

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

47 Howard

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	164	COD	20.76
Total Sales Price	\$13,203,484	PRD	106.97
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,169,584	COV	55.30
Total Assessed Value	\$11,919,487	STD	53.54
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$80,302	Avg. Abs. Dev.	19.42
Avg. Assessed Value	\$72,680	Min	13.33
Median	93.51	Max	720.63
Wgt. Mean	90.51	95% Median C.I.	90.87 to 96.13
Mean	96.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	86.70 to 94.32
		95% Mean C.I.	88.62 to 105.01
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			29.98
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			6.59
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			7.57
Average Assessed Value of the Base			63,326

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	164	93.51	20.76	106.97
2007	166	96.79	13.98	99.94
2006	171	98.13	11.46	100.81
2005	178	97.89	12.81	101.79
2004	182	96.63	15.45	102.13
2003	192	94	36.57	118.48
2002	202	92	38.53	111.41
2001	238	96	31.43	104.71

2008 Commission Summary

47 Howard

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	COD	12.98
Total Sales Price	\$1,254,347	PRD	99.85
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,191,247	COV	18.54
Total Assessed Value	\$1,159,891	STD	18.02
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$70,073	Avg. Abs. Dev.	12.31
Avg. Assessed Value	\$68,229	Min	67.08
Median	94.83	Max	141.54
Wgt. Mean	97.37	95% Median C.I.	87.97 to 110.01
Mean	97.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	87.69 to 107.04
		95% Mean C.I.	87.96 to 106.49
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			4.68
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			4.38
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.71
Average Assessed Value of the Base			63,412

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	17	94.83	12.98	99.85
2007	16	95.02	11.47	104.99
2006	25	99.35	14.26	98.53
2005	27	99.22	16.53	97.97
2004	31	97.25	22.94	95.93
2003	33	95	63.72	128.48
2002	40	100	61.41	115.03
2001	39	94	59.92	127.3

2008 Commission Summary

47 Howard

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	56	COD	20.22
Total Sales Price	\$10,919,194	PRD	104.44
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,740,194	COV	26.60
Total Assessed Value	\$7,703,498	STD	19.92
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$191,789	Avg. Abs. Dev.	14.47
Avg. Assessed Value	\$137,562	Min	45.30
Median	71.60	Max	135.43
Wgt. Mean	71.73	95% Median C.I.	67.63 to 76.45
Mean	74.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	66.48 to 76.97
		95% Mean C.I.	69.69 to 80.13
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			65.34
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			2.17
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.01
Average Assessed Value of the Base			133,167

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	56	71.60	20.22	104.44
2007	57	71.57	18.78	104.51
2006	90	76.73	16.80	105.65
2005	73	77.32	14.66	102.02
2004	72	76.39	15.48	100.71
2003	72	76	23.22	101.07
2002	83	74	24.78	101.19
2001	89	77	23.31	105.68

2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Howard 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 Howard County is 94% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Howard 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 Howard County is 93% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Howard County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen

Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	176	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	48.61	95% Median C.I.:	88.81 to 95.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,800,534	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	46.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.37 to 92.53
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,766,634	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	87.83 to 101.42
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,176,060						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,219	COD:	21.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	618.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,182	PRD:	106.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:25:54

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	27	99.94	98.05	97.09	9.04	101.00	59.42	124.94	93.09 to 103.48	91,714	89,043
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	94.43	93.45	92.45	13.63	101.08	65.41	117.12	70.56 to 106.83	78,670	72,731
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	20	94.08	94.43	92.66	16.24	101.91	55.39	142.77	83.70 to 102.20	64,818	60,061
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	31	88.00	93.33	90.45	18.53	103.18	61.14	142.60	78.26 to 100.33	62,944	56,934
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	28	91.92	87.91	87.73	17.41	100.20	13.33	122.99	81.86 to 100.00	95,755	84,004
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	75.41	72.54	70.69	31.03	102.62	24.08	122.79	42.28 to 94.04	67,575	47,770
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	21	88.47	92.18	80.62	24.17	114.34	21.42	169.63	76.40 to 107.50	108,757	87,680
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	23	92.22	116.99	90.16	44.18	129.76	35.66	618.20	82.70 to 102.97	51,630	46,552
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	90	94.97	95.01	93.63	14.65	101.47	55.39	142.77	89.79 to 99.97	74,089	69,368
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	86	89.34	94.23	83.58	28.68	112.74	13.33	618.20	85.02 to 93.78	82,542	68,987
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	93	88.39	88.80	87.09	19.81	101.97	13.33	142.77	84.17 to 94.04	73,923	64,377
<u>ALL</u>											
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RURAL	50	88.66	89.76	81.31	20.77	110.39	21.42	153.20	84.11 to 100.00	101,839	82,810
SMALL TOWN	36	96.07	98.09	94.47	16.83	103.84	61.14	169.63	89.79 to 101.64	45,111	42,614
ST PAUL	90	91.62	95.94	92.21	23.58	104.05	13.33	618.20	87.88 to 96.96	78,340	72,238
<u>ALL</u>											
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	116	92.73	97.32	92.31	22.05	105.42	35.66	618.20	88.81 to 97.20	67,115	61,954
3	60	89.99	89.43	83.42	20.61	107.21	13.33	153.20	87.00 to 99.97	99,687	83,154
<u>ALL</u>											
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	152	92.67	93.04	90.50	16.61	102.81	34.72	156.70	88.82 to 96.06	84,825	76,764
2	24	88.63	104.68	58.17	53.72	179.97	13.33	618.20	68.56 to 100.00	36,380	21,160
<u>ALL</u>											
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	176	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	48.61	95% Median C.I.:	88.81 to 95.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,800,534	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	46.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.37 to 92.53
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,766,634	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	87.83 to 101.42
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,176,060						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,219	COD:	21.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	618.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,182	PRD:	106.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:25:54

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	168	92.30	95.01	89.75	20.81	105.87	13.33	618.20	88.82 to 95.88	78,655	70,591
06	1	21.42	21.42	21.42			21.42	21.42	N/A	307,500	65,875
07	7	82.70	95.79	102.39	31.12	93.55	61.14	142.77	61.14 to 142.77	35,000	35,836
<u>ALL</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>92.16</u>	<u>94.63</u>	<u>88.45</u>	<u>21.50</u>	<u>106.99</u>	<u>13.33</u>	<u>618.20</u>	<u>88.81 to 95.33</u>	<u>78,219</u>	<u>69,182</u>

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
39-0010											
39-0501	1	77.90	77.90	77.90			77.90	77.90	N/A	2,100	1,636
40-0082	13	94.64	92.96	91.24	9.50	101.88	73.94	115.64	81.61 to 101.64	101,992	93,056
47-0001	129	92.22	94.81	88.57	23.59	107.05	13.33	618.20	88.00 to 97.20	77,656	68,781
47-0100	23	90.91	93.73	85.53	14.38	109.59	64.59	169.63	87.69 to 101.63	85,108	72,789
47-0103	10	89.49	98.13	90.13	27.20	108.88	61.14	142.77	63.68 to 142.60	46,340	41,766
61-0049											
82-0001											
NonValid School											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>92.16</u>	<u>94.63</u>	<u>88.45</u>	<u>21.50</u>	<u>106.99</u>	<u>13.33</u>	<u>618.20</u>	<u>88.81 to 95.33</u>	<u>78,219</u>	<u>69,182</u>

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	34	86.81	100.05	58.41	48.55	171.30	13.33	618.20	74.13 to 100.00	31,921	18,645
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	23	76.40	83.11	77.78	28.52	106.85	42.28	131.82	60.63 to 97.53	46,128	35,877
1900 TO 1919	16	91.78	93.96	89.85	15.05	104.58	67.84	117.20	76.71 to 110.31	57,000	51,212
1920 TO 1939	17	89.79	94.13	90.97	16.38	103.47	66.46	156.70	78.33 to 104.62	55,892	50,842
1940 TO 1949	4	106.35	112.24	105.07	12.73	106.82	96.06	140.18	N/A	59,500	62,519
1950 TO 1959	8	88.43	91.61	90.27	11.22	101.48	71.74	122.01	71.74 to 122.01	88,287	79,697
1960 TO 1969	15	94.64	96.76	88.85	13.01	108.90	68.32	142.77	88.31 to 102.97	96,000	85,300
1970 TO 1979	24	92.14	93.51	93.70	12.68	99.80	61.14	142.60	85.02 to 102.17	101,687	95,282
1980 TO 1989	13	101.18	100.34	99.22	8.42	101.14	82.88	117.12	87.00 to 110.50	113,000	112,115
1990 TO 1994	5	93.78	102.59	97.00	13.49	105.77	84.17	124.94	N/A	128,100	124,251
1995 TO 1999	12	94.13	91.50	89.22	10.49	102.55	64.59	115.89	81.77 to 100.20	160,489	143,194
2000 TO Present	5	88.47	88.92	87.10	7.14	102.08	74.38	101.49	N/A	179,600	156,435
<u>ALL</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>92.16</u>	<u>94.63</u>	<u>88.45</u>	<u>21.50</u>	<u>106.99</u>	<u>13.33</u>	<u>618.20</u>	<u>88.81 to 95.33</u>	<u>78,219</u>	<u>69,182</u>

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	176	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	48.61	95% Median C.I.:	88.81 to 95.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,800,534	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	46.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.37 to 92.53
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,766,634	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	87.83 to 101.42
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,176,060						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,219	COD:	21.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	618.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,182	PRD:	106.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:25:54

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	7	133.00	188.62	152.83	72.38	123.42	77.24	618.20	77.24 to 618.20	2,142	3,275	
5000 TO 9999	4	91.55	89.31	89.61	7.43	99.66	74.13	100.00	N/A	7,875	7,057	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	11	100.00	152.51	110.01	68.44	138.64	74.13	618.20	77.24 to 169.63	4,227	4,650	
10000 TO 29999	33	93.96	93.50	93.28	27.58	100.24	13.33	156.70	77.53 to 110.31	17,267	16,107	
30000 TO 59999	37	93.56	92.40	91.83	18.17	100.62	42.28	142.60	83.33 to 99.54	45,814	42,071	
60000 TO 99999	41	93.09	89.10	90.22	16.18	98.75	34.72	122.01	88.00 to 101.18	76,887	69,370	
100000 TO 149999	29	92.97	92.19	92.24	11.68	99.94	47.12	117.12	85.14 to 100.33	120,534	111,186	
150000 TO 249999	20	89.15	91.45	91.49	8.68	99.96	72.32	115.89	84.17 to 93.78	167,138	152,914	
250000 TO 499999	5	68.32	63.38	62.13	22.42	102.02	21.42	88.21	N/A	292,900	181,967	
ALL	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182	

ASSESSED VALUE *											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	7	90.87	90.96	58.84	32.85	154.58	13.33	142.77	13.33 to 142.77	4,536	2,669	
5000 TO 9999	13	74.13	119.30	69.37	82.32	171.97	24.08	618.20	61.14 to 100.00	10,807	7,497	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	20	77.57	109.38	67.43	65.83	162.21	13.33	618.20	68.56 to 100.00	8,612	5,807	
10000 TO 29999	31	91.19	91.64	78.12	26.38	117.31	34.72	153.20	77.53 to 104.15	25,561	19,967	
30000 TO 59999	41	92.09	91.45	86.23	20.13	106.06	47.12	156.70	76.71 to 99.54	51,943	44,788	
60000 TO 99999	39	96.06	94.84	88.87	12.13	106.72	21.42	131.82	88.82 to 102.17	90,910	80,790	
100000 TO 149999	32	91.87	93.35	92.09	9.52	101.37	72.32	117.12	85.14 to 96.37	138,211	127,274	
150000 TO 249999	13	93.78	91.60	88.05	12.26	104.03	64.59	115.89	74.38 to 104.40	208,000	183,152	
ALL	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182	

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	176	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	48.61	95% Median C.I.:	88.81 to 95.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,800,534	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	46.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.37 to 92.53
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,766,634	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	87.83 to 101.42
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,176,060						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,219	COD:	21.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	618.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,182	PRD:	106.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:25:54

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	25	78.26	84.42	77.11	30.72	109.48	13.33	169.63	74.13 to 100.00	21,593	16,650	
0	9	92.22	143.48	39.90	97.46	359.57	21.42	618.20	35.66 to 153.20	60,611	24,185	
20	14	88.05	95.14	93.48	34.32	101.78	42.28	156.70	59.42 to 131.82	38,100	35,615	
25	10	101.96	100.08	95.63	13.49	104.65	73.49	122.99	74.78 to 122.79	50,350	48,151	
30	90	91.14	91.41	89.78	14.27	101.82	55.39	142.77	87.88 to 95.88	87,143	78,234	
35	23	93.78	94.82	90.41	9.67	104.87	64.59	124.94	89.83 to 101.49	134,869	121,940	
40	5	101.54	102.48	102.40	8.26	100.08	84.26	115.89	N/A	139,900	143,253	
<u>ALL</u>												
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182	

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	34	86.81	100.05	58.41	48.55	171.30	13.33	618.20	74.13 to 100.00	31,921	18,645	
100	8	92.57	103.00	100.31	24.91	102.69	61.14	142.77	61.14 to 142.77	27,250	27,333	
101	102	92.07	92.44	90.80	15.15	101.81	42.28	156.70	88.00 to 96.06	97,208	88,263	
102	3	100.20	100.31	97.69	5.98	102.68	91.37	109.35	N/A	131,666	128,626	
103	1	122.01	122.01	122.01			122.01	122.01	N/A	67,000	81,745	
104	27	94.04	91.64	87.88	14.24	104.28	57.90	122.99	81.86 to 101.54	72,187	63,440	
111	1	102.20	102.20	102.20			102.20	102.20	N/A	137,000	140,015	
<u>ALL</u>												
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182	

CONDITION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	33	86.38	84.35	57.89	31.61	145.70	13.33	169.63	74.13 to 100.00	32,858	19,022	
0	1	618.20	618.20	618.20			618.20	618.20	N/A	1,000	6,182	
15	1	131.82	131.82	131.82			131.82	131.82	N/A	55,000	72,503	
20	2	105.35	105.35	106.99	7.12	98.46	97.85	112.85	N/A	41,000	43,867	
25	11	91.19	98.57	88.69	25.93	111.14	42.28	142.77	67.84 to 140.18	29,227	25,922	
30	80	91.62	92.70	91.57	13.76	101.23	59.42	156.70	88.00 to 95.30	90,739	83,092	
35	26	100.15	94.81	94.00	14.59	100.87	57.90	124.94	83.70 to 107.01	99,274	93,314	
40	21	93.56	88.69	85.00	13.81	104.34	55.39	117.20	84.26 to 101.49	109,880	93,395	
45	1	82.50	82.50	82.50			82.50	82.50	N/A	75,000	61,875	
<u>ALL</u>												
	176	92.16	94.63	88.45	21.50	106.99	13.33	618.20	88.81 to 95.33	78,219	69,182	

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

Residential

The Assessor and deputy assessor completed all pickup work. They physically inspected all known new improvements. They listed and valued the new improvements and reviewed and measured all previously existing improvements on these parcels.

