

## 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

68 Perkins

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	109	COD	12.19
Total Sales Price	\$6,228,850	PRD	103.06
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,244,350	COV	19.11
Total Assessed Value	\$6,003,055	STD	18.94
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$57,288	Avg. Abs. Dev.	12.00
Avg. Assessed Value	\$55,074	Min	56.26
Median	98.48	Max	193.20
Wgt. Mean	96.14	95% Median C.I.	96.00 to 100.00
Mean	99.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	93.87 to 98.40
		95% Mean C.I.	95.53 to 102.64
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			14.76
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			9.04
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			10.56
Average Assessed Value of the Base			47,132

---

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	109	98.48	12.19	103.06
2007	103	98.59	11.15	105.52
2006	88	98.24	17.76	103.14
2005	85	96.00	21.68	105.54
2004	105	93.33	24.39	110.30
2003	116	96	20.55	112.26
2002	122	96	16.82	103.58
2001	122	92	21.96	97.88

## 2008 Commission Summary

68 Perkins

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	13	COD	18.45
Total Sales Price	\$644,500	PRD	101.95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$624,000	COV	31.09
Total Assessed Value	\$519,390	STD	26.38
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$48,000	Avg. Abs. Dev.	17.22
Avg. Assessed Value	\$39,953	Min	27.03
Median	93.37	Max	124.66
Wgt. Mean	83.24	95% Median C.I.	66.32 to 101.50
Mean	84.86	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	72.15 to 94.32
		95% Mean C.I.	68.91 to 100.80
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			8.69
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			4.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			1.55
Average Assessed Value of the Base			124,871

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	13	93.37	18.45	101.95
2007	16	94.47	22.92	107.19
2006	19	96.00	24.60	113.61
2005	25	96.55	34.27	117.27
2004	29	100.00	25.78	102.69
2003	27	95	32.5	98.43
2002	25	95	29.75	91.04
2001	25	95	20.12	110.93



## 2008 Commission Summary

**68 Perkins**

### Agricultural Land - Current

<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>12.50</b>
Total Sales Price	\$20,413,214	<b>PRD</b>	<b>101.30</b>
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$19,892,827	COV	17.02
Total Assessed Value	\$14,476,928	STD	12.55
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$165,774	Avg. Abs. Dev.	9.26
Avg. Assessed Value	\$120,641	Min	33.35
<b>Median</b>	<b>74.08</b>	Max	122.29
Wgt. Mean	72.77	95% Median C.I.	70.95 to 75.81
Mean	73.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	69.46 to 76.09
		95% Mean C.I.	71.47 to 75.96
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			76.4
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			4.01
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.1
Average Assessed Value of the Base			98,246

### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
<b>2008</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>74.08</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>101.30</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>72.14</b>	<b>10.41</b>	<b>100.90</b>
<b>2006</b>	111	74.52	10.01	100.59
<b>2005</b>	109	74.92	9.43	103.55
<b>2004</b>	112	73.72	9.77	101.34
<b>2003</b>	125	75	10.66	101.55
<b>2002</b>	127	75	12.21	100.17
<b>2001</b>	138	76	11.21	101.05



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

### **Commercial Real Property**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Perkins County is 93% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Perkins 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 Perkins County is 74% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Perkins County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



**PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	110	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	22.13	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,248,850	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.44 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,264,350	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.08	95% Mean C.I.:	91.34 to 99.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,644,524						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	56,948	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,313	PRD:	105.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:52:59

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	10	100.00	108.86	97.82	15.48	111.29	89.52	193.20	89.74 to 117.39	28,300	27,683
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	13	101.22	104.13	98.35	12.16	105.87	65.24	160.00	93.69 to 111.11	67,892	66,774
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	98.00	98.20	93.50	7.67	105.03	70.34	128.80	93.33 to 101.11	55,108	51,526
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	17	96.30	98.92	96.48	8.47	102.53	74.73	135.00	93.75 to 104.17	57,326	55,310
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	19	92.00	85.28	86.91	17.88	98.12	26.19	120.00	70.00 to 100.00	57,605	50,065
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	80.00	78.40	76.77	15.66	102.12	49.59	121.21	59.57 to 94.53	80,100	61,490
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	99.34	97.93	88.88	17.92	110.19	64.92	133.33	78.74 to 118.15	67,479	59,972
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	95.83	93.61	83.60	13.88	111.98	56.33	126.00	76.74 to 109.09	36,545	30,551
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	57	100.00	101.64	96.23	10.37	105.62	65.24	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	53,982	51,949
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	53	89.89	88.44	84.19	18.74	105.05	26.19	133.33	80.19 to 97.50	60,138	50,629
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	64	95.63	91.15	88.60	13.69	102.88	26.19	135.00	91.93 to 98.00	60,734	53,810
<u>ALL</u>											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ELSIE	4	116.67	121.77	111.11	21.34	109.59	93.75	160.00	N/A	22,950	25,500
GRANT	68	96.47	94.42	93.45	12.38	101.04	56.26	135.00	90.20 to 100.00	55,612	51,968
MADRID	18	100.00	107.24	99.93	11.12	107.31	92.00	193.20	96.00 to 109.09	26,152	26,135
RURAL	19	81.64	81.23	79.87	23.42	101.70	26.19	121.21	64.92 to 98.48	99,850	79,747
VENANGO	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	23,000	23,000
<u>ALL</u>											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

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	88	98.37	98.37	94.55	12.82	104.04	56.26	193.20	95.83 to 100.00	46,744	44,196
2	3	95.60	97.20	98.35	10.11	98.83	83.51	112.50	N/A	95,233	93,666
3	19	81.64	80.68	79.04	22.75	102.07	26.19	121.21	64.92 to 98.48	98,165	77,589
<u>ALL</u>											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	110	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	22.13	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,248,850	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.44 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,264,350	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.08	95% Mean C.I.:	91.34 to 99.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,644,524						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	56,948	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,313	PRD:	105.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:52:59

**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	101	96.00	93.95	90.19	12.41	104.17	49.59	160.00	93.69 to 100.00	61,471	55,440
2	9	118.15	110.18	80.84	25.82	136.29	26.19	193.20	56.26 to 128.80	6,194	5,007
____ALL____											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	105	97.21	95.31	90.06	15.01	105.82	26.19	193.20	93.75 to 100.00	59,117	53,242
06											
07	5	95.83	94.75	94.91	2.94	99.82	88.57	100.00	N/A	11,400	10,820
____ALL____											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0095	1	81.64	81.64	81.64			81.64	81.64	N/A	130,000	106,130
43-0079											
51-0001											
51-0006											
56-0565											
68-0020	109	96.64	95.41	90.28	14.56	105.67	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,278	50,810
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	110	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	22.13	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,248,850	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.44 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,264,350	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.08	95% Mean C.I.:	91.34 to 99.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,644,524						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	56,948	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,313	PRD:	105.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:52:59

**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	11	112.00	104.22	70.20	28.40	148.46	26.19	193.20	56.26 to 128.80	11,968	8,401
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	2	92.63	92.63	95.15	13.63	97.34	80.00	105.25	N/A	25,000	23,788
1900 TO 1919	7	93.75	101.23	84.80	18.79	119.37	74.42	160.00	74.42 to 160.00	30,828	26,142
1920 TO 1939	25	100.00	98.06	93.31	11.16	105.09	65.24	135.00	92.11 to 101.54	40,798	38,070
1940 TO 1949	17	95.59	89.31	83.95	15.02	106.39	49.59	123.53	68.75 to 100.00	41,852	35,135
1950 TO 1959	13	90.20	90.78	86.75	12.80	104.65	70.34	133.33	78.74 to 98.73	68,303	59,252
1960 TO 1969	8	98.08	95.13	93.30	8.16	101.96	80.83	112.50	80.83 to 112.50	80,937	75,516
1970 TO 1979	15	95.83	90.54	87.42	12.45	103.57	63.29	111.11	76.74 to 102.04	85,633	74,857
1980 TO 1989	6	100.61	97.83	97.40	5.74	100.45	82.83	107.53	82.83 to 107.53	57,583	56,083
1990 TO 1994	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	157,000	157,000
1995 TO 1999	3	97.21	99.38	98.63	3.33	100.76	95.60	105.32	N/A	149,333	147,282
2000 TO Present	2	93.23	93.23	93.11	1.39	100.13	91.93	94.53	N/A	182,500	169,918
ALL	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**SALE PRICE \***

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	5	126.00	131.87	132.44	16.67	99.57	96.00	193.20	N/A	2,400	3,178
5000 TO 9999	9	105.00	106.64	104.71	17.47	101.84	56.26	160.00	88.57 to 128.80	6,583	6,893
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	14	110.55	115.65	109.38	19.98	105.73	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 128.80	5,089	5,566
10000 TO 29999	24	99.24	97.09	96.78	15.07	100.32	26.19	135.00	93.33 to 104.17	20,018	19,373
30000 TO 59999	30	94.97	92.23	91.77	10.24	100.50	63.64	121.21	89.74 to 100.00	42,893	39,361
60000 TO 99999	24	97.07	93.59	93.60	11.30	99.99	56.33	112.50	80.83 to 102.04	81,066	75,879
100000 TO 149999	10	88.88	84.10	83.90	15.41	100.24	49.59	105.32	65.24 to 104.19	115,625	97,005
150000 TO 249999	8	93.23	84.73	85.32	12.99	99.31	63.29	100.00	63.29 to 100.00	165,500	141,201
ALL	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	110	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	22.13	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,248,850	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.44 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:	6,264,350	MEAN:	95	AVG. ABS. DEV:	14.08	95% Mean C.I.:	91.34 to 99.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,644,524						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	56,948	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,313	PRD:	105.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:52:59

**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	6	122.08	119.27	104.37	23.86	114.27	56.26	193.20	56.26 to 193.20	3,166	3,305
5000 TO 9999	9	105.00	103.29	87.67	20.65	117.83	26.19	160.00	88.57 to 128.80	8,027	7,037
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	15	109.09	109.68	91.14	23.96	120.34	26.19	193.20	96.00 to 126.00	6,083	5,544
10000 TO 29999	24	97.24	96.26	94.45	13.24	101.92	59.57	135.00	92.00 to 100.00	20,810	19,655
30000 TO 59999	33	94.38	91.67	87.67	12.66	104.57	49.59	133.33	89.52 to 100.00	47,148	41,332
60000 TO 99999	21	96.64	92.39	90.64	10.87	101.93	65.24	112.50	80.83 to 100.00	84,928	76,977
100000 TO 149999	12	90.74	90.06	87.25	15.14	103.22	63.29	111.11	70.34 to 105.32	122,854	107,189
150000 TO 249999	5	95.60	95.85	95.68	2.25	100.18	91.93	100.00	N/A	172,000	164,567
ALL _____											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**QUALITY**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	118.15	118.22	79.54	19.01	148.62	56.33	193.20	98.48 to 128.80	11,627	9,248
0	2	41.23	41.23	33.99	36.47	121.30	26.19	56.26	N/A	13,500	4,588
10	6	98.00	94.11	85.76	9.11	109.73	70.97	109.09	70.97 to 109.09	11,000	9,433
15	3	80.00	77.19	77.37	13.51	99.76	59.57	92.00	N/A	22,833	17,666
20	31	100.00	100.97	93.62	11.98	107.85	49.59	160.00	95.59 to 103.23	30,856	28,886
25	9	78.87	79.54	79.34	12.33	100.25	63.64	102.04	66.67 to 97.50	70,511	55,944
30	42	96.22	93.55	90.34	11.13	103.55	63.29	135.00	89.74 to 100.00	79,667	71,972
35	1	94.53	94.53	94.53			94.53	94.53	N/A	165,000	155,978
40	7	97.21	95.55	96.51	6.34	99.01	76.74	105.32	76.74 to 105.32	128,000	123,529
ALL _____											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

**STYLE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	115.08	109.02	70.98	25.56	153.58	26.19	193.20	56.33 to 128.80	12,465	8,847
0	2	78.13	78.13	80.25	27.99	97.36	56.26	100.00	N/A	7,750	6,219
100	7	95.83	93.98	97.57	6.67	96.32	76.74	105.32	76.74 to 105.32	35,642	34,778
101	75	95.65	92.68	88.47	12.56	104.76	49.59	135.00	92.00 to 100.00	62,009	54,860
102	3	100.00	100.37	101.96	7.04	98.44	90.00	111.11	N/A	102,000	104,000
104	13	100.00	101.88	95.16	13.72	107.06	74.42	160.00	88.87 to 110.61	70,615	67,199
ALL _____											
	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313



