

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

73 Red Willow

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	375	COD	18.21
Total Sales Price	\$24,314,292	PRD	107.54
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$24,284,292	COV	27.22
Total Assessed Value	\$22,428,363	STD	27.03
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$64,758	Avg. Abs. Dev.	17.36
Avg. Assessed Value	\$59,809	Min	37.79
Median	95.37	Max	333.33
Wgt. Mean	92.36	95% Median C.I.	93.83 to 96.89
Mean	99.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	90.53 to 94.19
		95% Mean C.I.	96.58 to 102.06
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			42.89
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			7.7
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			8.85
Average Assessed Value of the Base			52,021

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	375	95.37	18.21	107.54
2007	379	93.71	16.86	105.81
2006	411	95.98	17.25	106.94
2005	479	97.42	15.14	106.19
2004	509	97.22	19.70	107.19
2003	485	95	25.75	110
2002	468	94	23.39	107.84
2001	514	95	25.32	105.54

2008 Commission Summary

73 Red Willow

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	31	COD	23.41
Total Sales Price	\$4,736,475	PRD	103.07
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,374,275	COV	35.70
Total Assessed Value	\$4,013,725	STD	33.76
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$141,106	Avg. Abs. Dev.	22.47
Avg. Assessed Value	\$129,475	Min	18.85
Median	96.00	Max	195.43
Wgt. Mean	91.76	95% Median C.I.	80.00 to 100.00
Mean	94.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	76.72 to 106.79
		95% Mean C.I.	82.19 to 106.96
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			15.65
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			4.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.34
Average Assessed Value of the Base			127,044

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	31	96.00	23.41	103.07
2007	25	97.38	20.97	106.64
2006	27	96.09	20.11	95.57
2005	43	96.09	25.75	99.38
2004	55	95.65	24.31	99.09
2003	57	96	18.85	95.17
2002	78	98	26.15	108.34
2001	84	100	29.1	111.23

2008 Commission Summary

73 Red Willow

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	52	COD	24.70
Total Sales Price	\$7,389,045	PRD	109.43
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,143,420	COV	40.87
Total Assessed Value	\$4,875,197	STD	30.53
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$137,373	Avg. Abs. Dev.	17.68
Avg. Assessed Value	\$93,754	Min	14.47
Median	71.59	Max	190.50
Wgt. Mean	68.25	95% Median C.I.	67.09 to 75.32
Mean	74.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	61.98 to 74.51
		95% Mean C.I.	66.39 to 82.98
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			36.69
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			2.07
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.32
Average Assessed Value of the Base			86,186

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	52	71.59	24.70	109.43
2007	48	71.69	26.81	108.15
2006	41	75.82	18.79	103.26
2005	48	76.33	15.56	102.21
2004	47	73.86	19.24	103.65
2003	60	76	18.81	103.54
2002	68	75	18.67	101.12
2001	69	75	17.78	100.27

2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County is 95% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Red Willow 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 Red Willow County is 96% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Red Willow 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 Red Willow County is 72% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Red Willow 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:	376	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	28.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.40 to 96.14	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,322,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.85 to 93.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,294,292	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.84	95% Mean C.I.:	95.40 to 100.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,279,213							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,612	COD:	18.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,253	PRD:	107.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.35			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:16

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	50	95.06	96.05	91.91	15.85	104.51	53.96	167.78	87.16 to 99.99	73,513	67,566
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	45	92.87	96.08	88.56	14.03	108.49	69.40	137.46	89.60 to 99.12	74,096	65,618
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	35	92.50	92.57	87.60	12.87	105.68	62.88	134.13	85.55 to 95.39	59,828	52,407
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	52	91.76	98.23	90.47	19.21	108.58	61.74	333.33	85.13 to 96.20	69,765	63,113
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	69	99.31	100.57	95.19	17.66	105.66	40.09	191.07	95.03 to 103.82	63,067	60,031
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	42	96.66	107.34	99.71	23.18	107.65	45.20	226.72	93.40 to 105.43	48,504	48,365
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	34	96.49	96.46	94.96	22.61	101.58	34.50	153.26	86.51 to 110.42	49,264	46,781
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	49	93.53	96.31	87.69	23.16	109.83	20.35	202.16	88.08 to 103.06	71,400	62,608
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	182	92.69	96.01	89.91	15.88	106.78	53.96	333.33	91.02 to 94.71	69,955	62,897
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	194	96.85	100.24	93.68	21.20	107.00	20.35	226.72	94.60 to 99.97	59,600	55,834
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	198	95.11	99.98	93.22	18.86	107.25	40.09	333.33	93.52 to 96.97	61,165	57,018
<u>ALL</u>											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	69.96	69.96	69.96			69.96	69.96	N/A	45,000	31,484
BARTLEY	11	96.89	93.85	84.81	20.59	110.66	50.00	168.10	61.74 to 110.42	33,454	28,372
DANBURY	4	95.57	84.85	97.28	19.12	87.22	42.00	106.28	N/A	16,500	16,051
INDIANOLA	22	91.76	99.52	84.56	27.49	117.69	53.96	202.16	76.71 to 118.50	43,852	37,080
LEBANON	2	101.05	101.05	96.71	4.96	104.48	96.03	106.06	N/A	6,437	6,226
MCCOOK	296	95.37	100.47	93.02	18.36	108.01	37.79	333.33	93.71 to 97.38	64,075	59,602
RURAL	18	87.01	83.04	85.29	17.42	97.37	34.50	125.30	73.33 to 94.72	82,577	70,429
SUB MCCOOK	22	91.93	84.26	89.45	16.08	94.20	20.35	109.86	76.79 to 97.24	108,404	96,963
<u>ALL</u>											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

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	336	95.37	99.92	92.44	18.95	108.09	37.79	333.33	93.70 to 96.94	60,782	56,185
2	23	92.63	84.71	89.57	15.37	94.57	20.35	109.86	80.77 to 95.74	106,300	95,218
3	17	85.67	82.36	84.89	18.12	97.01	34.50	125.30	73.08 to 96.22	83,905	71,229
<u>ALL</u>											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

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:	376	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	28.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.40 to 96.14	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,322,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.85 to 93.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,294,292	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.84	95% Mean C.I.:	95.40 to 100.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,279,213							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,612	COD:	18.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,253	PRD:	107.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.35			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:16

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	361	94.72	99.03	91.89	17.80	107.78	37.79	333.33	93.53 to 96.18	66,692	61,280
2	15	68.31	77.97	71.91	55.09	108.43	20.35	202.16	40.09 to 103.06	14,553	10,465
____ALL____											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	360	94.76	98.30	91.76	18.74	107.13	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.22	66,268	60,804
06											
07	16	92.44	95.88	88.98	20.99	107.75	61.24	191.07	73.08 to 100.52	27,356	24,342
____ALL____											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	1	94.44	94.44	94.44			94.44	94.44	N/A	31,800	30,031
44-0001	1	62.98	62.98	62.98			62.98	62.98	N/A	152,500	96,052
73-0017	325	94.96	99.05	92.81	18.17	106.73	20.35	333.33	93.70 to 96.44	66,940	62,125
73-0179	49	91.03	93.29	83.35	23.59	111.92	40.09	202.16	80.36 to 96.89	48,049	40,049
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

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:	376	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	28.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.40 to 96.14	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,322,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.85 to 93.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,294,292	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.84	95% Mean C.I.:	95.40 to 100.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,279,213							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,612	COD:	18.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,253	PRD:	107.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.35			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:16

YEAR BUILT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
0 OR Blank	22	89.69	94.66	81.11	46.40	116.71	20.35	333.33	45.20 to 106.06	18,044	14,636	
Prior TO 1860												
1860 TO 1899	13	89.35	98.43	93.82	20.25	104.91	70.83	159.00	77.84 to 115.64	32,838	30,810	
1900 TO 1919	52	97.99	102.61	93.04	22.68	110.29	50.00	168.10	89.60 to 110.42	42,722	39,746	
1920 TO 1939	81	96.97	102.97	95.24	18.42	108.11	37.79	226.72	94.61 to 103.68	49,334	46,988	
1940 TO 1949	29	94.27	100.80	97.75	16.57	103.11	73.32	162.41	87.10 to 107.52	58,360	57,050	
1950 TO 1959	58	94.88	99.37	93.16	18.41	106.67	60.35	187.17	87.16 to 102.53	58,283	54,296	
1960 TO 1969	53	93.76	93.47	91.88	11.65	101.73	61.24	134.13	87.94 to 98.10	84,283	77,440	
1970 TO 1979	31	91.10	93.41	87.24	17.02	107.07	62.88	191.07	81.73 to 94.71	80,770	70,465	
1980 TO 1989	19	92.49	93.03	91.07	11.31	102.15	73.41	124.67	83.85 to 101.68	120,973	110,176	
1990 TO 1994	4	95.38	92.71	92.17	5.05	100.59	80.77	99.31	N/A	166,625	153,577	
1995 TO 1999	7	84.75	86.10	83.91	11.35	102.61	73.08	100.52	73.08 to 100.52	149,900	125,779	
2000 TO Present	7	88.34	86.36	83.98	7.58	102.83	69.45	97.66	69.45 to 97.66	170,659	143,321	
ALL	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253	

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	6	112.28	145.48	139.83	64.59	104.04	42.00	333.33	42.00 to 333.33	1,979	2,767	
5000 TO 9999	14	94.84	104.93	101.90	36.48	102.97	34.50	226.72	80.66 to 158.41	7,607	7,751	
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	20	98.30	117.09	105.71	47.80	110.77	34.50	333.33	80.81 to 122.58	5,918	6,256	
10000 TO 29999	71	111.32	113.24	113.11	24.25	100.11	20.35	191.07	96.38 to 126.00	19,034	21,529	
30000 TO 59999	109	99.00	97.89	97.14	15.55	100.77	45.20	137.46	94.29 to 101.32	45,623	44,320	
60000 TO 99999	113	93.70	93.15	92.92	10.83	100.25	37.79	130.15	91.03 to 95.18	78,162	72,628	
100000 TO 149999	43	86.55	86.95	86.70	10.81	100.28	67.86	124.67	80.33 to 91.43	120,848	104,778	
150000 TO 249999	16	79.77	79.26	79.29	8.89	99.96	62.98	95.03	70.26 to 83.85	169,633	134,506	
250000 TO 499999	4	85.33	83.96	83.90	13.29	100.08	69.45	95.74	N/A	277,122	232,492	
ALL	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253	

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:	376	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	28.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.40 to 96.14	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,322,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.85 to 93.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,294,292	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.84	95% Mean C.I.:	95.40 to 100.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,279,213							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,612	COD:	18.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,253	PRD:	107.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.35			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:16