Statistical analyses were run on each of the three Assessor Locations as well as individually for each rural subdivision and rural acreages, each small town and St Paul. After a study of the market, it was decided to make an adjustment to the rural acreage locations of 6021, 6022 and 6023, which are the rural acreages that are not located within a rural subdivision. The land was left the same as 2007 with 8% added to the improvements for this particular sub-class of residential property.

A computer issue caused the Assessor to revert to Marshall Swift costing for 06/1999 through the TerrScan CAMA as the 06/2004 values and tables did not work correctly when applied to parcels.

There were 125 protests filed in 2007 each parcel was physically inspected, records were reviewed and recommendations were made to County Board of Equalization during protest hearings. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor physically inspected the protested properties and attended the protest hearings.

The Howard County Board of Commissioners terminated one position in the Assessor's office causing a staffing shortage and creating time spent in cross training the remaining staff. The Assessor stated that the termination caused them to be short handed and unable to complete their planned cyclical review work.

2008 Assessment Survey for Howard County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessment staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessment staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2004 pricing implemented this year
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2004
6.	What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
	Unknown by the current assessor
7.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:
	3
8.	How are these defined?
	By location
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?)
	No assessor location of suburban

11.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>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.</i>)
	None
12.	Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
	No, rural residential properties that are attached to on-going farming residences are valued less per acre than a rural residential property not attached to an on-going farming operation. Per the assessor, this is according to the market.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
74	6	212	292

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	164	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	55.30	95% Median C.I.:	90.87 to 96.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,203,484	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	53.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.70 to 94.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,169,584	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.42	95% Mean C.I.:	88.62 to 105.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,919,487						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	80,302	COD:	20.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	720.63		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,679	PRD:	106.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:45

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	26	98.74	100.36	99.27	9.88	101.10	59.42	131.99	93.60 to 107.01	95,126	94,431
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	11	93.56	93.60	93.43	14.55	100.18	65.41	125.30	70.56 to 113.86	83,409	77,932
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	20	94.35	124.15	95.22	46.94	130.38	55.39	720.63	83.70 to 102.38	64,818	61,718
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	30	92.12	95.00	92.08	17.06	103.17	61.14	133.00	82.88 to 100.33	64,709	59,585
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	26	91.92	86.97	88.31	16.03	98.48	13.33	122.99	82.62 to 96.13	90,236	79,689
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	82.50	78.91	74.40	22.74	106.07	37.95	133.99	57.90 to 88.00	70,850	52,711
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	93.60	95.41	84.40	22.42	113.05	33.77	169.63	81.77 to 107.54	113,070	95,432
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	18	93.83	95.02	90.79	17.08	104.66	63.68	140.18	78.44 to 104.54	56,250	51,070
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	87	95.26	103.13	95.56	21.47	107.91	55.39	720.63	92.31 to 99.97	76,189	72,809
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	77	90.91	89.69	85.38	19.71	105.04	13.33	169.63	86.78 to 94.57	84,949	72,533
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	89	89.83	96.85	88.84	25.36	109.02	13.33	720.63	85.20 to 94.32	73,088	64,933
<u>ALL</u>											
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13	80,302	72,679

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RURAL	44	93.04	90.09	85.13	19.16	105.83	13.33	134.34	88.64 to 100.00	107,208	91,270
SMALL TOWN	36	96.22	116.08	96.19	33.75	120.68	61.14	720.63	90.91 to 101.64	47,166	45,368
ST PAUL	84	91.62	92.08	92.83	15.77	99.19	55.39	156.40	87.88 to 97.20	80,409	74,646
<u>ALL</u>											
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13	80,302	72,679

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	120	93.58	99.28	93.51	21.37	106.17	55.39	720.63	89.89 to 97.20	70,436	65,863
3	44	93.04	90.09	85.13	19.16	105.83	13.33	134.34	88.64 to 100.00	107,208	91,270
<u>ALL</u>											
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13	80,302	72,679

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	147	93.78	98.35	92.45	19.69	106.39	37.95	720.63	91.47 to 96.37	85,302	78,859
2	17	78.26	83.51	51.91	33.04	160.86	13.33	169.63	54.55 to 100.00	37,063	19,241
<u>ALL</u>											
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13	80,302	72,679

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	164	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	55.30	95% Median C.I.:	90.87 to 96.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,203,484	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	53.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.70 to 94.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,169,584	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.42	95% Mean C.I.:	88.62 to 105.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,919,487						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	80,302	COD:	20.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	720.63		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,679	PRD:	106.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:45

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	158	93.69	93.86	91.81	16.33	102.24	13.33	169.63	91.37 to 96.37	80,788	74,168
06	1	33.77	33.77	33.77			33.77	33.77	N/A	307,500	103,840
07	5	79.53	202.87	99.49	172.31	203.91	61.14	720.63	N/A	19,500	19,400
<u>ALL</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>93.51</u>	<u>96.82</u>	<u>90.51</u>	<u>20.76</u>	<u>106.97</u>	<u>13.33</u>	<u>720.63</u>	<u>90.87 to 96.13</u>	<u>80,302</u>	<u>72,679</u>

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
39-0010											
39-0501	1	77.90	77.90	77.90			77.90	77.90	N/A	2,100	1,636
40-0082	13	95.26	95.28	94.23	8.08	101.12	73.94	122.08	89.15 to 101.64	101,992	96,103
47-0001	118	92.50	91.78	90.23	17.66	101.72	13.33	156.40	88.81 to 97.20	79,776	71,980
47-0100	22	94.81	99.09	88.37	15.82	112.13	65.45	169.63	88.85 to 104.78	89,295	78,910
47-0103	10	90.37	155.08	94.69	88.86	163.78	61.14	720.63	63.68 to 133.00	46,340	43,877
61-0049											
82-0001											
NonValid School											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>93.51</u>	<u>96.82</u>	<u>90.51</u>	<u>20.76</u>	<u>106.97</u>	<u>13.33</u>	<u>720.63</u>	<u>90.87 to 96.13</u>	<u>80,302</u>	<u>72,679</u>

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	25	81.00	85.88	61.95	30.68	138.62	13.33	169.63	77.24 to 100.00	36,331	22,507
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	23	76.40	84.44	78.89	27.66	107.03	55.39	134.34	64.65 to 97.54	46,128	36,391
1900 TO 1919	16	95.31	99.90	93.79	16.44	106.52	73.36	131.99	86.78 to 117.18	57,000	53,459
1920 TO 1939	16	91.97	94.54	91.39	14.61	103.44	68.61	156.40	82.50 to 102.36	56,260	51,418
1940 TO 1949	4	109.39	114.02	107.91	10.80	105.66	97.12	140.18	N/A	59,500	64,205
1950 TO 1959	8	89.00	92.24	91.37	10.52	100.95	71.74	122.01	71.74 to 122.01	88,287	80,672
1960 TO 1969	14	94.30	139.04	91.32	55.59	152.25	72.35	720.63	89.06 to 110.16	96,785	88,388
1970 TO 1979	24	94.43	93.55	95.05	12.38	98.43	61.14	129.30	85.02 to 102.17	101,687	96,652
1980 TO 1989	13	101.35	101.83	100.90	8.22	100.92	82.88	125.30	91.92 to 110.50	113,000	114,011
1990 TO 1994	5	93.78	98.77	93.64	8.98	105.48	85.20	124.94	N/A	128,100	119,950
1995 TO 1999	12	94.13	91.50	89.28	10.33	102.48	65.45	115.89	81.77 to 97.50	160,489	143,286
2000 TO Present	4	93.47	94.08	94.80	4.23	99.24	87.88	101.49	N/A	153,250	145,280
<u>ALL</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>93.51</u>	<u>96.82</u>	<u>90.51</u>	<u>20.76</u>	<u>106.97</u>	<u>13.33</u>	<u>720.63</u>	<u>90.87 to 96.13</u>	<u>80,302</u>	<u>72,679</u>

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	164	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	55.30	95% Median C.I.:	90.87 to 96.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,203,484	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	53.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.70 to 94.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,169,584	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.42	95% Mean C.I.:	88.62 to 105.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,919,487						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	80,302	COD:	20.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	720.63		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,679	PRD:	106.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:45

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	5	133.00	235.68	282.09	110.54	83.55	77.24	720.63	N/A	2,200	6,206	
5000 TO 9999	3	90.87	90.62	91.01	6.97	99.57	81.00	100.00	N/A	7,500	6,826	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	8	95.44	181.28	153.76	104.29	117.90	77.24	720.63	77.24 to 720.63	4,187	6,438	
10000 TO 29999	28	99.15	97.50	99.12	24.05	98.36	13.33	156.40	79.53 to 113.86	16,991	16,842	
30000 TO 59999	36	92.94	93.53	93.26	17.51	100.30	57.64	134.34	86.08 to 102.73	45,698	42,616	
60000 TO 99999	39	93.09	90.21	91.23	15.11	98.88	37.95	122.01	88.00 to 101.18	76,856	70,115	
100000 TO 149999	29	93.46	92.08	92.26	12.43	99.81	47.12	125.30	85.02 to 100.33	120,534	111,203	
150000 TO 249999	20	93.11	93.68	93.70	6.74	99.99	76.80	115.89	89.15 to 95.26	167,138	156,601	
250000 TO 499999	4	68.90	67.08	65.35	25.36	102.65	33.77	96.76	N/A	294,875	192,694	
<u>ALL</u>	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13	80,302	72,679	

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	5	77.90	78.47	44.08	34.22	177.99	13.33	133.00	N/A	5,151	2,270	
5000 TO 9999	9	76.73	83.86	73.99	26.04	113.34	54.55	169.63	61.14 to 100.00	10,611	7,851	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	14	77.57	81.93	67.64	28.94	121.14	13.33	169.63	61.14 to 100.00	8,661	5,858	
10000 TO 29999	28	99.15	119.19	90.38	42.81	131.88	37.95	720.63	84.62 to 113.86	22,854	20,656	
30000 TO 59999	40	90.68	90.47	85.56	20.57	105.74	47.12	156.40	76.71 to 99.38	52,653	45,048	
60000 TO 99999	37	97.12	96.33	94.67	10.83	101.76	66.84	134.34	90.91 to 101.64	85,216	80,672	
100000 TO 149999	30	93.04	92.57	89.10	10.38	103.89	33.77	125.30	86.78 to 96.13	141,942	126,477	
150000 TO 249999	15	95.26	95.53	92.63	9.40	103.13	65.45	115.89	91.92 to 106.21	192,733	178,529	
<u>ALL</u>	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13	80,302	72,679	

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	164	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	55.30	95% Median C.I.:	90.87 to 96.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,203,484	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	53.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.70 to 94.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,169,584	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.42	95% Mean C.I.:	88.62 to 105.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,919,487						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	80,302	COD:	20.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	720.63		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,679	PRD:	106.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	13.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:45

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	20	79.63	87.24	80.02	29.01	109.02	13.33	169.63	77.24 to 100.00		22,638	18,116
0	5	88.64	80.42	43.99	34.23	182.82	33.77	132.58	N/A		91,100	40,074
20	14	93.80	97.73	92.69	27.88	105.44	57.64	156.40	60.63 to 134.34		38,100	35,316
25	10	101.96	105.97	99.27	15.50	106.75	73.49	133.99	89.06 to 131.99		50,350	49,982
30	87	92.97	98.87	91.87	21.15	107.62	55.39	720.63	88.85 to 96.37		85,320	78,385
35	23	93.78	95.22	91.26	10.19	104.34	65.45	124.94	88.82 to 101.49		134,869	123,084
40	5	102.36	102.10	101.80	8.72	100.29	84.26	115.89	N/A		139,900	142,421
<u>ALL</u>												
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13		80,302	72,679

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	25	81.00	85.88	61.95	30.68	138.62	13.33	169.63	77.24 to 100.00		36,331	22,507
100	8	93.13	174.13	107.74	99.94	161.61	61.14	720.63	61.14 to 720.63		27,250	29,360
101	100	93.78	93.78	92.34	14.10	101.56	55.39	156.40	89.89 to 96.76		95,802	88,461
102	3	97.50	100.79	96.93	7.57	103.98	91.37	113.50	N/A		131,666	127,623
103	1	122.01	122.01	122.01			122.01	122.01	N/A		67,000	81,745
104	26	92.94	93.27	89.03	16.29	104.76	57.90	131.99	83.33 to 102.36		71,694	63,832
111	1	110.62	110.62	110.62			110.62	110.62	N/A		137,000	151,550
<u>ALL</u>												
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13		80,302	72,679

CONDITION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	25	81.00	85.88	61.95	30.68	138.62	13.33	169.63	77.24 to 100.00		36,331	22,507
15	1	134.34	134.34	134.34			134.34	134.34	N/A		55,000	73,888
20	1	99.38	99.38	99.38			99.38	99.38	N/A		32,000	31,801
25	11	98.29	159.52	102.78	75.71	155.21	64.65	720.63	84.62 to 140.18		29,227	30,038
30	78	93.03	93.66	93.29	13.47	100.39	59.42	156.40	89.15 to 95.88		88,322	82,399
35	26	99.76	94.83	94.29	14.20	100.57	57.90	124.94	85.14 to 107.01		99,274	93,606
40	21	93.56	89.96	86.58	14.29	103.90	55.39	126.36	84.26 to 102.36		109,880	95,137
45	1	82.50	82.50	82.50			82.50	82.50	N/A		75,000	61,875
<u>ALL</u>												
	164	93.51	96.82	90.51	20.76	106.97	13.33	720.63	90.87 to 96.13		80,302	72,679

2008 Correlation Section for Howard County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the statistical data and the assessment actions for residential property in Howard County supports the calculated median as the level of value for residential property at 94%.

