that in market area 3.
  - 2. Sales for recreational use.

#### County 23 - Dawes

Total Real Property Value Records 7,092 Value 540,827,835 Total Growth 5,942,943 (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)

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

					$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$
ſ	Urb		SubU	rban	Rur	ral	Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
1. Res UnImp Land	287	1,701,380	48	391,069	106	1,123,317	441	3,215,766	
2. Res Improv Land	2,175	11,286,740	119	1,645,312	242	3,548,820	2,536	16,480,872	
3. Res Improvements	2,417	118,523,955	120	10,770,149	359	24,334,372	2,896	153,628,476	
4. Res Total	2,704	131,512,075	168	12,806,530	465	29,006,509	3,337	173,325,114	2,291,503
% of Total	81.03	75.87	5.03	7.38	13.93	16.73	47.05	32.04	38.55
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
									ĺ
Res+Rec Total	2,704	131,512,075	168	12,806,530	465	29,006,509	3,337	173,325,114	2,291,503
% of Total	81.03	75.87	5.03	7.38	13.93	16.73	47.05	32.04	38.55
				j				Ţ	Ĵ

#### County 23 - Dawes

Total Real Property Value Records 7,092 Value 540,827,835 Total Growth 5,942,943 (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)

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

	Urk	nan n	SubUrban		Rur	-a1	Y Total Y		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	GLOWCII
9. Comm UnImp Land	67	901,860	4	69,775	4	175,330	75	1,146,965	
10. Comm Improv Land	377	6,154,495	22	401,810	10	348,285	409	6,904,590	
11. Comm Improvements	377	48,591,749	22	2,158,370	10	1,387,125	409	52,137,244	
12. Comm Total	444	55,648,104	26	2,629,955	14	1,910,740	484	60,188,799	1,240,315
% of Total	91.73	92.45	5.37	4.36	2.89	3.17	6.82	11.12	20.87
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comm+Ind Total	444	55,648,104	26	2,629,955	14	1,910,740	484	60,188,799	1,240,315
% of Total	91.73	92.45	5.37	4.36	2.89	3.17	6.82	11.12	20.87
17. Taxable Total	3,148	187,160,179	194	15,436,485	479	30,917,249	3,821	233,513,913	3,531,818
% of Total	82.38	80.14	5.07	5.48	12.53	12.42	53.87	43.17	59.42
								<u> </u>	

Coulity 23 - Dawes	County	<b>/ 23 -</b>	Dawes
--------------------	--------	---------------	-------

## 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule II:Tax Increment I	Financing (TIF)	Urban			SubUrban				
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess			
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0			
19. Commercial	0	3,040	0	0	0	0			
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0			
21. Other	1	0	1,326,050	0	0	0			

	Records	<b>Rural</b> Value Base	Value Excess	Records	<b>Total</b> Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	3,040	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	1	0	1,326,050
22. Total Sch II				1	3,040	1,326,050

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records Urban			SubUrb	SubUrban		Rural	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	4	137,100	11	67,499,040	
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	24	0	1	0	

	Total		Growth
	Records	Value	
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	15	67,636,140	C
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	25	0	0
25. Mineral Interest Total	40	67,636,140	0

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	<b>Total</b> Records
26. Exempt	157	5	341	503

Schedule V: Agricultural Re	ecords Urban		SubUrban	SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	43	1,279,200	2,508	138,764,365	2,551	140,043,565	
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	41,350	28	1,068,765	651	47,152,372	680	48,262,487	
29. Ag-Improvements	1	1,600	28	2,612,890	651	48,757,240	680	51,371,730	
30. Ag-Total Taxable							3,231	239,677,782	

