

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

63 Nance

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	133	COD	15.62
Total Sales Price	\$6,500,551	PRD	104.26
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,515,551	COV	22.63
Total Assessed Value	\$5,759,113	STD	20.85
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$48,989	Avg. Abs. Dev.	14.69
Avg. Assessed Value	\$43,302	Min	37.78
Median	94.08	Max	186.10
Wgt. Mean	88.39	95% Median C.I.	89.79 to 96.63
Mean	92.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	85.37 to 91.41
		95% Mean C.I.	88.61 to 95.70
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			16.62
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			8.7
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			9.5
Average Assessed Value of the Base			39,683

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	133	94.08	15.62	104.26
2007	105	98.63	7.19	102.13
2006	92	99.27	4.58	100.55
2005	114	99.40	28.28	117.42
2004	116	98.39	21.59	108.73
2003	100	97	16.49	110.66
2002	107	95	16.67	110.13
2001	132	98	18.36	106.4

2008 Commission Summary

63 Nance

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	COD	13.79
Total Sales Price	\$402,000	PRD	98.09
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$402,000	COV	19.56
Total Assessed Value	\$400,195	STD	19.10
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$36,545	Avg. Abs. Dev.	12.95
Avg. Assessed Value	\$36,381	Min	71.87
Median	93.94	Max	136.18
Wgt. Mean	99.55	95% Median C.I.	80.55 to 126.96
Mean	97.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	85.79 to 113.31
		95% Mean C.I.	84.82 to 110.48
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			3.63
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			5.56
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			3.02
Average Assessed Value of the Base			66,849

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	11	93.94	13.79	98.09
2007	8	93.06	30.01	110.81
2006	10	97.15	25.47	115.92
2005	14	97.49	34.21	121.17
2004	14	94.05	17.75	106.15
2003	17	98	26.81	123.08
2002	16	100	23.7	114.3
2001	24	100	35.91	120.68

2008 Commission Summary

63 Nance

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	44	COD	14.10
Total Sales Price	\$8,517,930	PRD	104.31
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,451,430	COV	19.01
Total Assessed Value	\$5,941,275	STD	13.94
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$192,078	Avg. Abs. Dev.	10.23
Avg. Assessed Value	\$135,029	Min	52.52
Median	72.57	Max	129.35
Wgt. Mean	70.30	95% Median C.I.	65.58 to 78.72
Mean	73.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	66.01 to 74.59
		95% Mean C.I.	69.21 to 77.44
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			79.75
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			1.9
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.64
Average Assessed Value of the Base			125,383

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	44	72.57	14.10	104.31
2007	38	72.86	12.74	103.36
2006	43	75.26	14.06	102.59
2005	48	76.52	16.33	103.66
2004	43	75.78	15.36	102.60
2003	34	76	13.34	99.54
2002	35	75	15.26	103.54
2001	39	75	14.65	104.45

2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nance 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 Nance County is 94% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Nance County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Nance County is 94% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Nance 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 Nance County is 73% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Nance County is not 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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	24.08	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	21.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.54	95% Mean C.I.:	87.45 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,646,443						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	16.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,454	PRD:	105.21	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.05		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:48:56

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	16	98.51	99.56	97.11	3.63	102.52	92.05	127.00	96.03 to 100.57	45,996	44,669
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	99.42	100.41	99.94	4.38	100.47	94.00	123.63	95.15 to 102.78	38,529	38,506
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	97.00	92.45	92.38	11.43	100.08	64.77	120.76	80.00 to 101.69	43,529	40,212
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	20	97.25	97.50	93.47	11.96	104.30	73.17	135.78	86.79 to 104.19	48,070	44,932
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	77.52	88.37	76.46	30.31	115.58	36.05	163.17	65.65 to 109.30	52,662	40,263
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	90.06	90.07	87.34	18.62	103.12	41.88	124.13	80.21 to 104.79	67,455	58,916
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	80.70	85.93	73.95	26.45	116.20	37.78	186.10	64.38 to 104.39	31,441	23,251
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	85.69	79.21	78.74	16.09	100.60	43.11	105.67	63.26 to 91.29	55,506	43,704
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	60	98.44	97.62	95.37	8.10	102.36	64.77	135.78	96.03 to 99.68	44,700	42,632
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	73	85.94	85.88	80.57	22.24	106.60	36.05	186.10	78.00 to 89.93	52,513	42,307
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	69	93.32	92.22	87.01	17.70	105.98	36.05	163.17	86.79 to 98.43	54,030	47,014
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELGRADE	7	89.25	95.64	93.14	20.42	102.68	64.77	135.78	64.77 to 135.78	14,242	13,266
FULLERTON	58	97.46	95.72	91.51	12.67	104.59	52.21	163.17	91.29 to 100.10	39,036	35,722
GENOA	56	93.32	89.03	86.16	16.66	103.33	37.78	186.10	82.95 to 96.03	54,001	46,527
RURAL	12	73.53	76.67	77.69	28.50	98.68	36.05	144.94	55.40 to 97.28	93,972	73,009
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

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	115	94.74	93.19	89.09	15.60	104.60	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.78	42,400	37,775
2	9	82.52	83.96	85.31	11.23	98.42	65.65	101.69	73.17 to 97.83	85,091	72,592
3	9	73.89	72.66	74.28	28.44	97.82	36.05	113.18	43.11 to 99.17	97,077	72,108
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	24.08	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	21.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.54	95% Mean C.I.:	87.45 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,646,443						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	16.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,454	PRD:	105.21	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.05		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:48:56

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	119	94.62	91.44	87.11	15.80	104.98	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 97.09	51,257	44,647
2	13	92.34	84.66	75.83	19.56	111.65	36.05	127.00	60.91 to 100.15	29,992	22,742
3	1	144.94	144.94	144.94			144.94	144.94	N/A	26,000	37,685
____ALL____	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	127	93.59	91.14	87.14	16.51	104.59	37.78	186.10	89.04 to 96.33	48,643	42,388
06	2	65.77	65.77	73.03	45.19	90.06	36.05	95.49	N/A	138,250	100,962
07	4	101.42	105.12	99.86	6.98	105.26	97.09	120.54	N/A	15,325	15,304
____ALL____	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	4	90.47	95.37	100.20	26.51	95.18	64.77	135.78	N/A	10,500	10,521
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	65	97.09	95.61	91.53	13.70	104.46	52.21	163.17	91.24 to 99.68	40,173	36,770
63-0030	64	92.19	86.41	83.22	18.47	103.83	36.05	186.10	80.83 to 95.34	60,347	50,222
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	24.08	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	21.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.54	95% Mean C.I.:	87.45 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,646,443						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	16.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,454	PRD:	105.21	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.05		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:48:56

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	17	94.00	86.63	79.32	18.10	109.22	36.05	127.00	65.65 to 102.39	29,992	23,790
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	66	94.35	90.14	85.84	15.79	105.00	37.78	163.17	88.39 to 97.78	38,694	33,215
1920 TO 1939	8	89.57	91.04	87.00	20.50	104.65	60.15	122.07	60.15 to 122.07	41,687	36,267
1940 TO 1949	2	100.73	100.73	100.65	0.15	100.07	100.57	100.88	N/A	36,125	36,360
1950 TO 1959	5	105.66	110.49	86.68	32.69	127.47	65.50	186.10	N/A	55,700	48,281
1960 TO 1969	14	92.15	89.21	88.06	12.15	101.31	58.63	109.30	70.12 to 101.44	73,750	64,946
1970 TO 1979	16	96.22	97.54	89.21	14.62	109.34	70.54	144.94	82.52 to 108.15	63,700	56,823
1980 TO 1989	1	93.59	93.59	93.59			93.59	93.59	N/A	80,000	74,870
1990 TO 1994	1	64.38	64.38	64.38			64.38	64.38	N/A	74,000	47,640
1995 TO 1999	2	86.12	86.12	91.69	12.97	93.91	74.95	97.28	N/A	219,950	201,682
2000 TO Present	1	82.95	82.95	82.95			82.95	82.95	N/A	122,000	101,200
ALL	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	110.43	109.99	107.91	9.89	101.93	92.34	127.00	92.34 to 127.00	3,583	3,866
5000 TO 9999	16	103.12	104.74	103.77	23.69	100.94	43.50	186.10	83.00 to 124.13	7,146	7,416
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	22	103.94	106.17	104.42	20.12	101.67	43.50	186.10	88.39 to 120.54	6,175	6,448
10000 TO 29999	23	97.78	95.15	94.66	14.22	100.52	37.78	144.94	94.08 to 101.49	19,765	18,709
30000 TO 59999	43	91.29	87.64	88.43	15.96	99.11	41.88	123.63	81.50 to 98.45	41,395	36,604
60000 TO 99999	33	93.05	88.64	88.08	11.52	100.64	43.11	109.30	87.29 to 96.17	73,400	64,648
100000 TO 149999	8	72.27	69.66	69.67	18.03	99.99	36.05	92.05	36.05 to 92.05	111,562	77,727
150000 TO 249999	3	82.52	84.69	84.74	7.85	99.94	76.05	95.49	N/A	166,833	141,370
250000 TO 499999	1	97.28	97.28	97.28			97.28	97.28	N/A	329,900	320,925
ALL	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	24.08	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	21.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.54	95% Mean C.I.:	87.45 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,646,443						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	16.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,454	PRD:	105.21	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.05		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:48:56

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	9	99.17	94.58	87.50	20.70	108.09	43.50	127.00	64.77 to 120.54	4,444	3,888
5000 TO 9999	13	103.84	108.62	102.82	20.69	105.64	63.26	186.10	88.39 to 124.13	7,719	7,936
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	22	103.12	102.87	98.45	20.66	104.49	43.50	186.10	88.39 to 115.19	6,379	6,280
10000 TO 29999	37	94.08	87.00	82.24	17.97	105.79	37.78	135.78	80.21 to 97.78	24,826	20,416
30000 TO 59999	40	90.61	89.13	84.16	17.48	105.91	36.05	144.94	81.50 to 98.51	53,365	44,910
60000 TO 99999	29	93.59	91.21	89.05	9.61	102.42	55.40	109.30	89.79 to 97.83	81,710	72,765
100000 TO 149999	3	82.52	80.51	80.15	2.79	100.45	76.05	82.95	N/A	150,166	120,353
150000 TO 249999	1	95.49	95.49	95.49			95.49	95.49	N/A	172,000	164,250
250000 TO 499999	1	97.28	97.28	97.28			97.28	97.28	N/A	329,900	320,925
ALL _____											
	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	18	92.66	85.29	75.56	18.38	112.88	36.05	127.00	69.58 to 100.15	32,492	24,550
20	37	95.15	96.25	87.44	23.85	110.07	37.78	186.10	83.58 to 104.79	24,216	21,174
30	71	93.32	89.83	87.01	12.80	103.24	43.11	135.78	87.66 to 96.33	60,123	52,313
40	7	98.99	93.24	92.29	7.73	101.04	65.50	102.96	65.50 to 102.96	109,414	100,973
ALL _____											
	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	19	94.64	90.94	88.36	17.43	102.91	36.05	127.00	83.00 to 105.67	47,673	42,125
100	4	101.42	105.12	99.86	6.98	105.26	97.09	120.54	N/A	15,325	15,304
101	75	93.05	91.27	87.12	17.69	104.77	37.78	186.10	85.94 to 96.33	47,386	41,284
102	5	97.83	89.79	88.05	10.68	101.98	62.37	102.78	N/A	61,740	54,362
103	1	98.50	98.50	98.50			98.50	98.50	N/A	65,000	64,025
104	26	91.67	88.97	83.67	15.09	106.34	43.11	124.13	79.53 to 98.81	60,492	50,615
106	3	102.39	90.69	76.54	12.50	118.49	65.65	104.04	N/A	15,990	12,239
ALL _____											
	133	94.08	91.18	86.66	16.52	105.21	36.05	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	42,454

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	24.08	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	21.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.54	95% Mean C.I.:	87.45 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,646,443						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	16.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,454	PRD:	105.21	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.05		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:48:56

CONDITION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	16	93.17	85.79	75.91	19.00	113.02	36.05	127.00	65.65 to 102.39	27,366	20,772
10	1	78.00	78.00	78.00			78.00	78.00	N/A	6,500	5,070
20	10	113.35	107.34	97.21	18.33	110.42	41.88	144.94	80.21 to 135.78	14,300	13,900
30	101	92.97	90.12	85.94	15.62	104.86	37.78	186.10	88.39 to 96.03	53,012	45,558
40	5	98.45	100.14	99.07	4.38	101.07	93.05	108.94	N/A	114,780	113,714
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.08</u>	<u>91.18</u>	<u>86.66</u>	<u>16.52</u>	<u>105.21</u>	<u>36.05</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>89.79 to 96.63</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>42,454</u>

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

Residential

Nance County annually conducts a market analysis that included the qualified residential sales that occurred from 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2007. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. The county also completes the pick-up of new construction of the residential property.

Contract appraiser Jerry Knoche has been systematically doing an on-site inspection to verify and update the improvement data on the rural and suburban record cards. This inspection process includes: the houses and the associated outbuildings on the rural and suburban residential records; and the houses and the associated outbuildings on rural and suburban agricultural records. This process has been ongoing throughout 2007, will continue in 2008 for implementation in 2009. This action is predominantly a residential action, but this paragraph has also been included in the agricultural assessment actions narrative since it includes agricultural outbuildings.

For 2008, the preliminary median for the residential class of real property is 94.08, the mean is 91.18 and the weighted mean is 86.66 with 133 qualified sales.

For 2008, there are no broad changes planned for the residential property. The only residential action that the county reported is changing site values on parcels described as large acreages near the towns of Fullerton and Genoa to \$4,000 per acre. The county identified trends in their market studies that indicated the need for the change. Among the parcels described as "Assessor Location" Rural, 12 have sold and have a median ratio of 73.53. The non urban residential properties are all slated for revaluation in 2009, so the county is cautious about any far reaching adjustments in the "Assessor Location" Rural subclass in 2008. Even though the subclass appears to be low, the data is conflicting since the 2007 final statistics had 7 sales in this class and a median ratio of 97.15%.