**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

NUMBER of Sales:	110	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	22.13	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,248,850	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.44 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,264,350	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.08	95% Mean C.I.:	91.34 to 99.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,644,524						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	56,948	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,313	PRD:	105.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:52:59

CONDITION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	112.00	104.24	88.15	25.15	118.24	26.19	193.20	56.33 to 126.00	20,280	17,878
10	7	100.00	99.63	98.68	10.21	100.97	70.97	121.21	70.97 to 121.21	20,214	19,947
15	1	59.57	59.57	59.57			59.57	59.57	N/A	23,500	14,000
20	30	98.00	99.67	97.35	10.91	102.38	68.75	160.00	94.38 to 100.00	25,335	24,664
25	8	75.10	78.76	70.62	21.69	111.53	49.59	120.00	49.59 to 120.00	61,512	43,440
30	44	95.93	92.97	89.91	11.33	103.40	63.29	135.00	88.89 to 100.00	82,557	74,231
40	7	95.60	94.01	95.15	5.39	98.81	76.74	102.08	76.74 to 102.08	135,857	129,262
ALL	110	96.47	95.28	90.11	14.60	105.74	26.19	193.20	94.38 to 100.00	56,948	51,313

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

**Residential**

The Perkins County Assessor took actions after reviewing the market information for residential property in the assessor location of Rural Residential. Rural Residential properties were revalued for 2008 using June/2007 Marshall and Swift costing and new 2008 depreciation tables. This included new increased land valuations for 2008. The first acre of the land value increased \$400 from 2007; to \$10,000 for the first acre. The additional 2-10 acres are valued at \$1,000 per acre, and over ten acres are valued at \$640 per acre.

After the valuations in all of the Villages were updated for the 2007 assessment year using June/2004 Marshall and Swift costing and new 2007 depreciation tables equalization has been achieved within the entire class of property. The County continues to complete a sales review and completes the pickup work in a timely manner.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2004 for all Villages and June 2007 for Rural Residentials
5.	<b>What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2006-Grant; 2008-Rural Residential; 2007- Villages
6.	<b>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?</b>
	The Assessor has not built specific models; however she utilizes the comparable sales that TerraScan recognizes when valuing like properties in Perkins County.
7.	<b>Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:</b>
	5
8.	<b>How are these defined?</b>
	Similar characteristics and location in the county.
9.	<b>Is “Assessor Location” a usable valuation identity?</b>
	Yes
10.	<b>Does the assessor location “suburban” mean something other than rural residential? (<i>that is, does the “suburban” location have its own market?</i>)</b>
	Yes

11.	<b>What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> ( <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> )
	The suburban is more comparable to Grant
12.	<b>Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?</b>
	Yes

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
15	25	10	50

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	109	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	19.11	95% Median C.I.:	96.00 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,228,850	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.87 to 98.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,244,350	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.00	95% Mean C.I.:	95.53 to 102.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,003,055						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,287	COD:	12.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,073	PRD:	103.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	56.26		

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:39

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	10	100.00	108.86	97.82	15.48	111.29	89.52	193.20	89.74 to 117.39	28,300	27,683
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	13	101.22	106.81	102.90	9.53	103.80	88.57	160.00	98.73 to 111.11	67,892	69,861
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	98.00	99.59	97.29	6.25	102.37	83.51	128.80	94.00 to 101.11	55,108	53,614
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	17	100.00	101.11	99.76	8.95	101.35	74.73	135.00	95.60 to 105.56	57,326	57,187
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	18	92.29	92.13	90.69	16.76	101.59	56.26	153.33	80.00 to 100.00	59,694	54,135
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	93.08	89.45	94.09	14.10	95.07	59.57	125.00	70.97 to 100.00	80,100	75,363
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	100.92	101.39	96.39	14.22	105.19	68.75	133.33	82.83 to 118.15	67,479	65,042
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	95.83	95.62	87.18	11.78	109.69	76.74	126.00	78.46 to 109.09	36,545	31,859
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	57	100.00	103.32	99.73	9.52	103.60	74.73	193.20	97.21 to 101.11	53,982	53,836
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	52	95.85	94.44	92.65	14.81	101.94	56.26	153.33	89.89 to 100.00	60,910	56,430
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	63	97.21	96.10	95.35	11.50	100.79	56.26	153.33	95.59 to 100.00	61,380	58,524
<u>ALL</u>											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ELSIE	4	116.67	121.77	111.11	21.34	109.59	93.75	160.00	N/A	22,950	25,500
GRANT	68	96.47	94.42	93.45	12.38	101.04	56.26	135.00	90.20 to 100.00	55,612	51,968
MADRID	18	100.00	107.24	99.93	11.12	107.31	92.00	193.20	96.00 to 109.09	26,152	26,135
RURAL	18	99.14	103.46	99.82	9.90	103.65	78.46	153.33	95.48 to 105.45	104,286	104,096
VENANGO	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	23,000	23,000
<u>ALL</u>											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

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	88	98.37	98.37	94.55	12.82	104.04	56.26	193.20	95.83 to 100.00	46,744	44,196
2	3	95.60	97.20	98.35	10.11	98.83	83.51	112.50	N/A	95,233	93,666
3	18	99.14	102.89	99.33	9.32	103.58	78.46	153.33	95.48 to 102.08	102,508	101,818
<u>ALL</u>											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	109	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	19.11	95% Median C.I.:	96.00 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,228,850	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.87 to 98.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,244,350	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.00	95% Mean C.I.:	95.53 to 102.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,003,055						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,287	COD:	12.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,073	PRD:	103.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	56.26		

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:40

**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	101	98.00	97.37	96.05	10.56	101.38	59.57	160.00	95.83 to 100.00	61,471	59,041
2	8	122.08	120.68	111.42	18.70	108.31	56.26	193.20	56.26 to 193.20	4,468	4,978
____ALL____											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	104	99.27	99.29	96.15	12.46	103.27	56.26	193.20	96.15 to 100.00	59,493	57,201
06											
07	5	95.83	94.75	94.91	2.94	99.82	88.57	100.00	N/A	11,400	10,820
____ALL____											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0095	1	98.46	98.46	98.46			98.46	98.46	N/A	130,000	128,000
43-0079											
51-0001											
51-0006											
56-0565											
68-0020	108	98.61	99.09	96.09	12.28	103.12	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	56,614	54,398
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	109	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	19.11	95% Median C.I.:	96.00 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,228,850	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.87 to 98.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,244,350	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.00	95% Mean C.I.:	95.53 to 102.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,003,055						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,287	COD:	12.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,073	PRD:	103.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	56.26		

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:40

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	10	115.08	114.24	90.97	21.03	125.58	56.26	193.20	78.46 to 128.80	11,165	10,156
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	2	116.67	116.67	124.00	31.43	94.08	80.00	153.33	N/A	25,000	31,000
1900 TO 1919	7	93.75	103.55	91.29	16.31	113.44	81.82	160.00	81.82 to 160.00	30,828	28,142
1920 TO 1939	25	100.00	100.29	98.99	9.24	101.31	70.00	135.00	96.00 to 101.54	40,798	40,384
1940 TO 1949	17	95.65	92.18	91.89	12.34	100.31	59.57	123.53	80.00 to 100.00	41,852	38,457
1950 TO 1959	13	94.00	95.60	93.81	13.06	101.90	70.97	133.33	80.19 to 103.23	68,303	64,076
1960 TO 1969	8	99.23	97.23	96.68	5.94	100.57	80.83	112.50	80.83 to 112.50	80,937	78,250
1970 TO 1979	15	95.83	94.56	94.79	8.25	99.76	66.67	111.11	88.89 to 102.04	85,633	81,173
1980 TO 1989	6	100.61	97.83	97.40	5.74	100.45	82.83	107.53	82.83 to 107.53	57,583	56,083
1990 TO 1994	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	157,000	157,000
1995 TO 1999	3	97.21	99.42	98.66	3.38	100.77	95.60	105.45	N/A	149,333	147,333
2000 TO Present	2	100.50	100.50	100.55	0.50	99.95	100.00	101.00	N/A	182,500	183,500
ALL	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

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	5	126.00	131.87	132.44	16.67	99.57	96.00	193.20	N/A	2,400	3,178
5000 TO 9999	9	105.00	106.64	104.71	17.47	101.84	56.26	160.00	88.57 to 128.80	6,583	6,893
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	14	110.55	115.65	109.38	19.98	105.73	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 128.80	5,089	5,566
10000 TO 29999	23	100.00	100.17	99.84	12.40	100.32	59.57	135.00	93.75 to 104.17	20,019	19,988
30000 TO 59999	30	95.86	94.89	94.06	12.84	100.88	63.64	153.33	89.74 to 100.00	42,893	40,346
60000 TO 99999	24	97.07	95.90	95.91	8.92	99.99	78.46	112.50	89.89 to 102.04	81,066	77,750
100000 TO 149999	10	98.37	95.23	95.31	6.45	99.92	66.67	105.45	88.89 to 104.19	115,625	110,200
150000 TO 249999	8	96.41	97.05	97.21	2.60	99.84	93.08	101.00	93.08 to 101.00	165,500	160,875
ALL	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**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

NUMBER of Sales:	109	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	19.11	95% Median C.I.:	96.00 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,228,850	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.87 to 98.40
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:	6,244,350	MEAN:	99	AVG. ABS. DEV:	12.00	95% Mean C.I.:	95.53 to 102.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,003,055						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,287	COD:	12.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,073	PRD:	103.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	56.26		

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:40

**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	6	122.08	119.27	104.37	23.86	114.27	56.26	193.20	56.26 to 193.20	3,166	3,305
5000 TO 9999	8	107.05	112.93	111.20	13.58	101.56	88.57	160.00	88.57 to 160.00	6,531	7,262
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	14	110.55	115.65	109.38	19.98	105.73	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 128.80	5,089	5,566
10000 TO 29999	24	97.24	96.26	94.45	13.24	101.92	59.57	135.00	92.00 to 100.00	20,810	19,655
30000 TO 59999	31	95.56	95.33	92.77	12.76	102.76	63.64	153.33	89.52 to 100.00	44,867	41,625
60000 TO 99999	21	97.50	96.70	95.02	8.83	101.76	66.67	122.45	90.70 to 101.22	81,785	77,714
100000 TO 149999	14	99.13	99.35	98.58	5.00	100.78	88.89	111.11	93.08 to 105.45	121,803	120,071
150000 TO 249999	5	100.00	98.76	98.84	1.64	99.92	95.60	101.00	N/A	172,000	170,000
ALL _____											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**QUALITY**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	118.15	120.68	93.29	16.93	129.36	78.46	193.20	98.48 to 128.80	11,627	10,847
0	1	56.26	56.26	56.26			56.26	56.26	N/A	7,000	3,938
10	6	98.00	94.11	85.76	9.11	109.73	70.97	109.09	70.97 to 109.09	11,000	9,433
15	3	80.00	77.19	77.37	13.51	99.76	59.57	92.00	N/A	22,833	17,666
20	31	100.00	105.12	102.61	12.63	102.44	68.75	160.00	95.83 to 104.17	30,856	31,661
25	9	82.50	83.24	84.15	14.22	98.92	63.64	102.04	66.67 to 97.50	70,511	59,333
30	42	97.75	97.04	96.48	7.77	100.57	78.74	135.00	94.00 to 100.00	79,667	76,866
35	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	165,000	165,000
40	7	100.00	96.87	98.55	5.57	98.29	76.74	105.45	76.74 to 105.45	128,000	126,142
ALL _____											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073

**STYLE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	118.15	120.68	93.29	16.93	129.36	78.46	193.20	98.48 to 128.80	11,627	10,847
0	2	78.13	78.13	80.25	27.99	97.36	56.26	100.00	N/A	7,750	6,219
100	7	95.83	94.00	97.64	6.69	96.28	76.74	105.45	76.74 to 105.45	35,642	34,800
101	75	97.21	95.81	94.66	10.17	101.22	59.57	135.00	95.48 to 100.00	62,009	58,698
102	3	100.00	100.37	101.96	7.04	98.44	90.00	111.11	N/A	102,000	104,000
104	13	100.00	108.66	101.85	15.07	106.68	74.73	160.00	95.60 to 125.00	70,615	71,923
ALL _____											
	109	98.48	99.08	96.14	12.19	103.06	56.26	193.20	96.00 to 100.00	57,287	55,073