County 23 - Dawes	2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45								
Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:	_	Urban			SubUrban				
Non-Agricultural Detail	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value			
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0			
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	24	26.000	208,650			
33. HomeSite Improvements	1		1,600	24		2,012,595			
34. HomeSite Total									
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	1.000	2,000	1	1.000	2,000			
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	24	25.000	50,000			
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	25		600,295			
38. FarmSite Total									
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			128.680				
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0			
		Rural			Total		Growth		
04 11 0': 11 1 1	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Value		
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	20	20.000	109,905	20	20.000	109,905			
32. HomeSite Improv Land	546	579.000	4,084,770	570	605.000	4,293,420			
33. HomeSite Improvements	556		38,240,772	581		40,254,967	200,795		
34. HomeSite Total				601	625.000	44,658,292			
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	10	11.000	15,000	12	13.000	19,000			
36. FarmSite Impr Land	567	568.000	868,882	591	593.000	918,882			
37. FarmSite Improv	610		10,516,468	635		11,116,763	2,210,330		
38. FarmSite Total				647	606.000	12,054,645			
39. Road & Ditches		5,580.960			5,709.640				
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0			
41. Total Section VI				1,248	6,940.640	56,712,937	2,411,125		
Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:					0.1111				
Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Records	<b>Urban</b> Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value			
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0			
		Rural			Total				
10.00 0.00	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value			
42. Game & Parks	34	5,432.120	3,050,100	34	5,432.120	3,050,100			
Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value	Records	<b>Urban</b> Acres	Value	Records	SubUrban Acres	Value			
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	59	6,830.770	1,706,515			
44. Recapture Val			0			3,384,400			
		Rural			Total				
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value			
43. Special Value	2,211	534,369.130	124,012,650	2,270	541,199.900	125,719,165			
44. Recapture Val			198,707,160			202,091,560			

## County 23 - Dawes

#### 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail Market Area: 1					ı: 1			
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,639.470	2,220,075	3,639.470	2,220,075
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	488.260	246,575	488.260	246,575
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,315.030	552,310	1,315.030	552,310
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,990.720	1,676,095	3,990.720	1,676,095
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,979.180	761,985	1,979.180	761,985
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,712.490	1,299,375	3,712.490	1,299,375
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,477.890	517,260	1,477.890	517,260
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	16,603.040	7,273,675	16,603.040	7,273,675
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	25,025.320	8,883,445	25,025.320	8,883,445
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	752.090	240,670	752.090	240,670
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,492.020	4,317,230	13,492.020	4,317,230
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,688.640	1,772,485	6,688.640	1,772,485
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,653.300	2,028,125	7,653.300	2,028,125
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,931.700	2,232,940	8,931.700	2,232,940
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,929.500	376,250	1,929.500	376,250
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	64,472.570	19,851,145	64,472.570	19,851,145
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,577.630	1,037,520	3,577.630	1,037,520
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	23,175.370	7,184,355	23,175.370	7,184,355
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,361.940	890,910	3,361.940	890,910
66. 2G	0.000	0	54.000	14,310	32,787.460	8,688,680	32,841.460	8,702,990
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	15,892.760	3,574,015	15,892.760	3,574,015
68. 3G	0.000	0	151.000	27,935	41,445.220	7,667,125	41,596.220	7,695,060
69. 4G1	0.000	0	9.000	1,665	35,549.545	6,576,670	35,558.545	6,578,335
70. 4G	0.000	0	234.170	43,320	290,198.475	53,684,785	290,432.645	53,728,105
71. Total	0.000	0	448.170	87,230	445,988.400	89,304,060	446,436.570	89,391,290
72. Waste	0.000	0	2.000	40	4,328.210	86,565	4,330.210	86,605
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	823.470	555,295	823.470	555,295
74. Exempt	10.300		0.000		23,646.040		23,656.340	
75. Total	0.000	0	450.170	87,270	532,215.690	117,070,740	532,665.860	117,158,010