2008 Assessment Survey for Nance County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006 The sales were reviewed and the market values were studied but resulted in no changes for 2007 and 2008.
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?
	2006 The sales were reviewed and the market values were studied but resulted in no changes for 2007 and 2008.
7.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:
	4
8.	How are these defined?
	The areas that are in place in Nance County are the 3 towns, Fullerton, Genoa and Belgrade. The residential parcels outside the town limits are considered rural. These areas are identified in the "Assessor Location" section of the residential Statistics.
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, Nance County has not identified any parcels as Assessor Location Suburban in 2008.

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 as a measurable subclass. These parcels are typically valued with the adjacent town, not with the rural residential or the ag residential.
12.	Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
	yes

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
31	12	0	43

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	22.63	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	20.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.37 to 91.41
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.69	95% Mean C.I.:	88.61 to 95.70
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,759,113						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	43,301	PRD:	104.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:44

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	16	98.51	99.56	97.11	3.63	102.52	92.05	127.00	96.03 to 100.57	45,996	44,669
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	99.42	100.41	99.94	4.38	100.47	94.00	123.63	95.15 to 102.78	38,529	38,506
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	97.00	93.19	93.31	12.20	99.88	64.77	120.76	80.00 to 102.39	43,529	40,615
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	20	97.25	97.95	95.10	11.49	102.99	73.17	135.78	86.79 to 104.19	48,070	45,714
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	80.35	91.27	82.00	25.84	111.30	55.40	163.17	70.12 to 109.30	52,662	43,185
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	90.06	90.07	87.34	18.62	103.12	41.88	124.13	80.21 to 104.79	67,455	58,916
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	80.70	85.93	73.95	26.45	116.20	37.78	186.10	64.38 to 104.39	31,441	23,251
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	85.94	82.53	82.77	12.29	99.71	43.50	105.67	74.22 to 91.29	55,506	45,941
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	60	98.44	97.92	96.14	8.10	101.85	64.77	135.78	96.03 to 99.68	44,700	42,974
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	73	86.66	87.42	82.97	20.30	105.37	37.78	186.10	80.35 to 89.93	52,513	43,570
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	69	93.32	93.19	88.90	16.93	104.83	41.88	163.17	86.79 to 98.43	54,030	48,031
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELGRADE	7	89.25	95.64	93.14	20.42	102.68	64.77	135.78	64.77 to 135.78	14,242	13,266
FULLERTON	58	97.46	96.03	92.42	12.67	103.91	52.21	163.17	91.29 to 100.10	39,036	36,075
GENOA	56	93.32	89.10	86.37	16.58	103.16	37.78	186.10	83.27 to 96.03	54,001	46,642
RURAL	12	80.78	85.68	85.30	17.67	100.45	55.40	144.94	73.17 to 97.28	93,972	80,156
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301

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	115	94.64	92.57	88.62	15.35	104.46	37.78	186.10	91.24 to 97.09	42,652	37,797
2	9	85.07	87.21	89.11	10.62	97.87	65.65	110.58	80.00 to 97.83	87,313	77,806
3	9	81.64	91.86	86.35	22.33	106.37	55.40	144.94	74.95 to 113.18	91,633	79,129
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301

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	120	94.63	92.44	88.40	15.67	104.57	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 97.09	51,047	45,127
2	13	92.34	89.52	88.18	14.29	101.52	43.50	127.00	80.00 to 100.15	29,992	26,448
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	22.63	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	20.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.37 to 91.41
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.69	95% Mean C.I.:	88.61 to 95.70
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,759,113						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	43,301	PRD:	104.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:44

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	127	93.59	91.83	88.24	15.93	104.07	37.78	186.10	89.04 to 96.33	48,643	42,922
06	2	87.22	87.22	89.24	9.48	97.74	78.95	95.49	N/A	138,250	123,375
07	4	101.42	105.12	99.86	6.98	105.26	97.09	120.54	N/A	15,325	15,304
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.08</u>	<u>92.16</u>	<u>88.39</u>	<u>15.62</u>	<u>104.26</u>	<u>37.78</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>89.79 to 96.63</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>43,301</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)											
06-0006	4	90.47	95.37	100.20	26.51	95.18	64.77	135.78	N/A	10,500	10,521
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	65	97.09	96.30	92.63	13.27	103.96	52.21	163.17	91.24 to 99.68	40,173	37,212
63-0030	64	92.19	87.75	85.40	17.02	102.76	37.78	186.10	81.50 to 95.34	60,347	51,535
72-0075											
NonValid School											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.08</u>	<u>92.16</u>	<u>88.39</u>	<u>15.62</u>	<u>104.26</u>	<u>37.78</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>89.79 to 96.63</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>43,301</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	17	94.00	90.35	88.77	14.15	101.78	43.50	127.00	80.00 to 102.39	29,992	26,624
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	66	94.35	90.95	87.50	15.21	103.94	37.78	163.17	88.39 to 97.78	38,694	33,858
1920 TO 1939	8	89.57	91.04	87.00	20.50	104.65	60.15	122.07	60.15 to 122.07	41,687	36,267
1940 TO 1949	2	100.73	100.73	100.65	0.15	100.07	100.57	100.88	N/A	36,125	36,360
1950 TO 1959	5	105.66	110.49	86.68	32.69	127.47	65.50	186.10	N/A	55,700	48,281
1960 TO 1969	14	92.15	89.21	88.06	12.15	101.31	58.63	109.30	70.12 to 101.44	73,750	64,946
1970 TO 1979	16	96.22	98.36	91.37	13.76	107.65	70.54	144.94	85.07 to 108.15	63,700	58,202
1980 TO 1989	1	93.59	93.59	93.59			93.59	93.59	N/A	80,000	74,870
1990 TO 1994	1	64.38	64.38	64.38			64.38	64.38	N/A	74,000	47,640
1995 TO 1999	2	86.12	86.12	91.69	12.97	93.91	74.95	97.28	N/A	219,950	201,682
2000 TO Present	1	82.95	82.95	82.95			82.95	82.95	N/A	122,000	101,200
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.08</u>	<u>92.16</u>	<u>88.39</u>	<u>15.62</u>	<u>104.26</u>	<u>37.78</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>89.79 to 96.63</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>43,301</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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	22.63	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	20.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.37 to 91.41
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.69	95% Mean C.I.:	88.61 to 95.70
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,759,113						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	43,301	PRD:	104.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:44

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	6	110.43	109.99	107.91	9.89	101.93	92.34	127.00	92.34 to 127.00	3,583	3,866	
5000 TO 9999	16	103.12	104.74	103.77	23.69	100.94	43.50	186.10	83.00 to 124.13	7,146	7,416	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	22	103.94	106.17	104.42	20.12	101.67	43.50	186.10	88.39 to 120.54	6,175	6,448	
10000 TO 29999	23	97.78	96.03	95.40	13.32	100.67	37.78	144.94	94.08 to 101.49	19,765	18,855	
30000 TO 59999	43	91.29	87.85	88.70	16.18	99.04	41.88	123.63	81.50 to 98.45	41,395	36,717	
60000 TO 99999	33	93.05	90.01	89.63	10.06	100.42	58.63	109.30	87.29 to 96.17	73,400	65,787	
100000 TO 149999	8	76.95	75.03	74.69	11.27	100.44	55.40	92.05	55.40 to 92.05	111,562	83,330	
150000 TO 249999	3	86.66	89.07	89.14	4.01	99.92	85.07	95.49	N/A	166,833	148,723	
250000 TO 499999	1	97.28	97.28	97.28			97.28	97.28	N/A	329,900	320,925	
ALL	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301	

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	9	99.17	94.58	87.50	20.70	108.09	43.50	127.00	64.77 to 120.54	4,444	3,888	
5000 TO 9999	13	103.84	108.62	102.82	20.69	105.64	63.26	186.10	88.39 to 124.13	7,719	7,936	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	22	103.12	102.87	98.45	20.66	104.49	43.50	186.10	88.39 to 115.19	6,379	6,280	
10000 TO 29999	37	94.08	87.54	82.60	17.39	105.98	37.78	135.78	81.21 to 97.78	24,826	20,506	
30000 TO 59999	36	92.96	91.96	88.74	15.01	103.62	58.63	144.94	85.69 to 98.81	50,434	44,757	
60000 TO 99999	33	93.32	90.80	88.62	10.30	102.47	55.40	110.58	87.29 to 96.33	81,472	72,200	
100000 TO 149999	3	85.07	84.89	85.04	1.45	99.82	82.95	86.66	N/A	150,166	127,706	
150000 TO 249999	1	95.49	95.49	95.49			95.49	95.49	N/A	172,000	164,250	
250000 TO 499999	1	97.28	97.28	97.28			97.28	97.28	N/A	329,900	320,925	
ALL	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301	

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	18	92.66	88.80	83.79	14.59	105.97	43.50	127.00	80.00 to 100.15	32,492	27,226	
20	37	95.15	96.42	87.98	23.67	109.60	37.78	186.10	83.58 to 104.79	24,216	21,305	
30	71	93.32	90.68	88.41	12.15	102.57	55.40	135.78	87.66 to 96.33	60,123	53,153	
40	7	98.99	93.24	92.29	7.73	101.04	65.50	102.96	65.50 to 102.96	109,414	100,973	
ALL	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63	48,989	43,301	

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:	133	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	22.63	95% Median C.I.:	89.79 to 96.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	20.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.37 to 91.41
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.69	95% Mean C.I.:	88.61 to 95.70
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,759,113						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	43,301	PRD:	104.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:44

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	19	94.64	94.26	93.68	13.92	100.62	43.50	127.00	83.00 to 105.67		47,673	44,660
100	4	101.42	105.12	99.86	6.98	105.26	97.09	120.54	N/A		15,325	15,304
101	75	93.05	91.53	87.58	17.66	104.52	37.78	186.10	86.66 to 96.33		47,386	41,498
102	5	97.83	89.79	88.05	10.68	101.98	62.37	102.78	N/A		61,740	54,362
103	1	98.50	98.50	98.50			98.50	98.50	N/A		65,000	64,025
104	26	91.67	90.80	86.75	13.09	104.67	55.40	124.13	85.07 to 98.81		60,492	52,476
106	3	102.39	90.69	76.54	12.50	118.49	65.65	104.04	N/A		15,990	12,239
<u>ALL</u>												
	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63		48,989	43,301

CONDITION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	16	93.17	89.74	86.91	14.76	103.26	43.50	127.00	80.00 to 102.39		27,366	23,783
10	1	78.00	78.00	78.00			78.00	78.00	N/A		6,500	5,070
20	10	113.35	107.34	97.21	18.33	110.42	41.88	144.94	80.21 to 135.78		14,300	13,900
30	101	92.97	90.78	87.14	15.10	104.18	37.78	186.10	88.39 to 96.03		53,012	46,197
40	5	98.45	100.14	99.07	4.38	101.07	93.05	108.94	N/A		114,780	113,714
<u>ALL</u>												
	133	94.08	92.16	88.39	15.62	104.26	37.78	186.10	89.79 to 96.63		48,989	43,301

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The purpose of the correlation narrative is to connect the assessment actions reported for the county for each class of property to the measurement of those actions. The actions are evaluated by making a comparison of the changes to the class or subclasses reported between the Preliminary Statistics and the R&O Statistics. There are six tables prepared for each class of property that are used to evaluate the level of value and the quality of the assessment of the class of property.

In this instance, there were several targeted assessment action that reflected in a significant statistical change. It should be noted that improvement to the statistical measurements were consistently reflected through the tables prepared to analyze the measurement process. The county has utilized a typical number of sales in the preparation of the assessment statistics. There is no reason to conclude that they have not used all available arms' length sales. All three measures of the level of value would have been within the acceptable range except the mean which was slightly above the range. Since the weighted mean was nearer to the bottom of the range, the quality statistics were both out. The two measures of uniformity, (PRD and COD) were well outside the acceptable range suggesting regressivity and uniformity issues remain in the assessment process.

For 2008, the county upgraded their residential valuations with locally defined subclasses intended to bring all relevant subclasses into compliance. They also progressed on their plan to inspect and update all residential property. These goals were accomplished. Although the statistics improved from the preliminary measurements to the final measurements the quality statistics were outside the acceptable standards.

In summary, there are numerous statistics that have been presented and discussed in the following six tables of the Correlation section of the R&O. There are a total of five that relate to the measurement of the level of value. In Table V, there was a presentation and narrative explanation prepared about the median, weighted mean and mean ratios. In Table III, there was a presentation and narrative discussion of the trended preliminary median. The fifth measure of central tendency was not independently presented or discussed. That measure, the 95% Confidence Interval measured around the median deserves mention. In this class, the confidence interval of 94.15 to 96.32 is entirely within the acceptable range. This, statistically speaking strongly indicates that the level of value is within the range. There is no indication among the statistics that the entire class should be adjusted and there is no compelling evidence that any notable subclass within this class should be adjusted. Giving due consideration to all of the measures, the median is considered the best indicator of the level of value for this class.

In this instance, there were only very limited assessment action that reflected in an insignificant statistical change. The county has utilized a typical number of sales in the preparation of the assessment statistics. There is no reason to conclude that they have not used all available arms' length sales. The weighted mean was well below the range and the median and the mean were in the lower end of the range. The two measures of uniformity, (PRD and COD) were slightly outside the acceptable range suggesting regressivity and uniformity issues are minimal in the assessment process.

For 2008, the county's only action was to the land of a partial subclass, and is not directly measurable in the R&O.