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	8	56.42	63.72	46.88	53.87	135.93	20.35	118.50	20.35 to 118.50	5,121	2,401
5000 TO 9999	14	89.41	108.52	80.14	46.83	135.41	40.09	333.33	61.24 to 122.58	9,014	7,224
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	22	80.94	92.23	71.99	48.17	128.11	20.35	333.33	49.77 to 104.28	7,598	5,470
10000 TO 29999	73	101.04	107.64	95.77	25.26	112.39	37.79	226.72	95.39 to 116.56	21,953	21,025
30000 TO 59999	115	96.44	99.68	94.60	17.63	105.38	55.68	187.17	92.69 to 100.52	47,606	45,034
60000 TO 99999	122	93.85	95.50	92.79	12.72	102.92	62.98	137.46	91.03 to 95.67	84,349	78,270
100000 TO 149999	37	91.23	89.94	88.23	10.79	101.94	69.40	124.67	83.85 to 95.35	136,651	120,568
150000 TO 249999	5	76.43	80.10	78.97	8.79	101.43	69.45	95.03	N/A	230,203	181,802
250000 TO 499999	2	95.30	95.30	95.30	0.46	100.00	94.86	95.74	N/A	276,000	263,021
ALL _____											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	19	81.07	95.18	74.39	57.94	127.96	20.35	333.33	42.00 to 118.50	12,009	8,933
10	1	75.47	75.47	75.47			75.47	75.47	N/A	90,000	67,920
20	41	97.66	103.15	99.55	17.04	103.62	50.00	158.17	93.88 to 108.17	29,468	29,335
25	37	97.24	102.50	96.18	19.83	106.58	60.35	187.17	92.69 to 108.91	45,405	43,670
30	261	93.76	97.21	91.68	16.68	106.03	37.79	226.72	91.93 to 95.40	70,900	65,003
35	11	95.43	104.31	92.74	17.86	112.48	76.43	191.07	76.45 to 120.88	103,618	96,090
40	5	83.81	85.19	86.48	9.32	98.51	75.75	95.74	N/A	232,326	200,906
45	1	69.45	69.45	69.45			69.45	69.45	N/A	281,489	195,484
ALL _____											
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14	64,612	59,253

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:	376	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	28.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.40 to 96.14	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,322,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.85 to 93.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,294,292	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.84	95% Mean C.I.:	95.40 to 100.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,279,213							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,612	COD:	18.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,253	PRD:	107.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.35			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:16

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	19	81.07	95.18	74.39	57.94	127.96	20.35	333.33	42.00 to 118.50		12,009	8,933
100	16	92.44	95.88	88.98	20.99	107.75	61.24	191.07	73.08 to 100.52		27,356	24,342
101	298	94.66	98.71	91.96	17.54	107.33	37.79	226.72	92.86 to 96.20		66,291	60,963
102	14	94.19	94.42	91.46	10.08	103.24	69.40	114.02	85.65 to 110.21		101,129	92,491
103	4	83.34	84.99	78.41	15.78	108.39	70.26	103.02	N/A		121,875	95,561
104	14	98.24	102.13	95.48	17.68	106.96	69.66	131.49	80.21 to 128.10		64,614	61,694
106	2	95.05	95.05	95.14	1.23	99.90	93.88	96.22	N/A		49,000	46,619
111	3	92.29	86.63	87.34	10.28	99.19	69.58	98.03	N/A		130,333	113,838
304	4	102.36	103.30	99.29	10.38	104.04	83.81	124.67	N/A		115,657	114,838
305	2	104.01	104.01	103.35	7.28	100.64	96.44	111.58	N/A		57,000	58,908
<u>ALL</u>												
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14		64,612	59,253

CONDITION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	19	81.07	95.18	74.39	57.94	127.96	20.35	333.33	42.00 to 118.50		12,009	8,933
10	7	108.17	119.48	111.31	28.66	107.33	70.83	226.72	70.83 to 226.72		11,811	13,148
15	5	113.15	118.33	116.84	17.13	101.28	94.61	159.00	N/A		16,400	19,162
20	37	111.32	114.42	108.48	21.58	105.47	37.79	191.07	96.38 to 129.80		26,489	28,735
25	50	97.91	99.41	95.68	18.80	103.90	55.68	153.26	87.25 to 106.91		43,128	41,266
30	185	93.95	96.79	92.14	14.45	105.04	50.00	187.17	92.07 to 95.42		79,046	72,835
35	47	90.71	92.23	88.85	13.17	103.80	67.86	165.98	84.09 to 96.08		85,856	76,286
40	22	89.49	87.08	82.58	17.21	105.45	53.96	147.93	69.66 to 99.99		87,476	72,239
50	3	77.39	75.24	71.34	13.09	105.46	58.97	89.35	N/A		39,366	28,085
60	1	96.81	96.81	96.81			96.81	96.81	N/A		63,500	61,475
<u>ALL</u>												
	376	94.66	98.19	91.71	18.84	107.07	20.35	333.33	93.40 to 96.14		64,612	59,253

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

Residential

All rural residential sites and farm sites up to twenty acres were revalued based on an analysis of the market.

Within the City of McCook the lot values in Golf Course Subdivision increased based on market activity. All sales within the various market areas of McCook were reviewed this year to better define problem areas in preparation for future reappraisal work.

All pickup work was completed for assessment year 2008.

2008 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	The assessor and staff.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The office staff.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June of 2002
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2004 for McCook and Suburban; 2005 for Indianola, Bartley, and neighborhoods 1205, 1505, and 2505; 2006 for Rural and rural subdivisions; 2007 for Danbury, Lebanon, Marion and mobile homes, and a subclass within Indianola based on effective age of 7-15 years.
6.	What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
	2007
7.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:
	18 – The City of McCook and 10 neighborhoods within, the suburban area, 4 villages, the rural area and a rural subdivision.
8.	How are these defined?
	By geographical boundaries and similar characteristics.
9.	Is “Assessor Location” a usable valuation identity?
	Yes
10.	Does the assessor location “suburban” mean something other than rural residential? <i>(that is, does the “suburban” location have its own market?)</i>
	Yes

11.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	There is a three mile radius around the City of McCook that has been designated as suburban and has been determined to be its own market area.
12.	Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
	Yes

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
74		42	116

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:	375	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.22	95% Median C.I.:	93.83 to 96.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,314,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 94.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,284,292	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.58 to 102.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,428,363							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,758	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,808	PRD:	107.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.79			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:06

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>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	50	95.06	96.59	92.66	16.11	104.24	53.96	167.78	87.16 to 99.99	73,513	68,117
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	45	94.29	97.44	89.70	14.38	108.63	69.40	147.85	89.60 to 99.12	74,096	66,467
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	34	93.77	93.64	88.28	13.31	106.07	62.88	134.13	85.55 to 97.27	61,352	54,162
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	52	92.39	98.81	90.72	18.42	108.91	61.74	333.33	87.04 to 96.20	69,727	63,258
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	69	99.31	100.88	95.68	17.16	105.43	49.31	191.07	95.18 to 103.68	63,067	60,344
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	42	97.30	108.85	100.62	21.85	108.18	49.77	226.72	94.61 to 105.43	48,504	48,804
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	34	98.47	100.76	95.93	18.97	105.03	42.00	153.26	90.03 to 111.39	49,264	47,259
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	49	93.94	96.96	88.04	22.43	110.13	37.79	202.16	88.08 to 103.06	71,400	62,859
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	181	93.68	96.88	90.62	15.86	106.92	53.96	333.33	91.10 to 95.68	70,286	63,689
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	194	97.31	101.59	94.27	19.94	107.76	37.79	226.72	95.18 to 100.48	59,600	56,188
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	197	96.03	100.78	93.75	18.19	107.50	49.31	333.33	93.76 to 97.40	61,424	57,586
<u>ALL</u>											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BARTLEY	10	97.15	95.15	84.90	20.93	112.08	50.00	168.10	61.74 to 110.42	36,000	30,563
DANBURY	4	95.57	84.85	97.28	19.12	87.22	42.00	106.28	N/A	16,500	16,051
INDIANOLA	22	91.76	99.46	84.49	27.56	117.71	53.96	202.16	76.71 to 118.50	43,852	37,051
LEBANON	2	97.85	97.85	96.28	1.85	101.63	96.03	99.66	N/A	6,437	6,198
MCCOOK	297	95.68	100.99	93.46	18.14	108.06	37.79	333.33	93.94 to 97.67	64,004	59,817
RURAL	18	94.12	92.76	87.84	12.89	105.61	64.30	130.78	80.95 to 100.00	82,577	72,533
SUB MCCOOK	22	92.52	86.71	90.55	13.96	95.76	48.44	109.86	80.77 to 97.66	108,404	98,158
<u>ALL</u>											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

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	335	95.68	100.50	92.90	18.72	108.18	37.79	333.33	93.94 to 97.38	60,934	56,606
2	23	93.81	87.06	90.65	13.21	96.04	48.44	109.86	85.55 to 97.24	106,300	96,361
3	17	93.88	92.65	87.55	13.63	105.83	64.30	130.78	78.90 to 100.51	83,905	73,456
<u>ALL</u>											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

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:	375	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.22	95% Median C.I.:	93.83 to 96.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,314,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 94.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,284,292	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.58 to 102.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,428,363							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,758	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,808	PRD:	107.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.79			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:06

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	361	95.21	99.46	92.36	17.80	107.68	37.79	333.33	93.76 to 96.81	66,686	61,594
2	14	98.78	95.74	91.74	27.69	104.36	42.00	202.16	49.31 to 119.29	15,021	13,780
____ALL____											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	359	95.42	99.47	92.41	18.09	107.64	37.79	333.33	93.88 to 97.24	66,425	61,381
06											
07	16	92.44	96.03	89.63	20.83	107.14	61.24	191.07	75.52 to 100.52	27,356	24,520
____ALL____											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	31,800	30,931
44-0001	1	64.30	64.30	64.30			64.30	64.30	N/A	152,500	98,062
73-0017	325	95.67	100.20	93.39	17.53	107.30	37.79	333.33	93.94 to 97.38	66,934	62,507
73-0179	48	91.82	94.12	84.58	23.12	111.28	42.00	202.16	80.36 to 97.40	48,883	41,344
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

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:	375	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.22	95% Median C.I.:	93.83 to 96.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,314,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 94.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,284,292	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.58 to 102.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,428,363							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,758	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,808	PRD:	107.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.79			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:06