#### County 23 - Dawes

### 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market A			Area Detail	a Detail Market Area:			2		
	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	149.800	91,380	149.800	91,380	
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	143.400	60,230	143.400	60,230	
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	96.880	40,690	96.880	40,690	
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	78.100	27,335	78.100	27,335	
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	468.180	219,635	468.180	219,635	
Dryland:									
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	10,980.640	3,980,925	10,980.640	3,980,925	
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	165.800	53,055	165.800	53,055	
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	10,767.150	3,479,155	10,767.150	3,479,155	
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,202.720	319,820	1,202.720	319,820	
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	195.000	48,750	195.000	48,750	
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,734.170	1,192,150	4,734.170	1,192,150	
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	769.200	153,475	769.200	153,475	
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	28,814.680	9,227,330	28,814.680	9,227,330	
Grass:									
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,084.770	1,123,320	4,084.770	1,123,320	
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,615.580	1,655,020	5,615.580	1,655,020	
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	648.430	174,040	648.430	174,040	
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,773.670	3,447,935	13,773.670	3,447,935	
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,738.640	366,215	1,738.640	366,215	
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	413.860	72,430	413.860	72,430	
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,741.930	1,337,555	7,741.930	1,337,555	
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	31,985.320	5,561,640	31,985.320	5,561,640	
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	66,002.200	13,738,155	66,002.200	13,738,155	
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,122.200	22,445	1,122.200	22,445	
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	708.720	577,550	708.720	577,550	
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		991.080	,	991.080	,	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	97,115.980	23,785,115	97,115.980	23,785,115	

#### 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: A	gricultural Records	: AgLand Market	Area Detail		Market Area	: 3		
	Urban		SubUrban	1	Rural		Total	
Irrigated:	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	12.000	7,320	12.000	7,320
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	15.000	6,300	15.000	6,300
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	19.000	6,650	19.000	6,650
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	46.000	20,270	46.000	20,270
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	12.000	4,260	12.000	4,260
55. 1D	0.000	0	354.780	129,975	5,529.619	1,993,700	5,884.399	2,123,675
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	51.000	16,320	51.000	16,320
57. 2D	0.000	0	755.060	257,710	6,280.338	2,064,745	7,035.398	2,322,455
58. 3D1	0.000	0	428.330	113,510	3,053.480	837,955	3,481.810	951,465
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	100.000	26,645	100.000	26,645
60. 4D1	0.000	0	157.600	39,400	4,692.200	1,223,345	4,849.800	1,262,745
61. 4D	0.000	0	42.300	8,250	829.343	171,190	871.643	179,440
62. Total	0.000	0	1,738.070	548,845	20,547.980	6,338,160	22,286.050	6,887,005
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	243.230	66,890	54,711.970	16,056,190	54,955.200	16,123,080
64. 1G	0.000	0	280.310	83,240	3,852.604	1,198,690	4,132.914	1,281,930
65. 2G1	0.000	0	16.000	4,240	97.430	27,615	113.430	31,855
66. 2G	0.000	0	1,311.100	339,565	8,881.017	2,285,455	10,192.117	2,625,020
67. 3G1	0.000	0	273.270	57,935	3,795.111	835,795	4,068.381	893,730
68. 3G	0.000	0	34.000	5,950	425.000	74,375	459.000	80,325
69. 4G1	0.000	0	528.280	98,950	8,325.330	1,493,830	8,853.610	1,592,780
70. 4G	0.000	0	1,895.970	338,690	51,620.318	9,268,165	53,516.288	9,606,855
71. Total	0.000	0	4,582.160	995,460	131,708.780	31,240,115	136,290.940	32,235,575
72. Waste	0.000	0	28.000	560	125.200	2,505	153.200	3,065
73. Other	68.700	39,350	598.750	455,180	3,043.370	2,381,275	3,710.820	2,875,805
74. Exempt	0.000		691.620		53,165.280		53,856.900	
75. Total	68.700	39,350	6,946.980	2,000,045	155,471.330	39,982,325	162,487.010	42,021,720

### County 23 - Dawes

## 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

	Urban		SubUrbar	SubUrban		Rural		Total	
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	17,117.220	7,513,580	17,117.220	7,513,580	
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	1,738.070	548,845	113,835.230	35,416,635	115,573.300	35,965,480	
78.Grass	0.000	0	5,030.330	1,082,690	643,699.380	134,282,330	648,729.710	135,365,020	
79.Waste	0.000	0	30.000	600	5,575.610	111,515	5,605.610	112,115	
80.Other	68.700	39,350	598.750	455,180	4,575.560	3,514,120	5,243.010	4,008,650	
81.Exempt	10.300	10,300	691.620	340,475	77,802.400	37,582,990	78,504.320	37,933,765	
82.Total	68.700	39,350	7,397.150	2,087,315	784,803.000	180,838,180	792,268.850	182,964,845	