**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

NUMBER of Sales:	109	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	19.11	95% Median C.I.:	96.00 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,228,850	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.87 to 98.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,244,350	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.00	95% Mean C.I.:	95.53 to 102.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,003,055						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,287	COD:	12.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,073	PRD:	103.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	56.26		

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:40

<b>CONDITION</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	112.25	112.58	99.14	19.18	113.56	56.26	193.20	96.15 to 126.00	20,304	20,130
10	7	100.00	100.18	99.65	10.76	100.53	70.97	125.00	70.97 to 125.00	20,214	20,142
15	1	59.57	59.57	59.57			59.57	59.57	N/A	23,500	14,000
20	30	100.00	102.21	101.06	12.85	101.14	68.75	160.00	95.59 to 100.00	25,335	25,603
25	8	81.35	84.85	82.10	18.10	103.35	63.64	120.00	63.64 to 120.00	61,512	50,500
30	44	97.75	97.06	96.42	7.30	100.66	78.74	135.00	93.69 to 100.00	82,557	79,599
40	7	100.00	96.09	98.00	4.79	98.05	76.74	102.08	76.74 to 102.08	135,857	133,142
<u>ALL</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>98.48</u>	<u>99.08</u>	<u>96.14</u>	<u>12.19</u>	<u>103.06</u>	<u>56.26</u>	<u>193.20</u>	<u>96.00 to 100.00</u>	<u>57,287</u>	<u>55,073</u>



**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The Perkins County Assessor took actions to implement new valuations, including land values for rural residential properties. June/2007 Marshall and Swift costing tables were applied with new 2008 depreciation tables to the rural residential properties. The land values were increased which includes the first acre changing from \$400 in 2007 to \$10,000 in 2008. In reviewing the preliminary statistics for the rural residential assessor location, the median was at 81.64% with a coefficient of dispersion of 23.42 and price related differential at 101.70. The new values improved the final rural residential statistics to a median measure of 99.14%; COD- 9.90 and PRD at 103.65. The overall county measures correlate better after the actions with the weighted mean and median having a 2.34 point spread. The preliminary measurements showed a 6.36 point difference.

The assessor location of Elsie includes only 4 qualified sales. When reviewing the four sales, it is apparent that one sale is an outlier that may not be representing the median of 116.67 fairly. This property has a total value of \$8,000. Hypothetically, the removal of the one outlier (Book 63 page 9) would change the median to 100% for Elsie. Elsie is a very small village located approximately 18 miles east of Grant, NE. No recommendations for adjustments are made to the Assessor Location of Elsie.

The R&O Statistics are representative of the residential level of value and quality of assessment practices for Perkins County. The median (98) best describes the level of value for the residential class of property. Both qualitative statistics indicate the county has attained uniform and proportionate assessments.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>70.32</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>69.59</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>72.73</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>69.67</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>73.94</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>71.17</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>73.94</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>79.74</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The total amount of residential sales has increased for this study period; likewise the number of qualified sales has increased also. The county has utilized over 70% of the available sales for measurement purposes for the development of the 2008 statistics. This percent is very adequate and indicates the county has not excessively trimmed the sample.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.47</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>99.54</b>	<b>98.48</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>96.30</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>98.79</b>	<b>98.59</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>91.00</b>	<b>1.61</b>	<b>92.47</b>	<b>98.24</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>92.31</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>93.12</b>	<b>96.00</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>93.33</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>93.33</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>96.69</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>6.24</b>	<b>97.74</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>88.35</b>	<b>92</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The 3.19% change in assessed value (excl. growth) includes the new values for rural residential properties. Rural residential were revalued using June/2007 Marshall & Swift costing and new depreciation tables applied. This included new increased land valuations also. Only 18 out of the 109 qualified residential sales represent the rural assessor location. The changes are supported through the assessor's actions and are a good indication that the assessment practices are similar in both the sales file and population.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales</b>		<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>10.05</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>3.19</b>
<b>1.98</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2.59</b>
<b>11.57</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>1.61</b>
<b>1.55</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>0.88</b>
<b>-0.4</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>2.25</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>1.78</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>6.24</b>
<b>12.98</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>5.18</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Through the assessment actions reported by the County Assessor, rural residential properties were revalued for 2008 along with increased land values. In reviewing the residential statistics for Perkins County, 17% of the qualified sales are in the assessor location of rural residential. These new values are shown in the 10.05% change in the sales file column. The total representation of rural residential county wide would not be 17% respectively. The 3.19% change in overall assessed value is accurate for the valuation changes this year.



## 2008 Correlation Section for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>98.48</b>	<b>96.14</b>	<b>99.08</b>

RESIDENTIAL: All three statistical measures of central tendency calculate acceptable ratios for the residential property class. The similarity between the measures would indicate the county has attained the level of value and for direct equalization purposes; the median best describes the level of value in Perkins County.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>12.19</b>	<b>103.06</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.06</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both statistics that represent uniform and proportionate assessments in the residential class of property for 2008. Both qualitative measures are showing the county has attained uniform and proportionate assessments.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins County**

---

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96.47</b>	<b>98.48</b>	<b>2.01</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>90.11</b>	<b>96.14</b>	<b>6.03</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>95.28</b>	<b>99.08</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>14.60</b>	<b>12.19</b>	<b>-2.41</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>105.74</b>	<b>103.06</b>	<b>-2.68</b>
<b>Min Sales Ratio</b>	<b>26.19</b>	<b>56.26</b>	<b>30.07</b>
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	<b>193.20</b>	<b>193.20</b>	<b>0</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The changes in the statistics are reflective of the reported assessment changes for the rural residential assessor location. These properties in this assessor location were revalued using new 06/2007 costing and new depreciation tables. New land valuations also were applied. These actions improved the overall county weighted mean, bringing it from 90.11 at preliminary time to 96.14 for the R&O statistics.



**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	33.77	95% Median C.I.:	50.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	27.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 92.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.49	95% Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 96.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	505,137							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	22.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,856	PRD:	99.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:06

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	121.50	121.50	121.50			121.50	121.50	N/A	17,500	21,263
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	91.67	91.67	91.67			91.67	91.67	N/A	60,000	55,000
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	88.05	88.05	88.89	3.25	99.06	85.19	90.91	N/A	38,250	34,000
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	55.72	55.72	72.41	51.49	76.95	27.03	84.40	N/A	88,500	64,081
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	50.55	50.55	50.55			50.55	50.55	N/A	15,000	7,582
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	100.00	80.50	75.31	20.50	106.89	40.00	101.50	N/A	27,500	20,710
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	85.81	83.60	83.38	13.60	100.27	65.00	100.00	N/A	65,166	54,333
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	4	91.29	97.32	93.68	10.15	103.89	85.19	121.50	N/A	38,500	36,065
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	55.72	55.72	72.41	51.49	76.95	27.03	84.40	N/A	88,500	64,081
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	7	85.81	77.55	79.42	24.30	97.64	40.00	101.50	40.00 to 101.50	41,857	33,244
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	85.19	75.84	80.12	16.70	94.66	27.03	91.67	N/A	62,700	50,232
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	50.55	50.55	50.55			50.55	50.55	N/A	15,000	7,582
<u>ALL</u>											
	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRANT	7	90.91	91.44	87.92	12.13	104.01	65.00	121.50	65.00 to 121.50	49,928	43,894
MADRID	1	101.50	101.50	101.50			101.50	101.50	N/A	42,000	42,630
RURAL	3	84.40	78.32	81.77	19.53	95.77	50.55	100.00	N/A	53,500	43,748
VENANGO	2	33.52	33.52	33.33	19.35	100.55	27.03	40.00	N/A	36,000	12,000
<u>ALL</u>											
	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

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	8	85.50	74.53	77.59	23.65	96.05	27.03	101.50	27.03 to 101.50	49,562	38,453
2	4	95.46	99.20	89.38	12.10	110.99	84.40	121.50	N/A	53,125	47,481
3	1	50.55	50.55	50.55			50.55	50.55	N/A	15,000	7,582
<u>ALL</u>											
	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	33.77	95% Median C.I.:	50.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	27.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 92.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.49	95% Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 96.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	505,137							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	22.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,856	PRD:	99.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:06

**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	12	88.36	82.75	81.70	20.57	101.29	27.03	121.50	65.00 to 100.00	50,750	41,462
2	1	50.55	50.55	50.55			50.55	50.55	N/A	15,000	7,582
____ALL____	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**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	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856
04											
____ALL____	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0095											
43-0079											
51-0001											
51-0006											
56-0565	1	50.55	50.55	50.55			50.55	50.55	N/A	15,000	7,582
68-0020	12	88.36	82.75	81.70	20.57	101.29	27.03	121.50	65.00 to 100.00	50,750	41,462
NonValid School											
____ALL____	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	33.77	95% Median C.I.:	50.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	27.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 92.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.49	95% Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 96.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	505,137							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	22.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,856	PRD:	99.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:06

**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	3	50.55	59.19	40.14	48.12	147.46	27.03	100.00	N/A	19,166	7,694
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	85.19	85.19	85.19			85.19	85.19	N/A	27,000	23,000
1920 TO 1939	1	40.00	40.00	40.00			40.00	40.00	N/A	35,000	14,000
1940 TO 1949	1	91.67	91.67	91.67			91.67	91.67	N/A	60,000	55,000
1950 TO 1959	1	65.00	65.00	65.00			65.00	65.00	N/A	30,000	19,500
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	4	95.46	94.20	89.38	6.86	105.40	84.40	101.50	N/A	60,500	54,073
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	2	103.66	103.66	89.43	17.22	115.91	85.81	121.50	N/A	86,250	77,131
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	5,500	5,500
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	5,500	5,500
10000 TO 29999	4	92.60	89.31	89.06	23.15	100.28	50.55	121.50	N/A	17,500	15,586
30000 TO 59999	5	65.00	64.89	67.77	38.58	95.75	27.03	101.50	N/A	38,700	26,226
60000 TO 99999	1	91.67	91.67	91.67			91.67	91.67	N/A	60,000	55,000
100000 TO 149999	1	84.40	84.40	84.40			84.40	84.40	N/A	140,000	118,162
150000 TO 249999	1	85.81	85.81	85.81			85.81	85.81	N/A	155,000	133,000
ALL	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856



**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	33.77	95% Median C.I.:	50.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	27.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.90 to 92.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.49	95% Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 96.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	505,137							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	22.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,856	PRD:	99.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:06

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
5000 TO 9999	2	75.28	75.28	63.81	32.85	117.96	50.55	100.00	N/A	10,250	6,541
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	2	75.28	75.28	63.81	32.85	117.96	50.55	100.00	N/A	10,250	6,541
10000 TO 29999	6	75.10	73.12	62.59	38.76	116.83	27.03	121.50	27.03 to 121.50	26,166	16,377
30000 TO 59999	3	91.67	94.69	94.15	3.85	100.58	90.91	101.50	N/A	50,500	47,543
100000 TO 149999	2	85.11	85.11	85.14	0.83	99.96	84.40	85.81	N/A	147,500	125,581
ALL _____											
	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	50.55	59.19	40.14	48.12	147.46	27.03	100.00	N/A	19,166	7,694
20	10	88.36	86.60	85.09	16.43	101.77	40.00	121.50	65.00 to 101.50	56,650	48,205
ALL _____											
	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	75.28	75.28	63.81	32.85	117.96	50.55	100.00	N/A	10,250	6,541
344	1	85.19	85.19	85.19			85.19	85.19	N/A	27,000	23,000
350	2	33.52	33.52	33.33	19.35	100.55	27.03	40.00	N/A	36,000	12,000
353	2	78.34	78.34	82.78	17.02	94.63	65.00	91.67	N/A	45,000	37,250
406	2	106.21	106.21	98.90	14.40	107.39	90.91	121.50	N/A	33,500	33,131
417	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	10,500	10,500
428	1	84.40	84.40	84.40			84.40	84.40	N/A	140,000	118,162
528	1	101.50	101.50	101.50			101.50	101.50	N/A	42,000	42,630
531	1	85.81	85.81	85.81			85.81	85.81	N/A	155,000	133,000
ALL _____											
	13	85.81	80.27	80.95	22.72	99.16	27.03	121.50	50.55 to 100.00	48,000	38,856