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	21	97.81	106.94	91.45	33.02	116.94	42.00	333.33	81.07 to 111.39	18,522	16,939
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	13	89.35	98.64	94.65	20.02	104.22	70.83	159.00	78.47 to 115.64	32,838	31,080
1900 TO 1919	52	97.99	102.94	93.71	22.34	109.85	50.00	168.10	89.60 to 110.42	42,722	40,035
1920 TO 1939	81	96.97	103.21	95.50	18.29	108.07	37.79	226.72	94.61 to 102.29	49,334	47,115
1940 TO 1949	29	94.27	100.80	97.75	16.57	103.11	73.32	162.41	87.10 to 107.52	58,360	57,050
1950 TO 1959	58	95.78	100.65	94.06	19.23	107.01	60.35	187.17	88.51 to 106.91	58,249	54,788
1960 TO 1969	53	93.95	93.71	92.10	11.82	101.75	61.24	134.13	87.94 to 99.33	84,283	77,620
1970 TO 1979	31	91.10	93.58	87.47	16.86	106.99	62.88	191.07	81.73 to 94.71	80,770	70,646
1980 TO 1989	19	92.49	93.79	91.58	12.11	102.42	73.41	124.67	83.85 to 105.43	120,973	110,782
1990 TO 1994	4	96.49	93.27	92.80	5.19	100.50	80.77	99.31	N/A	166,625	154,631
1995 TO 1999	7	84.75	87.19	85.35	10.05	102.17	75.52	100.52	75.52 to 100.52	149,900	127,932
2000 TO Present	7	88.34	87.27	84.99	7.43	102.68	71.13	97.66	71.13 to 97.66	170,659	145,052
ALL	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	109.08	144.41	139.36	67.46	103.63	42.00	333.33	42.00 to 333.33	1,979	2,758
5000 TO 9999	13	100.63	117.59	115.78	27.13	101.56	80.66	226.72	85.10 to 158.41	7,576	8,772
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	19	100.63	126.06	118.32	41.66	106.54	42.00	333.33	85.10 to 158.41	5,809	6,873
10000 TO 29999	71	113.13	115.06	115.29	23.85	99.80	48.44	191.07	96.38 to 126.31	19,034	21,944
30000 TO 59999	109	99.31	98.50	97.65	14.74	100.87	50.00	137.46	95.21 to 101.53	45,605	44,533
60000 TO 99999	113	93.76	93.55	93.36	10.89	100.20	37.79	130.78	91.03 to 95.67	78,162	72,971
100000 TO 149999	43	86.55	87.35	87.14	10.49	100.24	67.86	124.67	81.14 to 91.43	120,848	105,304
150000 TO 249999	16	80.03	79.87	79.97	8.75	99.88	64.30	97.24	71.09 to 85.75	169,633	135,656
250000 TO 499999	4	86.52	84.98	84.91	11.93	100.08	71.13	95.74	N/A	277,122	235,315
ALL	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

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:	375	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.22	95% Median C.I.:	93.83 to 96.89	(! Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,314,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 94.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,284,292	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.58 to 102.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,428,363							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,758	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,808	PRD:	107.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.79			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:07

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	5	81.07	82.41	81.90	25.98	100.63	42.00	118.50	N/A	2,675	2,190
5000 TO 9999	14	94.84	110.48	86.11	43.02	128.31	48.44	333.33	61.24 to 122.58	8,221	7,079
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	19	93.71	103.10	85.67	38.70	120.34	42.00	333.33	68.88 to 104.28	6,761	5,792
10000 TO 29999	73	99.97	108.14	96.74	25.16	111.78	37.79	226.72	95.39 to 116.56	21,456	20,756
30000 TO 59999	116	97.34	100.95	95.90	17.70	105.27	58.97	187.17	93.88 to 100.90	47,014	45,086
60000 TO 99999	122	93.94	95.58	93.02	12.73	102.76	64.30	137.46	91.03 to 96.81	83,997	78,131
100000 TO 149999	38	91.16	89.98	88.34	10.66	101.86	69.40	124.67	83.85 to 95.37	136,450	120,544
150000 TO 249999	5	79.29	82.32	81.16	8.50	101.42	71.13	97.24	N/A	230,203	186,837
250000 TO 499999	2	95.30	95.30	95.30	0.46	100.00	94.86	95.74	N/A	276,000	263,021
ALL _____											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	18	99.70	109.60	93.39	36.45	117.36	42.00	333.33	81.07 to 118.50	12,231	11,423
10	1	75.47	75.47	75.47			75.47	75.47	N/A	90,000	67,920
20	41	99.00	103.88	99.85	17.18	104.03	50.00	158.17	93.88 to 111.32	29,419	29,375
25	37	97.24	102.50	96.18	19.83	106.58	60.35	187.17	92.69 to 108.91	45,405	43,670
30	261	94.27	97.68	92.15	16.75	106.00	37.79	226.72	92.07 to 96.14	70,900	65,332
35	11	97.24	104.36	93.35	16.80	111.79	76.45	191.07	79.29 to 120.88	103,618	96,727
40	5	85.75	86.60	87.69	7.92	98.76	78.18	95.74	N/A	232,326	203,723
45	1	71.13	71.13	71.13			71.13	71.13	N/A	281,489	200,210
ALL _____											
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89	64,758	59,808

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:	375	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.22	95% Median C.I.:	93.83 to 96.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,314,292	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 94.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,284,292	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.58 to 102.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,428,363							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	64,758	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	333.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,808	PRD:	107.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.79			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:07

STYLE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	18	99.70	109.60	93.39	36.45	117.36	42.00	333.33	81.07 to 118.50		12,231	11,423
100	16	92.44	96.03	89.63	20.83	107.14	61.24	191.07	75.52 to 100.52		27,356	24,520
101	298	95.28	99.19	92.46	17.58	107.28	37.79	226.72	93.53 to 96.94		66,284	61,285
102	14	94.19	94.62	91.71	9.87	103.17	69.40	114.02	85.65 to 110.21		101,129	92,743
103	4	83.34	84.99	78.41	15.78	108.39	70.26	103.02	N/A		121,875	95,561
104	14	98.24	102.53	96.00	17.27	106.80	71.09	131.49	80.21 to 128.10		64,614	62,032
106	2	97.19	97.19	97.46	3.41	99.72	93.88	100.51	N/A		49,000	47,757
111	3	92.29	86.63	87.34	10.28	99.19	69.58	98.03	N/A		130,333	113,838
304	4	102.36	103.79	100.16	9.91	103.62	85.75	124.67	N/A		115,657	115,838
305	2	104.01	104.01	103.35	7.28	100.64	96.44	111.58	N/A		57,000	58,908
<u>ALL</u>												
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89		64,758	59,808

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	18	99.70	109.60	93.39	36.45	117.36	42.00	333.33	81.07 to 118.50		12,231	11,423
10	7	108.17	119.48	111.31	28.66	107.33	70.83	226.72	70.83 to 226.72		11,811	13,148
15	5	113.15	118.33	116.84	17.13	101.28	94.61	159.00	N/A		16,400	19,162
20	37	111.62	114.29	108.49	20.79	105.35	37.79	191.07	97.27 to 129.09		26,489	28,737
25	50	97.91	99.76	96.38	18.44	103.51	60.35	153.26	87.25 to 106.91		43,128	41,566
30	185	94.50	97.55	92.73	14.84	105.20	50.00	187.17	92.29 to 96.68		79,035	73,288
35	47	90.71	92.28	88.96	12.91	103.73	67.86	165.98	84.20 to 96.08		85,856	76,380
40	22	89.49	87.33	83.10	16.92	105.09	53.96	147.93	71.13 to 99.99		87,476	72,696
50	3	77.39	75.24	71.34	13.09	105.46	58.97	89.35	N/A		39,366	28,085
60	1	96.81	96.81	96.81			96.81	96.81	N/A		63,500	61,475
<u>ALL</u>												
	375	95.37	99.32	92.36	18.21	107.54	37.79	333.33	93.83 to 96.89		64,758	59,808

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the 2008 residential statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the residential property in Red Willow County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the required parameter. Both qualitative measures are above the acceptable level but based on the assessment actions, and the relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median, it would suggest that the assessment practices are applied uniform and proportionately to the sales file and the population.

For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the residential class of property in Red Willow County and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio. There is no recommended adjustment for the residential class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	506	375	74.11
2007	496	379	76.41
2006	542	411	75.83
2005	580	479	82.59
2004	605	509	84.13
2003	570	485	85.09
2002	564	470	83.33
2001	608	514	84.54

RESIDENTIAL: The utilization grid is demonstrating a slight decrease in the percent of sales used; however there is only a minimal difference in the total number of sales and the qualified sales for 2007 versus 2008. Red Willow County continues to review and use a high proportion of the available residential sales in the measurement of the residential class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	94.66	0.4	95.04	95.37
2007	92.50	-0.04	92.46	93.71
2006	95.18	0.95	96.09	95.98
2005	95.85	1.89	97.66	97.42
2004	93.32	3.8	96.86	97.22
2003	90	4.3	93.87	95
2002	88	7.04	94.2	94
2001	95	0.12	95.11	95

RESIDENTIAL: There is less than a one point (.33) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, this comparison indicates the two measures are very similar and strongly support one another and an acceptable level of value. The action within the base supports the assessment actions.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0.63	2008	0.4
0.67	2007	-0.04
1.64	2006	0.95
3.06	2005	1.89
4.95	2004	3.8
6	2003	4
8.42	2002	7.04
0.41	2001	0.12

RESIDENTIAL: There is only a very slight difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base. Both statistics indicate that the sold and unsold properties are being treated fairly and support the assessment actions for 2008; all rural residential sites and farm sites up to twenty acres were revalued, and within the City of McCook the lot values in Golf Course Subdivision increased.

2008 Correlation Section for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	95.37	92.36	99.32

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required parameters and are supportive of one another. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the residential class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	18.21	107.54
Difference	3.21	4.54

RESIDENTIAL: Both qualitative measures are above the acceptable ranges for the residential property class. However based on the assessment practices, and the thorough verification and review process it is believed that the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	376	375	-1
Median	94.66	95.37	0.71
Wgt. Mean	91.71	92.36	0.65
Mean	98.19	99.32	1.13
COD	18.84	18.21	-0.63
PRD	107.07	107.54	0.47
Min Sales Ratio	20.35	37.79	17.44
Max Sales Ratio	333.33	333.33	0

RESIDENTIAL: The Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O statistics show no change in the number of sales. After reviewing the preliminary statistical report, the reported assessment actions and the R&O statistical report for residential property, the statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment action taken in Red Willow County. Which consisted of; all rural residential sites and farm sites up to twenty acres were revalued, within the City of McCook the lot values in Golf Course Subdivision increased, and the pickup work was completed.