The Howard County Assessor and her staff have been in place now just over one year and one full cycle of assessment. After discussion with the Assessor and deputy assessor, they have discovered issues with uniformity and accuracy in the data left from the previous administration. They are working on improving and correcting the data. Consequently, because of the uniformity issues, some valuation changes appear not equitable but are in fact corrections to achieve more uniform assessments.

Information gathered through the assessor survey indicated that the county board has cut the staffing in the Assessor's office eliminating the only lister. In addition, Howard County has never had cadastral maps. The county board is currently in a dispute and the geographic information system started, has to date, not yet been completed. The listing and inventorying of parcels is critical to assessing property and unfortunately the Howard County Assessor is extremely limited as to what resources she has available to her office.

The county reviewed the preliminary statistics and indicated levels of value and applied the reverted pricing to the residential property. Depreciation and economic factors were adjusted to bring properties to an acceptable level of assessment. Through the analysis the quality of assessment and the uniformity still remained outside the acceptable parameters. This can be attributed to the issues with uniformity.

Although the statistics do indicate there might be a problem with unimproved land, a closer look indicates the breakdown of the 17 sales to be from all three assessor locations with Rural having the largest number of sales but when further broken down, the rural unimproved are from all three market areas as well as one sale that has been determined to be recreational land. These sales indicate that a percentage adjustment would not improve uniformity as the sales have varying levels of sales ratios.

Based on the reported assessment actions and interviews with the assessor and her staff, the calculated R & O Median appears to be the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(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.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	297	164	55.22
2007	302	166	54.97
2006	279	171	61.29
2005	259	178	68.73
2004	253	182	71.94
2003	227	192	84.58
2002	231	202	87.45
2001	284	238	83.8

RESIDENTIAL: Table two represents evidence that the sales verification in Howard County is in it's second year of comparable use and appears to be uniformly utilized. The past 2 years the fluctuation in the percentage of sales used is minimal. A review of the total residential sales in Howard County shows 37 sales that were coded out for having substantially changed since the date of the sale. It does not appear that Howard County has excessively trimmed their sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

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

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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	92.16	0.03	92.19	93.51
2007	91.68	10.23	101.06	96.79
2006	94.96	2.82	97.63	98.13
2005	94.51	3.95	98.24	97.89
2004	91.73	14.1	104.66	96.63
2003	94	-0.94	93.12	94
2002	90	1.05	90.95	92
2001	95	0.16	95.15	96

RESIDENTIAL: Table 3 illustrates that the residential values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio very similar to the R & O Ratio. A conclusion may be drawn that the residential population and the residential sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers strong support for the calculated level of value at 93.51% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for residential property in Howard County.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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)
2.15	2008	0.03
9.06	2007	10.23
4.05	2006	2.82
4	2005	3.95
5.88	2004	14.1
0	2003	-0.94
1.68	2002	1.05
1.5	2001	0.16

RESIDENTIAL: Table 4 illustrates similar movement between the sales file and the base value. This offers support that either the calculated median or the trended median for residential property is an accurate reflection of the level of value in Howard County. It also indicates that the residential class of property has been valued uniformly.

2008 Correlation Section for Howard County

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.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	93.51	90.51	96.82

RESIDENTIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates the median coming in at 93.51% with the wgt mean lower at 90.51% and the mean at 96.82%. All three measures of central tendency are within or close to within the acceptable range giving credibility to the statistical level of value for residential property in Howard County.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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
R&O Statistics	20.76	106.97
Difference	5.76	3.97

RESIDENTIAL: Table 6 accurately reflects that the COD and PRD are both above the acceptable range for qualitative measures. This is to be expected after a review of the minimum and maximum sales which indicate that there are extreme outliers within the residential sales data base.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	176	164	-12
Median	92.16	93.51	1.35
Wgt. Mean	88.45	90.51	2.06
Mean	94.63	96.82	2.19
COD	21.50	20.76	-0.74
PRD	106.99	106.97	-0.02
Min Sales Ratio	13.33	13.33	0
Max Sales Ratio	618.20	720.63	102.43

RESIDENTIAL: Table 7 accurately reflects 12 sales that were removed after the preliminary statistical run. Following the completion of pickup work and sales verification, these 12 sales were found to have substantially changed since the date of the sale. The changes in the remaining statistics appear to be supported by the reported assessment actions including reverting to an older pricing table and uniformity issues.

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	19	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	29.40	95% Median C.I.:	67.48 to 101.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,268,347	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	26.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 99.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,205,247	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.86	95% Mean C.I.:	77.21 to 102.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,021,223							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,434	COD:	20.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	152.26			
AVG. Assessed Value:	53,748	PRD:	106.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.40			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:01

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	63.05	63.05	63.05			63.05	63.05	N/A	66,750	42,085
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	93.43	93.43	93.43			93.43	93.43	N/A	30,000	28,029
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	124.94	124.94	124.94			124.94	124.94	N/A	45,000	56,225
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	98.29	98.29	97.72	3.14	100.58	95.21	101.38	N/A	44,329	43,320
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	92.91	92.91	92.91			92.91	92.91	N/A	20,000	18,582
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	92.21	91.38	88.73	2.79	102.99	87.10	94.83	N/A	74,883	66,440
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	67.08	67.08	67.08			67.08	67.08	N/A	40,000	26,831
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	67.48	67.48	67.48			67.48	67.48	N/A	10,000	6,748
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	100.07	100.07	72.14	52.16	138.70	47.87	152.26	N/A	32,250	23,266
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	110.01	110.01	110.01			110.01	110.01	N/A	186,689	205,368
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	93.90	83.89	71.06	22.03	118.05	43.40	113.06	N/A	85,800	60,971
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	5	95.21	95.60	92.44	14.67	103.43	63.05	124.94	N/A	46,081	42,596
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	92.21	86.83	85.98	7.28	100.99	67.08	94.83	N/A	56,930	48,947
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	93.90	88.56	81.65	29.62	108.47	43.40	152.26	47.87 to 113.06	76,687	62,612
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	98.29	103.61	105.07	9.72	98.61	92.91	124.94	N/A	38,414	40,362
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	87.10	86.98	82.39	25.73	105.56	47.87	152.26	47.87 to 152.26	48,450	39,919
<u>ALL</u>											
	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RURAL	2	101.96	101.96	109.59	7.90	93.04	93.90	110.01	N/A	95,844	105,031
SMALL TOWN	3	94.83	85.71	86.14	9.89	99.49	67.08	95.21	N/A	41,833	36,037
ST PAUL	14	92.56	89.16	79.17	23.97	112.62	43.40	152.26	63.05 to 113.06	63,432	50,217
<u>ALL</u>											
	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	16	92.56	87.75	79.24	22.43	110.73	43.40	152.26	67.08 to 101.44	61,087	48,406
3	3	101.38	101.76	108.28	5.30	93.98	93.90	110.01	N/A	75,949	82,239
<u>ALL</u>											
	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	19	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	29.40	95% Median C.I.:	67.48 to 101.44	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,268,347	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	26.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 99.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,205,247	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.86	95% Mean C.I.:	77.21 to 102.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,021,223							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,434	COD:	20.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	152.26			
AVG. Assessed Value:	53,748	PRD:	106.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.40			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:02

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	92.91	89.05	84.57	22.11	105.30	43.40	152.26	67.08 to 110.01	70,073	59,258
2	2	97.67	97.67	98.75	3.86	98.91	93.90	101.44	N/A	7,000	6,912
____ALL____	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	87.10	87.10	87.10			87.10	87.10	N/A	170,000	148,064
03	18	93.67	90.12	84.34	20.87	106.85	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	57,513	48,508
04											
____ALL____	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
39-0010											
39-0501											
40-0082											
47-0001	15	92.91	90.55	84.52	23.52	107.13	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 110.01	71,649	60,561
47-0100	1	94.83	94.83	94.83			94.83	94.83	N/A	33,000	31,295
47-0103	3	93.90	85.40	83.60	9.99	102.15	67.08	95.21	N/A	32,500	27,170
61-0049											
82-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	19	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	29.40	95% Median C.I.:	67.48 to 101.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,268,347	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	26.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 99.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,205,247	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.86	95% Mean C.I.:	77.21 to 102.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,021,223							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,434	COD:	20.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	152.26			
AVG. Assessed Value:	53,748	PRD:	106.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.40			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:02

YEAR BUILT *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	4	94.37	95.77	95.08	2.51	100.73	92.91	101.44	N/A	16,750	15,925
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	43.40	43.40	43.40			43.40	43.40	N/A	70,000	30,377
1900 TO 1919	4	80.46	85.26	92.46	22.35	92.22	67.08	113.06	N/A	35,000	32,360
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	1	152.26	152.26	152.26			152.26	152.26	N/A	15,000	22,839
1950 TO 1959	1	92.21	92.21	92.21			92.21	92.21	N/A	21,650	19,963
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	3	110.01	110.05	109.64	9.01	100.38	95.21	124.94	N/A	94,729	103,859
1980 TO 1989	4	65.35	69.99	67.50	22.23	103.69	47.87	101.38	N/A	109,352	73,814
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	87.10	87.10	87.10			87.10	87.10	N/A	170,000	148,064
2000 TO Present											
ALL	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	97.67	97.67	98.75	3.86	98.91	93.90	101.44	N/A	7,000	6,912
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	97.67	97.67	98.75	3.86	98.91	93.90	101.44	N/A	7,000	6,912
10000 TO 29999	4	92.56	101.22	102.22	23.09	99.01	67.48	152.26	N/A	16,662	17,033
30000 TO 59999	7	94.83	89.25	88.31	17.05	101.06	47.87	124.94	47.87 to 124.94	40,879	36,102
60000 TO 99999	3	63.05	73.17	71.31	36.83	102.61	43.40	113.06	N/A	65,583	46,765
150000 TO 249999	2	98.56	98.56	99.09	11.62	99.46	87.10	110.01	N/A	178,344	176,716
250000 TO 499999	1	67.66	67.66	67.66			67.66	67.66	N/A	285,000	192,824
ALL	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	19	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	29.40	95% Median C.I.:	67.48 to 101.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,268,347	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	26.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 99.56	
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:	1,205,247	MEAN:	90	AVG. ABS. DEV:	18.86	95% Mean C.I.:	77.21 to 102.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,021,223							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,434	COD:	20.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	152.26			
AVG. Assessed Value:	53,748	PRD:	106.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.40			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:02

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	1	93.90	93.90	93.90			93.90	93.90	N/A	5,000	4,695
5000 TO 9999	2	84.46	84.46	83.57	20.10	101.07	67.48	101.44	N/A	9,500	7,939
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	3	93.90	87.61	85.72	12.06	102.20	67.48	101.44	N/A	8,000	6,857
10000 TO 29999	6	92.56	90.96	79.44	23.67	114.50	47.87	152.26	47.87 to 152.26	29,358	23,323
30000 TO 59999	6	95.02	87.13	81.28	21.09	107.20	43.40	124.94	43.40 to 124.94	50,568	41,103
60000 TO 99999	1	113.06	113.06	113.06			113.06	113.06	N/A	60,000	67,833
100000 TO 149999	1	87.10	87.10	87.10			87.10	87.10	N/A	170,000	148,064
150000 TO 249999	2	88.84	88.84	84.42	23.84	105.23	67.66	110.01	N/A	235,844	199,096
ALL _____											
	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	94.37	95.77	95.08	2.51	100.73	92.91	101.44	N/A	16,750	15,925
10	3	92.21	84.24	81.64	9.53	103.18	67.08	93.43	N/A	30,550	24,941
20	12	91.16	89.45	84.34	29.28	106.06	43.40	152.26	63.05 to 113.06	87,216	73,558
ALL _____											
	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	94.37	95.77	95.08	2.51	100.73	92.91	101.44	N/A	16,750	15,925
325	2	55.46	55.46	56.58	13.69	98.01	47.87	63.05	N/A	58,125	32,889
343	1	110.01	110.01	110.01			110.01	110.01	N/A	186,689	205,368
344	3	113.06	93.80	88.25	24.04	106.29	43.40	124.94	N/A	58,333	51,478
352	1	87.10	87.10	87.10			87.10	87.10	N/A	170,000	148,064
353	3	67.66	76.06	69.77	12.98	109.01	67.08	93.43	N/A	118,333	82,561
380	1	152.26	152.26	152.26			152.26	152.26	N/A	15,000	22,839
391	1	67.48	67.48	67.48			67.48	67.48	N/A	10,000	6,748
404	2	98.29	98.29	97.72	3.14	100.58	95.21	101.38	N/A	44,329	43,320
406	1	92.21	92.21	92.21			92.21	92.21	N/A	21,650	19,963
ALL _____											
	19	93.43	89.96	84.73	20.18	106.17	43.40	152.26	67.48 to 101.44	63,434	53,748

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

Commercial

The Assessor and deputy assessor completed all pickup work. They physically inspected all known new improvements. They listed and valued the new improvements and reviewed and measured all previously existing improvements on these parcels.