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

**Commercial**

The ethanol plant located in Madrid has been completed for the 2008 assessment year. Knoche Appraisal was contracted to perform the appraisal and valuation process for the plant. The Perkins County Assessor did increase the improvement values within Grant (excluding grain elevators) by 3% after a review of the commercial class of property. Land values for intensive use properties increased in all assessor locations. The first five acres remained valued at \$7,500 per acre; the 6+ acres are valued at the increased value of \$640 per acre. These parcels are located along the railroad tracks.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor (An appraiser is contracted to assist in the valuation of special properties)
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2003 for the majority of the properties; 2004 for sub-classifications within occupancy codes (such as large grain facilities). The Ethanol Plant at Madrid was valued using 2007 tables.
5.	<b>What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2004; except for the large facilities which used 2005 depreciation schedules.
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The income-expense figures are typically not available except for larger facilities where the income approach was used in 2005 and 2006 for the landfill.
7.	<b>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?</b>
	2004 for properties that information was available and 2005 for large facilities.
8.	<b>Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?</b>
	1
9.	<b>How are these defined?</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?</b>
	No
11.	<b>Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)</b>
	No

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

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
2	5	2	9

**PAD 2008 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	31.09	95% Median C.I.:	66.32 to 101.50	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	26.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.15 to 94.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.91 to 100.80	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	519,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	18.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,953	PRD:	101.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:43

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	124.66	124.66	124.66			124.66	124.66	N/A	17,500	21,816
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	93.97	93.97	93.97			93.97	93.97	N/A	60,000	56,380
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	90.31	90.31	91.21	3.39	99.01	87.24	93.37	N/A	38,250	34,886
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	55.72	55.72	72.41	51.49	76.95	27.03	84.40	N/A	88,500	64,081
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	94.76	94.76	94.76			94.76	94.76	N/A	15,000	14,214
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	100.00	80.50	75.31	20.50	106.89	40.00	101.50	N/A	27,500	20,710
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	87.95	85.41	85.38	13.50	100.03	66.32	101.95	N/A	65,166	55,638
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	4	93.67	99.81	96.08	10.15	103.88	87.24	124.66	N/A	38,500	36,992
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	55.72	55.72	72.41	51.49	76.95	27.03	84.40	N/A	88,500	64,081
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	7	94.76	84.64	83.02	16.46	101.95	40.00	101.95	40.00 to 101.95	41,857	34,751
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	87.24	77.20	81.12	17.40	95.17	27.03	93.97	N/A	62,700	50,862
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	94.76	94.76	94.76			94.76	94.76	N/A	15,000	14,214
<u>ALL</u>											
	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRANT	7	93.37	93.64	90.10	12.10	103.93	66.32	124.66	66.32 to 124.66	49,928	44,983
MADRID	1	101.50	101.50	101.50			101.50	101.50	N/A	42,000	42,630
RURAL	3	94.76	93.05	85.90	5.49	108.32	84.40	100.00	N/A	53,500	45,958
VENANGO	2	33.52	33.52	33.33	19.35	100.55	27.03	40.00	N/A	36,000	12,000
<u>ALL</u>											
	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

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	8	87.60	75.75	79.06	23.51	95.80	27.03	101.95	27.03 to 101.95	49,562	39,185
2	4	96.69	100.61	90.21	12.12	111.53	84.40	124.66	N/A	53,125	47,923
3	1	94.76	94.76	94.76			94.76	94.76	N/A	15,000	14,214
<u>ALL</u>											
	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	31.09	95% Median C.I.:	66.32 to 101.50	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	26.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.15 to 94.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.91 to 100.80	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	519,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	18.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,953	PRD:	101.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:43

**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	12	90.66	84.03	82.95	20.45	101.30	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	50,750	42,098
2	1	94.76	94.76	94.76			94.76	94.76	N/A	15,000	14,214
____ALL____	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**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	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953
04											
____ALL____	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0095											
43-0079											
51-0001											
51-0006											
56-0565	1	94.76	94.76	94.76			94.76	94.76	N/A	15,000	14,214
68-0020	12	90.66	84.03	82.95	20.45	101.30	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	50,750	42,098
NonValid School											
____ALL____	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	31.09	95% Median C.I.:	66.32 to 101.50	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	26.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.15 to 94.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.91 to 100.80	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	519,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	18.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,953	PRD:	101.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:43

**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	3	94.76	73.93	51.68	25.67	143.06	27.03	100.00	N/A	19,166	9,904
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	87.24	87.24	87.24			87.24	87.24	N/A	27,000	23,555
1920 TO 1939	1	40.00	40.00	40.00			40.00	40.00	N/A	35,000	14,000
1940 TO 1949	1	93.97	93.97	93.97			93.97	93.97	N/A	60,000	56,380
1950 TO 1959	1	66.32	66.32	66.32			66.32	66.32	N/A	30,000	19,896
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	4	97.44	95.30	89.96	6.59	105.94	84.40	101.95	N/A	60,500	54,428
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	2	106.31	106.31	91.67	17.27	115.96	87.95	124.66	N/A	86,250	79,065
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	5,500	5,500
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	5,500	5,500
10000 TO 29999	4	98.36	102.15	100.41	11.34	101.73	87.24	124.66	N/A	17,500	17,572
30000 TO 59999	5	66.32	65.64	68.60	38.55	95.69	27.03	101.50	N/A	38,700	26,548
60000 TO 99999	1	93.97	93.97	93.97			93.97	93.97	N/A	60,000	56,380
100000 TO 149999	1	84.40	84.40	84.40			84.40	84.40	N/A	140,000	118,162
150000 TO 249999	1	87.95	87.95	87.95			87.95	87.95	N/A	155,000	136,315
ALL	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**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:	13	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	31.09	95% Median C.I.:	66.32 to 101.50	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	644,500	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	26.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.15 to 94.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	624,000	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.91 to 100.80	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	519,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,000	COD:	18.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	124.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,953	PRD:	101.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.03			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:43

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
5000 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	5,500	5,500
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	5,500	5,500
10000 TO 29999	7	87.24	77.42	66.39	30.79	116.62	27.03	124.66	27.03 to 124.66	24,571	16,312
30000 TO 59999	3	93.97	96.28	95.86	2.88	100.44	93.37	101.50	N/A	50,500	48,409
100000 TO 149999	2	86.18	86.18	86.26	2.06	99.90	84.40	87.95	N/A	147,500	127,238
ALL _____											
	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	94.76	73.93	51.68	25.67	143.06	27.03	100.00	N/A	19,166	9,904
20	10	90.66	88.14	86.44	16.49	101.96	40.00	124.66	66.32 to 101.95	56,650	48,967
ALL _____											
	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	97.38	97.38	96.17	2.69	101.26	94.76	100.00	N/A	10,250	9,857
344	1	87.24	87.24	87.24			87.24	87.24	N/A	27,000	23,555
350	2	33.52	33.52	33.33	19.35	100.55	27.03	40.00	N/A	36,000	12,000
353	2	80.15	80.15	84.75	17.25	94.57	66.32	93.97	N/A	45,000	38,138
406	2	109.02	109.02	101.54	14.35	107.36	93.37	124.66	N/A	33,500	34,016
417	1	101.95	101.95	101.95			101.95	101.95	N/A	10,500	10,705
428	1	84.40	84.40	84.40			84.40	84.40	N/A	140,000	118,162
528	1	101.50	101.50	101.50			101.50	101.50	N/A	42,000	42,630
531	1	87.95	87.95	87.95			87.95	87.95	N/A	155,000	136,315
ALL _____											
	13	93.37	84.86	83.24	18.45	101.95	27.03	124.66	66.32 to 101.50	48,000	39,953





**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The Perkins County Assessor reported 2008 changes in value through the assessment actions report. A 3% increase to improvement values within Grant (excluding grain elevators) was given after the preliminary statistics were reviewed. Some land values were also increased in all assessor locations. These included areas along the railroad track locations. The assessment actions improved the statistical measures since the time of preliminary statistics. The median is the best indicator of the level of value at 93% with the small sample size of 13 qualified sales. Although the other two central tendency measures are below the acceptable range of value, both qualitative measures are within acceptable parameters and reflect has uniform and proportionate assessments.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>36.11</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>52.78</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>65.79</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>76.32</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>87.1</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>67.57</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>62.5</b>

COMMERCIAL: A decreased number of sales have been utilized by the assessor for the development of the R&O statistics. Historically the table reflects a various percent of sales used in different assessment years.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>85.81</b>	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>85.59</b>	<b>93.37</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>94.11</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>94.38</b>	<b>94.47</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>96.00</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>95.99</b>	<b>96.00</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>96.55</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>117.98</b>	<b>96.55</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>83.20</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>83.43</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>12.72</b>	<b>107.08</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>5.68</b>	<b>100.4</b>	<b>95</b>

COMMERCIAL: The assessor reported that a property parcel type moved from the commercial class; which is shown through the decrease in the percent change in assessed value. This is not representing the actions taken by the county. The primary use of the parcel that moved out of commercial is now a residential property. Therefore the Trended Preliminary Ratio is not fairly representing the assessment practices.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales</b>		<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>4.53</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>-0.26</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>0.28</b>
<b>10.37</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>-0.01</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>22.2</b>
<b>14.22</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>0.28</b>
<b>1.08</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>0.53</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>12.72</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>5.68</b>

COMMERCIAL: The assessor increased commercial improvement values within Grant (except grain elevators) by 3% along with some land value increases for intensive use properties along the railroad. Grant represents over 50% of the small sample size of 13 commercial sales where these changes occurred. This is supportive of the increase in the sales file by 4.53%. Overall in the county only small amounts of value changed for land values in excess of 5 acres.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>93.37</b>	<b>83.24</b>	<b>84.86</b>

COMMERCIAL: Within the small sample of 13 commercial sales, the median is the only measure that shows support of an acceptable level of value. The median can be used for the level of value to eliminate the influence of any outliers that distort the statistical measures. No further evidence is available to indicate that Perkins County has not attained the level of value for the current year.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>18.45</b>	<b>101.95</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

COMMERCIAL: Both qualitative measures are a mathematical outcome of the assessment actions taken by the county for 2008. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable ranges and reflect good uniformity in the county for the commercial property class.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins County**

---

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>85.81</b>	<b>93.37</b>	<b>7.56</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>80.95</b>	<b>83.24</b>	<b>2.29</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>80.27</b>	<b>84.86</b>	<b>4.59</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>22.72</b>	<b>18.45</b>	<b>-4.27</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>99.16</b>	<b>101.95</b>	<b>2.79</b>
<b>Min Sales Ratio</b>	<b>27.03</b>	<b>27.03</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	<b>121.50</b>	<b>124.66</b>	<b>3.16</b>

COMMERCIAL: Although the commercial property class includes a limited number of 13 sales, the assessor did increase the improvement values within Grant (excl. grain elevators) by 3% to improve the statistical measures. Other changes include increased land values on intensive use properties in all assessor locations. These properties are located along the railroad tracks throughout the county.