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:25

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	2	144.78	144.78	138.02	34.99	104.89	94.12	195.43	N/A	75,000	103,515
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	6	94.93	85.42	78.98	15.62	108.14	49.37	103.29	49.37 to 103.29	59,133	46,706
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	118.86	118.86	101.41	17.18	117.21	98.44	139.28	N/A	757,500	768,157
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	99.26	99.26	99.27	0.26	99.98	99.00	99.51	N/A	59,750	59,316
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	128.93	128.93	131.21	26.07	98.26	95.31	162.54	N/A	51,500	67,574
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	97.72	107.12	117.59	17.35	91.10	86.40	137.25	N/A	138,858	163,280
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	81.18	81.18	62.13	27.11	130.66	59.17	103.19	N/A	372,500	231,431
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	92.69	92.69	93.54	13.69	99.09	80.00	105.37	N/A	48,250	45,131
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	80.00	66.28	56.59	33.81	117.14	18.85	100.00	N/A	125,833	71,203
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	92.69	97.25	107.05	15.79	90.84	78.13	125.47	N/A	96,750	103,572
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	59.76	59.58	59.87	1.13	99.51	58.47	60.50	N/A	36,466	21,832
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	12	98.72	103.19	100.14	20.06	103.05	49.37	195.43	93.86 to 103.29	178,275	178,517
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	7	97.72	105.94	86.03	23.70	123.15	59.17	162.54	59.17 to 162.54	180,653	155,407
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	80.00	79.33	80.76	25.05	98.23	18.85	125.47	59.76 to 100.00	80,866	65,305
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	99.00	112.83	105.84	18.04	106.60	86.40	162.54	95.31 to 139.28	239,341	253,326
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	80.00	78.08	62.90	26.88	124.14	18.85	105.37	18.85 to 105.37	174,142	109,533
<u>ALL</u>											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
INDIANOLA	2	97.65	97.65	100.00	3.88	97.65	93.86	101.43	N/A	41,900	41,900
MCCOOK	29	96.00	94.36	91.60	24.75	103.02	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	147,947	135,514
<u>ALL</u>											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475
<u>ALL</u>											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:25

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	28	98.01	99.16	94.77	20.43	104.63	49.37	195.43	87.08 to 101.43	149,349	141,535
2	3	58.47	51.82	26.35	33.80	196.63	18.85	78.13	N/A	64,166	16,909
____ALL____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	162.54	162.54	162.54			162.54	162.54	N/A	55,000	89,398
03	30	95.66	92.31	90.86	21.96	101.60	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 99.51	143,975	130,810
04											
____ALL____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021											
44-0001											
73-0017	29	96.00	94.36	91.60	24.75	103.02	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	147,947	135,514
73-0179	2	97.65	97.65	100.00	3.88	97.65	93.86	101.43	N/A	41,900	41,900
NonValid School											
____ALL____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:25

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	58.47	51.82	26.35	33.80	196.63	18.85	78.13	N/A	64,166	16,909
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	101.43	109.25	110.33	17.12	99.02	80.00	162.54	N/A	52,500	57,923
1920 TO 1939	7	99.51	110.00	104.17	18.20	105.59	80.00	195.43	80.00 to 195.43	86,714	90,334
1940 TO 1949	2	99.62	99.62	102.66	5.78	97.03	93.86	105.37	N/A	33,650	34,546
1950 TO 1959	1	49.37	49.37	49.37			49.37	49.37	N/A	87,500	43,200
1960 TO 1969	5	96.00	108.63	116.00	17.16	93.65	87.08	139.28	N/A	90,400	104,861
1970 TO 1979	1	86.40	86.40	86.40			86.40	86.40	N/A	60,000	51,840
1980 TO 1989	3	98.30	98.44	113.10	26.28	87.03	59.76	137.25	N/A	139,825	158,144
1990 TO 1994	2	63.86	63.86	60.29	7.34	105.92	59.17	68.55	N/A	394,500	237,850
1995 TO 1999	1	98.44	98.44	98.44			98.44	98.44	N/A	1,405,000	1,383,107
2000 TO Present	1	60.50	60.50	60.50			60.50	60.50	N/A	32,000	19,361
ALL	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
10000 TO 29999	2	86.00	86.00	85.48	9.15	100.60	78.13	93.86	N/A	16,900	14,446
30000 TO 59999	9	99.00	100.58	103.20	16.00	97.46	60.50	162.54	80.00 to 105.37	47,333	48,846
60000 TO 99999	10	90.60	94.17	91.59	26.42	102.81	49.37	195.43	59.76 to 101.43	72,940	66,804
100000 TO 149999	3	98.30	111.77	110.44	14.09	101.20	97.72	139.28	N/A	121,666	134,372
150000 TO 249999	4	102.74	90.39	94.87	39.88	95.28	18.85	137.25	N/A	177,643	168,530
500000 +	2	78.81	78.81	85.45	24.92	92.23	59.17	98.44	N/A	1,050,000	897,186
ALL	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:25

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	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
10000 TO 29999	3	78.13	77.50	73.33	14.23	105.68	60.50	93.86	N/A	21,933	16,084
30000 TO 59999	11	95.31	81.50	69.17	20.27	117.84	18.85	105.37	49.37 to 103.29	65,400	45,235
60000 TO 99999	7	99.51	101.89	98.17	16.40	103.79	68.55	162.54	68.55 to 162.54	72,000	70,684
100000 TO 149999	4	98.01	117.86	105.73	29.59	111.47	80.00	195.43	N/A	117,500	124,235
150000 TO 249999	2	132.38	132.38	130.91	5.22	101.12	125.47	139.28	N/A	139,500	182,624
250000 TO 499999	2	98.21	98.21	78.37	39.75	125.32	59.17	137.25	N/A	460,787	361,118
500000 +	1	98.44	98.44	98.44			98.44	98.44	N/A	1,405,000	1,383,107
ALL _____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	68.30	87.72	69.03	71.83	127.07	18.85	195.43	N/A	64,375	44,439
10	3	87.08	80.23	76.07	13.05	105.48	59.76	93.86	N/A	52,900	40,239
20	22	98.37	96.30	100.20	14.14	96.10	49.37	139.28	86.40 to 103.19	145,821	146,117
30	2	110.86	110.86	66.76	46.62	166.06	59.17	162.54	N/A	375,000	250,331
ALL _____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:25

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	58.47	51.82	26.35	33.80	196.63	18.85	78.13	N/A	64,166	16,909
300	1	103.19	103.19	103.19			103.19	103.19	N/A	50,000	51,597
303	1	137.25	137.25	137.25			137.25	137.25	N/A	226,575	310,972
306	1	125.47	125.47	125.47			125.47	125.47	N/A	169,000	212,040
314	1	139.28	139.28	139.28			139.28	139.28	N/A	110,000	153,208
343	1	98.44	98.44	98.44			98.44	98.44	N/A	1,405,000	1,383,107
344	7	94.12	82.99	80.68	14.54	102.86	49.37	100.00	49.37 to 100.00	65,842	53,124
350	1	93.86	93.86	93.86			93.86	93.86	N/A	15,800	14,830
352	1	162.54	162.54	162.54			162.54	162.54	N/A	55,000	89,398
353	6	98.65	93.35	91.51	7.35	102.02	80.00	103.29	80.00 to 103.29	79,833	73,052
406	1	105.37	105.37	105.37			105.37	105.37	N/A	51,500	54,263
426	1	87.08	87.08	87.08			87.08	87.08	N/A	75,000	65,308
442	1	101.43	101.43	101.43			101.43	101.43	N/A	68,000	68,970
444	1	59.17	59.17	59.17			59.17	59.17	N/A	695,000	411,265
491	2	146.58	146.58	130.29	33.33	112.50	97.72	195.43	N/A	97,500	127,030
528	2	64.53	64.53	66.51	6.24	97.02	60.50	68.55	N/A	63,000	41,898
<u>ALL</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>96.00</u>	<u>94.57</u>	<u>91.76</u>	<u>23.41</u>	<u>103.07</u>	<u>18.85</u>	<u>195.43</u>	<u>80.00 to 100.00</u>	<u>141,105</u>	<u>129,475</u>

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

Commercial

Completed ninety-eight percent of the on-site inspections of the commercial class of property and completed data entry into the TerraScan CAMA system. Sales, rental, and expense information was gathered and provided to an outside appraisal company (Knoche Appraisal), the information will be used in the development of the market analysis for the three approaches to value. The project was not completed and implemented for 2008 due to lack of time.

Pickup work and any changes to commercial property that were discovered through the physical inspections were made for 2008 and equalized with other like commercial property.

2008 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by: The assessor and a contracted appraiser if needed.
2.	Valuation done by: The assessor.
3.	Pickup work done by whom: The office staff and a contracted appraiser if needed.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 1999
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? A commercial reappraisal was completed in 1999. New depreciation tables and values were implemented for all motels in 2006. New depreciation tables and values were implemented for feedlots and dairy operations in 2007.
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? All were done in 2000.
7.	When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? Implemented in 2000 and reviewed in 2005. In 2007 retail and office buildings in downtown McCook were reviewed and updated.
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? Basically the reviews and updates are conducted in terms of occupancy code, such as all motels or retail and office buildings. Reviews may be conducted along main business districts or various locations.
9.	How are these defined? They are defined by location and type of business, commercial or industrial and occupancy code.
10.	Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Not within the commercial class of property. More emphasis is put on occupancy codes, and possibly location like main street, in the valuation process. Models are

	built with similar property, that is to say with like retail or office businesses, but there are still various areas with mixed occupancy.
11.	Does the assessor location “suburban” mean something other than rural commercial? <i>(that is, does the “suburban” location have its own market?)</i>
	Not for the commercial class.

12.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? <i>(Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</i>
	The suburban location, as defined in regulation, does not have its own valuation grouping.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
14		693	707

The other included the onsite inspection of the commercial properties.