Statistical analyses were run on each of the three Assessor Locations as well as individually for each rural subdivision and rural acreages, each small town and St Paul. As was indicated by the market, an adjustment to St Paul's commercial highway parcels was needed. The land was revalued with corrections to the larger parcels as needed and values were increased by 20% on the improvements for this location. The assessor felt this was the only location with enough sales to do an accurate market study.

A computer issue caused the Assessor to revert to Marshall Swift costing for 06/1999 through the TerrScan CAMA as the 06/2004 values and tables did not work correctly when applied to parcels.

There were 125 protests filed in 2007 each parcel was physically inspected, records were reviewed and recommendations were made to County Board of Equalization during protest hearings. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor physically inspected the protested properties and attended the protest hearings.

The Howard County Board of Commissioners terminated one position in the Assessor's office causing a staffing shortage and creating time spent in cross training the remaining staff. The Assessor stated that the termination caused them to be short handed and unable to complete their planned cyclical review work.

2008 Assessment Survey for Howard County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and her staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and deputy
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and deputy
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	1999
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	1999
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?
	Unknown by the current assessor
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?
	Unknown by the current assessor
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
	3
9.	How are these defined?
	By location
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?)
	No assessor location of suburban

12.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>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.</i>)
	N/A

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
9			9

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	18.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.97 to 110.01	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,254,347	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	18.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 107.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,191,247	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.31	95% Mean C.I.:	87.96 to 106.49	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,159,891							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,073	COD:	12.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,228	PRD:	99.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.08			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:48

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	88.84	88.84	88.84			88.84	88.84	N/A	66,750	59,304
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	93.43	93.43	93.43			93.43	93.43	N/A	30,000	28,029
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	119.14	119.14	119.14			119.14	119.14	N/A	45,000	53,611
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	97.93	97.93	97.43	2.77	100.51	95.21	100.64	N/A	44,329	43,188
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	92.91	92.91	92.91			92.91	92.91	N/A	20,000	18,582
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	94.83	98.72	105.40	5.95	93.67	92.21	109.13	N/A	74,883	78,924
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	67.08	67.08	67.08			67.08	67.08	N/A	40,000	26,831
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	67.48	67.48	67.48			67.48	67.48	N/A	10,000	6,748
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	118.21	118.21	105.73	19.74	111.80	94.88	141.54	N/A	32,250	34,099
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	110.01	110.01	110.01			110.01	110.01	N/A	186,689	205,368
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	87.97	95.16	89.17	10.84	106.71	84.44	113.06	N/A	138,333	123,357
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	5	95.21	99.45	98.66	7.88	100.80	88.84	119.14	N/A	46,081	45,464
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	92.91	91.23	99.13	9.62	92.03	67.08	109.13	N/A	56,930	56,437
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	7	94.88	99.91	96.18	18.78	103.88	67.48	141.54	67.48 to 141.54	96,598	92,912
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	97.93	101.98	103.20	8.08	98.82	92.91	119.14	N/A	38,414	39,642
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	94.83	95.31	99.82	17.89	95.48	67.08	141.54	67.08 to 141.54	48,450	48,364
<u>ALL</u>											
	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RURAL	2	105.33	105.33	108.49	4.45	97.09	100.64	110.01	N/A	111,423	120,879
SMALL TOWN	3	94.83	85.71	86.14	9.89	99.49	67.08	95.21	N/A	41,833	36,037
ST PAUL	12	93.17	98.75	96.10	14.07	102.76	67.48	141.54	87.97 to 113.06	70,241	67,501
<u>ALL</u>											
	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	15	93.43	96.14	94.81	13.33	101.41	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 109.13	64,560	61,208
3	2	105.33	105.33	108.49	4.45	97.09	100.64	110.01	N/A	111,423	120,879
<u>ALL</u>											
	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	18.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.97 to 110.01	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,254,347	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	18.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 107.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,191,247	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.31	95% Mean C.I.:	87.96 to 106.49	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,159,891							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,073	COD:	12.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,228	PRD:	99.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.08			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:48

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228
____ALL____											
	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	109.13	109.13	109.13			109.13	109.13	N/A	170,000	185,514
03	16	94.13	96.48	95.41	12.94	101.12	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	63,827	60,898
04											
____ALL____											
	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
39-0010											
39-0501											
40-0082											
47-0001	14	94.16	99.69	98.69	13.74	101.02	67.48	141.54	87.97 to 113.06	76,124	75,127
47-0100	1	94.83	94.83	94.83			94.83	94.83	N/A	33,000	31,295
47-0103	2	81.15	81.15	83.04	17.33	97.71	67.08	95.21	N/A	46,250	38,408
61-0049											
82-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	18.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.97 to 110.01	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,254,347	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	18.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 107.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,191,247	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.31	95% Mean C.I.:	87.96 to 106.49	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,159,891							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,073	COD:	12.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,228	PRD:	99.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.08			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:49

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	93.87	93.87	94.11	1.02	99.75	92.91	94.83	N/A	26,500	24,938
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	87.97	87.97	87.97			87.97	87.97	N/A	70,000	61,576
1900 TO 1919	4	80.46	85.26	92.46	22.35	92.22	67.08	113.06	N/A	35,000	32,360
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	1	141.54	141.54	141.54			141.54	141.54	N/A	15,000	21,231
1950 TO 1959	1	92.21	92.21	92.21			92.21	92.21	N/A	21,650	19,963
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	3	110.01	108.12	108.72	7.25	99.45	95.21	119.14	N/A	94,729	102,988
1980 TO 1989	4	91.86	92.20	87.64	6.05	105.21	84.44	100.64	N/A	109,352	95,831
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	109.13	109.13	109.13			109.13	109.13	N/A	170,000	185,514
2000 TO Present											
ALL	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	4	92.56	98.54	99.81	20.19	98.72	67.48	141.54	N/A	16,662	16,631
30000 TO 59999	7	94.88	95.03	95.44	8.98	99.57	67.08	119.14	67.08 to 119.14	40,879	39,015
60000 TO 99999	3	88.84	96.62	95.92	9.41	100.74	87.97	113.06	N/A	65,583	62,904
150000 TO 249999	2	109.57	109.57	109.59	0.40	99.99	109.13	110.01	N/A	178,344	195,441
250000 TO 499999	1	84.44	84.44	84.44			84.44	84.44	N/A	285,000	240,663
ALL	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	18.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.97 to 110.01	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,254,347	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	18.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 107.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,191,247	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.31	95% Mean C.I.:	87.96 to 106.49	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,159,891							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,073	COD:	12.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,228	PRD:	99.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.08			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:49

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	67.48	67.48	67.48			67.48	67.48	N/A	10,000	6,748
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	67.48	67.48	67.48			67.48	67.48	N/A	10,000	6,748
10000 TO 29999	5	92.91	97.43	90.51	16.29	107.65	67.08	141.54	N/A	25,330	22,927
30000 TO 59999	6	95.04	98.92	98.11	6.39	100.83	88.84	119.14	88.84 to 119.14	47,151	46,258
60000 TO 99999	2	100.52	100.52	99.55	12.48	100.97	87.97	113.06	N/A	65,000	64,704
150000 TO 249999	3	109.13	101.19	98.42	7.81	102.82	84.44	110.01	N/A	213,896	210,515
ALL	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	93.87	93.87	94.11	1.02	99.75	92.91	94.83	N/A	26,500	24,938
10	3	92.21	84.24	81.64	9.53	103.18	67.08	93.43	N/A	30,550	24,941
20	12	97.93	101.03	98.91	14.87	102.14	67.48	141.54	87.97 to 113.06	87,216	86,265
ALL	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	93.87	93.87	94.11	1.02	99.75	92.91	94.83	N/A	26,500	24,938
325	2	91.86	91.86	91.42	3.29	100.49	88.84	94.88	N/A	58,125	53,135
343	1	110.01	110.01	110.01			110.01	110.01	N/A	186,689	205,368
344	3	113.06	106.72	104.58	9.19	102.05	87.97	119.14	N/A	58,333	61,006
352	1	109.13	109.13	109.13			109.13	109.13	N/A	170,000	185,514
353	3	84.44	81.65	83.25	10.40	98.08	67.08	93.43	N/A	118,333	98,507
380	1	141.54	141.54	141.54			141.54	141.54	N/A	15,000	21,231
391	1	67.48	67.48	67.48			67.48	67.48	N/A	10,000	6,748
404	2	97.93	97.93	97.43	2.77	100.51	95.21	100.64	N/A	44,329	43,188
406	1	92.21	92.21	92.21			92.21	92.21	N/A	21,650	19,963
ALL	17	94.83	97.22	97.37	12.98	99.85	67.08	141.54	87.97 to 110.01	70,073	68,228

2008 Correlation Section for Howard County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the statistical data and the assessment actions for commercial property in Howard County supports the calculated median as the level of value for commercial property at 93%.

The Howard County Assessor and her staff have been in place now just over one year and one full cycle of assessment. After discussion with the Assessor and deputy assessor, they have discovered issues with uniformity and accuracy in the data left from the previous administration. They are working on improving and correcting the data. Consequently, because of the uniformity issues, some valuation changes appear not equitable but are in fact corrections to achieve more uniform assessments.

Information gathered through the assessor survey indicated that the county board has cut the staffing in the Assessor's office eliminating the only lister. In addition, Howard County has never had cadastral maps. The county board is currently in a dispute and the geographic information system started, has to date, not yet been completed. The listing and inventorying of parcels is critical to assessing property and unfortunately the Howard County Assessor is extremely limited as to what resources she has available to her office.

As is common in rural counties, there were a limited number of sales that occurred in the last three years. The town of St Paul had the most, but even those sales were diverse in occupancy code and location within the community. Three sales in St Paul were all located on the highway and the sales indicated an increase of 20% would bring them up to market. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor felt the three sales were representative of all the commercial parcels along the highway and therefore made the increase. The county also had to review the data and discovered two major listing and classification errors causing what would appear to be unequal treatment of sold and unsold properties but was in fact a continuance of the effort to increase the accuracy of the data.

Based on the reported assessment actions and interviews with the assessor and her staff, the calculated R & O Median appears to be the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(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.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	50	17	34
2007	47	16	34.04
2006	50	25	50
2005	51	27	52.94
2004	49	31	63.27
2003	52	33	63.46
2002	62	40	64.52
2001	58	39	67.24

COMMERCIAL: Table two represents evidence that the sales verification in Howard County is in it's second year of comparable use and appears to be uniformly utilized. The past 2 years the fluctuation in the percentage of sales used is very minimal. A review of the total commercial sales in Howard County shows 9 sales that were coded out for having substantially changed since the date of the sale. This does not appear to be an unreasonable amount due to the diverse and scarcity of this type of property in rural counties. It does not appear that Howard County has excessively trimmed their sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

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

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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	93.43	12.15	104.79	94.83
2007	95.90	6.65	102.28	95.02
2006	99.22	-0.59	98.63	99.35
2005	99.35	6.24	105.55	99.22
2004	99.35	0.81	100.16	97.25
2003	95	-10.87	84.67	95
2002	94	3.07	96.89	100
2001	88	49.46	131.52	94

COMMERCIAL: At first glance, Table III would indicate a trended preliminary ratio of 104.79%. However, a review of the commercial assessment actions and a review of the sales would indicate that the calculated R & O Ratio to be a better indication of the level of value for commercial property in Howard County. As previously stated in Table 1 Howard County has encountered uniformity issues in the data. Three sales in St Paul were all located on the highway and the sales indicated an increase of 20% would bring them up to market. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor felt the three sales were representative of all the commercial parcels along the highway and therefore made the increase. The county also had to review the data and discovered two major listing and classification errors causing what would appear to be unequal treatment of sold and unsold properties but was in fact a continuance of the effort to increase the accuracy of the data.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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)
17.8	2008	12.15
9.07	2007	6.65
19.77	2006	-0.59
-6.2	2005	6.24
-2.1	2004	0.81
0	2003	-10.87
5.36	2002	3.07
11.78	2001	49.46

COMMERCIAL: As previously mentioned there are uniformity and accuracy issues in Howard County. A review of Table IV indicates similar movement in the sales file and the base, just not as uniform as desired. A review of the commercial assessment actions does indicate that highway commercial improvements received a 20% increase and this is evidenced in the sales file by the 3 highway parcels all receiving a 20% increase to the improvement value. However, all sales are reviewed for accuracy and with the county board reduction of the staff, not all of the base properties are able to be reviewed for accuracy in one year. Consequently, the sales file did receive two large corrections to sales for inaccurate listing information. This appears to have caused a somewhat, albeit not overly large, skewed movement of the sales file when compared to the base of commercial property.

2008 Correlation Section for Howard County

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.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94.83	97.37	97.22

COMMERCIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates all three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with the median coming in at 94.83% with the wgt mean slightly higher at 97.37% and the mean coming in at 97.22%. The measures of central tendency all give credibility to the statistical level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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
R&O Statistics	12.98	99.85
Difference	0	0

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential are both within the acceptable ranges. Both statistics indicate that uniformity has been met for the commercial class of property within Howard County.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	19	17	-2
Median	93.43	94.83	1.4
Wgt. Mean	84.73	97.37	12.64
Mean	89.96	97.22	7.26
COD	20.18	12.98	-7.2
PRD	106.17	99.85	-6.32
Min Sales Ratio	43.40	67.08	23.68
Max Sales Ratio	152.26	141.54	-10.72

COMMERCIAL: Table 7 accurately reflects 2 sales that were removed after the preliminary statistical run. Following the completion of pickup work and sales verification, these 2 sales were found to have substantially changed since the date of the sale. The changes in the remaining statistics appear to be supported by the reported assessment actions including reverting to an older pricing table and the revaluation of the highway properties.