**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:	116	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	16.87	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 70.27	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,676	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	11.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.21 to 69.52	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,490,789	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	65.23 to 69.37	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,271,463							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	159,403	COD:	12.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,788	PRD:	101.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.38			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:26

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	3	76.49	74.57	72.39	4.88	103.00	68.01	79.20	N/A	88,828	64,304
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	3	73.97	73.45	74.13	2.55	99.08	70.36	76.01	N/A	95,008	70,427
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	18	71.60	75.00	77.36	11.40	96.94	59.74	114.19	68.51 to 78.19	123,101	95,234
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	12	67.78	69.78	69.22	11.48	100.81	54.20	86.17	61.86 to 80.01	168,361	116,540
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	70.27	72.34	74.16	3.48	97.55	69.71	77.05	N/A	96,800	71,787
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	69.29	66.71	66.39	8.26	100.48	52.09	76.42	52.09 to 76.42	81,416	54,055
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	18	70.76	70.94	75.70	9.23	93.71	56.37	96.24	63.76 to 75.99	124,002	93,865
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	71.08	74.33	73.05	6.01	101.75	68.65	90.78	68.65 to 90.78	281,571	205,690
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	66.53	63.35	61.53	5.68	102.96	52.83	67.52	N/A	281,750	173,357
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	66.68	67.51	65.69	9.60	102.77	54.45	81.93	56.55 to 74.62	195,714	128,570
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	11	55.19	58.23	56.54	10.12	103.00	50.28	70.56	51.57 to 67.07	222,818	125,973
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	20	58.07	56.22	53.24	13.92	105.60	37.38	78.31	53.44 to 62.97	149,515	79,601
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	36	71.60	73.09	73.46	10.53	99.50	54.20	114.19	68.04 to 76.49	132,990	97,691
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	34	70.54	71.01	73.65	7.98	96.42	52.09	96.24	68.65 to 73.85	146,528	107,915
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	46	61.16	60.02	58.31	12.85	102.93	37.38	81.93	55.19 to 64.70	189,590	110,553
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	39	70.33	71.91	72.83	10.63	98.74	52.09	114.19	68.04 to 75.37	128,591	93,651
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	40	69.87	69.83	69.99	8.98	99.77	52.83	96.24	66.74 to 72.24	187,072	130,928
<u>ALL</u>											
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788

**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:	116	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	16.87	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 70.27	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,676	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	11.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.21 to 69.52	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,490,789	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	65.23 to 69.37	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,271,463							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	159,403	COD:	12.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,788	PRD:	101.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.38			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:26

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
3151	5	74.05	75.04	78.73	7.17	95.31	66.74	86.80	N/A	170,800	134,477	
3153	8	58.20	62.28	60.37	18.80	103.17	42.88	96.24	42.88 to 96.24	289,025	174,470	
3155	9	67.52	67.27	66.68	15.31	100.88	42.23	90.78	56.97 to 83.41	155,111	103,433	
3157	4	68.19	67.97	67.77	3.95	100.29	63.02	72.47	N/A	102,250	69,293	
3159	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	121,000	82,326	
3161	3	61.75	66.50	65.11	9.86	102.13	59.74	78.00	N/A	169,250	110,203	
3361	1	66.31	66.31	66.31			66.31	66.31	N/A	405,000	268,552	
3363	1	61.15	61.15	61.15			61.15	61.15	N/A	94,200	57,599	
3365	4	65.41	66.31	65.01	4.60	102.00	62.90	71.51	N/A	146,830	95,453	
3367	5	64.61	66.81	67.56	5.64	98.90	61.86	76.54	N/A	183,180	123,751	
3369	3	65.80	61.87	56.64	7.17	109.24	52.83	66.99	N/A	194,666	110,255	
3371	10	69.56	68.91	68.24	7.82	100.98	53.44	78.29	62.50 to 75.99	124,815	85,174	
3373	7	74.54	72.57	72.25	5.09	100.44	63.65	78.19	63.65 to 78.19	74,879	54,101	
3375	8	70.44	71.65	72.39	6.76	98.99	60.96	86.17	60.96 to 86.17	229,985	166,475	
3377	7	67.07	72.70	78.72	15.69	92.36	55.77	114.19	55.77 to 114.19	123,685	97,366	
3379	3	68.65	65.27	69.01	7.01	94.58	56.37	70.80	N/A	130,000	89,718	
3383	1	65.56	65.56	65.56			65.56	65.56	N/A	160,000	104,902	
3385	2	55.74	55.74	55.99	1.46	99.55	54.92	56.55	N/A	327,000	183,071	
3387	3	61.10	62.64	61.91	9.77	101.17	54.45	72.36	N/A	157,333	97,411	
3585	5	53.69	63.31	63.84	19.61	99.17	52.09	80.01	N/A	91,800	58,608	
3587	2	63.68	63.68	60.40	16.17	105.42	53.38	73.97	N/A	105,500	63,724	
3589	3	71.69	73.02	73.54	2.17	99.29	71.35	76.01	N/A	104,341	76,731	
3591	6	48.17	49.34	48.68	19.31	101.34	37.38	62.97	37.38 to 62.97	185,266	90,194	
3593	11	70.36	69.64	67.64	12.40	102.97	54.20	86.26	55.05 to 81.93	130,134	88,020	
3595	3	78.31	78.81	78.73	1.68	100.11	77.09	81.04	N/A	183,466	144,442	
3597	1	74.62	74.62	74.62			74.62	74.62	N/A	73,917	55,157	
ALL												
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
0	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	
ALL												
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	

**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:	116	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	16.87	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 70.27	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,676	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	11.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.21 to 69.52	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,490,789	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	65.23 to 69.37	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,271,463							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	159,403	COD:	12.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,788	PRD:	101.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.38			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:26

**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
2	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788
ALL											
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788

**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	51	69.87	69.18	68.74	8.05	100.63	37.97	81.04	67.52 to 71.08	96,455	66,304
DRY-N/A	15	64.61	66.04	67.53	10.52	97.80	52.09	86.26	61.10 to 71.96	143,460	96,876
GRASS	8	58.76	59.11	55.91	17.93	105.71	37.38	76.01	37.38 to 76.01	93,153	52,082
GRASS-N/A	5	62.37	58.97	58.78	12.16	100.33	42.23	71.51	N/A	162,664	95,614
IRRGTD	1	64.08	64.08	64.08			64.08	64.08	N/A	399,000	255,683
IRRGTD-N/A	36	66.69	68.23	66.44	17.21	102.70	42.88	114.19	59.40 to 72.36	262,837	174,621
ALL											
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788

**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	60	69.19	68.63	67.96	8.76	100.98	37.97	86.26	66.99 to 70.82	96,336	65,473
DRY-N/A	6	69.04	66.84	70.21	8.66	95.21	52.09	74.88	52.09 to 74.88	215,150	151,048
GRASS	11	56.37	57.50	54.98	17.05	104.58	37.38	76.01	42.23 to 71.69	110,565	60,790
GRASS-N/A	2	67.61	67.61	66.03	5.78	102.39	63.70	71.51	N/A	171,161	113,015
IRRGTD	21	67.07	69.33	68.26	13.97	101.56	50.28	96.24	61.86 to 77.05	252,944	172,660
IRRGTD-N/A	16	61.12	66.54	64.10	21.51	103.80	42.88	114.19	53.44 to 76.54	284,331	182,260
ALL											
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788

**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	66	69.19	68.46	68.37	8.75	100.13	37.97	86.26	66.99 to 70.82	107,138	73,252
GRASS	13	61.15	59.05	57.41	15.53	102.87	37.38	76.01	44.76 to 71.51	119,888	68,825
IRRGTD	37	66.31	68.12	66.34	16.93	102.68	42.88	114.19	59.74 to 71.99	266,517	176,811
ALL											
	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788

**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:	116	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	16.87	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 70.27	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,676	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	11.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.21 to 69.52	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,490,789	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	65.23 to 69.37	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,271,463							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	159,403	COD:	12.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,788	PRD:	101.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.38			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:26

<b>SCHOOL DISTRICT *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
25-0095	9	70.56	72.38	72.97	13.76	99.19	50.28	96.24	59.40 to 86.80	225,688	164,687	
43-0079												
51-0001												
51-0006	1	78.00	78.00	78.00			78.00	78.00	N/A	131,750	102,770	
56-0565	8	57.78	63.06	62.87	16.86	100.31	52.09	80.01	52.09 to 80.01	116,375	73,159	
68-0020	98	67.52	67.07	65.61	11.73	102.23	37.38	114.19	64.70 to 70.07	157,110	103,073	
NonValid School												
ALL	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	

<b>ACRES IN SALE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
50.01 TO 100.00	2	61.75	61.75	63.53	8.71	97.19	56.37	67.12	N/A	30,000	19,060	
100.01 TO 180.00	70	68.51	66.99	65.28	10.67	102.62	37.38	90.78	64.70 to 70.36	108,437	70,790	
180.01 TO 330.00	32	68.03	68.15	66.35	13.82	102.71	42.23	114.19	61.86 to 73.85	217,552	144,342	
330.01 TO 650.00	11	63.70	67.34	67.54	19.48	99.70	44.76	96.24	51.57 to 86.80	276,224	186,570	
650.01 +	1	72.24	72.24	72.24			72.24	72.24	N/A	840,000	606,779	
ALL	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											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	1	56.37	56.37	56.37			56.37	56.37	N/A	20,000	11,274	
30000 TO 59999	7	69.71	70.24	70.22	9.62	100.02	55.77	86.26	55.77 to 86.26	46,571	32,702	
60000 TO 99999	43	68.85	67.52	66.90	8.84	100.92	37.38	80.01	64.70 to 70.61	76,368	51,093	
100000 TO 149999	18	71.74	68.59	68.23	13.44	100.53	37.97	90.78	62.37 to 77.74	127,718	87,141	
150000 TO 249999	30	64.63	66.08	65.84	11.60	100.38	53.44	114.19	60.96 to 68.01	192,589	126,792	
250000 TO 499999	15	66.31	68.21	66.94	19.41	101.91	44.76	96.24	52.83 to 81.93	361,955	242,288	
500000 +	2	57.56	57.56	61.08	25.50	94.24	42.88	72.24	N/A	677,500	413,808	
ALL	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	



**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:	116	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	16.87	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 70.27	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,676	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	11.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.21 to 69.52	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,490,789	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	65.23 to 69.37	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,271,463							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	159,403	COD:	12.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,788	PRD:	101.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.38			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:53:26

<b>ASSESSED VALUE *</b>											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	5	67.12	64.13	64.55	8.72	99.36	55.77	71.69	N/A	38,200	24,656	
30000 TO 59999	48	68.68	66.89	65.30	10.57	102.44	37.38	86.26	64.61 to 70.61	77,267	50,453	
60000 TO 99999	12	65.19	65.99	64.92	11.36	101.66	53.38	90.78	56.97 to 71.51	130,166	84,501	
100000 TO 149999	32	67.29	66.59	64.97	10.97	102.50	44.76	83.41	60.96 to 72.36	182,733	118,721	
150000 TO 249999	13	70.21	69.61	64.83	21.82	107.39	42.88	114.19	51.57 to 81.93	335,958	217,788	
250000 TO 499999	5	66.31	75.06	74.74	17.22	100.43	61.86	96.24	N/A	394,800	295,056	
500000 +	1	72.24	72.24	72.24			72.24	72.24	N/A	840,000	606,779	
ALL	116	67.77	67.30	66.37	12.39	101.41	37.38	114.19	65.56 to 70.27	159,403	105,788	

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

**Agricultural**

Based on the market information within the current study period, the assessor determined that all agricultural land would be increased for tax year 2008 to bring the agricultural land class in Perkins County within the statutory level of value.