					Market Area: 1
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	3,639.470	21.92%	2,220,075	30.52%	609.999
2A1	488.260	2.94%	246,575	3.39%	505.007
2A	1,315.030	7.92%	552,310	7.59%	419.998
3A1	3,990.720	24.04%	1,676,095	23.04%	419.998
3A	1,979.180	11.92%	761,985	10.48%	385.000
4A1	3,712.490	22.36%	1,299,375	17.86%	350.000
4A	1,477.890	8.90%	517,260	7.11%	349.998
Irrigated Total	16,603.040	100.00%	7,273,675	100.00%	438.092
Dry:					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	25,025.320	38.82%	8,883,445	44.75%	354.978
2D1	752.090	1.17%	240,670	1.21%	320.001
2D	13,492.020	20.93%	4,317,230	21.75%	319.983
3D1	6,688.640	10.37%	1,772,485	8.93%	264.999
3D	7,653.300	11.87%	2,028,125	10.22%	265.000
4D1	8,931.700	13.85%	2,232,940	11.25%	250.001
4D	1,929.500	2.99%	376,250	1.90%	194.998
Dry Total	64,472.570	100.00%	19,851,145	100.00%	307.900
Grass:	- ,		-,,		
1G1	3,577.630	0.80%	1,037,520	1.16%	290.002
1G	23,175.370	5.19%	7,184,355	8.04%	309.999
2G1	3,361.940	0.75%	890,910	1.00%	264.998
2G	32,841.460	7.36%	8,702,990	9.74%	265.000
3G1	15,892.760	3.56%	3,574,015	4.00%	224.883
3G	41,596.220	9.32%	7,695,060	8.61%	184.994
4G1	35,558.545	7.96%	6,578,335	7.36%	185.000
4G	290,432.645	65.06%	53,728,105	60.10%	184.993
Grass Total	446,436.570	100.00%	89,391,290	100.00%	200.232
Irrigated Total	16,603.040	3.12%	7,273,675	6.21%	438.092
Dry Total	64,472.570	12.10%	19,851,145	16.94%	307.900
Grass Total	446,436.570	83.81%	89,391,290	76.30%	200.232
Waste	4,330.210	0.81%	86,605	0.07%	20.000
Other	823.470	0.15%	555,295	0.47%	674.335
Exempt	23,656.340	4.44%	,		
Market Area Total	532,665.860	100.00%	117,158,010	100.00%	219.946
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	16,603.040	97.00%	7,273,675	96.81%	
Dry Total	64,472.570	55.79%	19,851,145	55.19%	
Grass Total	446,436.570	68.82%	89,391,290	66.04%	
Waste	4,330.210	77.25%	86,605	77.25%	
Other	823.470	15.71%	555,295	13.85%	
Exempt	23,656.340	30.13%	000,290	10.0070	
Market Area Total	532,665.860	67.23%	117,158,010	64.03%	
market Alea Total	332,003.000	01.23/0	117,136,010	04.0370	

•					Market Area: 2
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	149.800	32.00%	91,380	41.61%	610.013
2A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A	143.400	30.63%	60,230	27.42%	420.013
3A1	96.880	20.69%	40,690	18.53%	420.004
3A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A1	78.100	16.68%	27,335	12.45%	350.000
4A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Irrigated Total	468.180	100.00%	219,635	100.00%	469.125
Dry:					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	10,980.640	38.11%	3,980,925	43.14%	362.540
2D1	165.800	0.58%	53,055	0.57%	319.993
2D	10,767.150	37.37%	3,479,155	37.70%	323.126
3D1	1,202.720	4.17%	319,820	3.47%	265.913
3D	195.000	0.68%	48,750	0.53%	250.000
4D1	4,734.170	16.43%	1,192,150	12.92%	251.818
4D	769.200	2.67%	153,475	1.66%	199.525
Dry Total	28,814.680	100.00%	9,227,330	100.00%	320.230
Grass:	,		• •		
1G1	4,084.770	6.19%	1,123,320	8.18%	275.002
1G	5,615.580	8.51%	1,655,020	12.05%	294.719
2G1	648.430	0.98%	174,040	1.27%	268.402
2G	13,773.670	20.87%	3,447,935	25.10%	250.327
3G1	1,738.640	2.63%	366,215	2.67%	210.633
3G	413.860	0.63%	72,430	0.53%	175.010
4G1	7,741.930	11.73%	1,337,555	9.74%	172.767
4G	31,985.320	48.46%	5,561,640	40.48%	173.881
Grass Total	66,002.200	100.00%	13,738,155	100.00%	208.146
Irrigated Total	468.180	0.48%	219,635	0.92%	469.125
Dry Total	28,814.680	29.67%	9,227,330	38.79%	320.230
Grass Total	66,002.200	67.96%	13,738,155	57.76%	208.146
Waste	1,122.200	1.16%	22,445	0.09%	20.000
Other	708.720	0.73%	577,550	2.43%	814.919
Exempt	991.080	1.02%	·		
Market Area Total	97,115.980	100.00%	23,785,115	100.00%	244.914
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	468.180	2.74%	219,635	2.92%	
Dry Total	28,814.680	24.93%	9,227,330	25.66%	
Grass Total	66,002.200	10.17%	13,738,155	10.15%	
Waste	1,122.200	20.02%	22,445	20.02%	
Other	708.720	13.52%	577,550	14.41%	
Exempt	991.080	1.26%			
Market Area Total	97,115.980	12.26%	23,785,115	13.00%	
	37,113,000	12.2370	20,700,170	10.0070	