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified
 Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	57	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	25.87	95% Median C.I.:	62.33 to 73.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,977,694	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.58 to 71.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,798,694	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.28 to 74.68	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,170,114							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	189,450	COD:	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	125,791	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:22

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	5	86.77	94.07	88.64	25.70	106.13	61.03	124.81	N/A	107,345	95,153
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	11	63.46	65.39	57.59	21.26	113.54	42.03	106.59	43.75 to 77.44	178,369	102,727
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	10	72.75	73.58	72.03	11.85	102.15	50.55	97.34	60.08 to 87.01	145,910	105,095
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	60.87	60.87	57.07	17.58	106.66	50.17	71.57	N/A	90,750	51,790
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	62.66	65.15	65.09	5.03	100.10	61.67	71.12	N/A	217,666	141,670
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	73.63	73.63	73.63			73.63	73.63	N/A	312,000	229,735
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	72.89	73.02	71.57	12.08	102.03	57.06	93.93	57.06 to 93.93	224,675	160,802
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	62.28	63.99	73.17	20.22	87.45	44.66	93.71	N/A	177,892	130,166
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	66.71	66.71	66.71			66.71	66.71	N/A	105,000	70,044
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	63.90	66.58	65.14	18.04	102.22	48.62	96.62	N/A	281,380	183,286
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	56.68	60.30	55.05	17.65	109.53	46.06	86.98	46.06 to 86.98	246,800	135,869
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	92.89	92.89	92.89			92.89	92.89	N/A	217,294	201,849
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	28	71.75	73.11	66.68	19.80	109.64	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 75.54	147,835	98,582
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	66.60	68.48	70.89	15.21	96.59	44.66	93.93	61.67 to 73.63	213,500	151,359
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	60.52	65.33	61.89	21.27	105.56	46.06	96.62	49.01 to 86.98	246,913	152,815
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	16	71.44	70.41	69.44	11.29	101.40	50.17	97.34	61.67 to 75.54	162,850	113,080
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	66.60	68.10	69.40	16.96	98.13	44.66	96.62	57.06 to 78.10	220,553	153,066
<u>ALL</u>											
	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	57	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	25.87	95% Median C.I.:	62.33 to 73.45	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,977,694	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.58 to 71.22	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,798,694	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.28 to 74.68	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,170,114							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	189,450	COD:	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	125,791	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:22

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2617	1	60.08	60.08	60.08			60.08	60.08	N/A	130,602	78,460	
2619	1	86.98	86.98	86.98			86.98	86.98	N/A	95,000	82,632	
2621	3	66.71	75.33	81.26	16.97	92.70	62.66	96.62	N/A	143,000	116,200	
2623	5	71.21	66.34	60.29	8.38	110.04	48.62	73.87	N/A	146,640	88,409	
2717	4	104.76	101.95	96.48	20.84	105.66	73.47	124.81	N/A	97,022	93,609	
2719	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	100,000	71,870	
2721	3	57.13	62.32	62.84	9.16	99.18	57.07	72.77	N/A	221,193	139,000	
2723	7	49.01	50.05	51.33	11.70	97.52	42.03	63.90	42.03 to 63.90	335,900	172,410	
2913	2	69.88	69.88	66.19	10.81	105.58	62.33	77.44	N/A	154,500	102,270	
2915	5	73.63	73.44	72.90	11.76	100.74	61.67	92.89	N/A	235,354	171,570	
2917	5	71.12	70.02	78.00	14.50	89.77	52.69	93.71	N/A	160,540	125,224	
2919	6	72.89	73.02	71.57	12.08	102.03	57.06	93.93	57.06 to 93.93	224,675	160,802	
3013	4	72.62	66.58	60.43	10.65	110.16	46.06	75.01	N/A	195,785	118,322	
3015	4	56.70	62.74	61.16	19.66	102.58	50.55	87.01	N/A	162,575	99,433	
3019	6	71.91	75.78	74.45	24.94	101.79	44.66	106.59	44.66 to 106.59	139,660	103,972	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
7100	22	71.60	72.42	69.61	21.55	104.03	44.66	124.81	57.06 to 78.10	172,285	119,926	
7200	24	62.90	66.91	62.84	20.66	106.48	42.03	106.59	57.07 to 75.54	228,219	143,412	
7300	11	71.30	71.80	71.18	11.05	100.88	48.62	96.62	62.66 to 86.77	139,197	99,076	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	57	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	25.87	95% Median C.I.:	62.33 to 73.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,977,694	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.58 to 71.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,798,694	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.28 to 74.68	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,170,114							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	189,450	COD:	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	125,791	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:22

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	4	66.45	68.14	68.75	16.98	99.12	52.69	86.98	N/A	90,675	62,336	
DRY-N/A	6	70.16	83.19	75.33	34.02	110.43	44.66	124.81	44.66 to 124.81	115,096	86,703	
GRASS	9	62.66	66.47	67.56	13.35	98.39	52.63	86.77	56.68 to 73.87	114,396	77,283	
GRASS-N/A	10	71.39	68.95	66.49	14.28	103.69	48.62	93.93	50.17 to 77.44	138,050	91,794	
IRRGTD	2	71.38	71.38	71.32	0.36	100.08	71.12	71.63	N/A	183,500	130,867	
IRRGTD-N/A	26	63.68	68.72	64.94	22.95	105.82	42.03	106.59	57.13 to 75.01	268,013	174,050	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	4	66.45	68.14	68.75	16.98	99.12	52.69	86.98	N/A	90,675	62,336	
DRY-N/A	6	70.16	83.19	75.33	34.02	110.43	44.66	124.81	44.66 to 124.81	115,096	86,703	
GRASS	14	64.69	66.95	68.11	15.15	98.30	50.17	93.93	56.68 to 73.87	111,969	76,259	
GRASS-N/A	5	75.54	70.08	64.79	9.13	108.16	48.62	77.44	N/A	168,500	109,173	
IRRGTD	17	71.12	68.78	63.19	21.87	108.85	43.75	106.59	49.01 to 87.01	282,652	178,595	
IRRGTD-N/A	11	63.46	69.12	69.20	17.59	99.88	42.03	93.71	57.13 to 92.89	230,023	159,175	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	8	72.74	82.56	78.27	26.78	105.47	52.69	124.81	52.69 to 124.81	92,665	72,529	
DRY-N/A	2	55.63	55.63	60.69	19.72	91.66	44.66	66.60	N/A	155,980	94,664	
GRASS	18	68.96	67.34	66.28	14.61	101.61	48.62	93.93	57.07 to 73.87	124,170	82,294	
GRASS-N/A	1	75.54	75.54	75.54			75.54	75.54	N/A	175,000	132,200	
IRRGTD	26	67.51	68.24	64.49	20.76	105.82	42.03	106.59	57.13 to 73.63	264,925	170,840	
IRRGTD-N/A	2	77.61	77.61	77.18	19.69	100.56	62.33	92.89	N/A	223,647	172,607	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified
 Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	57	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	25.87	95% Median C.I.:	62.33 to 73.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,977,694	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.58 to 71.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,798,694	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.28 to 74.68	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,170,114							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	189,450	COD:	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	125,791	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:22

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
39-0010	3	71.30	70.63	70.48	3.35	100.21	66.71	73.87	N/A	97,666	68,833	
39-0501	1	60.08	60.08	60.08			60.08	60.08	N/A	130,602	78,460	
40-0082	6	62.13	61.58	57.27	19.05	107.53	46.06	75.01	46.06 to 75.01	200,240	114,678	
47-0001	26	68.91	67.87	67.91	14.18	99.95	48.62	96.62	61.67 to 73.45	199,019	135,144	
47-0100	10	77.33	77.28	78.30	19.37	98.69	44.66	106.59	60.76 to 97.34	136,625	106,981	
47-0103	4	64.95	68.49	65.86	17.53	103.98	57.07	86.98	N/A	189,645	124,908	
61-0049	3	122.74	113.83	107.70	8.39	105.69	93.93	124.81	N/A	85,306	91,871	
82-0001	4	44.29	48.63	51.80	12.95	93.88	42.03	63.90	N/A	404,600	209,565	
NonValid School												
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
50.01 TO 100.00	15	71.57	72.63	70.33	19.93	103.27	44.66	124.81	60.76 to 77.44	90,241	63,466	
100.01 TO 180.00	29	66.71	66.88	62.74	18.20	106.59	42.03	122.74	57.06 to 72.77	189,712	119,031	
180.01 TO 330.00	9	73.45	74.10	69.95	19.34	105.94	49.01	96.62	57.13 to 93.93	263,061	184,003	
330.01 TO 650.00	4	75.33	73.25	70.45	22.55	103.98	48.62	93.71	N/A	393,967	277,541	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

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 \$												
30000 TO 59999	3	73.47	89.95	87.98	24.15	102.24	71.57	124.81	N/A	49,333	43,404	
60000 TO 99999	12	71.26	73.86	73.50	22.40	100.49	44.66	122.74	57.07 to 86.98	84,918	62,416	
100000 TO 149999	12	66.71	69.59	70.05	14.73	99.34	50.17	97.34	60.08 to 75.01	118,736	83,174	
150000 TO 249999	17	72.77	73.49	73.64	12.85	99.79	52.63	96.62	63.26 to 86.77	198,972	146,526	
250000 TO 499999	11	50.55	57.77	58.29	24.15	99.11	42.03	93.71	43.75 to 73.63	332,954	194,071	
500000 +	2	56.46	56.46	57.42	13.19	98.32	49.01	63.90	N/A	580,900	333,542	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified
 Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	57	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	25.87	95% Median C.I.:	62.33 to 73.45	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,977,694	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.58 to 71.22	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,798,694	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.28 to 74.68	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,170,114							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	189,450	COD:	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	125,791	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:26:22

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
30000 TO 59999	9	60.76	66.97	62.64	21.90	106.91	44.66	124.81	52.69 to 73.47	73,188	45,847	
60000 TO 99999	17	71.21	73.04	70.25	16.61	103.98	50.17	122.74	62.28 to 77.44	108,226	76,027	
100000 TO 149999	15	72.33	69.78	65.63	17.61	106.32	42.03	97.34	57.06 to 78.10	198,990	130,604	
150000 TO 249999	13	66.60	66.66	63.03	21.66	105.76	43.75	96.62	48.62 to 86.77	300,377	189,339	
250000 TO 499999	3	73.45	77.02	74.06	13.53	104.00	63.90	93.71	N/A	470,133	348,174	
ALL	57	71.12	69.98	66.40	18.97	105.40	42.03	124.81	62.33 to 73.45	189,450	125,791	

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

Agricultural

The Assessor and deputy assessor completed all pickup work. They physically inspected all known new improvements. They listed and valued the new improvements and reviewed and measured all previously existing improvements on these parcels.

A computer issue caused the Assessor to revert to Marshall Swift costing for 06/1999 through the TerrScan CAMA as the 06/2004 values and tables did not work correctly when applied to parcels.

Sales were reviewed for accuracy. Some sales were deemed to have substantially changed and were therefore removed from the qualified unimproved agricultural sales.

The Assessor's office processed the newly certified irrigated farm acres made available from Lower Loup NRD District and corrected acres. While processing each of these parcels all other acres were verified and records updated.

Statistical analyses were run for each market location. Adjustments were made indicated by the market in order to have all market areas within the acceptable range for unimproved agland. The Assessor and deputy assessor utilized an excel spreadsheet to set their values.

Several parcels were moved to "recreational" as sales questionnaires and other information indicated the predominant use was not agricultural. Properties that had been classified as Agricultural that are being used either in full or in part for recreational purposes were brought back to 100% by applying a 1.333 factor. This includes three parcels enrolled in the Wetlands Reserve Program allowing them to be used for recreation purposes but no longer used for agricultural purposes.

There were 125 protests filed in 2007 each parcel was physically inspected, records were reviewed and recommendations were made to County Board of Equalization during protest hearings. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor physically inspected the protested properties and attended the protest hearings.

The Howard County Board of Commissioners terminated one position in the Assessor's office causing a staffing shortage and creating time spent in cross training the remaining staff. The Assessor stated that the termination caused them to be short handed and unable to complete their planned cyclical review work.