The Assessor and staff have completed land use updates countywide to update current irrigated acres in conjunction with the certified allocated Natural Resource District acres by ownership. Perkins County uses the GIS for land use map purposes and has obtained the certified irrigated number of acres from the Natural Resource District. The shifts of acre changes shown on the abstract or Form 45 are related to this update for the 2008 assessment rolls. Water availability continues to be a factor in the increased market value for agricultural land in Perkins County similar to surrounding counties in the Republican River Basin south of Perkins County.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	No
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	N/A
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	N/A
6.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1989
7.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008; the land use is kept current each assessment year.
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	The county utilizes GIS and physical inspections.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100%
8.	<b>Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:</b>
	1
9.	<b>How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class?</b>

	Perkins County has one market area which includes the entire County Boundaries.
10.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	No

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	33	32	66

**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:	120	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	17.02	95% Median C.I.:	70.95 to 75.81	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	20,413,214	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.46 to 76.09	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,892,827	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.26	95% Mean C.I.:	71.47 to 75.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,476,928							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,773	COD:	12.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	122.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,641	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.35			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:56

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>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	3	84.70	81.03	77.93	5.50	103.97	72.20	86.18	N/A	88,694	69,121
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	3	78.36	83.67	86.86	8.25	96.32	76.62	96.02	N/A	95,008	82,525
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	19	79.68	82.86	84.87	11.23	97.63	65.94	122.29	74.16 to 88.70	122,232	103,734
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	12	73.90	75.35	74.53	11.05	101.10	59.99	92.87	65.87 to 84.75	168,361	125,483
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	84.40	83.47	85.89	6.88	97.19	74.30	91.72	N/A	96,800	83,138
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	74.85	74.60	74.81	4.14	99.72	67.67	80.97	67.67 to 80.97	81,416	60,904
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	19	77.39	77.37	82.88	9.01	93.35	66.72	106.10	70.50 to 82.84	148,063	122,712
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	75.48	80.31	79.15	7.46	101.46	73.12	99.80	73.12 to 99.80	281,571	222,877
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	74.25	64.50	69.68	15.43	92.57	33.35	76.75	N/A	229,400	159,852
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	70.81	70.97	68.69	11.48	103.32	55.88	87.28	56.40 to 79.71	197,348	135,551
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	61.35	63.16	61.53	9.02	102.65	54.30	75.63	56.66 to 69.85	260,642	160,381
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	20	64.97	64.12	60.99	11.61	105.13	40.15	87.49	60.93 to 68.43	149,515	91,190
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	37	78.36	80.34	80.34	10.92	100.00	59.99	122.29	74.54 to 84.57	132,266	106,262
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	35	75.48	78.00	81.01	8.30	96.29	66.72	106.10	73.50 to 79.78	158,945	128,757
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	48	65.98	65.49	64.00	12.78	102.33	33.35	87.49	61.82 to 69.58	196,580	125,806
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	40	77.60	79.41	79.89	10.51	99.41	59.99	122.29	74.30 to 82.66	128,041	102,289
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	42	75.26	74.65	76.30	10.35	97.84	33.35	106.10	71.06 to 78.53	192,905	147,190
<u>ALL</u>											
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**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:	120	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	17.02	95% Median C.I.:	70.95 to 75.81	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	20,413,214	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.46 to 76.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,892,827	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.26	95% Mean C.I.:	71.47 to 75.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,476,928							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,773	COD:	12.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	122.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,641	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.35			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:56

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
3151	5	78.82	83.68	88.08	9.20	95.00	75.63	96.20	N/A	170,800	150,439	
3153	8	63.88	68.01	66.37	17.73	102.46	48.71	106.10	48.71 to 106.10	289,025	191,835	
3155	11	71.71	73.51	74.13	13.63	99.16	55.88	99.80	60.93 to 87.88	203,222	150,648	
3157	4	74.96	73.51	74.26	4.76	98.99	66.72	77.39	N/A	102,250	75,927	
3159	1	71.99	71.99	71.99			71.99	71.99	N/A	121,000	87,105	
3161	3	66.71	71.77	70.60	8.35	101.65	65.94	82.65	N/A	169,250	119,496	
3361	1	74.25	74.25	74.25			74.25	74.25	N/A	405,000	300,697	
3363	1	77.72	77.72	77.72			77.72	77.72	N/A	94,200	73,214	
3365	3	71.06	74.24	72.68	8.20	102.14	67.09	84.57	N/A	115,666	84,070	
3367	5	74.16	74.12	73.62	6.71	100.68	65.28	84.85	N/A	183,180	134,852	
3369	3	69.73	67.61	64.44	4.21	104.92	62.14	70.95	N/A	194,666	125,441	
3371	10	73.68	74.00	73.77	7.99	100.31	60.04	82.85	67.40 to 82.84	124,815	92,072	
3373	7	78.80	76.93	76.61	4.94	100.43	68.43	82.89	68.43 to 82.89	74,879	57,361	
3375	8	74.85	76.41	77.79	7.31	98.22	64.56	92.87	64.56 to 92.87	229,985	178,916	
3377	7	73.88	80.55	85.54	15.56	94.17	67.52	122.29	67.52 to 122.29	123,685	105,798	
3379	3	73.12	72.13	73.82	3.25	97.71	68.07	75.20	N/A	130,000	95,970	
3383	2	51.47	51.47	65.55	35.20	78.51	33.35	69.58	N/A	90,000	58,997	
3385	2	61.39	61.39	61.26	0.70	100.22	60.96	61.82	N/A	327,000	200,308	
3387	3	69.00	67.63	65.84	10.18	102.72	56.40	77.48	N/A	157,333	103,583	
3585	6	64.12	68.12	64.23	15.97	106.05	56.40	84.75	56.40 to 84.75	189,284	121,581	
3587	2	69.61	69.61	66.82	12.58	104.16	60.85	78.36	N/A	105,500	70,500	
3589	4	89.48	88.25	88.11	5.46	100.16	78.03	96.02	N/A	104,907	92,432	
3591	6	56.76	58.97	56.93	20.04	103.59	40.15	87.49	40.15 to 87.49	185,266	105,470	
3593	11	76.82	77.59	75.54	10.98	102.72	59.99	96.88	64.31 to 87.28	130,098	98,276	
3595	3	87.51	86.68	87.77	1.96	98.76	83.69	88.84	N/A	183,466	161,021	
3597	1	78.88	78.88	78.88			78.88	78.88	N/A	73,917	58,309	
ALL												
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
0	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641	
ALL												
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641	

**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:	120	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	17.02	95% Median C.I.:	70.95 to 75.81	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	20,413,214	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.46 to 76.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,892,827	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.26	95% Mean C.I.:	71.47 to 75.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,476,928							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,773	COD:	12.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	122.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,641	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.35			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:56

**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
2	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641
ALL											
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**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	52	74.23	73.72	72.64	8.63	101.49	40.15	87.51	71.99 to 77.39	99,559	72,316
DRY-N/A	15	75.63	73.41	74.23	9.01	98.90	60.85	96.88	66.72 to 78.40	143,460	106,483
GRASS	10	72.90	70.87	71.50	22.71	99.11	33.35	96.02	46.11 to 90.26	87,183	62,338
GRASS-N/A	4	72.82	73.90	72.55	9.33	101.86	65.38	84.57	N/A	143,250	103,923
IRRGTD	1	69.85	69.85	69.85			69.85	69.85	N/A	399,000	278,696
IRRGTD-N/A	38	73.50	74.68	72.77	17.06	102.61	48.71	122.29	65.28 to 79.78	282,104	205,300
ALL											
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**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	61	74.16	73.52	72.24	9.11	101.78	40.15	96.88	71.71 to 75.81	98,985	71,504
DRY-N/A	6	77.03	74.94	77.15	4.60	97.13	67.67	79.00	67.67 to 79.00	215,150	165,995
GRASS	13	68.82	70.75	70.96	19.78	99.71	33.35	96.02	56.54 to 88.70	103,294	73,293
GRASS-N/A	1	84.57	84.57	84.57			84.57	84.57	N/A	102,000	86,261
IRRGTD	22	74.07	75.82	75.17	14.34	100.87	54.30	106.10	65.87 to 87.28	267,862	201,346
IRRGTD-N/A	17	66.71	72.91	69.85	19.98	104.38	48.71	122.29	60.57 to 84.85	307,412	214,735
ALL											
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**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	67	74.30	73.65	73.10	8.77	100.75	40.15	96.88	71.71 to 76.62	109,388	79,966
GRASS	14	72.82	71.73	71.92	18.90	99.75	33.35	96.02	56.54 to 88.70	103,202	74,219
IRRGTD	39	73.12	74.55	72.67	16.82	102.59	48.71	122.29	65.28 to 79.78	285,102	207,182
ALL											
	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**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:	120	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	17.02	95% Median C.I.:	70.95 to 75.81	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	20,413,214	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.46 to 76.09	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,892,827	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.26	95% Mean C.I.:	71.47 to 75.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,476,928							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,773	COD:	12.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	122.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,641	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.35			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:56

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0095	9	76.02	79.91	80.65	14.98	99.09	54.30	106.10	65.87 to 96.20	225,688	182,012
43-0079											
51-0001											
51-0006	1	82.65	82.65	82.65			82.65	82.65	N/A	131,750	108,888
56-0565	9	67.67	67.95	64.70	13.77	105.02	56.40	84.75	56.40 to 82.66	178,633	115,581
68-0020	101	73.88	73.59	72.51	11.97	101.50	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.48	159,625	115,739
NonValid School											
ALL	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	33.35	33.35	33.35			33.35	33.35	N/A	20,000	6,670
50.01 TO 100.00	2	69.57	69.57	70.06	2.15	99.30	68.07	71.06	N/A	30,000	21,017
100.01 TO 180.00	70	74.02	73.25	71.28	10.58	102.76	40.15	99.80	70.50 to 75.63	108,432	77,295
180.01 TO 330.00	32	74.79	75.07	72.94	12.69	102.93	48.71	122.29	68.16 to 79.71	217,552	158,672
330.01 TO 650.00	14	73.82	76.12	74.23	19.79	102.54	55.88	106.10	56.98 to 96.02	315,778	234,392
650.01 +	1	78.40	78.40	78.40			78.40	78.40	N/A	840,000	658,533
ALL	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641

**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	2	50.71	50.71	50.71	34.23	100.00	33.35	68.07	N/A	20,000	10,141
30000 TO 59999	7	84.40	81.73	81.65	9.97	100.10	67.52	96.88	67.52 to 96.88	46,571	38,024
60000 TO 99999	43	74.30	73.18	72.62	7.88	100.78	46.11	87.49	70.95 to 76.62	76,359	55,448
100000 TO 149999	19	78.82	77.49	76.94	11.76	100.72	40.15	99.80	71.99 to 84.57	126,607	97,410
150000 TO 249999	29	69.58	72.22	72.05	11.49	100.24	56.40	122.29	65.94 to 74.00	190,943	137,580
250000 TO 499999	16	72.05	74.23	73.14	19.41	101.49	54.30	106.10	56.98 to 88.84	355,477	259,985
500000 +	4	69.49	67.85	69.11	19.01	98.17	48.71	83.71	N/A	653,213	451,447
ALL	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641



**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:	120	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	17.02	95% Median C.I.:	70.95 to 75.81	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	20,413,214	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.46 to 76.09	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,892,827	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.26	95% Mean C.I.:	71.47 to 75.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,476,928							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,773	COD:	12.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	122.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,641	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.35			

Printed: 03/31/2008 20:01:56

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
5000 TO 9999	1	33.35	33.35	33.35			33.35	33.35	N/A	20,000	6,670
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	33.35	33.35	33.35			33.35	33.35	N/A	20,000	6,670
10000 TO 29999	2	69.57	69.57	70.06	2.15	99.30	68.07	71.06	N/A	30,000	21,017
30000 TO 59999	47	74.40	73.50	71.73	9.49	102.47	40.15	96.88	71.71 to 76.62	73,292	52,571
60000 TO 99999	14	77.27	76.88	76.04	10.70	101.10	60.85	99.80	65.38 to 87.49	112,950	85,892
100000 TO 149999	33	70.82	71.80	70.46	10.73	101.91	55.88	96.02	66.71 to 76.75	179,387	126,389
150000 TO 249999	8	87.40	81.11	80.63	10.44	100.60	56.54	92.87	56.54 to 92.87	246,729	198,936
250000 TO 499999	14	67.57	74.73	71.60	24.14	104.37	48.71	122.29	56.98 to 96.20	432,368	309,570
500000 +	1	78.40	78.40	78.40			78.40	78.40	N/A	840,000	658,533
ALL	120	74.08	73.72	72.77	12.50	101.30	33.35	122.29	70.95 to 75.81	165,773	120,641



**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Perkins County has experienced many of the same influencing market factors for agricultural land values similar to Chase, Hayes and Dundy Counties like the other Republican River Basin Counties. Only a small portion of Perkins County is not the Republican River Basin. The water availability continues to be the main factor in the increased market in this area. The County Assessor and staff have completed land use updates countywide to update current irrigated acres in conjunction with the certified allocated Natural Resource district by ownership. Perkins County uses GIS for land use map purposes and has obtained certifications from the Natural Resource District. Through the review of market information the assessor has taken appropriate actions to increase the land values for 2008 by individual land classification groups. Higher increases are shown in the irrigated subclasses, with 4A increasing \$120 per acre. Lower increases of \$20-\$40 were given for dry sub-classes and grass subclasses took increases ranging from \$40-\$50 per acre. Perkins County continues to use a very adequate portion of the total sales file to determine the qualified statistics. 120 sales are included in the qualified agricultural unimproved property class out of a total of 188, or 64%.