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:11

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	2	144.78	144.78	138.02	34.99	104.89	94.12	195.43	N/A	75,000	103,515
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	6	94.93	85.42	78.98	15.62	108.14	49.37	103.29	49.37 to 103.29	59,133	46,706
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	118.86	118.86	101.41	17.18	117.21	98.44	139.28	N/A	757,500	768,157
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	2	99.26	99.26	99.27	0.26	99.98	99.00	99.51	N/A	59,750	59,316
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	128.93	128.93	131.21	26.07	98.26	95.31	162.54	N/A	51,500	67,574
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	97.72	107.12	117.59	17.35	91.10	86.40	137.25	N/A	138,858	163,280
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	12	98.72	103.19	100.14	20.06	103.05	49.37	195.43	93.86 to 103.29	178,275	178,517
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	7	97.72	105.94	86.03	23.70	123.15	59.17	162.54	59.17 to 162.54	180,653	155,407
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	80.00	79.33	80.76	25.05	98.23	18.85	125.47	59.76 to 100.00	80,866	65,305
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	99.00	112.83	105.84	18.04	106.60	86.40	162.54	95.31 to 139.28	239,341	253,326
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	80.00	78.08	62.90	26.88	124.14	18.85	105.37	18.85 to 105.37	174,142	109,533
<u>ALL</u>											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
INDIANOLA	2	97.65	97.65	100.00	3.88	97.65	93.86	101.43	N/A	41,900	41,900
MCCOOK	29	96.00	94.36	91.60	24.75	103.02	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	147,947	135,514
<u>ALL</u>											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475
<u>ALL</u>											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:11

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	28	98.01	99.16	94.77	20.43	104.63	49.37	195.43	87.08 to 101.43	149,349	141,535
2	3	58.47	51.82	26.35	33.80	196.63	18.85	78.13	N/A	64,166	16,909
____ALL____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	162.54	162.54	162.54			162.54	162.54	N/A	55,000	89,398
03	30	95.66	92.31	90.86	21.96	101.60	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 99.51	143,975	130,810
04											
____ALL____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021											
44-0001											
73-0017	29	96.00	94.36	91.60	24.75	103.02	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	147,947	135,514
73-0179	2	97.65	97.65	100.00	3.88	97.65	93.86	101.43	N/A	41,900	41,900
NonValid School											
____ALL____	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:11

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	3	58.47	51.82	26.35	33.80	196.63	18.85	78.13	N/A	64,166	16,909
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	101.43	109.25	110.33	17.12	99.02	80.00	162.54	N/A	52,500	57,923
1920 TO 1939	7	99.51	110.00	104.17	18.20	105.59	80.00	195.43	80.00 to 195.43	86,714	90,334
1940 TO 1949	2	99.62	99.62	102.66	5.78	97.03	93.86	105.37	N/A	33,650	34,546
1950 TO 1959	1	49.37	49.37	49.37			49.37	49.37	N/A	87,500	43,200
1960 TO 1969	5	96.00	108.63	116.00	17.16	93.65	87.08	139.28	N/A	90,400	104,861
1970 TO 1979	1	86.40	86.40	86.40			86.40	86.40	N/A	60,000	51,840
1980 TO 1989	3	98.30	98.44	113.10	26.28	87.03	59.76	137.25	N/A	139,825	158,144
1990 TO 1994	2	63.86	63.86	60.29	7.34	105.92	59.17	68.55	N/A	394,500	237,850
1995 TO 1999	1	98.44	98.44	98.44			98.44	98.44	N/A	1,405,000	1,383,107
2000 TO Present	1	60.50	60.50	60.50			60.50	60.50	N/A	32,000	19,361
ALL	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
10000 TO 29999	2	86.00	86.00	85.48	9.15	100.60	78.13	93.86	N/A	16,900	14,446
30000 TO 59999	9	99.00	100.58	103.20	16.00	97.46	60.50	162.54	80.00 to 105.37	47,333	48,846
60000 TO 99999	10	90.60	94.17	91.59	26.42	102.81	49.37	195.43	59.76 to 101.43	72,940	66,804
100000 TO 149999	3	98.30	111.77	110.44	14.09	101.20	97.72	139.28	N/A	121,666	134,372
150000 TO 249999	4	102.74	90.39	94.87	39.88	95.28	18.85	137.25	N/A	177,643	168,530
500000 +	2	78.81	78.81	85.45	24.92	92.23	59.17	98.44	N/A	1,050,000	897,186
ALL	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:12

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	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	58.47	58.47	58.47			58.47	58.47	N/A	9,500	5,555
10000 TO 29999	3	78.13	77.50	73.33	14.23	105.68	60.50	93.86	N/A	21,933	16,084
30000 TO 59999	11	95.31	81.50	69.17	20.27	117.84	18.85	105.37	49.37 to 103.29	65,400	45,235
60000 TO 99999	7	99.51	101.89	98.17	16.40	103.79	68.55	162.54	68.55 to 162.54	72,000	70,684
100000 TO 149999	4	98.01	117.86	105.73	29.59	111.47	80.00	195.43	N/A	117,500	124,235
150000 TO 249999	2	132.38	132.38	130.91	5.22	101.12	125.47	139.28	N/A	139,500	182,624
250000 TO 499999	2	98.21	98.21	78.37	39.75	125.32	59.17	137.25	N/A	460,787	361,118
500000 +	1	98.44	98.44	98.44			98.44	98.44	N/A	1,405,000	1,383,107
ALL _____											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	68.30	87.72	69.03	71.83	127.07	18.85	195.43	N/A	64,375	44,439
10	3	87.08	80.23	76.07	13.05	105.48	59.76	93.86	N/A	52,900	40,239
20	22	98.37	96.30	100.20	14.14	96.10	49.37	139.28	86.40 to 103.19	145,821	146,117
30	2	110.86	110.86	66.76	46.62	166.06	59.17	162.54	N/A	375,000	250,331
ALL _____											
	31	96.00	94.57	91.76	23.41	103.07	18.85	195.43	80.00 to 100.00	141,105	129,475

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:	31	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	35.70	95% Median C.I.:	80.00 to 100.00	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,736,475	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	33.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.72 to 106.79	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,374,275	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.47	95% Mean C.I.:	82.19 to 106.96	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,013,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	141,105	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,475	PRD:	103.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:12

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	58.47	51.82	26.35	33.80	196.63	18.85	78.13	N/A	64,166	16,909
300	1	103.19	103.19	103.19			103.19	103.19	N/A	50,000	51,597
303	1	137.25	137.25	137.25			137.25	137.25	N/A	226,575	310,972
306	1	125.47	125.47	125.47			125.47	125.47	N/A	169,000	212,040
314	1	139.28	139.28	139.28			139.28	139.28	N/A	110,000	153,208
343	1	98.44	98.44	98.44			98.44	98.44	N/A	1,405,000	1,383,107
344	7	94.12	82.99	80.68	14.54	102.86	49.37	100.00	49.37 to 100.00	65,842	53,124
350	1	93.86	93.86	93.86			93.86	93.86	N/A	15,800	14,830
352	1	162.54	162.54	162.54			162.54	162.54	N/A	55,000	89,398
353	6	98.65	93.35	91.51	7.35	102.02	80.00	103.29	80.00 to 103.29	79,833	73,052
406	1	105.37	105.37	105.37			105.37	105.37	N/A	51,500	54,263
426	1	87.08	87.08	87.08			87.08	87.08	N/A	75,000	65,308
442	1	101.43	101.43	101.43			101.43	101.43	N/A	68,000	68,970
444	1	59.17	59.17	59.17			59.17	59.17	N/A	695,000	411,265
491	2	146.58	146.58	130.29	33.33	112.50	97.72	195.43	N/A	97,500	127,030
528	2	64.53	64.53	66.51	6.24	97.02	60.50	68.55	N/A	63,000	41,898
<u>ALL</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>96.00</u>	<u>94.57</u>	<u>91.76</u>	<u>23.41</u>	<u>103.07</u>	<u>18.85</u>	<u>195.43</u>	<u>80.00 to 100.00</u>	<u>141,105</u>	<u>129,475</u>

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the 2008 commercial statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the commercial property in Red Willow County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the required parameter and both qualitative measures have met the standards indicating that the commercial properties have been treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the commercial class of property in Red Willow County. There is no recommended adjustment for the commercial class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	70	31	44.29
2007	62	25	40.32
2006	78	27	34.62
2005	103	43	41.75
2004	118	55	46.61
2003	109	57	52.29
2002	106	78	73.58
2001	120	84	70

COMMERCIAL: From a historical perspective the percentage of sales used in the measurement of the commercial properties has been low for six years. However, Red Willow County has attempted use as many sales as possible in the measurement of the commercial class of property. Of the 70 commercial sales the review process has determined 31 of them to be qualified sales. The 39 not used were a mixture of substantially changed, partial interests, foreclosures, corrective deeds, splits, land use changes, and centrally assessed.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	96.00	-3.42	92.71	96.00
2007	93.86	0.83	94.64	97.38
2006	96.00	0.98	96.94	96.09
2005	96.09	-0.02	96.07	96.09
2004	94.57	-1.24	93.4	95.65
2003	92	-0.37	91.66	96
2002	98	0.17	98.17	98
2001	100	0.65	100.65	100

COMMERCIAL: There is a 3.29 point difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, they barely support each. However, both statistical measures support an acceptable level of value. The trended preliminary ratio is supportive of the assessment actions; the negative percent change in the base is due to the physical inspections that were completed for all commercial properties, even though there was not sufficient time to re-price all commercial properties and complete the project this year. Discoveries were made and the determination was made that some of the issues could not wait to be addressed, such as buildings that no longer existed or deteriorated buildings that had been closed up. No other action was taken within the commercial class for assessment year 2008.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2008	-3.42
0	2007	0.83
39.32	2006	0.98
-0.91	2005	-0.02
0	2004	-1.24
0	2003	0
7.89	2002	0.17
2.4	2001	0.65

COMMERCIAL: The negative percent change in the base is due to the physical inspections that were completed for all commercial properties, even though there was not sufficient time to re-price all commercial properties and complete the project this year. Discoveries were made and the determination was made that some of the issues could not wait to be addressed, such as buildings that no longer existed or deteriorated buildings that had been closed up. No other action was taken within the commercial class for assessment year 2008.

2008 Correlation Section for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	96.00	91.76	94.57

COMMERCIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required parameters and are supportive of one another. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the commercial class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	23.41	103.07
Difference	3.41	0.07

COMMERCIAL: Of the qualitative measures only the coefficient of dispersion is above the acceptable standard, the price related differential when rounded (103) is within the range. With the diversity of the sales within the commercial class of property this would not be uncommon, based on the assessment practices and the thorough verification and review process it is believed that the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	31	31	0
Median	96.00	96.00	0
Wgt. Mean	91.76	91.76	0
Mean	94.57	94.57	0
COD	23.41	23.41	0
PRD	103.07	103.07	0
Min Sales Ratio	18.85	18.85	0
Max Sales Ratio	195.43	195.43	0

COMMERCIAL: The table is a reflection of the assessment actions for 2008 in that there was no significant action taken other than routine maintenance, and if changes to commercial property were discovered through the physical inspections the property record cards were made to reflect it and the values were equalized with other like property for assessment year 2008.