2008 Assessment Survey for Howard County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
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?
	By usage
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?
	Unknown by current assessor
6.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1974
7.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	The current assessor believes this was last completed in 1987
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Unknown by current assessor
b.	By whom?
	Unknown by current assessor
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	Unknown by current assessor
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:
	3

9.	How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class?
	By the geographic characteristics/rivers
10.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
36		48	84

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 76.45	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,919,194	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	19.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.48 to 76.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,740,194	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.47	95% Mean C.I.:	69.69 to 80.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,703,498							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	191,789	COD:	20.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,562	PRD:	104.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.30			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:55

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	5	86.77	98.49	91.14	30.45	108.07	61.61	135.43	N/A	107,345	97,829
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	11	71.87	72.22	65.50	17.25	110.26	48.58	106.59	51.00 to 86.80	178,369	116,827
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	10	72.75	77.86	76.94	17.74	101.19	50.55	106.40	60.08 to 103.18	145,910	112,265
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	50.17	50.17	50.17			50.17	50.17	N/A	123,000	61,710
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	62.66	66.87	66.84	7.95	100.04	61.51	76.45	N/A	217,666	145,497
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	71.30	71.30	71.30			71.30	71.30	N/A	312,000	222,470
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	78.31	79.52	76.83	14.70	103.51	60.01	110.62	60.01 to 110.62	224,675	172,608
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	65.33	67.14	77.95	22.47	86.13	45.30	102.60	N/A	177,892	138,669
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	66.71	66.71	66.71			66.71	66.71	N/A	105,000	70,044
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	67.63	72.85	72.74	15.03	100.15	56.20	99.97	N/A	281,380	204,683
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	64.67	67.45	61.65	21.49	109.41	46.14	90.77	46.14 to 90.77	246,800	152,142
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	91.34	91.34	91.34			91.34	91.34	N/A	217,294	198,469
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	27	73.47	78.36	72.50	22.14	108.08	48.58	135.43	70.85 to 86.77	151,144	109,578
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	69.28	72.32	74.57	17.55	96.99	45.30	110.62	61.51 to 81.15	213,500	159,197
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	67.17	71.03	68.18	18.68	104.18	46.14	99.97	56.20 to 90.77	246,913	168,351
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	15	71.30	73.38	72.37	16.31	101.39	50.17	106.40	61.51 to 79.63	169,806	122,888
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	68.57	73.17	75.28	18.28	97.20	45.30	110.62	60.01 to 81.33	220,553	166,026
<u>ALL</u>											
	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 76.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,919,194	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	19.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.48 to 76.97	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,740,194	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.47	95% Mean C.I.:	69.69 to 80.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,703,498							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	191,789	COD:	20.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,562	PRD:	104.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.30			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:55

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2617	1	60.08	60.08	60.08			60.08	60.08	N/A	130,602	78,460
2619	1	90.77	90.77	90.77			90.77	90.77	N/A	95,000	86,231
2621	3	66.71	76.45	83.00	18.64	92.11	62.66	99.97	N/A	143,000	118,685
2623	5	71.21	67.86	63.85	6.25	106.27	56.20	73.87	N/A	146,640	93,636
2717	4	110.12	107.29	99.76	24.67	107.54	73.47	135.43	N/A	97,022	96,792
2719	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	100,000	71,870
2721	3	77.75	75.19	77.37	5.38	97.18	67.63	80.19	N/A	221,193	171,145
2723	7	51.00	54.79	57.05	10.11	96.04	48.58	73.75	48.58 to 73.75	335,900	191,628
2913	2	84.60	84.60	83.53	2.59	101.28	82.41	86.80	N/A	154,500	129,057
2915	5	71.30	80.28	77.48	18.34	103.61	61.51	106.40	N/A	235,354	182,363
2917	4	69.03	73.46	84.44	23.27	87.00	53.19	102.60	N/A	186,050	157,101
2919	6	78.31	79.52	76.83	14.70	103.51	60.01	110.62	60.01 to 110.62	224,675	172,608
3013	4	73.40	69.20	62.52	14.05	110.69	46.14	83.85	N/A	195,785	122,397
3015	4	68.12	69.38	66.23	17.27	104.74	50.55	90.72	N/A	162,575	107,681
3019	6	74.46	78.22	77.14	24.51	101.40	45.30	106.59	45.30 to 106.59	139,660	107,731
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
7100	21	71.63	77.73	74.18	25.19	104.79	45.30	135.43	61.61 to 83.85	177,703	131,818
7200	24	72.53	73.41	69.59	20.04	105.48	48.58	106.59	60.08 to 82.41	228,219	158,828
7300	11	71.30	72.79	73.37	10.51	99.21	56.20	99.97	62.66 to 86.77	139,197	102,130
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 76.45	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,919,194	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	19.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.48 to 76.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,740,194	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.47	95% Mean C.I.:	69.69 to 80.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,703,498							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	191,789	COD:	20.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,562	PRD:	104.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.30			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:55

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	66.74	69.36	69.99	17.92	99.10	53.19	90.77	N/A	90,675	63,461
DRY-N/A	6	76.57	89.01	80.43	37.32	110.67	45.30	135.43	45.30 to 135.43	115,096	92,570
GRASS	9	71.30	69.32	70.47	9.16	98.37	59.47	86.77	60.08 to 73.87	114,396	80,610
GRASS-N/A	9	71.21	77.26	75.62	22.27	102.18	50.17	110.62	56.20 to 106.40	146,888	111,073
IRRGTD	2	74.04	74.04	74.59	3.25	99.27	71.63	76.45	N/A	183,500	136,867
IRRGTD-N/A	26	74.46	73.69	70.25	19.61	104.90	46.14	106.59	61.51 to 81.33	268,013	188,282
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	66.74	69.36	69.99	17.92	99.10	53.19	90.77	N/A	90,675	63,461
DRY-N/A	6	76.57	89.01	80.43	37.32	110.67	45.30	135.43	45.30 to 135.43	115,096	92,570
GRASS	14	69.42	70.73	72.03	13.11	98.19	50.17	110.62	60.08 to 73.87	111,969	80,654
GRASS-N/A	4	83.22	82.26	76.02	17.24	108.21	56.20	106.40	N/A	196,000	148,997
IRRGTD	17	71.63	71.41	66.36	21.37	107.61	46.14	106.59	51.00 to 90.72	282,652	187,566
IRRGTD-N/A	11	80.19	77.28	78.27	12.22	98.74	48.58	102.60	65.33 to 91.34	230,023	180,039
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	77.86	87.11	82.73	30.53	105.30	53.19	135.43	53.19 to 135.43	92,665	76,660
DRY-N/A	2	57.29	57.29	62.82	20.93	91.19	45.30	69.28	N/A	155,980	97,992
GRASS	17	71.21	71.34	70.71	13.75	100.90	50.17	110.62	60.08 to 79.63	128,033	90,526
GRASS-N/A	1	106.40	106.40	106.40			106.40	106.40	N/A	175,000	186,208
IRRGTD	26	72.69	72.71	69.41	18.96	104.75	46.14	106.59	61.51 to 80.19	264,925	183,886
IRRGTD-N/A	2	86.88	86.88	86.75	5.14	100.15	82.41	91.34	N/A	223,647	194,006
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 76.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,919,194	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	19.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.48 to 76.97	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,740,194	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.47	95% Mean C.I.:	69.69 to 80.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,703,498							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	191,789	COD:	20.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,562	PRD:	104.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.30			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:55

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
39-0010	3	71.30	70.63	70.48	3.35	100.21	66.71	73.87	N/A	97,666	68,833	
39-0501	1	60.08	60.08	60.08			60.08	60.08	N/A	130,602	78,460	
40-0082	6	68.15	65.33	60.23	16.95	108.47	46.14	83.85	46.14 to 83.85	200,240	120,606	
47-0001	25	71.21	72.03	72.45	16.22	99.43	49.48	106.40	61.61 to 76.45	204,639	148,257	
47-0100	10	83.22	80.97	81.25	17.73	99.66	45.30	106.59	65.33 to 103.18	136,625	111,010	
47-0103	4	78.97	79.08	79.05	8.10	100.04	67.63	90.77	N/A	189,645	149,917	
61-0049	3	133.47	126.51	121.59	6.20	104.04	110.62	135.43	N/A	85,306	103,725	
82-0001	4	51.05	56.11	59.78	12.37	93.85	48.58	73.75	N/A	404,600	241,878	
NonValid School												
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562	

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
50.01 TO 100.00	14	71.60	76.81	74.07	20.39	103.70	45.30	135.43	61.61 to 90.77	92,508	68,517	
100.01 TO 180.00	29	71.21	71.95	67.95	19.35	105.89	46.14	133.47	61.51 to 80.19	189,712	128,909	
180.01 TO 330.00	9	77.75	79.29	74.92	18.19	105.84	49.48	110.62	60.08 to 99.97	263,061	197,075	
330.01 TO 650.00	4	80.26	79.83	78.19	18.51	102.10	56.20	102.60	N/A	393,967	308,046	
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562	

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 \$												
30000 TO 59999	2	104.45	104.45	103.93	29.66	100.50	73.47	135.43	N/A	44,750	46,508	
60000 TO 99999	12	71.43	77.78	77.14	22.50	100.83	45.30	133.47	61.61 to 90.77	84,918	65,502	
100000 TO 149999	12	66.71	71.97	72.67	16.83	99.03	50.17	110.62	60.08 to 75.17	118,736	86,287	
150000 TO 249999	17	81.15	80.80	80.64	11.10	100.19	60.01	106.40	69.28 to 90.72	198,972	160,458	
250000 TO 499999	11	56.20	62.93	63.54	22.85	99.04	46.14	102.60	48.58 to 77.75	332,954	211,555	
500000 +	2	61.61	61.61	63.18	19.69	97.52	49.48	73.75	N/A	580,900	367,040	
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562	

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 76.45	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,919,194	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	19.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.48 to 76.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,740,194	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.47	95% Mean C.I.:	69.69 to 80.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,703,498							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	191,789	COD:	20.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,562	PRD:	104.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.30			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:32:55

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	7	67.63	72.60	67.41	25.42	107.70	45.30	135.43	45.30 to 135.43	70,885	47,781
60000 TO 99999	15	71.21	71.91	70.45	13.60	102.08	50.17	106.59	62.66 to 75.17	103,882	73,184
100000 TO 149999	13	71.63	77.45	71.46	22.42	108.39	48.58	133.47	60.01 to 90.72	179,596	128,333
150000 TO 249999	16	78.32	76.38	71.80	20.43	106.38	46.14	110.62	56.20 to 91.34	256,043	183,830
250000 TO 499999	5	75.47	75.81	73.71	15.14	102.85	49.48	102.60	N/A	450,860	332,329
ALL	56	71.60	74.91	71.73	20.22	104.44	45.30	135.43	67.63 to 76.45	191,789	137,562

2008 Correlation Section for Howard County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the statistical data and the assessment actions for agricultural unimproved property in Howard County supports the calculated median as the level of value for agricultural unimproved property at 72%.

The Howard County Assessor and her staff have been in place now just over one year and one full cycle of assessment. After discussion with the Assessor and deputy assessor, they have discovered issues with uniformity and accuracy in the data left from the previous administration. They are working on improving and correcting the data. Consequently, because of the uniformity issues, some valuation changes appear not equitable but are in fact corrections to achieve more uniform assessments.

There have historically been a large number of protests in Howard County and increasing public education to the process would be beneficial to all.

Information gathered through the assessor survey indicated that the county board has cut the staffing in the Assessor's office eliminating the only lister. In addition, Howard County has never had cadastral maps. The county board is currently in a dispute and the geographic information system started, has to date, not yet been completed. The listing and inventorying of parcels is critical to assessing property and unfortunately the Howard County Assessor is extremely limited as to what resources she has available to her office. In addition to some sort of inventorying system, additional excel classes to more fully and accurately utilize the agricultural spreadsheet would be beneficial.

The county also had to review the data and discovered two major listing and classification errors causing what would appear to be unequal treatment of sold and unsold properties but was in fact a continuance of the effort to increase the accuracy of the data.

Based on the reported assessment actions and interviews with the assessor and her staff, the calculated R & O Median appears to be the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(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.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	115	56	48.7
2007	126	57	45.24
2006	154	90	58.44
2005	130	73	56.15
2004	121	72	59.5
2003	113	72	63.72
2002	118	83	70.34
2001	143	89	62.24

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table two represents evidence that the sales verification in Howard County is in it's second year of comparable use and appears to be uniformly utilized. The past 2 years the fluctuation in the percentage of sales used is minimal. A review of the total agricultural sales in Howard County shows 13 sales that were coded out for having substantially changed since the date of the sale. The majority of these were from the certification of irrigated acres from the NRD. It does not appear that Howard County has excessively trimmed their sales. It should be noted that the number of unimproved agricultural sales has declined over the past three years.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

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

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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	71.12	7.06	76.14	71.60
2007	67.09	4.83	70.33	71.57
2006	74.71	2.49	76.57	76.73
2005	74.98	5.57	79.15	77.32
2004	70.32	9.03	76.67	76.39
2003	75	-0.05	74.96	76
2002	76	-1.12	75.15	74
2001	76	5.16	79.92	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: At first glance, Table III would indicate a trended preliminary ratio of 76.14%, just above the acceptable range. However, a review of the agricultural assessment actions and a review of the sales would indicate that the calculated R & O Ratio to be a better indication of the level of value for agricultural property in Howard County. As previously stated in Table 1 Howard County has encountered uniformity issues in the data and although minimal changes to LCGs occurred in market area 3, 2 sales were discovered to have been irrigated at the time they sold and moved the sales file not in direct relation to the base.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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)
10.16	2008	7.06
9.38	2007	4.83
6.05	2006	2.49
8.81	2005	5.57
16.61	2004	9.03
1.47	2003	0
0.29	2002	-1.12
-0.51	2001	5.16

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: As previously mentioned there are uniformity and accuracy issues in Howard County. A review of Table IV indicates similar movement in the sales file and the base, just not as uniform as desired. A review of the agricultural assessment actions does indicate that varying changes were made to all market areas, but not all LCGs in each market area received a change. However, all sales are reviewed for accuracy and with the county board reduction of the staff, not all of the base properties are able to be reviewed for accuracy in one year. Consequently, the sales file did receive two large corrections to sales for inaccurate listing information. These properties were sold as irrigated land but the property record file did not have them valued as irrigated. This appears to have caused a somewhat, albeit not overly large, skewed movement of the sales file when compared to the base of agricultural property.