The median, weighted mean and mean are all three very close and show nice support of each other. The median will represent the level of value for agricultural unimproved land in Perkins County for 2008 at 74%. Through the assessor's actions to increase land values to equalize the property class with the increasing market prices, the qualitative measures reflect uniformity and proportionality. Each measure is well within the prescribed parameters for each.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>63.83</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>66.26</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>64.91</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>58.92</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>54.11</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>60.39</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>66.84</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>74.59</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Although the percentage of sales used has decreased, the number of qualified sales increased by 12 sales. The 63.83% of the total sales used to determine the R&O statistical measurements is very adequate and represents a fair population of the agricultural unimproved land class.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>67.77</b>	<b>8.97</b>	<b>73.85</b>	<b>74.08</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>72.14</b>	<b>-0.46</b>	<b>71.81</b>	<b>72.14</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>73.97</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>77.06</b>	<b>74.52</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>74.12</b>	<b>4.59</b>	<b>77.52</b>	<b>74.92</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>73.72</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>73.74</b>	<b>73.72</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>75.05</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>74.84</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>11.09</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>76</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Only a minor difference of .23 points is between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio. This is very supportive of the assessment practices and reflects that all properties, sold and unsold are treated in a similar manner.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales</b>		<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>9.76</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>8.97</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>-0.46</b>
<b>3.86</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>4.18</b>
<b>4.03</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>4.59</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>0.03</b>
<b>2.9</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2.81</b>
<b>4.88</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>3.49</b>
<b>7.75</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>11.09</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both percent changes are similar and represent the new increased agricultural land values in Perkins County for 2008. The assessor also updated current irrigated land use acres in conjunction with certified allocations with the Natural Resource District.



## 2008 Correlation Section for Perkins 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 Perkins County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>74.08</b>	<b>72.77</b>	<b>73.72</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median ratio, weighted mean ratio and mean ratio correlate well and support each other in the agricultural unimproved class of real property. The assessor's actions to increase values for all subclasses are the outcome of the good equalization as shown in these central tendency measures. The median best describes the level of value at 74. The weighted mean would respectively round to 73 supporting the other measures.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>101.30</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Increased agricultural land values in each land use were implemented by the assessor to equalize the property class as a whole. Through these 2008 actions and qualitative measures, it is believed that Perkins County has uniform and proportionate assessments.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Perkins County**

---

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>67.77</b>	<b>74.08</b>	<b>6.31</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>66.37</b>	<b>72.77</b>	<b>6.4</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>67.30</b>	<b>73.72</b>	<b>6.42</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>12.39</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>0.11</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>101.41</b>	<b>101.30</b>	<b>-0.11</b>
<b>Min Sales Ratio</b>	<b>37.38</b>	<b>33.35</b>	<b>-4.03</b>
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	<b>114.19</b>	<b>122.29</b>	<b>8.1</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The review process completed by the county assessor increased the number of qualified sales by 4. The county reviewed all available market information to set increased 2008 agricultural land values countywide. Appropriate increases by irrigated, dry and grass subclasses brought all measurements within the acceptable parameters for each statistic. The changes are a good example of the equalization in Perkins County after the increased agricultural land values were implemented.



**County 68 - Perkins**

<b>Total Real Property Value</b> (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	<b>Records</b> 4,515	<b>Value</b> 384,995,782	<b>Total Growth</b> 2,712,490 (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	162	372,800	11	29,594	14	55,595	187	457,989	
2. Res Improv Land	797	3,242,921	37	428,798	144	2,096,869	978	5,768,588	
3. Res Improvements	815	35,754,011	38	3,267,080	166	11,593,178	1,019	50,614,269	
4. Res Total	977	39,369,732	49	3,725,472	180	13,745,642	1,206	56,840,846	545,970
% of Total	81.01	69.26	4.06	6.55	14.92	24.18	26.71	14.76	20.12
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res+Rec Total	977	39,369,732	49	3,725,472	180	13,745,642	1,206	56,840,846	545,970
% of Total	81.01	69.26	4.06	6.55	14.92	24.18	26.71	14.76	20.12

**County 68 - Perkins**

<b>Total Real Property Value</b> (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	<b>Records</b> 4,515	<b>Value</b> 384,995,782	<b>Total Growth</b> 2,712,490 (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	24	146,125	8	47,093	34	165,822	66	359,040	
10. Comm Improv Land	117	860,135	28	401,209	41	4,906,662	186	6,168,006	
11. Comm Improvements	127	11,344,525	30	3,539,401	44	11,987,560	201	26,871,486	
12. Comm Total	151	12,350,785	38	3,987,703	78	17,060,044	267	33,398,532	1,282,584
% of Total	56.55	36.98	14.23	11.93	29.21	51.08	5.91	8.67	47.28
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	1	48,638	0	0	0	0	1	48,638	
15. Ind Improvements	1	18,360	0	0	0	0	1	18,360	
16. Ind Total	1	66,998	0	0	0	0	1	66,998	0
% of Total	***	***	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
Comm+Ind Total	152	12,417,783	38	3,987,703	78	17,060,044	268	33,465,530	1,282,584
% of Total	56.71	37.10	14.17	11.91	29.10	50.97	5.93	8.69	47.28
17. Taxable Total	1,129	51,787,515	87	7,713,175	258	30,805,686	1,474	90,306,376	1,828,554
% of Total	76.59	57.34	5.90	4.12	17.50	15.22	32.64	23.45	67.41

**County 68 - Perkins**

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	66,998	17,856,478	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	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	66,998	17,856,478
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>22. Total Sch II</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>66,998</b>	<b>17,856,478</b>

**Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	0	0	10	534,260
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	37	6,408

  

	Total		Growth
	Records	Value	
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	10	534,260	534,260
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	37	6,408	0
<b>25. Mineral Interest Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>540,668</b>	<b>534,260</b>

**Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural**

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	76	2	156	<b>234</b>

**Schedule V: Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	1,094	10	27,346	2,380	199,562,867	2,391	199,591,307
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	2	18,071	561	64,164,828	563	64,182,899
29. Ag-Improvements	1	230	2	43,419	600	30,330,883	603	30,374,532
<b>30. Ag-Total Taxable</b>							<b>2,994</b>	<b>294,148,738</b>



**County 68 - Perkins**

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

**Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:**

Non-Agricultural Detail	Urban			SubUrban			Growth Value
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	1		3,200	
<b>34. HomeSite Total</b>							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	2	7.930	14,435	
37. FarmSite Improv	1		230	1		40,219	
<b>38. FarmSite Total</b>							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			0.970		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	10	10.000	93,200	10	10.000	93,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	335	337.010	3,240,900	335	337.010	3,240,900	
33. HomeSite Improvements	337		23,185,156	338		23,188,356	349,676
<b>34. HomeSite Total</b>				<b>348</b>	<b>347.010</b>	<b>26,522,456</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	63	357.180	147,453	63	357.180	147,453	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	551	2,006.030	1,337,560	553	2,013.960	1,351,995	
37. FarmSite Improv	575		7,145,727	577		7,186,176	0
<b>38. FarmSite Total</b>				<b>640</b>	<b>2,371.140</b>	<b>8,685,624</b>	
39. Road & Ditches		9,134.100			9,135.070		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
<b>41. Total Section VI</b>				<b>988</b>	<b>11,853.220</b>	<b>35,208,080</b>	<b>349,676</b>

**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	0	0.000	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0</b>

**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	<b>0</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0</b>
44. Recapture Val			0			<b>0</b>

County 68 - Perkins

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	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	42,528.870	42,578,825	42,528.870	42,578,825
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	19,267.460	19,156,448	19,267.460	19,156,448
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	20,577.530	19,599,964	20,577.530	19,599,964
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	17,091.420	16,079,248	17,091.420	16,079,248
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,417.160	6,311,271	7,417.160	6,311,271
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	28,395.670	22,166,504	28,395.670	22,166,504
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	232.030	168,516	232.030	168,516
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	135,510.140	126,060,776	135,510.140	126,060,776
<b>Dryland:</b>								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	40.650	15,040	145,571.140	53,861,529	145,611.790	53,876,569
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	33,409.980	12,361,757	33,409.980	12,361,757
57. 2D	0.000	0	18.570	6,500	52,353.840	18,324,342	52,372.410	18,330,842
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	39,216.100	13,725,946	39,216.100	13,725,946
59. 3D	0.000	0	3.570	1,000	16,442.420	4,603,875	16,445.990	4,604,875
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	29,997.120	7,499,791	29,997.120	7,499,791
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,557.700	889,460	3,557.700	889,460
62. Total	0.000	0	62.790	22,540	320,548.300	111,266,700	320,611.090	111,289,240
<b>Grass:</b>								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	3.700	926	27.050	6,766	3,219.530	804,995	3,250.280	812,687
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,217.250	804,401	3,217.250	804,401
66. 2G	0.670	168	5.730	1,434	3,608.170	902,144	3,614.570	903,746
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,580.880	1,339,413	5,580.880	1,339,413
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,397.400	1,295,371	5,397.400	1,295,371
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	52,977.790	12,714,675	52,977.790	12,714,675
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	12,843.370	3,082,412	12,843.370	3,082,412
71. Total	4.370	1,094	32.780	8,200	86,844.390	20,943,411	86,881.540	20,952,705
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.410	33	4,882.740	390,620	4,883.150	390,653
73. Other	0.000	0	0.870	209	1,047.490	247,075	1,048.360	247,284
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		297.890		297.890	
75. Total	4.370	1,094	96.850	30,982	548,833.060	258,908,582	548,934.280	258,940,658

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	135,510.140	126,060,776	135,510.140	126,060,776
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	62.790	22,540	320,548.300	111,266,700	320,611.090	111,289,240
78.Grass	4.370	1,094	32.780	8,200	86,844.390	20,943,411	86,881.540	20,952,705
79.Waste	0.000	0	0.410	33	4,882.740	390,620	4,883.150	390,653
80.Other	0.000	0	0.870	209	1,047.490	247,075	1,048.360	247,284
81.Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	297.890	0	297.890	0
<b>82.Total</b>	4.370	1,094	96.850	30,982	548,833.060	258,908,582	<b>548,934.280</b>	<b>258,940,658</b>

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 68 - Perkins

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	42,528.870	31.38%	42,578,825	33.78%	1,001.174
2A1	19,267.460	14.22%	19,156,448	15.20%	994.238
2A	20,577.530	15.19%	19,599,964	15.55%	952.493
3A1	17,091.420	12.61%	16,079,248	12.76%	940.778
3A	7,417.160	5.47%	6,311,271	5.01%	850.901
4A1	28,395.670	20.95%	22,166,504	17.58%	780.629
4A	232.030	0.17%	168,516	0.13%	726.268
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>135,510.140</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>126,060,776</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>930.268</b>

**Dry:**

1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	145,611.790	45.42%	53,876,569	48.41%	370.001
2D1	33,409.980	10.42%	12,361,757	11.11%	370.001
2D	52,372.410	16.34%	18,330,842	16.47%	350.009
3D1	39,216.100	12.23%	13,725,946	12.33%	350.007
3D	16,445.990	5.13%	4,604,875	4.14%	279.999
4D1	29,997.120	9.36%	7,499,791	6.74%	250.017
4D	3,557.700	1.11%	889,460	0.80%	250.009
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>320,611.090</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>111,289,240</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>347.116</b>

**Grass:**

1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	3,250.280	3.74%	812,687	3.88%	250.036
2G1	3,217.250	3.70%	804,401	3.84%	250.027
2G	3,614.570	4.16%	903,746	4.31%	250.028
3G1	5,580.880	6.42%	1,339,413	6.39%	240.000
3G	5,397.400	6.21%	1,295,371	6.18%	239.999
4G1	52,977.790	60.98%	12,714,675	60.68%	240.000
4G	12,843.370	14.78%	3,082,412	14.71%	240.000
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>86,881.540</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>20,952,705</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>241.164</b>

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>135,510.140</b>	<b>24.69%</b>	<b>126,060,776</b>	<b>48.68%</b>	<b>930.268</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>320,611.090</b>	<b>58.41%</b>	<b>111,289,240</b>	<b>42.98%</b>	<b>347.116</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>86,881.540</b>	<b>15.83%</b>	<b>20,952,705</b>	<b>8.09%</b>	<b>241.164</b>
Waste	4,883.150	0.89%	390,653	0.15%	80.000
Other	1,048.360	0.19%	247,284	0.10%	235.876
Exempt	297.890	0.05%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>548,934.280</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>258,940,658</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>471.715</b>