2008 Correlation Section for Nance County

In summary, there are numerous statistics that have been presented and discussed in the following six tables of the Correlation section of the R&O. There are a total of five that relate to the measurement of the level of value. In Table V, there was a presentation and narrative explanation prepared about the median, weighted mean and mean ratios. In Table III, there was a presentation and narrative discussion of the trended preliminary median. The fifth measure of central tendency was not independently presented or discussed. That measure, the 95% Confidence Interval measured around the median deserves mention. In this class, the confidence interval of 89.79 to 96.63 is not within the acceptable range, and indicates that the level of value is probably in the low end of the range. This, statistically speaking strongly indicates that the level of value as demonstrated by the median ratio is within the range. There is no indication among the statistics that the entire class should be adjusted. There are two subclasses in the "Assessor Location" section of the R&O Statistics that should be discussed. In both cases, the R&O Statistics prepared in 2005, 2006, and 2007 all demonstrated that these locations were within or above the range. In both cases, nothing has occurred economically, or in the assessment process in the county to suddenly have them be undervalued. "Assessor Location" Belgrade with 7 sales has a median ratio of 89.25 but a mean of 95.64 and a weighted mean of 93.14. Belgrade's 95% confidence interval of 64.77 to 135.78 suggests that a wide range of numbers could statistically represent the level of value. Under the circumstances, Belgrade really not a good candidate for adjustment. The circumstances are very similar for "Assessor Location" Rural, with 12 sales a median ratio of 80.78 a mean of 85.68 and a weighted mean of 85.30. "Assessor Location" Rural's 95% confidence interval of 73.17 to 97.28 suggests that statistically the subclass is probably low but indicates little else of value. Based on the history of the level of value of this subclass, the lack of any notable economic change the diversity of the locations within this subclass, it is not the best candidate for adjustment. If the adjustment proposed were 5 or even 10%, it would be supported, but a calculated increase of nearly 19% that would be needed to move the median ratio the middle of the range, and based on the facts of the subclass is not supportable. Therefore, there is no compelling evidence that any notable subclass within this class should be adjusted. Giving due consideration to all of the measures, the median is considered the best indicator of the level of value for this class.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	220	133	60.45
2007	166	105	63.25
2006	158	92	58.23
2005	180	114	63.33
2004	170	116	68.24
2003	161	106	65.84
2002	155	113	72.9
2001	175	135	77.14

RESIDENTIAL: Table II is indicative that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms' length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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 Nance 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	94.08	1.58	95.57	94.08
2007	98.51	0.8	99.3	98.63
2006	92.44	12.13	103.65	99.27
2005	102.00	-0.4	101.59	99.40
2004	98.80	-0.12	98.68	98.39
2003	98	-0.27	97.74	97
2002	94.16	6.59	100.37	95
2001	98	0.92	98.9	98

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the assessed base has increased more than the sales file. In this case, the assessment action was minor and while there was some impact on the assessed base and on most of the measurement statistics, it did not impact the median. This can occur when an equal number of sales change on both sides of the median, and apparently it did so in this case. Since the action was minimal, it is likely that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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 Nance 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)
2.98	2008	1.58
0.98	2007	0.8
20.86	2006	12.13
-1.46	2005	-0.4
-0.14	2004	-0.12
-2	2003	0
3.19	2002	6.59
1.26	2001	0.92

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar enough to rely on the statistical calculations from the sales file as a reasonable measure of the population. In this class, the assessed value did not increase as much as the sale file, but the difference is within an acceptable tolerance for a county with good assessment practices.

2008 Correlation Section for Nance 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 Nance County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94.08	88.39	92.16

RESIDENTIAL: The median ratio and mean ratio are within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is outside the acceptable range. Both of the measures in the range are in the lower part of the range and the weighted mean is below the range. Taken together, it is likely that the level of value is not high, but probably in the range. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by outliers and unpredictable small dollar sales. In this subclass, it is the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	15.62	104.26
Difference	0.62	1.26

RESIDENTIAL: In this class of property, both the coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are outside the acceptable range. The interpretation of high COD’s and PRD’s that this class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. Like many counties with similar demographics, the county has done a statistically respectable job on residences which sold for \$30,000 or more. They struggle with the lower cost parcels. While, it would be good to have better indicators of uniform valuation, the positive view is that these sales have not been trimmed or selectively revalued. Even though the quality of the residential valuation may be stated to be unacceptable, they really are not significantly out and look respectable for a relatively small number of sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	133	133	0
Median	94.08	94.08	0
Wgt. Mean	86.66	88.39	1.73
Mean	91.18	92.16	0.98
COD	16.52	15.62	-0.9
PRD	105.21	104.26	-0.95
Min Sales Ratio	36.05	37.78	1.73
Max Sales Ratio	186.10	186.10	0

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the Preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The same sales were used to measure the Preliminary and R&O Statistics, so there was no impact due to the removal of sales.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Query: 6253

What If ID: 5359

Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 6253

<u>Strata Hdg.</u>	<u>Strata</u>	<u>Chg.Value</u>	<u>Chg.Type</u>	<u>Pct.Chg.</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Priority</u>
Assessor Location	Rural	Total	Increase	19.000	A	1

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	133	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	22.79	95% Median C.I.:	91.29 to 97.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	21.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.29 to 95.10
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.56	95% Mean C.I.:	90.00 to 97.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,870						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,675	PRD:	102.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/02/2008 14:34:12

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	16	98.51	99.56	97.11	3.63	102.52	92.05	127.00	96.03 to 100.57	45,996	44,669
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	99.77	103.49	106.89	6.67	96.82	94.00	123.63	95.15 to 113.64	38,529	41,182
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	97.00	93.19	93.31	12.20	99.88	64.77	120.76	80.00 to 102.39	43,529	40,615
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	20	97.25	98.64	95.89	10.78	102.87	81.50	135.78	87.08 to 104.19	48,070	46,096
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	93.32	96.03	87.66	22.08	109.55	64.44	172.48	71.55 to 109.30	52,662	46,163
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	90.06	91.70	93.02	18.86	98.58	41.88	124.13	82.95 to 112.56	67,455	62,748
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	80.70	85.93	73.95	26.45	116.20	37.78	186.10	64.38 to 104.39	31,441	23,251
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	89.04	84.15	84.26	12.36	99.88	43.50	105.67	74.22 to 96.63	55,506	46,769
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	60	98.47	98.77	97.62	8.39	101.18	64.77	135.78	96.17 to 100.15	44,700	43,637
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	73	88.39	89.40	86.70	20.16	103.12	37.78	186.10	82.95 to 93.32	52,513	45,529
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	69	93.95	95.04	92.52	16.34	102.73	41.88	172.48	89.19 to 100.10	54,030	49,986
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELGRADE	7	89.25	95.64	93.14	20.42	102.68	64.77	135.78	64.77 to 135.78	14,242	13,266
FULLERTON	58	97.46	96.03	92.42	12.67	103.91	52.21	163.17	91.29 to 100.10	39,036	36,075
GENOA	56	93.32	89.10	86.37	16.58	103.16	37.78	186.10	83.27 to 96.03	54,001	46,642
RURAL	12	96.13	101.96	101.50	17.67	100.45	65.93	172.48	87.08 to 115.76	93,972	95,386
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675

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	115	94.64	92.69	88.77	15.23	104.41	37.78	186.10	91.24 to 97.09	42,652	37,863
2	9	86.66	92.31	95.08	11.69	97.09	78.12	113.64	80.00 to 110.58	87,313	83,016
3	9	97.15	106.92	101.90	19.87	104.93	65.93	172.48	89.19 to 118.00	91,633	93,375
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675

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	120	94.94	93.51	90.57	15.37	103.25	37.78	186.10	90.87 to 97.15	51,047	46,230
2	13	94.00	94.70	101.09	15.14	93.68	43.50	127.00	83.00 to 113.64	29,992	30,319
<u>ALL</u>											
	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	133	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	22.79	95% Median C.I.:	91.29 to 97.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	21.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.29 to 95.10
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.56	95% Mean C.I.:	90.00 to 97.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,870						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,675	PRD:	102.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/02/2008 14:34:12

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	127	94.62	93.10	90.44	15.60	102.95	37.78	186.10	89.93 to 96.64	48,643	43,992
06	2	103.80	103.80	106.20	9.49	97.74	93.95	113.64	N/A	138,250	146,816
07	4	101.42	105.12	99.86	6.98	105.26	97.09	120.54	N/A	15,325	15,304
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.74</u>	<u>93.63</u>	<u>91.20</u>	<u>15.37</u>	<u>102.67</u>	<u>37.78</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>91.29 to 97.09</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>44,675</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)											
06-0006	4	90.47	95.37	100.20	26.51	95.18	64.77	135.78	N/A	10,500	10,521
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	65	97.09	97.48	94.63	13.46	103.00	52.21	172.48	92.97 to 100.10	40,173	38,017
63-0030	64	93.32	89.61	88.77	16.26	100.94	37.78	186.10	85.69 to 96.03	60,347	53,572
72-0075											
NonValid School											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.74</u>	<u>93.63</u>	<u>91.20</u>	<u>15.37</u>	<u>102.67</u>	<u>37.78</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>91.29 to 97.09</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>44,675</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	17	96.64	95.05	99.47	13.56	95.55	43.50	127.00	83.00 to 105.67	29,992	29,834
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	66	94.69	91.79	89.24	14.38	102.86	37.78	163.17	89.04 to 97.78	38,694	34,531
1920 TO 1939	8	89.57	91.04	87.00	20.50	104.65	60.15	122.07	60.15 to 122.07	41,687	36,267
1940 TO 1949	2	100.73	100.73	100.65	0.15	100.07	100.57	100.88	N/A	36,125	36,360
1950 TO 1959	5	105.66	110.49	86.68	32.69	127.47	65.50	186.10	N/A	55,700	48,281
1960 TO 1969	14	92.15	89.21	88.06	12.15	101.31	58.63	109.30	70.12 to 101.44	73,750	64,946
1970 TO 1979	16	96.22	100.08	92.07	15.55	108.70	70.54	172.48	85.07 to 108.15	63,700	58,650
1980 TO 1989	1	93.59	93.59	93.59			93.59	93.59	N/A	80,000	74,870
1990 TO 1994	1	64.38	64.38	64.38			64.38	64.38	N/A	74,000	47,640
1995 TO 1999	2	102.48	102.48	109.12	12.96	93.91	89.19	115.76	N/A	219,950	240,002
2000 TO Present	1	82.95	82.95	82.95			82.95	82.95	N/A	122,000	101,200
<u>ALL</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>94.74</u>	<u>93.63</u>	<u>91.20</u>	<u>15.37</u>	<u>102.67</u>	<u>37.78</u>	<u>186.10</u>	<u>91.29 to 97.09</u>	<u>48,989</u>	<u>44,675</u>

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	133	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	22.79	95% Median C.I.:	91.29 to 97.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	21.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.29 to 95.10
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.56	95% Mean C.I.:	90.00 to 97.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,870						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,675	PRD:	102.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/02/2008 14:34:12

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	6	116.60	113.12	112.11	7.48	100.90	92.34	127.00	92.34 to 127.00	3,583	4,017	
5000 TO 9999	16	103.12	104.74	103.77	23.69	100.94	43.50	186.10	83.00 to 124.13	7,146	7,416	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	22	104.42	107.02	105.09	20.43	101.84	43.50	186.10	88.39 to 120.54	6,175	6,489	
10000 TO 29999	23	97.78	97.90	97.53	13.86	100.38	37.78	172.48	95.15 to 101.49	19,765	19,277	
30000 TO 59999	43	91.29	88.46	89.37	15.51	98.99	41.88	123.63	82.96 to 98.45	41,395	36,993	
60000 TO 99999	33	93.59	90.94	90.65	9.40	100.32	58.63	109.30	89.79 to 96.33	73,400	66,534	
100000 TO 149999	8	81.89	80.00	79.56	11.65	100.55	65.50	93.95	65.50 to 93.95	111,562	88,761	
150000 TO 249999	3	86.66	95.12	95.38	10.99	99.73	85.07	113.64	N/A	166,833	159,126	
250000 TO 499999	1	115.76	115.76	115.76			115.76	115.76	N/A	329,900	381,901	
ALL	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675	

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	9	105.67	96.67	89.76	20.73	107.70	43.50	127.00	64.77 to 120.54	4,444	3,989	
5000 TO 9999	13	103.84	108.62	102.82	20.69	105.64	63.26	186.10	88.39 to 124.13	7,719	7,936	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	22	103.94	103.73	99.10	20.91	104.67	43.50	186.10	88.39 to 118.00	6,379	6,321	
10000 TO 29999	37	95.15	88.30	83.34	16.52	105.95	37.78	135.78	82.96 to 97.78	24,826	20,690	
30000 TO 59999	36	92.96	93.11	89.56	15.42	103.97	58.63	172.48	86.79 to 98.81	50,434	45,168	
60000 TO 99999	33	94.64	92.94	91.15	8.23	101.96	65.50	110.58	91.24 to 97.15	81,472	74,263	
100000 TO 149999	3	85.07	84.89	85.04	1.45	99.82	82.95	86.66	N/A	150,166	127,706	
150000 TO 249999	1	113.64	113.64	113.64			113.64	113.64	N/A	172,000	195,458	
250000 TO 499999	1	115.76	115.76	115.76			115.76	115.76	N/A	329,900	381,901	
ALL	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675	

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	18	93.97	93.24	93.12	14.47	100.12	43.50	127.00	83.00 to 104.04	32,492	30,258	
20	37	95.62	97.58	90.06	23.91	108.35	37.78	186.10	88.39 to 104.79	24,216	21,808	
30	71	93.59	91.44	89.55	11.41	102.12	58.63	135.78	89.19 to 96.63	60,123	53,838	
40	7	100.10	95.88	100.25	9.63	95.65	65.50	115.76	65.50 to 115.76	109,414	109,684	
ALL	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09	48,989	44,675	

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Query: 6253

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	133	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	22.79	95% Median C.I.:	91.29 to 97.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,500,551	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	21.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.29 to 95.10
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,515,551	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.56	95% Mean C.I.:	90.00 to 97.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,870						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,989	COD:	15.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,675	PRD:	102.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 04/02/2008 14:34:12

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	19	96.64	98.78	105.97	15.10	93.22	43.50	127.00	86.79 to 113.89		47,673	50,518
100	4	101.42	105.12	99.86	6.98	105.26	97.09	120.54	N/A		15,325	15,304
101	75	93.32	92.30	88.54	17.65	104.24	37.78	186.10	88.39 to 96.33		47,386	41,955
102	5	97.83	89.79	88.05	10.68	101.98	62.37	102.78	N/A		61,740	54,362
103	1	98.50	98.50	98.50			98.50	98.50	N/A		65,000	64,025
104	26	92.82	92.34	88.84	11.70	103.94	64.38	124.13	87.08 to 98.81		60,492	53,742
106	3	102.39	94.85	85.37	8.44	111.10	78.12	104.04	N/A		15,990	13,651
<u>ALL</u>												
	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09		48,989	44,675