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:	52	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	42.26	95% Median C.I.:	61.67 to 69.65	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,386,460	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	28.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.76 to 68.37	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,140,835	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 75.63	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,467,756							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,323	COD:	24.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	188.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,918	PRD:	108.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.83			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:44

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	79.22	79.22	79.22			79.22	79.22	N/A	157,700	124,931
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	3	71.17	71.25	72.83	11.85	97.83	58.64	83.94	N/A	265,564	193,410
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	133.38	133.38	90.03	41.47	148.15	78.07	188.69	N/A	98,107	88,325
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	4	68.63	66.82	66.31	13.44	100.76	53.52	76.51	N/A	118,659	78,688
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	83.90	83.90	83.90			83.90	83.90	N/A	46,770	39,240
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	22.09	30.38	31.86	88.42	95.37	8.83	68.52	N/A	189,285	60,301
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	10	63.69	78.10	64.14	37.61	121.75	18.09	162.85	62.77 to 122.37	126,351	81,047
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	72.22	67.68	69.60	11.58	97.24	53.79	81.71	N/A	155,703	108,375
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	61.08	60.15	60.82	3.80	98.90	56.21	63.17	N/A	44,166	26,862
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	66.22	65.75	63.45	4.22	103.62	59.44	71.65	N/A	100,145	63,538
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	75.52	68.33	64.23	12.26	106.39	43.09	79.18	N/A	175,000	112,396
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	59.22	59.34	59.15	10.31	100.32	49.66	69.65	51.59 to 67.70	133,642	79,053
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	10	76.05	82.70	73.62	24.44	112.33	53.52	188.69	58.64 to 83.94	162,524	119,656
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	63.69	66.24	57.37	35.56	115.46	8.83	162.85	58.40 to 72.29	142,296	81,639
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	63.72	62.54	61.37	11.16	101.91	43.09	79.18	56.21 to 67.70	121,347	74,472
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	11	68.52	67.22	52.34	44.39	128.45	8.83	188.69	12.87 to 83.90	134,069	70,168
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	63.90	70.81	65.44	21.71	108.21	18.09	162.85	62.77 to 71.65	116,315	76,114
<u>ALL</u>											
	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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:	52	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	42.26	95% Median C.I.:	61.67 to 69.65	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,386,460	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	28.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.76 to 68.37	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,140,835	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 75.63	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,467,756							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,323	COD:	24.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	188.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,918	PRD:	108.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.83			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:44

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
4095	1	76.51	76.51	76.51			76.51	76.51	N/A	142,000	108,640
4097	3	63.90	65.56	62.99	6.09	104.08	60.55	72.22	N/A	145,107	91,402
4099	1	66.59	66.59	66.59			66.59	66.59	N/A	94,000	62,590
4101	4	65.53	68.35	75.33	10.27	90.73	58.40	83.94	N/A	133,181	100,326
4275	4	34.84	36.46	40.34	60.22	90.38	12.87	63.29	N/A	190,000	76,643
4277	5	56.21	48.13	45.60	21.26	105.55	8.83	63.47	N/A	107,292	48,926
4279	4	58.46	84.23	49.59	71.30	169.86	31.31	188.69	N/A	146,178	72,485
4281	3	71.17	70.12	66.69	24.83	105.15	43.09	96.10	N/A	216,845	144,605
4335	7	63.17	65.39	63.63	9.95	102.76	54.17	76.00	54.17 to 76.00	120,591	76,737
4337	2	78.65	78.65	78.61	0.73	100.04	78.07	79.22	N/A	166,350	130,775
4341	4	77.78	86.89	75.35	20.88	115.32	69.65	122.37	N/A	90,962	68,536
4521	11	65.07	74.11	69.62	23.85	106.45	49.66	162.85	52.86 to 81.71	122,626	85,366
4527	3	62.77	67.68	64.82	9.61	104.40	61.08	79.18	N/A	171,833	111,388
ALL											
	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918
ALL											
	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918
ALL											
	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	56.21	60.19	59.02	11.39	101.99	52.86	83.90	52.86 to 83.90	60,595	35,763
DRY-N/A	17	65.02	75.19	66.13	24.51	113.70	49.66	188.69	59.44 to 79.18	138,259	91,426
GRASS	2	10.85	10.85	10.81	18.62	100.35	8.83	12.87	N/A	147,500	15,947
GRASS-N/A	18	70.41	70.06	64.95	21.78	107.86	18.09	162.85	63.12 to 76.51	156,232	101,474
IRRGTD	4	69.44	64.49	57.03	16.27	113.08	43.09	76.00	N/A	133,659	76,229
IRRGTD-N/A	4	66.38	71.88	68.99	18.50	104.18	58.64	96.10	N/A	181,109	124,951
ALL											
	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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:	52	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	42.26	95% Median C.I.:	61.67 to 69.65	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,386,460	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	28.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.76 to 68.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,140,835	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 75.63	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,467,756							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,323	COD:	24.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	188.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,918	PRD:	108.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.83			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:44

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	11	57.90	60.17	60.08	11.28	100.15	49.66	83.90	52.86 to 68.52	85,594	51,421
DRY-N/A	13	65.07	79.82	67.59	28.88	118.10	51.59	188.69	61.08 to 83.94	141,003	95,305
GRASS	6	40.78	40.68	45.13	67.23	90.13	8.83	71.17	8.83 to 71.17	169,792	76,634
GRASS-N/A	14	71.97	74.19	66.97	21.11	110.78	31.31	162.85	61.67 to 79.22	149,173	99,901
IRRGTD	6	67.76	64.80	58.59	14.46	110.60	43.09	76.00	43.09 to 76.00	137,642	80,650
IRRGTD-N/A	2	78.32	78.32	74.06	22.69	105.77	60.55	96.10	N/A	216,609	160,410
ALL	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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	23	63.17	65.69	64.09	14.68	102.50	49.66	122.37	57.90 to 66.59	119,711	76,720
DRY-N/A	1	188.69	188.69	188.69			188.69	188.69	N/A	21,215	40,030
GRASS	19	69.65	64.19	59.67	29.25	107.57	8.83	162.85	54.17 to 76.51	156,956	93,659
GRASS-N/A	1	63.12	63.12	63.12			63.12	63.12	N/A	125,000	78,895
IRRGTD	6	67.76	64.80	58.59	14.46	110.60	43.09	76.00	43.09 to 76.00	137,642	80,650
IRRGTD-N/A	2	78.32	78.32	74.06	22.69	105.77	60.55	96.10	N/A	216,609	160,410
ALL	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	5	58.40	47.32	54.91	39.82	86.17	12.87	83.94	N/A	177,000	97,197
44-0001	1	59.44	59.44	59.44			59.44	59.44	N/A	256,000	152,161
73-0017	8	65.44	66.53	65.78	9.30	101.14	54.17	76.00	54.17 to 76.00	148,016	97,365
73-0179	38	65.04	71.04	63.35	26.39	112.14	8.83	188.69	61.08 to 72.22	126,729	80,281
NonValid School											
ALL	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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:	52	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	42.26	95% Median C.I.:	61.67 to 69.65	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,386,460	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	28.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.76 to 68.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,140,835	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 75.63	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,467,756							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,323	COD:	24.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	188.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,918	PRD:	108.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.83			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:57:44

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	3	56.21	61.77	61.43	13.08	100.56	53.52	75.58	N/A	15,879	9,754
30.01 TO 50.00	4	63.72	85.79	65.52	43.58	130.92	52.86	162.85	N/A	24,812	16,258
50.01 TO 100.00	7	72.22	93.20	83.63	41.49	111.44	54.17	188.69	54.17 to 188.69	38,401	32,115
100.01 TO 180.00	18	62.19	54.56	50.61	22.75	107.80	8.83	79.18	49.66 to 66.59	118,590	60,023
180.01 TO 330.00	6	61.83	63.04	59.49	20.82	105.96	31.31	96.10	31.31 to 96.10	208,509	124,051
330.01 TO 650.00	11	71.17	69.83	68.79	10.62	101.51	51.59	83.94	59.44 to 79.22	229,768	158,064
650.01 +	3	75.04	72.81	72.07	8.90	101.02	61.67	81.71	N/A	270,666	195,071
ALL	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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	162.85	162.85	162.85			162.85	162.85	N/A	6,000	9,771
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	162.85	162.85	162.85			162.85	162.85	N/A	6,000	9,771
10000 TO 29999	6	69.92	93.44	97.29	50.69	96.04	53.52	188.69	53.52 to 188.69	19,697	19,163
30000 TO 59999	6	64.00	64.19	65.22	11.65	98.43	52.86	83.90	52.86 to 83.90	38,499	25,107
60000 TO 99999	8	67.15	68.56	68.20	6.14	100.53	61.08	79.18	61.08 to 79.18	77,502	52,860
100000 TO 149999	10	60.76	53.99	52.98	24.04	101.91	12.87	76.51	18.09 to 76.00	126,488	67,011
150000 TO 249999	11	69.65	65.42	66.18	18.77	98.84	8.83	96.10	53.79 to 79.22	182,779	120,964
250000 TO 499999	10	61.11	61.11	61.20	19.50	99.86	31.31	83.94	43.09 to 81.71	289,017	176,874
ALL	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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	108.19	108.19	88.04	50.53	122.88	53.52	162.85	N/A	9,500	8,364
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	108.19	108.19	88.04	50.53	122.88	53.52	162.85	N/A	9,500	8,364
10000 TO 29999	12	59.69	54.96	33.65	35.38	163.32	8.83	122.37	18.09 to 66.22	58,599	19,718
30000 TO 59999	10	69.68	80.42	69.98	26.85	114.92	49.66	188.69	61.08 to 83.90	71,160	49,796
60000 TO 99999	10	63.21	59.78	56.15	10.87	106.46	31.31	76.00	53.79 to 66.59	140,278	78,763
100000 TO 149999	7	72.29	68.05	65.96	12.56	103.17	43.09	79.22	43.09 to 79.22	189,577	125,044
150000 TO 249999	10	66.21	68.97	67.11	14.75	102.77	51.59	96.10	59.44 to 81.71	264,721	177,650
250000 TO 499999	1	83.94	83.94	83.94			83.94	83.94	N/A	330,000	276,997
ALL	52	64.55	67.84	62.57	24.80	108.43	8.83	188.69	61.67 to 69.65	137,323	85,918

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

Agricultural

The GIS mapping has been completed which changed some soil types and land classifications. Updated maps were mailed to each property owner along with a request for permission to get the most current FSA maps. Appointments were made to meet with individuals to discuss land use changes, and worked closely with the NRD to verify certified irrigated acres.

A study of all agricultural unimproved sales showed dry land below 69-75% of market value, therefore the value on all classes of dry land increased. With limited water for irrigation, the additional occupation tax, and the NRD bond levy, further data is needed to support any change in irrigated value. New subclasses were built for future market analysis for CREP, CRP, EQIP, and irrigated grass.

Based on the definition of grassland the tree cover along the river was reclassified as grass/tree and value increased to 210 per acre. There is no evidence to support a second market area at this time.

2008 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Office staff.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor and assistant assessor, ultimately however the assessor makes the final determination.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The assessor and office staff.
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By soil classification and land use.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	Non-applicable.
6.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1967
7.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2007
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	GIS, and the FSA maps were also reviewed.
b.	By whom?
	The assessor and staff.
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	Completed.
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:
	None

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

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total

Homes and buildings would be included in the residential county. All other work in the agricultural area deals with the land and maps from the FSA and GIS.