2008 Correlation Section for Howard County

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.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71.60	71.73	74.91

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of Table 5 indicates all three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with the median coming in at 71.60% with the wgt mean nearly identical at 71.73% and the mean coming in at 74.91%. The measures of central tendency all give credibility to the statistical level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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
R&O Statistics	20.22	104.44
Difference	0.22	1.44

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both qualitative measures reflect good assessment uniformity. The coefficient of dispersion rounds to within the range and the price-related differential is just so slightly above the range. The qualitative measures indicate that the Howard County Assessor has valued agricultural property in Howard County uniformly.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	57	56	-1
Median	71.12	71.60	0.48
Wgt. Mean	66.40	71.73	5.33
Mean	69.98	74.91	4.93
COD	18.97	20.22	1.25
PRD	105.40	104.44	-0.96
Min Sales Ratio	42.03	45.30	3.27
Max Sales Ratio	124.81	135.43	10.62

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 7 accurately reflects 1 sale that was removed after the preliminary statistical run. Following the completion of pickup work and sales verification, this 1 sale was found to have substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remainder of the statistics reflect that changes were made throughout the ag file to various LCGs in all three market areas but no across the board percentage changes were indicated by the market study.

County 47 - Howard

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 5,455	Value 525,596,555	Total Growth 7,390,652 (Sum 17, 25, & 41)
--	----------------------	--------------------------	---

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

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
1. Res UnImp Land	201	949,944	0	0	219	2,420,102	420	3,370,046	
2. Res Improv Land	1,320	8,049,163	0	0	646	15,084,388	1,966	23,133,551	
3. Res Improvements	1,361	72,153,895	0	0	705	58,755,327	2,066	130,909,222	
4. Res Total	1,562	81,153,002	0	0	924	76,259,817	2,486	157,412,819	4,823,975
% of Total	62.83	51.55	0.00	0.00	37.16	48.44	45.57	29.94	65.27
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	2	141,861	2	141,861	
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	2	141,861	2	141,861	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	***	***	0.03	0.02	0.00
Res+Rec Total	1,562	81,153,002	0	0	926	76,401,678	2,488	157,554,680	4,823,975
% of Total	62.78	51.50	0.00	0.00	37.21	48.49	45.60	29.97	65.27

County 47 - Howard

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 5,455	Value 525,596,555	Total Growth 7,390,652 (Sum 17, 25, & 41)
--	----------------------	--------------------------	---

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

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
9. Comm UnImp Land	67	510,560	0	0	8	114,563	75	625,123	
10. Comm Improv Land	260	1,899,745	0	0	35	1,153,213	295	3,052,958	
11. Comm Improvements	270	16,669,424	0	0	43	4,256,159	313	20,925,583	
12. Comm Total	337	19,079,729	0	0	51	5,523,935	388	24,603,664	495,248
% of Total	86.85	77.54	0.00	0.00	13.14	22.45	7.11	4.68	6.70
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	337	19,079,729	0	0	51	5,523,935	388	24,603,664	495,248
% of Total	86.85	77.54	0.00	0.00	13.14	22.45	7.11	4.68	6.70
17. Taxable Total	1,899	100,232,731	0	0	977	81,925,613	2,876	182,158,344	5,319,223
% of Total	66.02	55.02	0.00	0.00	33.97	41.94	52.72	34.65	71.97

County 47 - Howard

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule II: Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	28,784	1,091,375	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rural						
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Total Value Base	Total Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	28,784	1,091,375
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	28,784	1,091,375

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	160	0	159	319

Schedule V: Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,615	158,170,442	1,615	158,170,442
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	927	125,903,099	927	125,903,099
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	0	0	964	59,364,670	964	59,364,670
30. Ag-Total Taxable							2,579	343,438,211

County 47 - Howard

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:

Non-Agricultural Detail	Urban			SubUrban			Growth Value
	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	0	0.000	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	0		0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	0		0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			0.000		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	2.000	22,000	2	2.000	22,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	675	679.020	7,546,000	675	679.020	7,546,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	711		46,210,857	711		46,210,857	2,071,429
34. HomeSite Total				713	681.020	53,778,857	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	42	190.570	314,951	42	190.570	314,951	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	850	4,345.710	6,599,824	850	4,345.710	6,599,824	
37. FarmSite Improv	897		13,153,813	897		13,153,813	0
38. FarmSite Total				939	4,536.280	20,068,588	
39. Road & Ditches		6,626.880			6,626.880		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,652	11,844.180	73,847,445	2,071,429

Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:

Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	5	608.320	273,508	5	608.320	273,508

Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records:

Special Value	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
44. Recapture Val			0			0
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
44. Recapture Val			0			0

County 47 - Howard

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 71

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	336.600	562,122	336.600	562,122
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,136.560	5,065,549	3,136.560	5,065,549
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,357.050	6,426,664	4,357.050	6,426,664
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,935.660	2,709,924	1,935.660	2,709,924
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	9,788.880	12,480,859	9,788.880	12,480,859
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,021.580	5,900,378	5,021.580	5,900,378
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,753.820	2,629,909	2,753.820	2,629,909
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,719.070	12,827,347	13,719.070	12,827,347
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	41,049.220	48,602,752	41,049.220	48,602,752
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	111.840	112,958	111.840	112,958
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	954.260	959,034	954.260	959,034
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,294.030	1,239,939	1,294.030	1,239,939
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	819.870	780,617	819.870	780,617
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,455.280	3,109,752	3,455.280	3,109,752
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,137.910	1,921,067	2,137.910	1,921,067
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	817.550	692,942	817.550	692,942
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,286.380	2,760,557	3,286.380	2,760,557
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	12,877.120	11,576,866	12,877.120	11,576,866
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	26.660	19,462	26.660	19,462
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	398.950	281,261	398.950	281,261
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	655.480	457,378	655.480	457,378
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,753.190	1,187,602	1,753.190	1,187,602
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,005.820	1,983,883	3,005.820	1,983,883
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,681.990	4,436,862	6,681.990	4,436,862
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	9,087.160	5,968,527	9,087.160	5,968,527
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	26,208.010	16,902,164	26,208.010	16,902,164
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	47,817.260	31,237,139	47,817.260	31,237,139
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,650.120	247,520	1,650.120	247,520
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	238.380	35,758	238.380	35,758
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		609.190		609.190	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	103,632.100	91,700,035	103,632.100	91,700,035

County 47 - Howard

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 72

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	11,627.720	18,488,084	11,627.720	18,488,084
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	30,411.160	47,897,702	30,411.160	47,897,702
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,174.850	3,841,571	3,174.850	3,841,571
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,523.600	2,902,147	2,523.600	2,902,147
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,578.890	5,013,923	4,578.890	5,013,923
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	770.890	801,724	770.890	801,724
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	15,144.670	15,371,945	15,144.670	15,371,945
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,618.690	5,506,320	5,618.690	5,506,320
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	73,850.470	99,823,416	73,850.470	99,823,416
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	713.430	556,476	713.430	556,476
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,043.130	2,358,475	3,043.130	2,358,475
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	576.130	368,724	576.130	368,724
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	823.500	518,809	823.500	518,809
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	981.380	588,828	981.380	588,828
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	366.680	212,674	366.680	212,674
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,908.100	4,151,810	7,908.100	4,151,810
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,036.870	1,518,435	3,036.870	1,518,435
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	17,449.220	10,274,231	17,449.220	10,274,231
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,420.810	866,695	1,420.810	866,695
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,605.470	2,055,123	3,605.470	2,055,123
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,257.410	710,446	1,257.410	710,446
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,694.020	898,183	1,694.020	898,183
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,283.000	615,842	1,283.000	615,842
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,172.710	1,039,267	2,172.710	1,039,267
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	16,395.230	6,326,867	16,395.230	6,326,867
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	33,275.180	12,143,501	33,275.180	12,143,501
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	61,103.830	24,655,924	61,103.830	24,655,924
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,155.260	173,292	1,155.260	173,292
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	133.780	20,068	133.780	20,068
74. Exempt	26.530		0.000		1,127.330		1,153.860	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	153,692.560	134,946,931	153,692.560	134,946,931

County 47 - Howard

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 73

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,822.440	2,460,297	1,822.440	2,460,297
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,350.140	6,687,685	5,350.140	6,687,685
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	675.020	668,270	675.020	668,270
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	991.390	926,954	991.390	926,954
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	200.720	177,639	200.720	177,639
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	614.630	510,143	614.630	510,143
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,749.100	1,364,299	1,749.100	1,364,299
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,646.300	1,201,798	1,646.300	1,201,798
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,049.740	13,997,085	13,049.740	13,997,085
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,035.050	1,200,678	2,035.050	1,200,678
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,334.190	1,950,507	3,334.190	1,950,507
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	166.230	86,440	166.230	86,440
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	502.600	256,326	502.600	256,326
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	149.950	67,478	149.950	67,478
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	99.500	43,283	99.500	43,283
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,982.750	1,282,585	2,982.750	1,282,585
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,828.060	740,369	1,828.060	740,369
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	11,098.330	5,627,666	11,098.330	5,627,666
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	448.620	222,071	448.620	222,071
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,712.050	821,784	1,712.050	821,784
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	418.380	196,639	418.380	196,639
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	642.310	289,042	642.310	289,042
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	158.920	70,720	158.920	70,720
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	482.210	212,173	482.210	212,173
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	12,054.880	5,243,885	12,054.880	5,243,885
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	38,520.230	16,178,496	38,520.230	16,178,496
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	54,437.600	23,234,810	54,437.600	23,234,810
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	561.590	84,239	561.590	84,239
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		636.810		636.810	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	79,147.260	42,943,800	79,147.260	42,943,800

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	127,949.430	162,423,253	127,949.430	162,423,253
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	0.000	0	41,424.670	27,478,763	41,424.670	27,478,763
78.Grass	0.000	0	0.000	0	163,358.690	79,127,873	163,358.690	79,127,873
79.Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,366.970	505,051	3,366.970	505,051
80.Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	372.160	55,826	372.160	55,826
81.Exempt	26.530	0	0.000	0	2,385.980	0	2,412.510	0
82.Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	336,471.920	269,590,766	336,471.920	269,590,766

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 47 - Howard

Market Area: 71

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	336.600	0.82%	562,122	1.16%	1,670.000
1A	3,136.560	7.64%	5,065,549	10.42%	1,615.001
2A1	4,357.050	10.61%	6,426,664	13.22%	1,475.003
2A	1,935.660	4.72%	2,709,924	5.58%	1,400.000
3A1	9,788.880	23.85%	12,480,859	25.68%	1,275.003
3A	5,021.580	12.23%	5,900,378	12.14%	1,175.004
4A1	2,753.820	6.71%	2,629,909	5.41%	955.003
4A	13,719.070	33.42%	12,827,347	26.39%	935.001
Irrigated Total	41,049.220	100.00%	48,602,752	100.00%	1,184.011

Dry:

1D1	111.840	0.87%	112,958	0.98%	1,009.996
1D	954.260	7.41%	959,034	8.28%	1,005.002
2D1	1,294.030	10.05%	1,239,939	10.71%	958.199
2D	819.870	6.37%	780,617	6.74%	952.122
3D1	3,455.280	26.83%	3,109,752	26.86%	900.000
3D	2,137.910	16.60%	1,921,067	16.59%	898.572
4D1	817.550	6.35%	692,942	5.99%	847.583
4D	3,286.380	25.52%	2,760,557	23.85%	839.999
Dry Total	12,877.120	100.00%	11,576,866	100.00%	899.026

Grass:

1G1	26.660	0.06%	19,462	0.06%	730.007
1G	398.950	0.83%	281,261	0.90%	705.003
2G1	655.480	1.37%	457,378	1.46%	697.775
2G	1,753.190	3.67%	1,187,602	3.80%	677.394
3G1	3,005.820	6.29%	1,983,883	6.35%	660.013
3G	6,681.990	13.97%	4,436,862	14.20%	664.003
4G1	9,087.160	19.00%	5,968,527	19.11%	656.808
4G	26,208.010	54.81%	16,902,164	54.11%	644.923
Grass Total	47,817.260	100.00%	31,237,139	100.00%	653.260

Irrigated Total	41,049.220	39.61%	48,602,752	53.00%	1,184.011
Dry Total	12,877.120	12.43%	11,576,866	12.62%	899.026
Grass Total	47,817.260	46.14%	31,237,139	34.06%	653.260
Waste	1,650.120	1.59%	247,520	0.27%	150.001
Other	238.380	0.23%	35,758	0.04%	150.004
Exempt	609.190	0.59%			
Market Area Total	103,632.100	100.00%	91,700,035	100.00%	884.861

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	41,049.220	32.08%	48,602,752	29.92%	
Dry Total	12,877.120	31.09%	11,576,866	42.13%	
Grass Total	47,817.260	29.27%	31,237,139	39.48%	
Waste	1,650.120	49.01%	247,520	49.01%	
Other	238.380	64.05%	35,758	64.05%	
Exempt	609.190	25.25%			
Market Area Total	103,632.100	30.80%	91,700,035	34.01%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 47 - Howard

Market Area: **72**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	11,627.720	15.74%	18,488,084	18.52%	1,590.000
1A	30,411.160	41.18%	47,897,702	47.98%	1,575.004
2A1	3,174.850	4.30%	3,841,571	3.85%	1,210.000
2A	2,523.600	3.42%	2,902,147	2.91%	1,150.002
3A1	4,578.890	6.20%	5,013,923	5.02%	1,095.008
3A	770.890	1.04%	801,724	0.80%	1,039.997
4A1	15,144.670	20.51%	15,371,945	15.40%	1,015.006
4A	5,618.690	7.61%	5,506,320	5.52%	980.000
Irrigated Total	73,850.470	100.00%	99,823,416	100.00%	1,351.696

Dry:

1D1	713.430	4.09%	556,476	5.42%	780.000
1D	3,043.130	17.44%	2,358,475	22.96%	775.016
2D1	576.130	3.30%	368,724	3.59%	640.001
2D	823.500	4.72%	518,809	5.05%	630.004
3D1	981.380	5.62%	588,828	5.73%	600.000
3D	366.680	2.10%	212,674	2.07%	579.998
4D1	7,908.100	45.32%	4,151,810	40.41%	525.007
4D	3,036.870	17.40%	1,518,435	14.78%	500.000
Dry Total	17,449.220	100.00%	10,274,231	100.00%	588.807