**As Related to the County as a Whole**

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>135,510.140</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>126,060,776</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>320,611.090</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>111,289,240</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>86,881.540</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>20,952,705</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
Waste	4,883.150	100.00%	390,653	100.00%
Other	1,048.360	100.00%	247,284	100.00%
Exempt	297.890	100.00%		
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>548,934.280</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>258,940,658</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 68 - Perkins

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	135,510.140	126,060,776
Dry	0.000	0	62.790	22,540	320,548.300	111,266,700
Grass	4.370	1,094	32.780	8,200	86,844.390	20,943,411
Waste	0.000	0	0.410	33	4,882.740	390,620
Other	0.000	0	0.870	209	1,047.490	247,075
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	297.890	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.370</b>	<b>1,094</b>	<b>96.850</b>	<b>30,982</b>	<b>548,833.060</b>	<b>258,908,582</b>

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	135,510.140	126,060,776	135,510.140	24.69%	126,060,776	48.68%	930.268
Dry	320,611.090	111,289,240	320,611.090	58.41%	111,289,240	42.98%	347.116
Grass	86,881.540	20,952,705	86,881.540	15.83%	20,952,705	8.09%	241.164
Waste	4,883.150	390,653	4,883.150	0.89%	390,653	0.15%	80.000
Other	1,048.360	247,284	1,048.360	0.19%	247,284	0.10%	235.876
Exempt	297.890	0	297.890	0.05%	0	0.00%	0.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>548,934.280</b>	<b>258,940,658</b>	<b>548,934.280</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>258,940,658</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>471.715</b>

\* 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)**

68 Perkins

	<b>2007 CTL County Total</b>	<b>2008 Form 45 County Total</b>	<b>Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>2008 Growth (New Construction Value)</b>	<b>% Change excl. Growth</b>
1. Residential	54,555,902	56,840,846	2,284,944	4.19	545,970	3.19
2. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	24,591,651	26,522,456	1,930,805	7.85	*-----	7.85
<b>4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>79,147,553</b>	<b>83,363,302</b>	<b>4,215,749</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>545,970</b>	<b>4.64</b>
5. Commercial	32,159,006	33,398,532	1,239,526	3.85	1,282,584	-0.13
6. Industrial	107,970	66,998	-40,972	-37.95	0	-37.95
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	8,388,950	8,685,624	296,674	3.54	349,676	-0.63
8. Minerals	0	540,668	540,668		534,260	
<b>9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>40,655,926</b>	<b>42,691,822</b>	<b>2,035,896</b>	<b>5.01</b>	<b>1,282,584</b>	<b>0.54</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>119,803,479</b>	<b>126,055,124</b>	<b>6,251,645</b>	<b>5.22</b>	<b>2,712,490</b>	<b>2.95</b>
11. Irrigated	115,835,381	126,060,776	10,225,395	8.83		
12. Dryland	104,332,619	111,289,240	6,956,621	6.67		
13. Grassland	16,955,410	20,952,705	3,997,295	23.58		
14. Wasteland	429,913	390,653	-39,260	-9.13		
15. Other Agland	79,277	79,277	168,007	211.92		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>237,632,600</b>	<b>258,940,658</b>	<b>21,308,058</b>	<b>8.97</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)</b>	<b>357,436,079</b>	<b>384,995,782</b>	<b>27,559,703</b>	<b>7.71</b>	<b>2,712,490</b>	<b>6.95</b>

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

**2007 Plan of Assessment for Perkins County  
Assessment Years 2008, 2009, and 2010  
Date: June 15, 2007**

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

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

**Real Property Assessment Requirements:**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112(Reissue 2006).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-5023(2), 77-1344.

**General Description of Real Property in Perkins County\***

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Total Value	% of Taxable Value Base		
Residential	1199	25.5%	\$87,559,486	24.5%		
Commercial & Industrial	265	5.5%	\$32,301,346	9%		
Agricultural	2993	64%	\$237,657,665	66.5%		
Tax Exempt TIF	231 1	5%				
Total	4689	100%	\$357,518,497	100%		

\*2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property

Agricultural land – taxable acres – 549,291 acres

Other pertinent facts: 66.5% of Perkins County Valuation is agricultural and of that 66.5%, the primary land use is dry but the greatest amount of valuation is in irrigated land with \$116 million of value.

New Property: For assessment year 2007, an estimated 125 building or improvement statements or zoning permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

**Current Resources**

A. Staff/Budget/Training

Staff

1 Assessor

1 Deputy Assessor

Temporary or Seasonal employees as needed and budget allows



### Contract Appraiser

Knoche Appraisal and Consulting will be contracted for 2008 to review the new ethanol plant in Madrid, the new bio-diesel plant in Grant and all large commercial facilities including elevators, hog farms and landfill. Pritchett & Abbott of Fort Worth, Texas will be contracted to value our mineral interests in Perkins County.

### Budget Request

2007-08 Assessor = \$80,246

2007-08 Reappraisal = \$32,000

The purchase of a Geographic Information System was approved in June, 2005. The total cost of the GIS will run approximately \$60,000 to be paid over a three year period. The maps and pictures were loaded on the office computer summer, 2006. Of the reappraisal budget, \$20,000 is for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and final installment for GIS and an additional \$12,000 is requested for 2008 to fund the appraisal of the ethanol plant, the bio-diesel plant and all large commercial facilities along with the appraisal of the mineral interests in the county. All other work is done in office by the staff available and the budget available in the Assessor's budget.

### Training

The Assessor holds a current Assessor Certification dated September 21, 1995. The Deputy Assessor holds a current Assessor Certification dated February 7, 2002.

B. Cadastral Maps - Cadastral maps of agricultural land used in the Assessor's office have been scanned by GIS Workshop as part of the upgrade to a GIS system. The office staff is currently working on updating the land use maps on GIS. Aerial photos of rural sites have also been taken and have been attached to our Terra-Scan files.

C. Property Record Cards – Hard copies and electronic copies of the property record cards are maintained. The information contained within these property record cards meets the requirements of the law. Property record cards are available to the public on our website, [perkins.gisworkshop.com](http://perkins.gisworkshop.com).

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS- Computer services are contracted through ASI/Terra Scan. The Assessor's office has both the administrative and CAMA package in operation. We have been with Terra Scan since June, 1998. GIS was implemented in summer, 2006 and our website came on line February, 2007. The website is updated nightly by GIS Workshop.

### **Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property – Building permits are provided from the city of Grant on a monthly basis, and by the village of Madrid at the end of each year. No building permits are provided to the assessor's office from Elsie or Venango. Zoning permits are provided to the assessor's office by the Zoning Administrator. These building and zoning permits help us to list new construction in the incorporated areas. Zoning permits are not required for agricultural buildings. Improvement statements are filed by the office personnel whenever new construction is observed or reported. Notice is published at the end of each year to remind the taxpayers that an improvement statement must be filed with the County Assessor on all improvements to real property amounting to a value of two thousand five hundred dollars or more.
- B. Data Collection – Data collection is done yearly on different parts of the county. For the 2005 appraisal year, complete data collection was done on the rural residential. For 2006, data collection was done on Grant, Grant Suburban and Kenton Heights consisting of a questionnaire to all residential property owners, and new pictures and measurements when needed. For 2007, data collection consisting of a questionnaire to all residential property owners and new pictures and measurement when needed was done on Madrid, Elsie, Venango, Grinton, and Brandon.
- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions- Assessment sales ratios are reviewed yearly to determine what areas need to be adjusted.

D. Approaches to Value

- 1) Market Approach; sales comparisons- Residential and Commercial sales books are kept updated when new sales are processed.
- 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study. – The 06/04 Marshall and Swift costs are used for the residential reappraisal. A current depreciation study is done yearly and implemented on whatever part of the county that is being revalued.
- 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market. – An income approach to value is done by the contracted appraiser when they appraise our commercial facilities.
- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas- Sales Books are kept updated on all vacant land sales. Agricultural sales books are kept updated as are maps of sales of specific land use.
- 5) Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions-A complete review of sales ratios is done after the yearly assessment actions to determine the new ratios.

F. Notices and Public Relations – Notices are published timely to notify the public.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2006**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	99.0	11.15	105.52
Commercial	94.0	22.92	107.19
Agricultural	72.0	10.41	100.90

## **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008**

### ***Residential***

Appraisal maintenance will be done on residential properties for 2008, since all the residential properties were reappraised in 2005, 2006, and 2007. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for residential properties.

***Commercial*** Knoche Appraisal & Consulting will be contracted to appraise the new ethanol plant in Madrid, the new bio-diesel plant in Grant and all large commercial facilities including elevators, hog farms and landfill. Pritchett & Abbott of Fort Worth, Texas will be contracted to value our mineral interests in Perkins County.

All commercial property will be updated and revalued in 2008. There are approximately 265 commercial parcels in Perkins County and this review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property with new digital pictures if needed and interior inspections if possible. Sales review and pick-up work will be done. Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

### ***Agricultural***

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, will be completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book trying to determine value of the pivot in an irrigated land sale.

## **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009**

### ***Residential***

Rural residential property will be updated and revalued for 2009. There are approximately 500 rural parcels in Perkins County. These parcels were all inspected in 2005 so the review will consist of a questionnaire mailed to home owners concerning changes made since 2005. These properties will be valued using the most recent M & S cost tables available and a market derived depreciation and sales approach to value. Appraisal maintenance will be done on all other residential property, which includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of lots in towns, and sales of rural properties will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

### ***Commercial***

Appraisal maintenance will be done on commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

### ***Agricultural***

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book of pivots in irrigated land sales.

## **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010**

### ***Residential***

For 2010, all residential property in Grant including lot values will be updated and revalued. This review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property along with verifying information located on the property record card. New digital pictures will be taken. Questionnaires will be mailed to all owners to verify information located on the property record card. There are approximately 500 parcels in Grant. These properties will be valued using the most recent M & S cost tables and a market derived depreciation table and sales approach to value. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for residential properties.

### ***Commercial***

Appraisal maintenance will be done on commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

### ***Agricultural***

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book trying to determine value of the pivot in an irrigated land sale.

The following is a time line table to give an overview of the narrative portion of the plan.

Class		2008	2009	2010	
Residential		Appraisal Maintenance of all residential	Review of All rural Residential Property(500)	Review of Grant property (500)	
Commercial		Review of All Commercial Properties in County(265)	Appraisal Maintenance Of all Commercial	Appraisal Maintenance Of all Commercial	
Agricultural		Market analysis by land classification	Market analysis by land classification	Market analysis by land classification	

**Other functions performed by the assessor’s office, but not limited to:**

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA & T, rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property

j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property - administer annual filing of approximately 655 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions - administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions - administer approximately 130 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA & T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list corrections documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide information.
12. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearing before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education/Assessor Education – attend meeting, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.



**Conclusion:**

For 2008, Perkins County will see many changes affecting the valuation of the County. We should see substantial growth in value with the new Rockies Express Pipeline that should be completed in our county by the end of 2007 along with the producing mineral interests south of Grant and the pipeline that has been laid to transport this gas north. The new ethanol plant should be in full production for 2008 and their personal property will also increase the counties overall valuation.

Purchasing a Geographical Information System is a step has helped our office to be more efficient. As of February, 2007, the property records from the assessor's office are accessible on the internet. After the completion of all the work on the GIS maps, these also will be on the internet to be accessed by different county departments including the Sheriff's Department, Planning and Zoning, Weed and Road along with the public.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year.

Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept, of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$80,246
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$10,400
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	N/A
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$700.00
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$32,000 (Commercial update costs and Oil & Gas Appraisals; \$20,000 for GIS)
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$69,146
13.	<b>Total budget:</b>
	\$112,246

	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
a.	Yes, \$4,282 was the balance not spent.

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes since 1991.
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?    Grant and Madrid</b>
	Grant and Madrid
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>

	2001
--	------

**D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Pritchard & Abbott is contracted for operating mineral appraisals.
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	TerraScan



## 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 Perkins County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5906.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division



## Valuation History Charts