CONDITION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	16	95.32	94.73	99.37	14.38	95.33	43.50	127.00	83.00 to 105.67		27,366	27,194
10	1	78.00	78.00	78.00			78.00	78.00	N/A		6,500	5,070
20	10	113.35	110.09	102.21	20.76	107.71	41.88	172.48	80.21 to 135.78		14,300	14,616
30	101	93.59	91.47	88.27	14.39	103.63	37.78	186.10	89.19 to 96.17		53,012	46,791
40	5	102.96	103.83	109.70	6.45	94.65	93.05	115.76	N/A		114,780	125,909
<u>ALL</u>												
	133	94.74	93.63	91.20	15.37	102.67	37.78	186.10	91.29 to 97.09		48,989	44,675

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	21.79	95% Median C.I.:	68.44 to 120.23
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.16 to 107.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	78.14 to 104.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,920						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	15.27	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,265	PRD:	97.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:03

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											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	93.48	93.48	93.48			93.48	93.48	N/A	25,000	23,370
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	86.36	86.36	86.36			86.36	86.36	N/A	50,000	43,180
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	77.03	77.03	84.95	20.27	90.67	61.41	92.64	N/A	49,750	42,262
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	129.70	129.70	129.70			129.70	129.70	N/A	20,000	25,940
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	120.23	120.23	120.23			120.23	120.23	N/A	68,500	82,355
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	89.47	92.17	91.98	3.24	100.21	89.17	97.87	N/A	29,666	27,286
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	78.23	78.23	78.23			78.23	78.23	N/A	15,000	11,735
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	68.44	68.44	68.44			68.44	68.44	N/A	35,000	23,955
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	2	89.92	89.92	88.73	3.96	101.34	86.36	93.48	N/A	37,500	33,275
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	106.44	101.00	102.56	22.52	98.47	61.41	129.70	N/A	47,000	48,205
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	89.17	84.64	84.57	9.12	100.08	68.44	97.87	N/A	27,800	23,510
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	89.50	92.53	90.65	20.83	102.08	61.41	129.70	N/A	42,375	38,411
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	89.47	94.99	102.00	11.33	93.13	78.23	120.23	N/A	34,500	35,190
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
FULLERTON	6	91.33	96.73	100.30	19.43	96.44	61.41	129.70	61.41 to 129.70	33,333	33,431
GENOA	5	89.47	85.33	87.29	9.80	97.75	68.44	97.87	N/A	40,400	35,266
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265

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	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	21.79	95% Median C.I.:	68.44 to 120.23
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.16 to 107.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	78.14 to 104.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,920						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	15.27	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,265	PRD:	97.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:03

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	10	89.32	87.73	91.88	12.32	95.48	61.41	120.23	68.44 to 97.87	38,200	35,098
3	1	129.70	129.70	129.70			129.70	129.70	N/A	20,000	25,940
____ALL____	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265
04											
____ALL____	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006											
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	6	91.33	96.73	100.30	19.43	96.44	61.41	129.70	61.41 to 129.70	33,333	33,431
63-0030	5	89.47	85.33	87.29	9.80	97.75	68.44	97.87	N/A	40,400	35,266
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	21.79	95% Median C.I.:	68.44 to 120.23
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.16 to 107.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	78.14 to 104.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,920						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	15.27	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,265	PRD:	97.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:03

YEAR BUILT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
0 OR Blank												
Prior TO 1860												
1860 TO 1899												
1900 TO 1919	2	85.86	85.86	87.76	8.88	97.83	78.23	93.48	N/A	20,000	17,552	
1920 TO 1939												
1940 TO 1949	3	89.17	101.74	97.34	16.20	104.52	86.36	129.70	N/A	27,333	26,606	
1950 TO 1959												
1960 TO 1969	2	83.16	83.16	81.26	17.70	102.33	68.44	97.87	N/A	31,000	25,190	
1970 TO 1979	1	61.41	61.41	61.41			61.41	61.41	N/A	24,500	15,045	
1980 TO 1989	1	92.64	92.64	92.64			92.64	92.64	N/A	75,000	69,480	
1990 TO 1994	2	104.85	104.85	107.25	14.67	97.76	89.47	120.23	N/A	59,250	63,545	
1995 TO 1999												
2000 TO Present												
ALL	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265	

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 \$												
10000 TO 29999	6	91.33	91.64	91.67	16.83	99.97	61.41	129.70	61.41 to 129.70	20,583	18,869	
30000 TO 59999	3	86.36	81.42	82.87	8.12	98.26	68.44	89.47	N/A	45,000	37,290	
60000 TO 99999	2	106.44	106.44	105.81	12.96	100.59	92.64	120.23	N/A	71,750	75,917	
ALL	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265	

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 \$												
10000 TO 29999	7	89.17	88.33	86.54	18.10	102.06	61.41	129.70	61.41 to 129.70	22,642	19,595	
30000 TO 59999	2	87.91	87.91	87.91	1.77	100.00	86.36	89.47	N/A	50,000	43,957	
60000 TO 99999	2	106.44	106.44	105.81	12.96	100.59	92.64	120.23	N/A	71,750	75,917	
ALL	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265	

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	21.79	95% Median C.I.:	68.44 to 120.23
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.16 to 107.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	78.14 to 104.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,920						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	15.27	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,265	PRD:	97.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:03

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
10	1	129.70	129.70	129.70			129.70	129.70	N/A	20,000	25,940	
20	10	89.32	87.73	91.88	12.32	95.48	61.41	120.23	68.44 to 97.87	38,200	35,098	
____ALL____	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	93.48	92.57	91.15	4.10	101.56	86.36	97.87	N/A	34,000	30,991	
32	1	68.44	68.44	68.44			68.44	68.44	N/A	35,000	23,955	
341	1	120.23	120.23	120.23			120.23	120.23	N/A	68,500	82,355	
344	1	78.23	78.23	78.23			78.23	78.23	N/A	15,000	11,735	
35	1	89.17	89.17	89.17			89.17	89.17	N/A	12,000	10,700	
384	1	61.41	61.41	61.41			61.41	61.41	N/A	24,500	15,045	
408	1	129.70	129.70	129.70			129.70	129.70	N/A	20,000	25,940	
410	1	89.47	89.47	89.47			89.47	89.47	N/A	50,000	44,735	
442	1	92.64	92.64	92.64			92.64	92.64	N/A	75,000	69,480	
____ALL____	11	89.47	91.55	93.76	15.27	97.64	61.41	129.70	68.44 to 120.23	36,545	34,265	

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

Commercial / Industrial

Nance County annually conducts a market analysis that included the qualified commercial and industrial sales that occurred from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2007. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. The county also completes the pick-up of new construction of commercial and industrial property.

For 2008, the preliminary median is 89.47, the mean is 91.55 and the weighted mean is 93.76 with only qualified 11 sales.

For 2008, Nance County reports that their sale review and market analysis with only 11 sales was not able to establish any subclasses that they could confidently adjust. The final measured Level of Value from 2001 through 2007 has shown a gradual decline from 100% to 93%, so it is reasonable to conclude that the preliminary median fits that pattern and an adjustment was needed. The county decided to increase all commercial by 5.0%. This action should raise the median and probably the mean and weighted mean above 92% and into the acceptable range. Short of a complete revaluation, the county saw no other options.

2008 Assessment Survey for Nance County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and contract appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and contract appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2002
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2002
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
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?
	2004 (by Jeff White Appraisal)
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
	4
9.	How are these defined?
	The areas that are in place in Nance County are the 3 towns, Fullerton, Genoa and Belgrade. The residential parcels outside the town limits are considered rural. These areas are identified in the "Assessor Location" section of the commercial statistics. In 2008, no sales occurred in Belgrade or the rural areas.
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, Nance County has no parcels identified as Assessor Location Suburban in 2008.

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>)
	None as a measurable subclass. These parcels are typically valued with the adjacent town, not with the rural residential or the ag residential.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
3	1	0	4

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	19.56	95% Median C.I.:	80.55 to 126.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	19.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.79 to 113.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.95	95% Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 110.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	400,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	13.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,381	PRD:	98.09	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:47

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											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	98.16	98.16	98.16			98.16	98.16	N/A	25,000	24,540
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	90.67	90.67	90.67			90.67	90.67	N/A	50,000	45,335
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	88.91	88.91	93.16	9.40	95.44	80.55	97.27	N/A	49,750	46,345
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	126.96	126.96	126.96			126.96	126.96	N/A	68,500	86,970
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	93.94	96.78	96.57	3.24	100.21	93.63	102.76	N/A	29,666	28,650
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	82.13	82.13	82.13			82.13	82.13	N/A	15,000	12,320
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	35,000	25,155
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	2	94.41	94.41	93.17	3.97	101.34	90.67	98.16	N/A	37,500	34,937
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	112.12	110.24	110.05	19.03	100.17	80.55	136.18	N/A	47,000	51,723
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	93.63	88.87	88.79	9.12	100.08	71.87	102.76	N/A	27,800	24,685
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	93.97	101.17	97.50	16.56	103.76	80.55	136.18	N/A	42,375	41,315
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	93.94	99.88	107.39	11.49	93.01	82.13	126.96	N/A	34,500	37,048
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
FULLERTON	6	95.90	104.36	107.53	16.76	97.05	80.55	136.18	80.55 to 136.18	33,333	35,841
GENOA	5	93.94	89.59	91.66	9.80	97.75	71.87	102.76	N/A	40,400	37,029
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

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	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	19.56	95% Median C.I.:	80.55 to 126.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	19.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.79 to 113.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.95	95% Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 110.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	400,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	13.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,381	PRD:	98.09	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:47

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	10	93.79	93.79	97.63	10.69	96.07	71.87	126.96	80.55 to 102.76	38,200	37,296
3	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235
____ALL____	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381
04											
____ALL____	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006											
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	6	95.90	104.36	107.53	16.76	97.05	80.55	136.18	80.55 to 136.18	33,333	35,841
63-0030	5	93.94	89.59	91.66	9.80	97.75	71.87	102.76	N/A	40,400	37,029
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	19.56	95% Median C.I.:	80.55 to 126.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	19.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.79 to 113.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.95	95% Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 110.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	400,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	13.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,381	PRD:	98.09	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:47

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											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	90.15	90.15	92.15	8.89	97.82	82.13	98.16	N/A	20,000	18,430
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	3	93.63	106.83	102.20	16.20	104.53	90.67	136.18	N/A	27,333	27,935
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	87.32	87.32	85.32	17.69	102.34	71.87	102.76	N/A	31,000	26,450
1970 TO 1979	1	80.55	80.55	80.55			80.55	80.55	N/A	24,500	19,735
1980 TO 1989	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
1990 TO 1994	2	110.45	110.45	113.03	14.95	97.72	93.94	126.96	N/A	59,250	66,970
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

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	6	95.90	98.90	99.44	14.04	99.46	80.55	136.18	80.55 to 136.18	20,583	20,468
30000 TO 59999	3	90.67	85.49	87.01	8.11	98.26	71.87	93.94	N/A	45,000	39,153
60000 TO 99999	2	112.12	112.12	111.45	13.24	100.60	97.27	126.96	N/A	71,750	79,962
ALL	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

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 \$											
10000 TO 29999	7	93.63	95.04	93.35	15.65	101.81	71.87	136.18	71.87 to 136.18	22,642	21,137
30000 TO 59999	2	92.31	92.31	92.31	1.77	100.00	90.67	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,152
60000 TO 99999	2	112.12	112.12	111.45	13.24	100.60	97.27	126.96	N/A	71,750	79,962
ALL	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	19.56	95% Median C.I.:	80.55 to 126.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	402,000	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	19.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.79 to 113.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	402,000	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.95	95% Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 110.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	400,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,545	COD:	13.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,381	PRD:	98.09	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:47

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
10	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235	
20	10	93.79	93.79	97.63	10.69	96.07	71.87	126.96	80.55 to 102.76	38,200	37,296	
____ALL____	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	98.16	97.20	95.71	4.11	101.56	90.67	102.76	N/A	34,000	32,540	
32	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	35,000	25,155	
341	1	126.96	126.96	126.96			126.96	126.96	N/A	68,500	86,970	
344	1	82.13	82.13	82.13			82.13	82.13	N/A	15,000	12,320	
35	1	93.63	93.63	93.63			93.63	93.63	N/A	12,000	11,235	
384	1	80.55	80.55	80.55			80.55	80.55	N/A	24,500	19,735	
408	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235	
410	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970	
442	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955	
____ALL____	11	93.94	97.65	99.55	13.79	98.09	71.87	136.18	80.55 to 126.96	36,545	36,381	

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified commercial statistics indicates that all valuation subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD and PRD statistics are both within of the range. The narrative in Table VI suggests that the assessment of the commercial class cannot be critically evaluated due to the diversity of the class and she small number of sales. There is little information to confidently determine whether the valuations have been done uniformly and proportionately or not so for 2008, the indication is favorable.

In summary, there are numerous statistics that have been presented and discussed in the following six tables of the Correlation section of the R&O. There are a total of five that relate to the measurement of the level of value. In Table V, there was a presentation and narrative explanation prepared about the median, weighted mean and mean ratios. In Table III, there was a presentation and narrative discussion of the trended preliminary median. The fifth measure of central tendency was not independently presented or discussed. That measure, the 95% Confidence Interval measured around the median deserves mention. In this class, the confidence interval of 80.55 to 126.96 includes the acceptable range, allowing for the likelihood that the level of value is in the acceptable range. There is no indication among the statistics that the entire class should be adjusted and there is no compelling evidence that any notable subclass within this class should be adjusted. Given the wide diversity of the property uses and the small number of sales representing the commercial class, there are rarely circumstances when the statistical data will clearly support an adjustment to any subclass. Giving due consideration to all of the measures, the median is considered the best indicator of the level of value for this class and the COD and PRD indicate that the quality of assessment is acceptable.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	29	11	37.93
2007	29	8	27.59
2006	35	10	28.57
2005	35	14	40
2004	29	14	48.28
2003	26	17	65.38
2002	28	18	64.29
2001	40	26	65

COMMERCIAL: Table II demonstrates a relatively low rate of utilization compared to similar counties. However, this alone does not indicate that the County has underutilized the available sales. Nothing was observed or reported to indicate that the measurement of this class of property was not done with all available arms' length sales. This utilization rate is not believed to have resulted from the excessive trimming of sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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.