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:	52	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	40.87	95% Median C.I.:	67.09 to 75.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,389,045	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.53	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.98 to 74.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,143,420	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.68	95% Mean C.I.:	66.39 to 82.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,875,197							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,373	COD:	24.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	190.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,753	PRD:	109.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.47			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:22

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	1	85.72	85.72	85.72			85.72	85.72	N/A	157,700	135,177
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	3	73.79	75.41	77.34	13.41	97.51	61.37	91.06	N/A	266,426	206,042
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	2	135.90	135.90	93.10	40.18	145.97	81.30	190.50	N/A	98,107	91,342
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	4	69.80	70.60	70.96	11.00	99.49	60.05	82.76	N/A	118,659	84,206
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	96.39	96.39	96.39			96.39	96.39	N/A	46,770	45,081
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	23.19	35.12	35.87	86.97	97.90	14.47	79.64	N/A	189,285	67,902
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	10	71.85	86.30	70.98	37.22	121.59	19.47	168.23	66.00 to 150.09	126,351	89,684
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	70.94	73.84	76.63	10.31	96.36	63.87	88.43	N/A	155,703	119,318
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	67.09	78.29	68.07	33.32	115.02	50.36	117.43	N/A	44,166	30,063
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	72.61	72.78	70.67	6.15	102.98	65.93	79.45	N/A	100,145	70,772
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	79.98	73.28	68.46	14.37	107.04	44.65	88.49	N/A	175,000	119,801
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	66.11	65.65	65.02	8.59	100.97	57.30	74.27	57.84 to 72.74	133,642	86,900
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	10	77.55	86.61	78.19	25.35	110.77	60.05	190.50	61.37 to 91.06	162,783	127,281
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	71.23	73.46	63.60	34.48	115.49	14.47	168.23	66.00 to 79.64	142,296	90,506
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	69.22	70.38	67.13	14.40	104.84	44.65	117.43	60.78 to 77.36	121,347	81,466
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	11	73.79	71.92	56.70	42.37	126.83	14.47	190.50	15.44 to 96.39	134,069	76,018
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	71.52	79.61	72.42	24.29	109.92	19.47	168.23	67.09 to 78.99	116,315	84,238
<u>ALL</u>											
	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753

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:	52	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	40.87	95% Median C.I.:	67.09 to 75.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,389,045	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.53	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.98 to 74.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,143,420	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.68	95% Mean C.I.:	66.39 to 82.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,875,197							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,373	COD:	24.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	190.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,753	PRD:	109.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.47			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:23

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
4095	1	82.76	82.76	82.76			82.76	82.76	N/A	142,000	117,517	
4097	3	70.94	68.87	66.90	3.46	102.96	64.16	71.52	N/A	145,107	97,070	
4099	1	77.36	77.36	77.36			77.36	77.36	N/A	94,000	72,722	
4101	4	70.58	74.80	82.44	9.98	90.72	66.97	91.06	N/A	133,181	109,798	
4275	4	38.66	42.02	46.13	63.54	91.08	15.44	75.32	N/A	190,000	87,653	
4277	5	61.37	53.80	49.50	19.09	108.69	14.47	67.09	N/A	107,292	53,106	
4279	4	68.02	89.37	53.99	61.70	165.54	30.93	190.50	N/A	146,178	78,915	
4281	3	73.79	72.62	69.09	24.74	105.10	44.65	99.41	N/A	217,707	150,414	
4335	7	73.79	76.20	70.19	15.79	108.56	57.30	117.43	57.30 to 117.43	120,591	84,646	
4337	2	83.51	83.51	83.39	2.65	100.14	81.30	85.72	N/A	166,350	138,723	
4341	4	87.92	99.67	82.15	26.81	121.32	72.74	150.09	N/A	90,962	74,729	
4521	11	71.65	81.53	77.28	21.25	105.49	59.80	168.23	60.78 to 88.43	122,626	94,771	
4527	3	70.55	69.80	69.86	18.02	99.91	50.36	88.49	N/A	171,833	120,044	
ALL												
	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	
ALL												
	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	
ALL												
	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	7	67.09	76.10	72.16	20.90	105.45	59.80	117.43	59.80 to 117.43	60,595	43,728	
DRY-N/A	17	71.52	82.78	73.35	25.53	112.86	50.36	190.50	65.93 to 88.49	138,259	101,408	
GRASS	2	14.96	14.96	14.95	3.24	100.06	14.47	15.44	N/A	147,500	22,045	
GRASS-N/A	18	73.27	74.74	69.30	22.31	107.85	19.47	168.23	66.00 to 81.30	156,375	108,362	
IRRGTD	4	74.56	68.17	61.74	12.00	110.41	44.65	78.91	N/A	133,659	82,524	
IRRGTD-N/A	4	67.55	73.97	71.84	16.59	102.96	61.37	99.41	N/A	181,109	130,112	
ALL												
	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

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:	52	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	40.87	95% Median C.I.:	67.09 to 75.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,389,045	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.53	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.98 to 74.51	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,143,420	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.68	95% Mean C.I.:	66.39 to 82.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,875,197							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,373	COD:	24.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	190.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,753	PRD:	109.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.47			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:23

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	11	67.09	73.78	71.39	16.47	103.36	59.80	117.43	60.05 to 96.39	85,594	61,103	
DRY-N/A	13	71.65	86.79	74.08	30.80	117.16	50.36	190.50	65.93 to 91.06	141,003	104,454	
GRASS	6	42.74	43.65	48.18	63.63	90.60	14.47	73.79	14.47 to 73.79	170,223	82,013	
GRASS-N/A	14	79.22	79.52	71.95	19.89	110.53	30.93	168.23	65.80 to 85.72	149,173	107,323	
IRRGTD	6	72.37	67.50	62.31	11.76	108.32	44.65	78.91	44.65 to 78.91	137,642	85,768	
IRRGTD-N/A	2	81.79	81.79	77.55	21.55	105.47	64.16	99.41	N/A	216,609	167,970	
ALL	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	23	70.28	76.06	72.26	18.42	105.26	50.36	150.09	65.93 to 77.36	119,711	86,505	
DRY-N/A	1	190.50	190.50	190.50			190.50	190.50	N/A	21,215	40,414	
GRASS	19	72.74	68.58	63.80	29.61	107.49	14.47	168.23	57.30 to 81.30	157,092	100,231	
GRASS-N/A	1	72.17	72.17	72.17			72.17	72.17	N/A	125,000	90,209	
IRRGTD	6	72.37	67.50	62.31	11.76	108.32	44.65	78.91	44.65 to 78.91	137,642	85,768	
IRRGTD-N/A	2	81.79	81.79	77.55	21.55	105.47	64.16	99.41	N/A	216,609	167,970	
ALL	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
33-0021	5	66.97	53.65	61.41	39.26	87.37	15.44	91.06	N/A	177,000	108,698	
44-0001	1	65.93	65.93	65.93			65.93	65.93	N/A	256,000	168,785	
73-0017	8	73.79	76.48	71.94	13.04	106.30	57.30	117.43	57.30 to 117.43	148,339	106,722	
73-0179	38	71.59	77.31	68.72	25.60	112.50	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 79.45	126,729	87,082	
NonValid School												
ALL	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753	

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:	52	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	40.87	95% Median C.I.:	67.09 to 75.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,389,045	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.53	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.98 to 74.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,143,420	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.68	95% Mean C.I.:	66.39 to 82.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,875,197							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,373	COD:	24.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	190.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,753	PRD:	109.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.47			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:45:23

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	3	67.09	66.98	67.23	6.83	99.63	60.05	73.79	N/A	15,879	10,675
30.01 TO 50.00	4	94.54	104.28	86.79	40.78	120.15	59.80	168.23	N/A	24,812	21,534
50.01 TO 100.00	7	72.61	100.91	90.06	47.26	112.05	57.30	190.50	57.30 to 190.50	38,401	34,583
100.01 TO 180.00	18	68.99	60.53	56.51	22.66	107.12	14.47	88.49	50.36 to 75.32	118,590	67,014
180.01 TO 330.00	6	68.16	67.95	63.57	23.17	106.89	30.93	99.41	30.93 to 99.41	208,509	132,540
330.01 TO 650.00	11	73.79	75.15	74.44	10.69	100.96	57.84	91.06	65.93 to 85.72	230,003	171,216
650.01 +	3	81.05	78.43	77.59	9.31	101.07	65.80	88.43	N/A	270,666	210,022
ALL	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753

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	168.23	168.23	168.23			168.23	168.23	N/A	6,000	10,094
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	168.23	168.23	168.23			168.23	168.23	N/A	6,000	10,094
10000 TO 29999	6	72.72	102.20	107.18	49.41	95.34	60.05	190.50	60.05 to 190.50	19,697	21,112
30000 TO 59999	6	70.58	78.68	78.16	23.80	100.66	57.30	117.43	57.30 to 117.43	38,499	30,092
60000 TO 99999	8	72.60	72.63	72.41	10.00	100.31	50.36	88.49	50.36 to 88.49	77,502	56,118
100000 TO 149999	10	67.52	60.21	59.05	21.44	101.97	15.44	82.76	19.47 to 78.91	126,488	74,686
150000 TO 249999	11	75.32	71.51	71.90	16.76	99.46	14.47	99.41	61.37 to 85.72	183,014	131,590
250000 TO 499999	10	65.87	66.04	66.24	20.29	99.69	30.93	91.06	44.65 to 88.43	289,017	191,456
ALL	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753

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	60.05	60.05	60.05			60.05	60.05	N/A	13,000	7,807
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	60.05	60.05	60.05			60.05	60.05	N/A	13,000	7,807
10000 TO 29999	11	67.09	62.58	34.19	39.07	183.03	14.47	168.23	15.44 to 73.79	59,555	20,363
30000 TO 59999	8	87.92	103.18	85.67	40.29	120.43	50.36	190.50	50.36 to 190.50	49,760	42,631
60000 TO 99999	13	69.91	68.40	63.53	11.67	107.66	30.93	88.49	63.87 to 77.36	124,645	79,192
100000 TO 149999	7	79.64	72.97	70.32	12.28	103.76	44.65	85.72	44.65 to 85.72	182,720	128,491
150000 TO 249999	10	73.27	74.81	73.11	12.99	102.33	57.84	99.41	64.16 to 88.43	248,779	181,891
250000 TO 499999	2	80.81	80.81	80.36	12.69	100.55	70.55	91.06	N/A	345,000	277,245
ALL	52	71.59	74.69	68.25	24.70	109.43	14.47	190.50	67.09 to 75.32	137,373	93,753

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the 2008 agricultural unimproved statistics reveals two measures of central tendency, the median and mean are within the acceptable range. The assessor has tried to use as many sales as possible in the determination of the agricultural land values for each classification group, agricultural sales are made up of a mix of dry, grass, and or irrigated land, pure sales of just dry, grass, or irrigated are not the normal.