Grass:

1G1	1,420.810	2.33%	866,695	3.52%	610.000
1G	3,605.470	5.90%	2,055,123	8.34%	570.001
2G1	1,257.410	2.06%	710,446	2.88%	565.007
2G	1,694.020	2.77%	898,183	3.64%	530.208
3G1	1,283.000	2.10%	615,842	2.50%	480.001
3G	2,172.710	3.56%	1,039,267	4.22%	478.327
4G1	16,395.230	26.83%	6,326,867	25.66%	385.896
4G	33,275.180	54.46%	12,143,501	49.25%	364.941
Grass Total	61,103.830	100.00%	24,655,924	100.00%	403.508

Irrigated Total	73,850.470	48.05%	99,823,416	73.97%	1,351.696
Dry Total	17,449.220	11.35%	10,274,231	7.61%	588.807
Grass Total	61,103.830	39.76%	24,655,924	18.27%	403.508
Waste	1,155.260	0.75%	173,292	0.13%	150.002
Other	133.780	0.09%	20,068	0.01%	150.007
Exempt	1,153.860	0.75%			
Market Area Total	153,692.560	100.00%	134,946,931	100.00%	878.031

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	73,850.470	57.72%	99,823,416	61.46%	
Dry Total	17,449.220	42.12%	10,274,231	37.39%	
Grass Total	61,103.830	37.40%	24,655,924	31.16%	
Waste	1,155.260	34.31%	173,292	34.31%	
Other	133.780	35.95%	20,068	35.95%	
Exempt	1,153.860	47.83%			
Market Area Total	153,692.560	45.68%	134,946,931	50.06%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 47 - Howard

Market Area: **73**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	1,822.440	13.97%	2,460,297	17.58%	1,350.001
1A	5,350.140	41.00%	6,687,685	47.78%	1,250.001
2A1	675.020	5.17%	668,270	4.77%	990.000
2A	991.390	7.60%	926,954	6.62%	935.004
3A1	200.720	1.54%	177,639	1.27%	885.008
3A	614.630	4.71%	510,143	3.64%	830.000
4A1	1,749.100	13.40%	1,364,299	9.75%	780.000
4A	1,646.300	12.62%	1,201,798	8.59%	729.999
Irrigated Total	13,049.740	100.00%	13,997,085	100.00%	1,072.594

Dry:

1D1	2,035.050	18.34%	1,200,678	21.34%	589.999
1D	3,334.190	30.04%	1,950,507	34.66%	585.001
2D1	166.230	1.50%	86,440	1.54%	520.002
2D	502.600	4.53%	256,326	4.55%	510.000
3D1	149.950	1.35%	67,478	1.20%	450.003
3D	99.500	0.90%	43,283	0.77%	435.005
4D1	2,982.750	26.88%	1,282,585	22.79%	430.000
4D	1,828.060	16.47%	740,369	13.16%	405.002
Dry Total	11,098.330	100.00%	5,627,666	100.00%	507.073

Grass:

1G1	448.620	0.82%	222,071	0.96%	495.009
1G	1,712.050	3.14%	821,784	3.54%	480.000
2G1	418.380	0.77%	196,639	0.85%	470.000
2G	642.310	1.18%	289,042	1.24%	450.003
3G1	158.920	0.29%	70,720	0.30%	445.003
3G	482.210	0.89%	212,173	0.91%	440.001
4G1	12,054.880	22.14%	5,243,885	22.57%	435.001
4G	38,520.230	70.76%	16,178,496	69.63%	419.999
Grass Total	54,437.600	100.00%	23,234,810	100.00%	426.815

Irrigated Total	13,049.740	16.49%	13,997,085	32.59%	1,072.594
Dry Total	11,098.330	14.02%	5,627,666	13.10%	507.073
Grass Total	54,437.600	68.78%	23,234,810	54.11%	426.815
Waste	561.590	0.71%	84,239	0.20%	150.000
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	636.810	0.80%			
Market Area Total	79,147.260	100.00%	42,943,800	100.00%	542.581

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	13,049.740	10.20%	13,997,085	8.62%	
Dry Total	11,098.330	26.79%	5,627,666	20.48%	
Grass Total	54,437.600	33.32%	23,234,810	29.36%	
Waste	561.590	16.68%	84,239	16.68%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	636.810	26.40%			
Market Area Total	79,147.260	23.52%	42,943,800	15.93%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 47 - Howard

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	127,949.430	162,423,253
Dry	0.000	0	0.000	0	41,424.670	27,478,763
Grass	0.000	0	0.000	0	163,358.690	79,127,873
Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,366.970	505,051
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	372.160	55,826
Exempt	26.530	0	0.000	0	2,385.980	0
Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	336,471.920	269,590,766

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Total Acres	% of Acres*	Total Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	127,949.430	162,423,253	127,949.430	38.03%	162,423,253	60.25%	1,269.433
Dry	41,424.670	27,478,763	41,424.670	12.31%	27,478,763	10.19%	663.342
Grass	163,358.690	79,127,873	163,358.690	48.55%	79,127,873	29.35%	484.381
Waste	3,366.970	505,051	3,366.970	1.00%	505,051	0.19%	150.001
Other	372.160	55,826	372.160	0.11%	55,826	0.02%	150.005
Exempt	2,412.510	0	2,412.510	0.72%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	336,471.920	269,590,766	336,471.920	100.00%	269,590,766	100.00%	801.228

* 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)**

47 Howard

	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	152,685,230	157,412,819	4,727,589	3.1	4,823,975	-0.06
2. Recreational	0	141,861	141,861		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	52,517,779	53,778,857	1,261,078	2.4	*-----	2.4
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	205,203,009	211,333,537	6,130,528	2.99	4,823,975	0.64
5. Commercial	21,495,773	24,603,664	3,107,891	14.46	495,248	12.15
6. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	19,783,156	20,068,588	285,432	1.44	2,071,429	-9.03
8. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	41,278,929	44,672,252	3,393,323	8.22	495,248	7.02
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	246,481,938	256,005,789	9,523,851	3.86	7,390,652	0.87
11. Irrigated	143,506,881	162,423,253	18,916,372	13.18		
12. Dryland	33,408,330	27,478,763	-5,929,567	-17.75		
13. Grassland	74,200,331	79,127,873	4,927,542	6.64		
14. Wasteland	640,360	505,051	-135,309	-21.13		
15. Other Agland	48,093	48,093	7,733	16.08		
16. Total Agricultural Land	251,803,995	269,590,766	17,786,771	7.06		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	498,285,933	525,596,555	27,310,622	5.48	7,390,652	4

*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.

2007 Plan of Assessment for Howard County

Assessment years 2008, 2009, 2010

Date: June 15, 2007

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land.
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticulture land

General Description of Real Property in Howard County

Per the 2007 County Abstract, Howard County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	2506	45%	31%
Commercial	378	7%	4%
Agricultural	2652	48%	65%

Agricultural land – taxable acres for 2007 assessment were 338,587.90.

Agricultural land is 51% of the real property valuation base in Howard County and of that 29% is assessed as irrigated, 15% is assessed as grass and 7% is assessed as dry.

For assessment year 2007, an estimated 132 permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2007 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the assessor. The assessor and deputy are certified by the Property Tax Administrator. The deputy is also a Registered Appraiser.

The certificate holders will continue to keep their certifications current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours required by the Property Tax Division. At least part of these hours will be courses offered by IAAO or the equivalent. The assessor or a staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current statutes and regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made to them.

The county started a GIS project in 2005, which is greatly needed as Howard County does not have any Cadastral Maps. The Howard County Assessor's office is currently working on this project with GIS Workshop to complete the project. Projected completion is within 18 to 24 months, with the implementation of GIS, the information will be available electronically. Maps will be printed in the future, when the information is available.

Office Budget for July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 was \$128,352.00.

Terra Scan is the vendor for the assessment administration and CAMA. ArcView is the GIS software currently being used by Howard County and is supported by GIS Workshop in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Real Estate transfer statements are handled daily. Depending on the number of transfers filed, there is a 2-4 week turn around time. Ownership changes are made as sales are processed. All Residential, Agricultural and Commercial sales are verified by sales questionnaires mailed to buyer and seller, by telephone calls and physical inspections as necessary. Most residential sales are inspected and new photos taken if necessary. Building permits are checked yearly beginning in July. Pickup work is to be completed by March 1 each year.

It is the goal of the office to review at least 25 percent of the properties yearly. Market data is gathered and reviewed yearly.

Ratio studies are done on all the sales after August 15 each year. These studies are used to determine the areas that are out of compliance and need reviewing for the next assessment cycle.

Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Howard County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes and subclasses of Howard County.

By approximately March 1 of each year, ratio studies are run using the newly established values to see if the areas out of compliance will now meet the guidelines.

Notices of Valuation Changes are mailed to the property owners on or before June 1.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2007:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	96.79	13.98	99.94
Commercial	95.02	11.47	104.99
Agricultural Land	71.57	18.78	104.51

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2007 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008:

Residential:

A review of current data on all St Paul residential properties will be completed for 2008. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2008. A ratio study will be done on all other residential properties and adjustments will be made if they are out of compliance. Corrections of listings errors will be done when correct information is obtained.

Commercial:

A ratio study will be completed for 2008 to see if any commercial properties are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when correct information is obtained. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2008.

Agricultural Land:

A Market Area analysis will be conducted to verify boundaries between the 3 market areas for 2008. The use of agricultural land use for recreational purposes will be reviewed and possibly reclassified as recreational property. A market analysis will be conducted for 2008 and agricultural land values will be assessed at market value. Corrections of listing errors will be done when correct information is obtained. The certification of irrigated acres for the NRD will be completed and those changes will be made for the 2008 assessment year.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2009:

Residential:

A review of current data on all residential properties in all rural subdivisions and acreages will be completed for 2009. A ratio study will be done on all residential properties and adjustments will be made if they are out of compliance. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2009. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained.

Commercial:

A review & reappraisal of all commercial properties in the county will be done in 2009. The review and market study will be completed for setting values for 2009. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2009.

Agricultural:

A market analysis will be conducted for 2009 and agricultural land values will be assessed at market value and market areas will be reviewed. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. We will begin a land use study to update our property record cards with possible changes.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2010:

Residential:

A review of the rural residential improved agricultural properties will be done in 2010. The review and market study will be used in setting the values for the year 2010. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2010. A ratio study will be done on all other residential properties and adjustments will be made if they are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained.

Commercial:

A ratio study will be completed for 2010 to see if any commercial properties are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2010.

Agricultural Land:

A market analysis will be conducted for 2010 and agricultural land values will be assessed at market value and market areas will be reviewed. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. We will continue to do a land use study to update our property record cards with possible changes.

Other functions performed by the Assessor's Office, but not limited to:

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the assessor's office from the register of deeds and the green sheets are worked and forwarded to the property tax division. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the assessor's office from the county clerk. These will be updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer administrative package.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update & w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivision
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 850 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer approximately 350 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists – prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops and education classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and work toward an appraiser license. The staff of the assessor's office with an assessor's certificate will meet their 60 hours of education in the 4 year period to maintain it and the remainder of the staff will take the required test to obtain an assessor's certificate. The Assessor and Field Appraiser/Deputy are working toward an appraiser's license and will obtain the necessary hours to maintain this certification when it is acquired.

Conclusion:

The Howard County Assessor's Office will strive for a uniform and proportionate valuing of property throughout the county.

Amendment to the Howard County 3 year Plan of Assessment:

Previously in 2006 the appraisal work was done by the County Assessor and staff of 4. The Board eliminated one of the staff from the Assessor's office without consulting the Assessor, when approached and told that this office had not done all of the pick-up work in the past 12 years without either a 4th person or hiring someone else to do pick-up work they advised they would not adjust the budget to allow for the additional help. Currently the Plan of Assessment will be to attempt to make a uniform adjustment of values in Residential and possibly Commercial based on the current sales file. Additionally the Board cut the Reappraisal fund which was at \$3000 to \$0. The budget was cut to \$105,970 from the prior year's budget of \$128,352.

Additionally the GIS project, which was started by the previous assessor to create a parcel map, was put on hold again as the staff member that was dismissed was also working on the GIS project as well as helping with the pick-up work. The project is currently approximately 50% finished. The estimated cost to contract the completion of the parcel map layer is \$75,000. The Board has been made aware that per statute Section 77-1329 Tax maps; county assessor; maintain: The Property Tax Administrator shall require each county assessor to maintain tax maps in accordance with standards specified by the Property Tax Administrator. Whenever necessary to correct mapping deficiencies, the Property Tax Administrator shall install standard maps or approve mapping plans and supervise map production. The Property Tax Administrator may require the county to reimburse the state for tax maps installed.

2008 Assessment Survey for Howard County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	1 week seasonal temporary employee
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$140,180.32
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	Data Processing - \$9,168.69
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$105,970.69
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	0 All deducted from the requested budget
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$900 convention \$1,400 training
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	0
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0

13.	Total budget
	\$105,970.69
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	0, left over expenses from previous assessor had to be paid

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software
	Terra Scan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Howard County has NO cadastral Maps, they have been requested and denied from the county board. The county has never had cadastral maps.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	N/A
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes, it is only partially implemented due to a conflict and litigation between the county board and vendor; an alternative vendor has now been hired to complete the implementation of the GIS
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/A
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

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?

	St Paul and Boelus Dannebrog, Elba, Cushing & Cotesfield were dropped from the County Zoning plan and no permits are issued for these towns.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1970 The smaller villages were dropped from the plan 4 or 5 years ago

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	None
2.	Other services
	None

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 Howard County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5265.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

Valuation History Charts