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

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	89.47	3.29	92.41	93.94
2007	93.06	5.44	98.13	93.06
2006	97.15	-0.99	96.19	97.15
2005	97.49	-0.18	97.31	97.49
2004	94.05	0.2	94.23	94.05
2003	100	-1.9	98.1	98
2002	115.81	0.12	115.95	100
2001	102	1.81	103.85	100

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. This also indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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 Nance 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)
4.99	2008	3.29
0	2007	5.44
0	2006	-0.99
0	2005	-0.18
4.82	2004	0.2
22	2003	-2
-2.66	2002	0.12
7.01	2001	1.81

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar enough to rely on the statistical calculations from the sales file as a reasonable measure of the population. In this class, the assessed value did not increase as much as the sale file, but the difference is within an acceptable tolerance for a county with good assessment practices.

2008 Correlation Section for Nance 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 Nance County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	93.94	99.55	97.65

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	13.79	98.09
Difference	0	0

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. In a file of only 11 sales there is probably little significance to this, considering the diversity of a commercial class of property. Having said that, there is also nothing to indicate that the assessments have not been done uniformly and proportionately.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	11	11	0
Median	89.47	93.94	4.47
Wgt. Mean	93.76	99.55	5.79
Mean	91.55	97.65	6.1
COD	15.27	13.79	-1.48
PRD	97.64	98.09	0.45
Min Sales Ratio	61.41	71.87	10.46
Max Sales Ratio	129.70	136.18	6.48

COMMERCIAL: The change between the Preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The same sales were used to measure the Preliminary and R&O Statistics, so there was no impact due to the removal of sales.

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:	44	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	55.13 to 70.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.51 to 64.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.82 to 66.77	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,051,630							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	17.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.28			
AVG. Assessed Value:	114,809	PRD:	105.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.45			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:21

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	65.33	65.33	65.33			65.33	65.33	N/A	95,000	62,065
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	65.16	66.36	64.44	14.52	102.98	53.55	81.56	N/A	172,262	111,003
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	4	72.38	69.79	68.93	4.92	101.24	60.90	73.50	N/A	261,586	180,317
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	74.22	74.22	74.22			74.22	74.22	N/A	250,000	185,540
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	66.16	64.15	60.69	15.09	105.70	49.23	75.04	N/A	156,130	94,748
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	70.61	66.48	65.13	8.72	102.08	49.42	73.73	49.42 to 73.73	154,880	100,873
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	77.08	77.08	77.08			77.08	77.08	N/A	120,000	92,490
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	56.10	56.10	56.10			56.10	56.10	N/A	190,560	106,900
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	56.77	64.53	55.75	26.24	115.75	42.96	112.28	42.96 to 112.28	272,101	151,687
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	51.62	52.57	49.82	14.23	105.52	35.45	77.32	44.71 to 56.07	177,508	88,432
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	57.33	58.08	56.96	8.15	101.96	51.80	65.86	N/A	173,656	98,916
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	9	70.08	67.77	67.05	9.48	101.06	53.55	81.56	60.24 to 73.50	203,377	136,372
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	14	72.16	67.13	65.55	9.55	102.41	49.23	77.08	54.42 to 74.22	159,540	104,572
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	55.13	57.77	53.80	16.94	107.39	35.45	112.28	50.45 to 59.65	208,927	112,393
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	73.20	67.77	66.94	8.38	101.25	49.23	75.04	59.10 to 74.22	213,429	142,867
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	68.25	65.69	59.87	16.20	109.72	42.96	112.28	54.42 to 72.51	203,194	121,658
<u>ALL</u>											
	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

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:	44	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	55.13 to 70.08	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.51 to 64.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.82 to 66.77	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,051,630							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	17.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.28			
AVG. Assessed Value:	114,809	PRD:	105.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.45			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:21

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2339	2	62.99	62.99	62.33	9.87	101.05	56.77	69.21	N/A	199,000	124,045
2341	2	60.37	60.37	61.12	21.75	98.78	47.24	73.50	N/A	314,972	192,502
2343	3	59.10	59.47	57.99	11.76	102.55	49.23	70.08	N/A	185,166	107,376
2413	3	55.72	60.91	64.56	10.55	94.35	54.69	72.32	N/A	137,116	88,518
2415	9	60.24	61.46	57.77	15.04	106.38	42.96	81.56	51.62 to 73.20	237,578	137,259
2417	2	65.87	65.87	61.73	17.38	106.71	54.42	77.32	N/A	228,542	141,075
2419	4	55.60	57.58	55.66	11.63	103.44	47.09	72.01	N/A	156,725	87,230
2421	3	59.65	62.84	59.79	14.13	105.11	51.80	77.08	N/A	200,541	119,898
2625	2	54.59	54.59	47.77	35.06	114.27	35.45	73.73	N/A	171,055	81,715
2627	4	73.37	68.06	68.79	8.96	98.94	50.45	75.04	N/A	155,629	107,052
2629	3	68.25	62.06	51.79	13.92	119.82	44.71	73.22	N/A	203,082	105,181
2633	3	69.07	82.40	80.92	22.40	101.83	65.86	112.28	N/A	84,386	68,286
2713	2	60.90	60.90	62.54	12.07	97.38	53.55	68.25	N/A	302,500	189,182
2715	2	57.38	57.38	56.95	13.86	100.75	49.42	65.33	N/A	100,390	57,170
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	25	65.86	63.88	60.16	17.30	106.19	35.45	112.28	54.42 to 72.32	175,879	105,801
3	16	57.60	60.17	58.27	14.93	103.25	42.96	81.56	51.62 to 71.55	219,415	127,861
4	3	69.21	67.77	66.35	9.90	102.13	56.77	77.32	N/A	181,261	120,271
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

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	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

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:	44	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	55.13 to 70.08	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.51 to 64.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.82 to 66.77	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,051,630							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	17.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.28			
AVG. Assessed Value:	114,809	PRD:	105.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.45			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:21

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	2	60.23	60.23	50.92	21.57	118.29	47.24	73.22	N/A	172,998	88,087
DRY-N/A	10	56.42	57.09	54.21	16.13	105.31	35.45	71.55	42.96 to 69.07	209,849	113,764
GRASS	11	56.10	59.33	58.97	11.35	100.61	49.42	77.08	51.62 to 69.21	170,358	100,458
GRASS-N/A	8	73.47	69.25	67.63	10.43	102.39	47.09	81.56	47.09 to 81.56	152,227	102,956
IRRGTD	1	59.10	59.10	59.10			59.10	59.10	N/A	239,500	141,540
IRRGTD-N/A	12	69.16	67.15	62.32	17.23	107.74	44.71	112.28	54.42 to 73.50	222,973	138,964
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

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	62.57	61.40	54.38	15.57	112.90	47.24	73.22	N/A	125,499	68,251
DRY-N/A	8	55.89	55.72	53.58	17.45	103.99	35.45	71.55	35.45 to 71.55	242,811	130,101
GRASS	12	58.17	60.43	59.60	12.38	101.39	49.42	77.08	51.80 to 69.21	163,828	97,645
GRASS-N/A	7	73.73	68.78	67.23	11.64	102.30	47.09	81.56	47.09 to 81.56	160,831	108,135
IRRGTD	6	59.38	60.36	58.38	12.43	103.39	44.71	73.50	44.71 to 73.50	273,144	159,470
IRRGTD-N/A	7	72.01	71.82	66.78	17.24	107.55	49.23	112.28	49.23 to 112.28	182,330	121,755
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

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	10	55.54	55.78	50.48	17.21	110.50	35.45	73.22	42.96 to 71.55	197,949	99,923
DRY-N/A	2	66.79	66.79	67.65	2.19	98.72	65.33	68.25	N/A	232,500	157,295
GRASS	17	60.24	62.26	61.06	15.45	101.97	47.09	81.56	51.80 to 73.73	163,278	99,693
GRASS-N/A	2	74.12	74.12	74.02	1.24	100.14	73.20	75.04	N/A	158,012	116,955
IRRGTD	11	59.65	65.33	60.51	20.40	107.96	44.71	112.28	49.23 to 73.50	233,789	141,477
IRRGTD-N/A	2	73.12	73.12	73.61	1.51	99.32	72.01	74.22	N/A	171,750	126,432
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809

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:	44	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	55.13 to 70.08	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.51 to 64.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.82 to 66.77	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,051,630							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	17.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.28			
AVG. Assessed Value:	114,809	PRD:	105.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.45			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:21

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
06-0006	2	53.47	53.47	53.55	3.11	99.84	51.80	55.13	N/A	270,275	144,740	
06-0017	1	47.24	47.24	47.24			47.24	47.24	N/A	297,000	140,300	
39-0010	2	68.36	68.36	65.70	12.75	104.06	59.65	77.08	N/A	172,812	113,537	
61-0049	4	57.38	55.98	51.16	23.61	109.42	35.45	73.73	N/A	135,722	69,442	
63-0001	21	60.90	62.63	60.63	15.03	103.30	44.71	77.32	54.42 to 72.51	196,826	119,328	
63-0030	14	67.47	66.64	62.16	17.76	107.21	42.96	112.28	54.69 to 73.50	185,143	115,079	
72-0075												
NonValid School												
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809	

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
30.01 TO 50.00	1	73.22	73.22	73.22			73.22	73.22	N/A	48,997	35,875	
50.01 TO 100.00	11	59.10	65.59	63.04	18.61	104.06	49.23	112.28	54.69 to 72.01	118,378	74,620	
100.01 TO 180.00	25	60.24	61.66	59.60	17.60	103.46	35.45	81.56	54.42 to 72.32	196,793	117,284	
180.01 TO 330.00	7	60.90	60.96	57.92	16.23	105.25	42.96	75.04	42.96 to 75.04	311,489	180,404	
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809	

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	1	73.22	73.22	73.22			73.22	73.22	N/A	48,997	35,875	
60000 TO 99999	7	69.07	71.71	71.15	16.69	100.78	54.69	112.28	54.69 to 112.28	85,601	60,907	
100000 TO 149999	11	68.25	65.27	65.75	12.89	99.27	49.42	77.32	50.45 to 77.08	120,058	78,940	
150000 TO 249999	15	59.10	59.78	59.13	15.56	101.09	35.45	81.56	51.62 to 71.55	201,009	118,854	
250000 TO 499999	9	55.13	58.91	58.52	15.86	100.66	44.71	74.22	47.24 to 73.50	320,382	187,486	
500000 +	1	42.96	42.96	42.96			42.96	42.96	N/A	584,000	250,870	
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809	

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:	44	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	55.13 to 70.08	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.51 to 64.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.82 to 66.77	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,051,630							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	17.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.28			
AVG. Assessed Value:	114,809	PRD:	105.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.45			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:49:21

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	7	55.72	59.03	57.40	10.06	102.85	49.42	73.22	49.42 to 73.22	86,682	49,751	
60000 TO 99999	13	68.25	66.10	61.16	18.52	108.08	35.45	112.28	49.23 to 73.73	128,393	78,529	
100000 TO 149999	15	59.65	62.93	61.08	14.75	103.02	47.24	81.56	53.55 to 73.20	202,449	123,661	
150000 TO 249999	7	60.90	62.17	60.61	15.43	102.58	44.71	74.22	44.71 to 74.22	312,113	189,167	
250000 TO 499999	2	55.61	55.61	52.77	22.74	105.38	42.96	68.25	N/A	477,000	251,697	
ALL	44	60.57	62.79	59.77	17.64	105.05	35.45	112.28	55.13 to 70.08	192,077	114,809	

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

Agricultural

Nance County annually conducts a market analysis that included the qualified unimproved agricultural sales that occurred from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2007.

In this analysis, the county considers each of the following: across the board adjustments; broad adjustments to each individual market area; adjustments to each major land use countywide; adjustments to each major land use within individual market area; adjustments to individual land capability groups (LCGs) countywide; and adjustments to individual land capability groups within individual market area.

After careful consideration of each possibility, the county analyzes the sales in a database of all the unimproved qualified sales and tests the change or combination of changes that produces the best statistical fit in the database. Those adjustments are then made to the applicable parcels in the assessment record files and reported in the abstract.

For 2008, the preliminary median for the agricultural land class of real property is 60.57, the mean is 62.79 and the weighted mean is 59.77 with 44 qualified unimproved sales.

In 2008, there has been an extraordinary increase in all agricultural land values. The county has developed a variety of changes to be applied to individual LCGs in each market area. The aggregate changes measure from over 5% in market area 4 to nearly 20% in market area 3. Market areas 1 and 2 were closer to 10%. While there were no sales in area 2, the assessed values were adjusted on the strength of the market in area 1. The resulting median ratio is estimated to be about 72%.

Nance County has also been systematically converting their land use and acre count to their new Agri Data System.

Nance has updated land use using NRD maps. This action consisted of a records review over 600 agricultural record files, the corresponding NRD records and some FSA records. The county's goal was to correlate all of the sources of irrigated acres and adjust the classified acres their files accordingly. The county also reviewed the records of parcels with accretion land along the river changed the acres classified as waste to a timbered class.

Contract appraiser Jerry Knoche has been systematically doing an on-site inspection to verify and update the improvement data on the rural and suburban record cards. This inspection process includes: the houses and the associated outbuildings on the rural and suburban residential

records; and the houses and the associated outbuildings on rural and suburban agricultural records. This process has been ongoing throughout 2007, will continue in 2008 for implementation in 2009.