					Market Area: 3
Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	12.000	26.09%	7,320	36.11%	610.000
2A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A1	15.000	32.61%	6,300	31.08%	420.000
3A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A	19.000	41.30%	6,650	32.81%	350.000
Irrigated Total	46.000	100.00%	20,270	100.00%	440.652
Dry:					
1D1	12.000	0.05%	4,260	0.06%	355.000
1D	5,884.399	26.40%	2,123,675	30.84%	360.899
2D1	51.000	0.23%	16,320	0.24%	320.000
2D	7,035.398	31.57%	2,322,455	33.72%	330.109
3D1	3,481.810	15.62%	951,465	13.82%	273.267
3D	100.000	0.45%	26,645	0.39%	266.450
4D1	4,849.800	21.76%	1,262,745	18.34%	260.370
4D	871.643	3.91%	179,440	2.61%	205.864
Dry Total	22,286.050	100.00%	6,887,005	100.00%	309.027
Grass:		10010070	3,001,000		000.021
1G1	54,955.200	40.32%	16,123,080	50.02%	293.385
1G	4,132.914	3.03%	1,281,930	3.98%	310.175
2G1	113.430	0.08%	31,855	0.10%	280.834
2G	10,192.117	7.48%	2,625,020	8.14%	257.553
3G1	4,068.381	2.99%	893,730	2.77%	219.677
3G	459.000	0.34%	80,325	0.25%	175.000
4G1	8,853.610	6.50%	1,592,780	4.94%	179.901
4G	53,516.288	39.27%	9,606,855	29.80%	179.512
Grass Total	136,290.940	100.00%	32,235,575	100.00%	236.520
Irrigated Total	46.000	0.03%	20,270	0.05%	440.652
Dry Total	22,286.050	13.72%	6,887,005	16.39%	309.027
Grass Total	136,290.940	83.88%	32,235,575	76.71%	236.520
Waste	153.200	0.09%	3,065	0.01%	20.006
Other	3,710.820	2.28%	2,875,805	6.84%	774.978
Exempt	53,856.900	33.15%			
Market Area Total	162,487.010	100.00%	42,021,720	100.00%	258.615
As Related to the C	ounty as a Whol	e			
Irrigated Total	46.000	0.27%	20,270	0.27%	
Dry Total	22,286.050	19.28%	6,887,005	19.15%	
Grass Total	136,290.940	21.01%	32,235,575	23.81%	
Waste	153.200	2.73%	3,065	2.73%	
Other	3,710.820	70.78%	2,875,805	71.74%	
Exempt	53,856.900	68.60%		, 0	
Market Area Total	162,487.010	20.51%	42,021,720	22.97%	
	102, 107.010	_0.0170	12,021,120		