2008 Assessment Survey for Nance County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No written policy, however, the county indicated that they follow the Rules and Regulations and State Statutes that pertain to agricultural land.
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	According to the statutes and regulations.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1955
7.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	FSA and NRD registrations and maps are typically used. The county mailed questionnaires to sellers and buyers about land use. One additional tool that the county has used to confirm current land use is the current registered groundwater wells from the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%

8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:
	4

9.	How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class?
	The areas are defined by similar soil types and topography.
10.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No, Nance County has not identified any value differences due to non-agricultural influences.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
20	11	0	31

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:	44	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	19.01	95% Median C.I.:	65.58 to 78.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	13.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.01 to 74.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.23	95% Mean C.I.:	69.21 to 77.44	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	14.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.35			
AVG. Assessed Value:	135,028	PRD:	104.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:54

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>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	79.39	79.39	79.39			79.39	79.39	N/A	95,000	75,425
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	76.29	79.19	77.35	12.83	102.37	65.58	98.58	N/A	172,262	133,251
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	4	83.78	81.56	79.20	9.28	102.98	69.26	89.42	N/A	261,586	207,177
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	88.13	88.13	88.13			88.13	88.13	N/A	250,000	220,325
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	70.94	72.14	69.41	11.40	103.93	62.56	84.11	N/A	156,130	108,362
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	78.87	76.09	74.15	9.37	102.62	61.05	89.41	61.05 to 89.41	154,880	114,844
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	120,000	87,000
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	68.65	68.65	68.65			68.65	68.65	N/A	190,560	130,810
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	65.39	74.71	65.46	22.98	114.12	52.52	129.35	52.52 to 129.35	272,101	178,129
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	62.55	63.25	61.42	11.58	102.97	52.64	81.05	53.69 to 69.35	177,508	109,031
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	70.00	71.31	69.91	8.05	102.00	63.99	81.25	N/A	173,656	121,402
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	9	79.37	80.26	78.52	9.84	102.23	65.58	98.58	69.26 to 89.42	203,377	159,682
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	14	77.53	75.56	74.30	10.31	101.70	61.05	89.41	62.56 to 84.11	159,540	118,537
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	66.47	68.86	64.83	14.46	106.21	52.52	129.35	59.64 to 72.64	208,927	135,457
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	78.31	78.10	77.18	10.96	101.20	62.56	89.42	65.53 to 89.25	213,429	164,720
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	73.17	74.87	69.00	15.15	108.51	52.52	129.35	61.86 to 81.64	203,194	140,204
<u>ALL</u>											
	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028

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:	44	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	19.01	95% Median C.I.:	65.58 to 78.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	13.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.01 to 74.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.23	95% Mean C.I.:	69.21 to 77.44	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	14.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.35			
AVG. Assessed Value:	135,028	PRD:	104.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:54

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2339	2	68.60	68.60	68.12	6.66	100.71	64.03	73.17	N/A	199,000	135,550	
2341	2	68.97	68.97	69.51	13.53	99.23	59.64	78.31	N/A	314,972	218,935	
2343	3	65.53	69.15	67.24	8.55	102.85	62.56	79.37	N/A	185,166	124,505	
2413	3	69.05	73.13	76.60	8.40	95.47	66.47	83.87	N/A	137,116	105,026	
2415	9	69.26	74.53	69.78	15.94	106.80	52.52	98.58	62.55 to 89.42	237,578	165,791	
2417	2	71.46	71.46	67.98	13.43	105.11	61.86	81.05	N/A	228,542	155,367	
2419	4	62.08	64.87	63.85	13.93	101.60	53.69	81.64	N/A	156,725	100,066	
2421	3	72.50	69.71	68.93	3.98	101.13	63.99	72.64	N/A	200,541	138,235	
2625	2	74.18	74.18	72.46	6.51	102.37	69.35	79.01	N/A	171,055	123,950	
2627	4	86.12	79.33	80.09	10.96	99.05	55.66	89.41	N/A	155,629	124,640	
2629	3	76.34	69.23	59.85	11.39	115.67	52.64	78.72	N/A	203,082	121,553	
2633	3	81.25	95.50	94.38	21.93	101.18	75.89	129.35	N/A	84,386	79,648	
2713	2	70.86	70.86	72.04	7.45	98.37	65.58	76.14	N/A	302,500	217,910	
2715	2	70.22	70.22	69.73	13.06	100.71	61.05	79.39	N/A	100,390	70,000	
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	25	75.89	74.25	70.99	14.46	104.59	52.64	129.35	65.39 to 79.39	175,879	124,863	
3	16	68.85	71.98	69.23	12.82	103.98	52.52	98.58	62.56 to 79.37	219,415	151,901	
4	3	73.17	72.75	71.58	7.75	101.63	64.03	81.05	N/A	181,261	129,753	
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	

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	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	

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:	44	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	19.01	95% Median C.I.:	65.58 to 78.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	13.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.01 to 74.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.23	95% Mean C.I.:	69.21 to 77.44	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	14.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.35			
AVG. Assessed Value:	135,028	PRD:	104.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:54

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	2	67.99	67.99	62.00	12.28	109.65	59.64	76.34	N/A	172,998	107,267
DRY-N/A	10	68.35	68.83	66.36	13.42	103.73	52.52	89.25	55.66 to 79.39	209,849	139,254
GRASS	12	68.85	68.89	68.40	6.07	100.72	61.05	81.25	63.99 to 73.17	175,745	120,214
GRASS-N/A	7	84.11	82.18	81.70	10.81	100.59	53.69	98.58	53.69 to 98.58	140,403	114,707
IRRGTD	1	62.56	62.56	62.56			62.56	62.56	N/A	239,500	149,840
IRRGTD-N/A	12	78.52	78.12	72.46	15.36	107.81	52.64	129.35	65.39 to 83.87	222,973	161,569
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028

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	67.77	67.66	63.45	12.48	106.63	58.76	76.34	N/A	125,499	79,632
DRY-N/A	8	68.35	69.21	66.33	13.64	104.34	52.52	89.25	52.52 to 89.25	242,811	161,068
GRASS	13	69.05	70.47	69.28	7.85	101.72	61.05	89.41	63.99 to 73.21	169,303	117,295
GRASS-N/A	6	82.58	80.98	80.90	11.78	100.09	53.69	98.58	53.69 to 98.58	148,470	120,115
IRRGTD	6	69.02	68.49	66.23	12.01	103.40	52.64	79.37	52.64 to 79.37	273,144	180,904
IRRGTD-N/A	7	81.64	84.16	78.61	16.67	107.06	61.86	129.35	61.86 to 129.35	182,330	143,320
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028

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	10	65.69	66.88	63.14	13.33	105.91	52.52	89.25	55.66 to 76.34	197,949	124,994
DRY-N/A	2	77.77	77.77	76.80	2.09	101.25	76.14	79.39	N/A	232,500	178,565
GRASS	17	69.26	72.26	70.99	11.65	101.80	53.69	98.58	63.99 to 81.05	163,278	115,904
GRASS-N/A	2	86.77	86.77	87.07	3.06	99.65	84.11	89.42	N/A	158,012	137,577
IRRGTD	11	72.64	75.48	69.68	17.73	108.31	52.64	129.35	61.86 to 83.87	233,789	162,910
IRRGTD-N/A	2	84.88	84.88	86.36	3.82	98.29	81.64	88.13	N/A	171,750	148,327
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028

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:	44	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	19.01	95% Median C.I.:	65.58 to 78.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	13.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.01 to 74.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.23	95% Mean C.I.:	69.21 to 77.44	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	14.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.35			
AVG. Assessed Value:	135,028	PRD:	104.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:55

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
06-0006	2	64.69	64.69	64.73	1.08	99.94	63.99	65.39	N/A	270,275	174,945	
06-0017	1	59.64	59.64	59.64			59.64	59.64	N/A	297,000	177,130	
39-0010	2	72.57	72.57	72.59	0.10	99.97	72.50	72.64	N/A	172,812	125,442	
61-0049	4	74.18	72.20	71.45	9.44	101.05	61.05	79.39	N/A	135,722	96,975	
63-0001	21	73.17	71.62	69.77	13.37	102.65	52.64	89.42	62.55 to 81.05	196,826	137,326	
63-0030	14	77.10	78.53	72.98	16.73	107.60	52.52	129.35	65.53 to 89.25	185,143	135,114	
72-0075												
NonValid School												
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
30.01 TO 50.00	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	48,997	37,405	
50.01 TO 100.00	11	69.05	75.88	73.08	16.36	103.84	58.76	129.35	62.56 to 81.64	118,378	86,507	
100.01 TO 180.00	25	72.64	72.62	70.50	13.71	103.01	52.64	98.58	64.03 to 79.39	196,793	138,744	
180.01 TO 330.00	7	69.26	71.39	68.04	13.67	104.92	52.52	88.13	52.52 to 88.13	311,489	211,952	
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	

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	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	48,997	37,405	
60000 TO 99999	7	79.39	82.99	82.56	17.86	100.52	58.76	129.35	58.76 to 129.35	85,601	70,669	
100000 TO 149999	11	78.72	73.56	73.72	9.14	99.78	55.66	84.11	61.05 to 81.25	120,058	88,501	
150000 TO 249999	15	69.35	72.81	72.23	13.22	100.80	53.69	98.58	64.03 to 83.87	201,009	145,182	
250000 TO 499999	9	65.39	68.37	67.67	12.52	101.04	52.64	88.13	59.64 to 78.31	320,382	216,805	
500000 +	1	52.52	52.52	52.52			52.52	52.52	N/A	584,000	306,690	
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028	

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:	44	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	19.01	95% Median C.I.:	65.58 to 78.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,517,930	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	13.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.01 to 74.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,451,430	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.23	95% Mean C.I.:	69.21 to 77.44	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,941,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	192,077	COD:	14.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.35			
AVG. Assessed Value:	135,028	PRD:	104.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:38:55

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	4	71.18	69.37	68.24	9.48	101.65	58.76	76.34	N/A	72,636	49,566
60000 TO 99999	14	78.87	76.96	74.48	14.62	103.33	53.69	129.35	61.05 to 81.64	111,238	82,851
100000 TO 149999	9	68.65	70.54	69.38	9.20	101.67	62.55	84.11	62.56 to 81.05	188,563	130,831
150000 TO 249999	14	69.31	73.54	70.63	15.76	104.12	52.64	98.58	61.86 to 89.25	258,537	182,605
250000 TO 499999	3	76.14	68.99	65.98	11.29	104.56	52.52	78.31	N/A	428,981	283,045
ALL	44	72.57	73.33	70.30	14.10	104.31	52.52	129.35	65.58 to 78.72	192,077	135,028

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the unimproved agricultural statistics indicates that all market areas are within the acceptable range in Nance County. The statistics also indicate that the major land uses may be within the range. The 95% and 80% Majority Land Use tables both indicate that grass land is at about 69%. Neither table groups a sufficient number of sales of any other land use to make any real indication of the level of value of any other major use. The system that the county uses to analyze and apply the values assures that all parcels within each market area have been valued uniformly and proportionately. The analysis is done within the framework of the agricultural land classification structure and the valuations are applied within the same classification structure.

In summary, there are numerous statistics that have been presented and discussed in the following six tables of the Correlation section of the R&O. There are a total of five that relate to the measurement of the level of value. In Table V, there was a presentation and narrative explanation prepared about the median, weighted mean and mean ratios. In Table III, there was a presentation and narrative discussion of the trended preliminary median. The fifth measure of central tendency was not independently presented or discussed. That measure, the 95% Confidence Interval measured around the median deserves mention. In this class, the confidence interval of 65.58 to 78.72 includes the acceptable range, allowing for the possibility that the level of value is in the acceptable range. There is no indication among the statistics that the entire class should be adjusted and there is no compelling evidence that any notable subclass within this class should be adjusted. Giving due consideration to all of the measures, the median is considered the best indicator of the level of value for this class.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	96	44	45.83
2007	98	38	38.78
2006	106	43	40.57
2005	102	48	47.06
2004	82	43	52.44
2003	59	34	57.63
2002	55	35	63.64
2001	64	39	60.94

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II demonstrates a relatively low rate of utilization compared to similar counties. This alone does not indicate that the county has underutilized the available sales. Nothing was observed to indicate other than that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms' length sales. This utilization pattern is not deemed to result from the excessive trimming of sales, rather from an extraordinary period of the development of new irrigated land driven by high grain prices. Currently, low levels of sale utilization are common in counties with significant irrigation and contrast sharply with prior years and with predominantly dry land counties.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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.

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

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	60.57	15.86	70.18	72.57
2007	70.63	5.29	74.37	72.86
2006	75.03	0.53	75.43	75.26
2005	76.52	0.03	76.54	76.52
2004	68.01	10.36	75.06	75.78
2003	73	5.45	76.98	76
2002	71.93	3.99	74.8	75
2001	75	0.43	75.32	75

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary ratio is slightly lower than the calculated median for this class of property. Even with the difference, the relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. This also indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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 Nance 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	Year	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
20.5	2008	15.86
10.67	2007	5.29
0	2006	0.53
0	2005	0.03
14.78	2004	10.36
6	2003	5
3.39	2002	3.99
0	2001	0.43

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change in the sales file and percent change in the abstract is significant. Table IV indicates 4.64% difference, an amount that might be construed as disparate treatment of the sales and the assessed base. The County's actions were primarily motivated to attain uniformity among the market areas as well as to increase the level of value. The statistics that resulted seem to indicate disparate treatment when actually; the county was only making changes within selected subclasses which may not result in a direct change in the R&O Statistics. For agricultural land, changes are usually made at the LCG level within a market area. This can easily cause different percentage changes to individual parcels because of their individual uses and classified acres. While the application of the adjustment is done absolutely uniformly, the measured outcome is not patterned similarly to other classes. The median still provides the best measure of the level of value in this case.

2008 Correlation Section for Nance 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 Nance County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	72.57	70.30	73.33

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency all are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	14.10	104.31
Difference	0	1.31

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range and price related differential is out of the acceptable range. This is a situation where a relative small group of sales is can be impacted by one or two outliers. The outliers drive the mean ratio which raises the PRD. This statistic is only slightly out of compliance which still indicates that this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Nance 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	44	44	0
Median	60.57	72.57	12
Wgt. Mean	59.77	70.30	10.53
Mean	62.79	73.33	10.54
COD	17.64	14.10	-3.54
PRD	105.05	104.31	-0.74
Min Sales Ratio	35.45	52.52	17.07
Max Sales Ratio	112.28	129.35	17.07

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the Preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The same sales were used to measure the Preliminary and R&O Statistics, so there was no impact due to the removal of sales.