	Urban		SubUrbar	1	Rural		
AgLand	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	
Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	17,117.220	7,513,580	
Dry	0.000	0	1,738.070	548,845	113,835.230	35,416,635	
Grass	0.000	0	5,030.330	1,082,690	643,699.380	134,282,330	
Waste	0.000	0	30.000	600	5,575.610	111,515	
Other	68.700	39,350	598.750	455,180	4,575.560	3,514,120	
Exempt	10.300	10,300	691.620	340,475	77,802.400	37,582,990	
Total	68.700	39,350	7,397.150	2,087,315	784,803.000	180,838,180	

AgLand	Tota Acres	l Value	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	17,117.220	7,513,580	17,117.220	2.16%	7,513,580	4.11%	438.948
Dry	115,573.300	35,965,480	115,573.300	14.59%	35,965,480	19.66%	311.191
Grass	648,729.710	135,365,020	648,729.710	81.88%	135,365,020	73.98%	208.661
Waste	5,605.610	112,115	5,605.610	0.71%	112,115	0.06%	20.000
Other	5,243.010	4,008,650	5,243.010	0.66%	4,008,650	2.19%	764.570
Exempt	78,504.320	37,933,765	78,504.320	9.91%	37,933,765	20.73%	483.206
Total	792,268.850	182,964,845	792,268.850	100.00%	182,964,845	100.00%	230.937

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

## 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

#### 23 Dawes

	2007 CTL County Total	2008 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)	Percent Change	2008 Growth (New Construction Value)	% Change excl. Growth
1. Residential	169,289,196	173,325,114	4,035,918	2.38	2,291,503	1.03
2. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	44,299,040	44,658,292	359,252	0.81	*	0.81
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	213,588,236	217,983,406	4,395,170	2.06	2,291,503	0.98
5. Commercial	53,236,505	60,188,799	6,952,294	13.06	1,240,315	10.73
6. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	11,860,927	12,054,645	193,718	1.63	2,411,125	-18.7
8. Minerals	68,009,570	67,636,140	-373,430	-0.55	0	-0.55
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	133,107,002	139,879,584	6,772,582	5.09	3,450,645	2.5
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	346,695,238	357,862,990	11,167,752	3.22	5,942,943	1.51
11. Irrigated	5,163,460	7,513,580	2,350,120	45.51		
12. Dryland	35,058,570	35,965,480	906,910	2.59		
13. Grassland	122,705,790	135,365,020	12,659,230	10.32		
14. Wasteland	112,115	112,115	0	0		
15. Other Agland	4,156,765	4,156,765	-148,115	-3.56		
16. Total Agricultural Land	167,196,700	182,964,845	15,768,145	9.43		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	513,891,938	540,827,835	26,935,897	5.24	5,942,943	4.09

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

## 3 YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT ROBERTA "LINDY" COLEMAN DAWES COUNTY ASSESSOR

#### 2008 Tax Year

- Commercial Appraisal Completion
- New pictures for files
- GIS Completion
- Coding Error Corrections Completed
- Convert land calculations from CAMA to County Solutions for uniformity of land valuations
- Review and Update Assessor Locations
- Review and Update Market Area Boundaries

#### 2009 Tax Year

- Review Town of Chadron and Subdivisions
- New pictures for files
- Update Marshall & Swift files
- Complete coding corrections and updates not completed in 2008
- Begin adding Exempt parcels and their values
- Update and maintain GIS files

#### 2010 Tax Year

- Complete exempt parcel additions
- Review Rural Residential
- New pictures for files
- Review and Update Assessor Locations
- Update and maintain GIS files
- Assess system coding for maximum reporting capabilities

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Dawes County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	None
3.	Other full-time employees
	One clerical
4.	Other part-time employees
	One—for pickup work and GIS
5.	Number of shared employees
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$199,071
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$21,000
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$171,000
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$40,000
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$3,500
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	Part of budget
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$171,100
	XX/
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$16,820.31

## **B.** Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	County Solutions
2.	CAMA software
	MIPS
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	No
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	N/A
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes, GIS WorkShop
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS WorkShop
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

## **C. Zoning Information**

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Chadron & Crawford
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2002

## **D.** Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Contracted: Stanard Appraisal
2.	Other services
	GIS WorkShop Software, County Solutions for administrative, MIPS for CAMA and personal property software.

### Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 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 Dawes County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5555.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.

Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Divisio