County 63 - Nance

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 4,047	Value 364,885,792	Total Growth 3,493,320 (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	115	293,835	28	225,535	20	144,890	163	664,260	
2. Res Improv Land	1,129	3,937,242	67	993,815	113	1,117,705	1,309	6,048,762	
3. Res Improvements	1,138	40,571,405	68	4,247,869	124	8,019,294	1,330	52,838,568	
4. Res Total	1,253	44,802,482	96	5,467,219	144	9,281,889	1,493	59,551,590	934,289
% of Total	83.92	75.23	6.43	9.18	9.64	15.58	36.89	16.32	26.74
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	7	189,615	8	568,000	15	757,615	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	6	125,800	6	125,800	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	20	201,065	20	201,065	
8. Rec Total	0	0	7	189,615	28	894,865	35	1,084,480	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	20.00	17.48	80.00	82.51	0.86	0.29	0.00
Res+Rec Total	1,253	44,802,482	103	5,656,834	172	10,176,754	1,528	60,636,070	934,289
% of Total	82.00	73.88	6.74	9.32	11.25	16.78	37.75	16.61	26.74

County 63 - Nance

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 4,047	Value 364,885,792	Total Growth 3,493,320 (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	12	172,055	3	32,475	1	8,845	16	213,375	
10. Comm Improv Land	155	338,700	11	248,900	2	2,560	168	590,160	
11. Comm Improvements	164	7,702,735	11	2,293,010	6	103,280	181	10,099,025	
12. Comm Total	176	8,213,490	14	2,574,385	7	114,685	197	10,902,560	317,195
% of Total	89.34	75.33	7.10	23.61	3.55	1.05	4.86	2.98	9.08
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	0	0	1	492,800	1	492,800	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	1,840,775	1	1,840,775	
16. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	1	2,333,575	1	2,333,575	1,740,775
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	***	***	0.02	0.63	49.83
Comm+Ind Total	176	8,213,490	14	2,574,385	8	2,448,260	198	13,236,135	2,057,970
% of Total	88.88	62.05	7.07	19.44	4.04	18.49	4.89	3.62	58.91
17. Taxable Total	1,429	53,015,972	117	8,231,219	180	12,625,014	1,726	73,872,205	2,992,259
% of Total	82.79	71.76	6.77	7.65	10.42	13.77	42.64	20.24	85.65

County 63 - Nance

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	4	107,015	1,640,120	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	4	107,015	1,640,120
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	107,015	1,640,120

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

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	130	9	278	417

Schedule V: Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	3	30,290	30	1,627,365	1,611	168,516,303	1,644	170,173,958
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	100,500	24	1,973,200	606	82,946,300	633	85,020,000
29. Ag-Improvements	3	130,845	25	1,336,354	649	34,352,430	677	35,819,629
30. Ag-Total Taxable							2,321	291,013,587

County 63 - Nance

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	1	2.000	4,000	12	18.310	36,620	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1		87,035	13		868,300	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	2	3.360	3,360	18	39.600	39,600	
37. FarmSite Improv	2		43,810	24		468,054	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		19.210			91.490		
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	3.000	6,000	2	3.000	6,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	374	395.890	791,780	387	416.200	832,400	
33. HomeSite Improvements	376		15,153,957	390		16,109,292	192,287
34. HomeSite Total				392	419.200	16,947,692	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	5	37.000	37,000	5	37.000	37,000	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	550	1,723.390	1,893,470	570	1,766.350	1,936,430	
37. FarmSite Improv	617		19,198,473	643		19,710,337	308,774
38. FarmSite Total				648	1,803.350	21,683,767	
39. Road & Ditches		5,711.800			5,822.500		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,040	8,045.050	38,631,459	501,061

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	9	1,145.580	714,565	9	1,145.580	714,565

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 63 - Nance

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	19.000	34,010	574.000	1,027,460	14,746.060	26,395,450	15,339.060	27,456,920
46. 1A	0.000	0	81.000	135,270	2,536.000	4,235,120	2,617.000	4,370,390
47. 2A1	12.000	18,960	251.950	398,080	8,906.500	14,072,270	9,170.450	14,489,310
48. 2A	1.300	1,965	79.000	119,290	3,985.140	6,017,560	4,065.440	6,138,815
49. 3A1	0.000	0	6.000	8,760	4,641.970	6,770,070	4,647.970	6,778,830
50. 3A	0.000	0	20.000	28,200	1,763.000	2,485,830	1,783.000	2,514,030
51. 4A1	0.000	0	40.000	46,800	3,577.000	4,185,090	3,617.000	4,231,890
52. 4A	0.000	0	50.000	58,000	3,106.000	3,602,960	3,156.000	3,660,960
53. Total	32.300	54,935	1,101.950	1,821,860	43,261.670	67,764,350	44,395.920	69,641,145
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	6.000	5,130	159.420	136,305	5,818.500	4,974,820	5,983.920	5,116,255
55. 1D	0.000	0	73.000	56,210	6,050.720	4,659,055	6,123.720	4,715,265
56. 2D1	0.000	0	117.310	85,050	5,776.000	4,187,605	5,893.310	4,272,655
57. 2D	0.000	0	72.000	50,400	3,592.000	2,514,400	3,664.000	2,564,800
58. 3D1	0.000	0	8.000	5,520	3,990.510	2,753,450	3,998.510	2,758,970
59. 3D	0.000	0	17.000	11,220	2,471.290	1,631,050	2,488.290	1,642,270
60. 4D1	0.000	0	67.660	42,965	6,362.860	4,040,415	6,430.520	4,083,380
61. 4D	0.000	0	45.000	22,500	4,468.600	2,234,300	4,513.600	2,256,800
62. Total	6.000	5,130	559.390	410,170	38,530.480	26,995,095	39,095.870	27,410,395
Grass:								
63. 1G1	2.770	1,715	59.840	37,100	1,994.870	1,202,135	2,057.480	1,240,950
64. 1G	0.000	0	6.000	3,720	1,260.000	762,750	1,266.000	766,470
65. 2G1	0.000	0	44.430	25,075	4,337.750	2,573,760	4,382.180	2,598,835
66. 2G	0.000	0	67.000	35,740	4,444.550	2,368,535	4,511.550	2,404,275
67. 3G1	0.000	0	49.000	25,190	8,324.630	4,417,395	8,373.630	4,442,585
68. 3G	0.000	0	21.310	11,295	6,099.040	3,261,940	6,120.350	3,273,235
69. 4G1	0.000	0	112.000	59,195	14,629.030	7,766,435	14,741.030	7,825,630
70. 4G	0.000	0	476.850	245,725	43,863.440	22,955,750	44,340.290	23,201,475
71. Total	2.770	1,715	836.430	443,040	84,953.310	45,308,700	85,792.510	45,753,455
72. Waste	0.000	0	109.500	18,650	2,441.150	541,443	2,550.650	560,093
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	376.000	131,600	376.000	131,600
74. Exempt	0.000		45.700		1,789.870		1,835.570	
75. Total	41.070	61,780	2,607.270	2,693,720	169,562.610	140,741,188	172,210.950	143,496,688

County 63 - Nance

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 2

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	48.000	83,130	48.000	83,130
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	572.000	884,320	572.000	884,320
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	40.000	59,425	40.000	59,425
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	611.000	860,110	611.000	860,110
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	568.000	781,000	568.000	781,000
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	34.000	37,740	34.000	37,740
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	63.000	69,840	63.000	69,840
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,936.000	2,775,565	1,936.000	2,775,565
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	28.000	23,940	28.000	23,940
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	189.000	137,025	189.000	137,025
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	130.000	91,000	130.000	91,000
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	369.000	254,610	369.000	254,610
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	163.000	107,580	163.000	107,580
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	24.000	15,240	24.000	15,240
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	15.000	7,500	15.000	7,500
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	918.000	636,895	918.000	636,895
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	34.000	21,080	34.000	21,080
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	75.000	45,750	75.000	45,750
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	64.000	34,240	64.000	34,240
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	775.000	411,290	775.000	411,290
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	609.070	322,805	609.070	322,805
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	52.000	27,300	52.000	27,300
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	494.120	259,485	494.120	259,485
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,103.190	1,121,950	2,103.190	1,121,950
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	81.000	24,050	81.000	24,050
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	335.810	117,535	335.810	117,535
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		6.390		6.390	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,374.000	4,675,995	5,374.000	4,675,995

County 63 - Nance

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 3

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	22.000	43,120	158.000	309,680	3,092.300	6,060,905	3,272.300	6,413,705
46. 1A	0.000	0	22.000	42,680	5,114.000	9,921,160	5,136.000	9,963,840
47. 2A1	3.000	5,745	29.000	55,535	2,111.350	4,043,235	2,143.350	4,104,515
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	215.000	396,675	215.000	396,675
49. 3A1	0.000	0	10.000	17,850	1,120.000	1,999,200	1,130.000	2,017,050
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,270.120	3,881,905	2,270.120	3,881,905
51. 4A1	0.000	0	13.000	20,865	3,445.380	5,529,835	3,458.380	5,550,700
52. 4A	2.000	3,100	2.000	3,100	2,983.810	4,624,905	2,987.810	4,631,105
53. Total	27.000	51,965	234.000	449,710	20,351.960	36,457,820	20,612.960	36,959,495
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	3.000	3,990	64.000	85,120	1,416.950	1,884,545	1,483.950	1,973,655
55. 1D	0.000	0	8.000	10,000	7,177.020	8,971,280	7,185.020	8,981,280
56. 2D1	2.000	2,480	6.000	7,440	1,507.700	1,869,550	1,515.700	1,879,470
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	175.610	216,880	175.610	216,880
58. 3D1	0.000	0	2.000	2,400	1,182.500	1,419,000	1,184.500	1,421,400
59. 3D	0.000	0	14.000	15,400	2,750.210	3,025,230	2,764.210	3,040,630
60. 4D1	0.000	0	35.000	36,225	4,129.660	4,274,210	4,164.660	4,310,435
61. 4D	1.000	980	5.000	4,900	3,101.750	3,039,715	3,107.750	3,045,595
62. Total	6.000	7,450	134.000	161,485	21,441.400	24,700,410	21,581.400	24,869,345
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	7.000	5,915	312.090	263,035	319.090	268,950
64. 1G	0.000	0	71.060	60,045	970.000	826,240	1,041.060	886,285
65. 2G1	0.000	0	16.000	13,440	1,676.300	1,306,765	1,692.300	1,320,205
66. 2G	0.000	0	1.000	835	547.980	398,500	548.980	399,335
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	942.610	745,915	942.610	745,915
68. 3G	0.000	0	1.000	780	1,552.850	1,244,745	1,553.850	1,245,525
69. 4G1	3.000	2,235	90.730	67,595	3,287.490	2,530,345	3,381.220	2,600,175
70. 4G	0.000	0	97.500	68,870	11,304.360	8,218,580	11,401.860	8,287,450
71. Total	3.000	2,235	284.290	217,480	20,593.680	15,534,125	20,880.970	15,753,840
72. Waste	0.000	0	13.000	1,950	1,274.320	172,575	1,287.320	174,525
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		1,464.500		1,464.500	
75. Total	36.000	61,650	665.290	830,625	63,661.360	76,864,930	64,362.650	77,757,205

County 63 - Nance

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 4

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	344.000	636,400	344.000	636,400
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,425.000	4,304,375	2,425.000	4,304,375
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,152.000	1,987,200	1,152.000	1,987,200
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	385.000	644,875	385.000	644,875
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	518.000	828,800	518.000	828,800
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	437.000	681,720	437.000	681,720
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,585.720	2,188,295	1,585.720	2,188,295
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	656.000	787,200	656.000	787,200
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,502.720	12,058,865	7,502.720	12,058,865
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	226.000	259,900	226.000	259,900
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,369.850	4,653,895	4,369.850	4,653,895
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	662.000	691,790	662.000	691,790
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	94.000	96,820	94.000	96,820
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	518.910	513,720	518.910	513,720
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	711.000	693,225	711.000	693,225
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,916.230	1,523,400	1,916.230	1,523,400
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,086.000	733,050	1,086.000	733,050
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	9,583.990	9,165,800	9,583.990	9,165,800
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	10.000	7,450	10.000	7,450
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	460.000	342,255	460.000	342,255
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	635.000	467,000	635.000	467,000
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	98.000	73,620	98.000	73,620
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	344.000	234,820	344.000	234,820
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	830.370	555,155	830.370	555,155
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,597.250	1,004,285	1,597.250	1,004,285
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,111.790	2,499,725	4,111.790	2,499,725
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,086.410	5,184,310	8,086.410	5,184,310
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	280.750	43,265	280.750	43,265
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		8.190		8.190	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	25,453.870	26,452,240	25,453.870	26,452,240

County 63 - Nance

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 10

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0

County 63 - Nance

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 11

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
72. Waste	0.000	0	71.710	0	0.000	0	71.710	0
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		2.190		2.190	
75. Total	0.000	0	71.710	0	0.000	0	71.710	0

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	59.300	106,900	1,335.950	2,271,570	73,052.350	119,056,600	74,447.600	121,435,070
77.Dry Land	12.000	12,580	693.390	571,655	70,473.870	61,498,200	71,179.260	62,082,435
78.Grass	5.770	3,950	1,120.720	660,520	115,736.590	67,149,085	116,863.080	67,813,555
79.Waste	0.000	0	194.210	20,600	4,077.220	781,333	4,271.430	801,933
80.Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	711.810	249,135	711.810	249,135
81.Exempt	0.000	0	45.700	0	3,271.140	0	3,316.840	0
82.Total	77.070	123,430	3,344.270	3,524,345	264,051.840	248,734,353	267,473.180	252,382,128

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	15,339.060	34.55%	27,456,920	39.43%	1,790.000
1A	2,617.000	5.89%	4,370,390	6.28%	1,670.000
2A1	9,170.450	20.66%	14,489,310	20.81%	1,579.999
2A	4,065.440	9.16%	6,138,815	8.81%	1,510.000
3A1	4,647.970	10.47%	6,778,830	9.73%	1,458.449
3A	1,783.000	4.02%	2,514,030	3.61%	1,410.000
4A1	3,617.000	8.15%	4,231,890	6.08%	1,170.000
4A	3,156.000	7.11%	3,660,960	5.26%	1,160.000
Irrigated Total	44,395.920	100.00%	69,641,145	100.00%	1,568.638

Dry:

1D1	5,983.920	15.31%	5,116,255	18.67%	855.000
1D	6,123.720	15.66%	4,715,265	17.20%	770.000
2D1	5,893.310	15.07%	4,272,655	15.59%	725.000
2D	3,664.000	9.37%	2,564,800	9.36%	700.000
3D1	3,998.510	10.23%	2,758,970	10.07%	689.999
3D	2,488.290	6.36%	1,642,270	5.99%	659.999
4D1	6,430.520	16.45%	4,083,380	14.90%	634.999
4D	4,513.600	11.54%	2,256,800	8.23%	500.000
Dry Total	39,095.870	100.00%	27,410,395	100.00%	701.107

Grass:

1G1	2,057.480	2.40%	1,240,950	2.71%	603.140
1G	1,266.000	1.48%	766,470	1.68%	605.426
2G1	4,382.180	5.11%	2,598,835	5.68%	593.046
2G	4,511.550	5.26%	2,404,275	5.25%	532.915
3G1	8,373.630	9.76%	4,442,585	9.71%	530.544
3G	6,120.350	7.13%	3,273,235	7.15%	534.811
4G1	14,741.030	17.18%	7,825,630	17.10%	530.874
4G	44,340.290	51.68%	23,201,475	50.71%	523.259
Grass Total	85,792.510	100.00%	45,753,455	100.00%	533.303

Irrigated Total	44,395.920	25.78%	69,641,145	48.53%	1,568.638
Dry Total	39,095.870	22.70%	27,410,395	19.10%	701.107
Grass Total	85,792.510	49.82%	45,753,455	31.88%	533.303
Waste	2,550.650	1.48%	560,093	0.39%	219.588
Other	376.000	0.22%	131,600	0.09%	350.000
Exempt	1,835.570	1.07%			
Market Area Total	172,210.950	100.00%	143,496,688	100.00%	833.261

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	44,395.920	59.63%	69,641,145	57.35%	
Dry Total	39,095.870	54.93%	27,410,395	44.15%	
Grass Total	85,792.510	73.41%	45,753,455	67.47%	
Waste	2,550.650	59.71%	560,093	69.84%	
Other	376.000	52.82%	131,600	52.82%	
Exempt	1,835.570	55.34%			
Market Area Total	172,210.950	64.38%	143,496,688	56.86%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

Market Area: 2

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	48.000	2.48%	83,130	3.00%	1,731.875
1A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A1	572.000	29.55%	884,320	31.86%	1,546.013
2A	40.000	2.07%	59,425	2.14%	1,485.625
3A1	611.000	31.56%	860,110	30.99%	1,407.708
3A	568.000	29.34%	781,000	28.14%	1,375.000
4A1	34.000	1.76%	37,740	1.36%	1,110.000
4A	63.000	3.25%	69,840	2.52%	1,108.571
Irrigated Total	1,936.000	100.00%	2,775,565	100.00%	1,433.659

Dry:

1D1	28.000	3.05%	23,940	3.76%	855.000
1D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D1	189.000	20.59%	137,025	21.51%	725.000
2D	130.000	14.16%	91,000	14.29%	700.000
3D1	369.000	40.20%	254,610	39.98%	690.000
3D	163.000	17.76%	107,580	16.89%	660.000
4D1	24.000	2.61%	15,240	2.39%	635.000
4D	15.000	1.63%	7,500	1.18%	500.000
Dry Total	918.000	100.00%	636,895	100.00%	693.785

Grass:

1G1	34.000	1.62%	21,080	1.88%	620.000
1G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G1	75.000	3.57%	45,750	4.08%	610.000
2G	64.000	3.04%	34,240	3.05%	535.000
3G1	775.000	36.85%	411,290	36.66%	530.696
3G	609.070	28.96%	322,805	28.77%	529.996
4G1	52.000	2.47%	27,300	2.43%	525.000
4G	494.120	23.49%	259,485	23.13%	525.145
Grass Total	2,103.190	100.00%	1,121,950	100.00%	533.451

Irrigated Total	1,936.000	36.03%	2,775,565	59.36%	1,433.659
Dry Total	918.000	17.08%	636,895	13.62%	693.785
Grass Total	2,103.190	39.14%	1,121,950	23.99%	533.451
Waste	81.000	1.51%	24,050	0.51%	296.913
Other	335.810	6.25%	117,535	2.51%	350.004
Exempt	6.390	0.12%			
Market Area Total	5,374.000	100.00%	4,675,995	100.00%	870.114

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	1,936.000	2.60%	2,775,565	2.29%	
Dry Total	918.000	1.29%	636,895	1.03%	
Grass Total	2,103.190	1.80%	1,121,950	1.65%	
Waste	81.000	1.90%	24,050	3.00%	
Other	335.810	47.18%	117,535	47.18%	
Exempt	6.390	0.19%			
Market Area Total	5,374.000	2.01%	4,675,995	1.85%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

Market Area: **3**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	3,272.300	15.87%	6,413,705	17.35%	1,959.999
1A	5,136.000	24.92%	9,963,840	26.96%	1,940.000
2A1	2,143.350	10.40%	4,104,515	11.11%	1,914.999
2A	215.000	1.04%	396,675	1.07%	1,845.000
3A1	1,130.000	5.48%	2,017,050	5.46%	1,785.000
3A	2,270.120	11.01%	3,881,905	10.50%	1,709.999
4A1	3,458.380	16.78%	5,550,700	15.02%	1,605.000
4A	2,987.810	14.49%	4,631,105	12.53%	1,549.999
Irrigated Total	20,612.960	100.00%	36,959,495	100.00%	1,793.022

Dry:

1D1	1,483.950	6.88%	1,973,655	7.94%	1,330.001
1D	7,185.020	33.29%	8,981,280	36.11%	1,250.000
2D1	1,515.700	7.02%	1,879,470	7.56%	1,240.001
2D	175.610	0.81%	216,880	0.87%	1,235.009
3D1	1,184.500	5.49%	1,421,400	5.72%	1,200.000
3D	2,764.210	12.81%	3,040,630	12.23%	1,099.999
4D1	4,164.660	19.30%	4,310,435	17.33%	1,035.002
4D	3,107.750	14.40%	3,045,595	12.25%	980.000
Dry Total	21,581.400	100.00%	24,869,345	100.00%	1,152.350

Grass:

1G1	319.090	1.53%	268,950	1.71%	842.865
1G	1,041.060	4.99%	886,285	5.63%	851.329
2G1	1,692.300	8.10%	1,320,205	8.38%	780.124
2G	548.980	2.63%	399,335	2.53%	727.412
3G1	942.610	4.51%	745,915	4.73%	791.329
3G	1,553.850	7.44%	1,245,525	7.91%	801.573
4G1	3,381.220	16.19%	2,600,175	16.51%	769.004
4G	11,401.860	54.60%	8,287,450	52.61%	726.850
Grass Total	20,880.970	100.00%	15,753,840	100.00%	754.459

Irrigated Total	20,612.960	32.03%	36,959,495	47.53%	1,793.022
Dry Total	21,581.400	33.53%	24,869,345	31.98%	1,152.350
Grass Total	20,880.970	32.44%	15,753,840	20.26%	754.459
Waste	1,287.320	2.00%	174,525	0.22%	135.572
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	1,464.500	2.28%			
Market Area Total	64,362.650	100.00%	77,757,205	100.00%	1,208.110

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	20,612.960	27.69%	36,959,495	30.44%	
Dry Total	21,581.400	30.32%	24,869,345	40.06%	
Grass Total	20,880.970	17.87%	15,753,840	23.23%	
Waste	1,287.320	30.14%	174,525	21.76%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	1,464.500	44.15%			
Market Area Total	64,362.650	24.06%	77,757,205	30.81%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

Market Area: 4

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	344.000	4.59%	636,400	5.28%	1,850.000
1A	2,425.000	32.32%	4,304,375	35.69%	1,775.000
2A1	1,152.000	15.35%	1,987,200	16.48%	1,725.000
2A	385.000	5.13%	644,875	5.35%	1,675.000
3A1	518.000	6.90%	828,800	6.87%	1,600.000
3A	437.000	5.82%	681,720	5.65%	1,560.000
4A1	1,585.720	21.14%	2,188,295	18.15%	1,380.000
4A	656.000	8.74%	787,200	6.53%	1,200.000
Irrigated Total	7,502.720	100.00%	12,058,865	100.00%	1,607.265

Dry:

1D1	226.000	2.36%	259,900	2.84%	1,150.000
1D	4,369.850	45.60%	4,653,895	50.77%	1,065.001
2D1	662.000	6.91%	691,790	7.55%	1,045.000
2D	94.000	0.98%	96,820	1.06%	1,030.000
3D1	518.910	5.41%	513,720	5.60%	989.998
3D	711.000	7.42%	693,225	7.56%	975.000
4D1	1,916.230	19.99%	1,523,400	16.62%	794.998
4D	1,086.000	11.33%	733,050	8.00%	675.000
Dry Total	9,583.990	100.00%	9,165,800	100.00%	956.365

Grass:

1G1	10.000	0.12%	7,450	0.14%	745.000
1G	460.000	5.69%	342,255	6.60%	744.032
2G1	635.000	7.85%	467,000	9.01%	735.433
2G	98.000	1.21%	73,620	1.42%	751.224
3G1	344.000	4.25%	234,820	4.53%	682.616
3G	830.370	10.27%	555,155	10.71%	668.563
4G1	1,597.250	19.75%	1,004,285	19.37%	628.758
4G	4,111.790	50.85%	2,499,725	48.22%	607.940
Grass Total	8,086.410	100.00%	5,184,310	100.00%	641.113

Irrigated Total	7,502.720	29.48%	12,058,865	45.59%	1,607.265
Dry Total	9,583.990	37.65%	9,165,800	34.65%	956.365
Grass Total	8,086.410	31.77%	5,184,310	19.60%	641.113
Waste	280.750	1.10%	43,265	0.16%	154.105
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	8.190	0.03%			
Market Area Total	25,453.870	100.00%	26,452,240	100.00%	1,039.222

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	7,502.720	10.08%	12,058,865	9.93%	
Dry Total	9,583.990	13.46%	9,165,800	14.76%	
Grass Total	8,086.410	6.92%	5,184,310	7.64%	
Waste	280.750	6.57%	43,265	5.40%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	8.190	0.25%			
Market Area Total	25,453.870	9.52%	26,452,240	10.48%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

Market Area: **10**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Irrigated Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Dry:					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Dry Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Grass:					
1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Grass Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
<hr/>					
Irrigated Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Dry Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Grass Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Waste	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Dry Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Grass Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Waste	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

Market Area: 11

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Irrigated Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000

Dry:

1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Dry Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000

Grass:

1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Grass Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000

Irrigated Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Dry Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Grass Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Waste	71.710	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	2.190	3.05%			
Market Area Total	71.710	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.000

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Dry Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Grass Total	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Waste	71.710	1.68%	0	0.00%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	2.190	0.07%			
Market Area Total	71.710	0.03%	0	0.00%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 63 - Nance

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	59.300	106,900	1,335.950	2,271,570	73,052.350	119,056,600
Dry	12.000	12,580	693.390	571,655	70,473.870	61,498,200
Grass	5.770	3,950	1,120.720	660,520	115,736.590	67,149,085
Waste	0.000	0	194.210	20,600	4,077.220	781,333
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	711.810	249,135
Exempt	0.000	0	45.700	0	3,271.140	0
Total	77.070	123,430	3,344.270	3,524,345	264,051.840	248,734,353

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Total Acres	% of Acres*	Total Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	74,447.600	121,435,070	74,447.600	27.83%	121,435,070	48.12%	1,631.148
Dry	71,179.260	62,082,435	71,179.260	26.61%	62,082,435	24.60%	872.198
Grass	116,863.080	67,813,555	116,863.080	43.69%	67,813,555	26.87%	580.282
Waste	4,271.430	801,933	4,271.430	1.60%	801,933	0.32%	187.743
Other	711.810	249,135	711.810	0.27%	249,135	0.10%	350.002
Exempt	3,316.840	0	3,316.840	1.24%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	267,473.180	252,382,128	267,473.180	100.00%	252,382,128	100.00%	943.579

* 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)**

63 Nance

	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	57,987,964	59,551,590	1,563,626	2.7	934,289	1.09
2. Recreational	785,610	1,084,480	298,870	38.04	0	38.04
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	16,649,425	16,947,692	298,267	1.79	*-----	1.79
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	75,422,999	77,583,762	2,160,763	2.86	934,289	1.63
5. Commercial	10,229,466	10,902,560	673,094	6.58	317,195	3.48
6. Industrial	592,800	2,333,575	1,740,775	293.65	1,740,775	0
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	20,850,406	21,683,767	833,361	4	501,061	1.59
8. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	31,672,672	34,919,902	3,247,230	10.25	2,366,744	2.78
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	107,095,671	112,503,664	5,407,993	5.05	3,493,320	1.79
11. Irrigated	101,576,600	121,435,070	19,858,470	19.55		
12. Dryland	57,366,820	62,082,435	4,715,615	8.22		
13. Grassland	57,972,845	67,813,555	9,840,710	16.97		
14. Wasteland	671,598	801,933	130,335	19.41		
15. Other Agland	245,575	245,575	3,560	1.45		
16. Total Agricultural Land	217,833,438	252,382,128	34,548,690	15.86		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	324,929,109	364,885,792	39,956,683	12.3	3,493,320	11.22

*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.

2008

JOYCE MASON-NEWQUIST- NANCE COUNTY

FOUR YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT CHART

Class	2007	2008	2009	2010
Residential				
Resi- parcl #433 Out bldg. #732	add new imp from zoning permits Begin reviewing rural residential/out bldg Resi- parcel #433 Out bldg. #732 entering rural out building in the cama system	add new imp from zoning permits Continue reviewing rural residential/out bldg continue entering rural out bldg in cama (farm)	add new imp from zoning permits Implement new values on rural using new replacement cost and deprec.	add new imp from zoning permits review sales ratio add new imp
Commercial				
Parcels #203	Add new improvements / market analysis Appraisal maintenance after completion of reappraisal	Add new improvements / market analysis Appraisal maintenance after completion of reappraisal	Add new improvements / market analysis Appraisal maintenance after completion of reappraisal	Add new improvements / market analysis review ratio maintenance after completion of reappraisal
Agricultural				
Parcels # 2,333	Market analysis by land classification groupings Begin review with physical inspection of farm improvments review crp and update	Market analysis by land classification groupings continue physical inspection of farm buildings.	Market analysis by land classification groupings Implement new values using new replacement cost & market depreciation	Market analysis by land classification groupings review sales ratio and value according to market

2008 Assessment Survey for Nance 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
	0
4.	Other part-time employees
	1
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$97,819
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$2,200
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$96,819 Note: The 2008 budget health care benefits, the 2006/07 budget did not.
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	None, appraisal budget is all separate.
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,425
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$55,685
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None

13.	Total budget
	\$153,504
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$1,832

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Fullerton and Genoa (only Belgrade is not zoned)

4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Jerry Knoche has been retained to all rural residential (acreage), ag residential, and ag outbuildings. Not completed in 2008, but now to be put on in 2009.
2.	Other services
	Nance County has contracted with Agri Data Inc. of South Dakota for software that is used to count acres and classify land.

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 Nance County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5852.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

Valuation History Charts