For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Red Willow County and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio. There is no recommended adjustment for the agricultural unimproved class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	119	52	43.7
2007	103	48	46.6
2006	99	41	41.41
2005	103	48	46.6
2004	104	47	45.19
2003	110	60	54.55
2002	115	68	59.13
2001	118	69	58.47

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: From a historical perspective the percentage of sales used in the measurement of the agricultural unimproved properties has always been low. However, Red Willow County has attempted to use as many sales as possible in the measurement of the agricultural unimproved class of property. Of the sales deemed not qualified 4% were substantially improved sales, of the remaining 52% coded do not use; 27% were family transactions, 18% were partial interests, 5% were land exchanges, 3% were foreclosures, and the remainder was a mixture of such things as corrective deeds, splits, land use changes, and centrally assessed.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	64.55	9.01	70.37	71.59
2007	69.85	3.04	71.98	71.69
2006	75.82	-0.02	75.8	75.82
2005	73.72	0.44	74.05	76.33
2004	73.86	0.17	73.98	73.86
2003	75	0.75	75.56	76
2002	73	2.52	74.84	75
2001	72	5.89	76.24	75

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is less than a one point (.38) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, this comparison indicates the two measures are very similar and strongly support one another and an acceptable level of value. The action within the base supports the assessment actions.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
9.39	2008	9.01
3.65	2007	3.04
0	2006	-0.02
-2.09	2005	0.44
0	2004	0.17
0	2003	1
3.2	2002	2.52
3.39	2001	5.89

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is only a very slight difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base. Both statistics indicate that the sold and unsold properties are being treated fairly and support the assessment actions for 2008; the values for the dry land classification groups were changed and the tree cover along the river was reclassified as grass/tree and valued at \$210 per acre.

2008 Correlation Section for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71.59	68.25	74.69

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Of the three measures of central tendency only the weighted mean is below the acceptable standard. In Red Willow County most agricultural sales are made up of a mix of dry, grass, and or irrigated land, pure sales of just dry, grass, or irrigated are not the normal, the assessor has tried to use as many sales as possible in the determination of the agricultural land values for each classification group. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	24.70	109.43
Difference	4.7	6.43

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both of the qualitative measures are above the acceptable standards. However for assessment year 2008 after an analysis of the agricultural unimproved market new dry land values and values for tree cover were implemented as stated in the 2008 Assessment Survey.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	52	52	0
Median	64.55	71.59	7.04
Wgt. Mean	62.57	68.25	5.68
Mean	67.84	74.69	6.85
COD	24.80	24.70	-0.1
PRD	108.43	109.43	1
Min Sales Ratio	8.83	14.47	5.64
Max Sales Ratio	188.69	190.50	1.81

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change from the Preliminary Statistics to the R&O Statistics is a reflection of a market analysis of the agricultural unimproved sales. The values for the dry land classification groups were changed and the tree cover along the river was reclassified as grass/tree and valued at \$210 per acre.

County 73 - Red Willow

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 8,179	Value 590,942,645	Total Growth 4,237,769 (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	440	1,884,157	119	725,768	79	279,149	638	2,889,074	
2. Res Improv Land	3,523	19,574,424	244	2,254,713	290	2,581,733	4,057	24,410,870	
3. Res Improvements	3,652	184,547,892	262	21,597,897	320	20,000,213	4,234	226,146,002	
4. Res Total	4,092	206,006,473	381	24,578,378	399	22,861,095	4,872	253,445,946	1,591,010
% of Total	83.99	81.28	7.82	9.69	8.18	9.02	59.56	42.88	37.54
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	4,092	206,006,473	381	24,578,378	399	22,861,095	4,872	253,445,946	1,591,010
% of Total	83.99	81.28	7.82	9.69	8.18	9.02	59.56	42.88	37.54

County 73 - Red Willow

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 8,179	Value 590,942,645	Total Growth 4,237,769 (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	128	1,670,068	3	10,650	1	150	132	1,680,868	
10. Comm Improv Land	509	10,649,794	25	286,890	12	400,151	546	11,336,835	
11. Comm Improvements	534	71,960,943	28	3,745,242	34	3,764,336	596	79,470,521	
12. Comm Total	662	84,280,805	31	4,042,782	35	4,164,637	728	92,488,224	2,406,791
% of Total	90.93	91.12	4.25	4.37	4.80	4.50	8.90	15.65	56.79
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comm+Ind Total	662	84,280,805	31	4,042,782	35	4,164,637	728	92,488,224	2,406,791
% of Total	90.93	91.12	4.25	4.37	4.80	4.50	8.90	15.65	56.79
17. Taxable Total	4,754	290,287,278	412	28,621,160	434	27,025,732	5,600	345,934,170	3,997,801
% of Total	84.89	83.91	7.35	7.10	7.75	6.60	68.46	58.53	94.33

County 73 - Red Willow

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	3	149,034	8,601,748	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	3	149,034	8,601,748
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	149,034	8,601,748

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	0	0	63	28,164,800
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Records	Total Value	Growth			
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	63	28,164,800	0			
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0			
25. Mineral Interest Total	63	28,164,800	0			

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	456	97	226	779

Schedule V: Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	26	195,371	137	7,803,102	1,729	125,968,850	1,892	133,967,323
28. Ag-Improved Land	2	42,622	82	5,947,556	511	48,254,264	595	54,244,442
29. Ag-Improvements	2	3,634	83	5,298,739	539	23,329,537	624	28,631,910
30. Ag-Total Taxable							2,516	216,843,675

County 73 - Red Willow

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	1	1.000	7,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	47	47.000	321,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1		2,980	52		3,899,899	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	3	53.770	14,618	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	1	1.000	1,000	72	213.640	243,082	
37. FarmSite Improv	1		654	72		1,398,840	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		4.530			476.880		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	7	7.000	37,000	8	8.000	44,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	332	333.000	1,703,000	379	380.000	2,024,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	340		17,357,905	393		21,260,784	239,968
34. HomeSite Total				401	388.000	23,328,784	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	22	518.910	146,433	25	572.680	161,051	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	444	1,764.510	1,674,529	517	1,979.150	1,918,611	
37. FarmSite Improv	498		5,971,632	571		7,371,126	0
38. FarmSite Total				596	2,551.830	9,450,788	
39. Road & Ditches		6,390.410			6,871.820		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				997	9,811.650	32,779,572	239,968

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	0	0.000	0

Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records:

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

County 73 - Red Willow

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	114.700	112,180	2,535.440	2,484,731	10,932.380	10,713,467	13,582.520	13,310,378
46. 1A	27.780	22,502	6,785.420	5,496,189	28,544.580	23,120,543	35,357.780	28,639,234
47. 2A1	11.920	8,940	320.020	236,689	4,195.260	3,144,958	4,527.200	3,390,587
48. 2A	0.000	0	772.450	521,410	1,343.570	884,658	2,116.020	1,406,068
49. 3A1	1.810	1,086	371.320	222,792	1,793.910	1,075,652	2,167.040	1,299,530
50. 3A	0.000	0	340.880	178,962	679.840	348,043	1,020.720	527,005
51. 4A1	0.000	0	183.920	78,175	2,147.110	910,233	2,331.030	988,408
52. 4A	1.750	525	586.340	175,902	1,515.910	451,223	2,104.000	627,650
53. Total	157.960	145,233	11,895.790	9,394,850	51,152.560	40,648,777	63,206.310	50,188,860
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	71.240	41,320	362.030	209,976	4,389.650	2,545,998	4,822.920	2,797,294
55. 1D	37.480	21,739	2,371.470	1,375,458	122,976.130	71,326,156	125,385.080	72,723,353
56. 2D1	0.000	0	66.600	31,966	4,828.880	2,317,864	4,895.480	2,349,830
57. 2D	0.440	194	51.570	22,688	858.460	377,723	910.470	400,605
58. 3D1	0.850	340	544.630	217,852	23,258.630	9,303,452	23,804.110	9,521,644
59. 3D	0.000	0	89.600	30,912	357.390	123,298	446.990	154,210
60. 4D1	22.120	6,636	279.040	83,712	11,511.640	3,453,492	11,812.800	3,543,840
61. 4D	3.700	888	213.090	51,135	5,568.130	1,336,352	5,784.920	1,388,375
62. Total	135.830	71,117	3,978.030	2,023,699	173,748.910	90,784,335	177,862.770	92,879,151
Grass:								
63. 1G1	29.990	6,298	170.150	35,732	1,222.330	256,709	1,422.470	298,739
64. 1G	9.870	2,074	711.370	149,400	19,245.120	4,041,565	19,966.360	4,193,039
65. 2G1	0.000	0	385.770	81,010	6,070.150	1,274,758	6,455.920	1,355,768
66. 2G	0.350	74	297.430	62,463	2,340.390	491,487	2,638.170	554,024
67. 3G1	4.090	859	130.270	27,358	5,924.130	1,244,107	6,058.490	1,272,324
68. 3G	0.000	0	410.560	86,221	857.680	180,120	1,268.240	266,341
69. 4G1	27.260	5,725	1,357.370	285,054	28,717.410	6,030,766	30,102.040	6,321,545
70. 4G	26.730	5,613	4,843.930	1,017,231	122,327.850	25,688,966	127,198.510	26,711,810
71. Total	98.290	20,643	8,306.850	1,744,469	186,705.060	39,208,478	195,110.200	40,973,590
72. Waste	0.000	0	77.260	1,940	817.590	20,562	894.850	22,502
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	392.080	236,993	24,257.930	13,164,958	412,424.120	170,662,152	437,074.130	184,064,103

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	157.960	145,233	11,895.790	9,394,850	51,152.560	40,648,777	63,206.310	50,188,860
77.Dry Land	135.830	71,117	3,978.030	2,023,699	173,748.910	90,784,335	177,862.770	92,879,151
78.Grass	98.290	20,643	8,306.850	1,744,469	186,705.060	39,208,478	195,110.200	40,973,590
79.Waste	0.000	0	77.260	1,940	817.590	20,562	894.850	22,502
80.Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
81.Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
82.Total	392.080	236,993	24,257.930	13,164,958	412,424.120	170,662,152	437,074.130	184,064,103

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 73 - Red Willow

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	13,582.520	21.49%	13,310,378	26.52%	979.963
1A	35,357.780	55.94%	28,639,234	57.06%	809.983
2A1	4,527.200	7.16%	3,390,587	6.76%	748.936
2A	2,116.020	3.35%	1,406,068	2.80%	664.487
3A1	2,167.040	3.43%	1,299,530	2.59%	599.679
3A	1,020.720	1.61%	527,005	1.05%	516.307
4A1	2,331.030	3.69%	988,408	1.97%	424.022
4A	2,104.000	3.33%	627,650	1.25%	298.312
Irrigated Total	63,206.310	100.00%	50,188,860	100.00%	794.048

Dry:

1D1	4,822.920	2.71%	2,797,294	3.01%	580.000
1D	125,385.080	70.50%	72,723,353	78.30%	580.000
2D1	4,895.480	2.75%	2,349,830	2.53%	479.999
2D	910.470	0.51%	400,605	0.43%	439.998
3D1	23,804.110	13.38%	9,521,644	10.25%	400.000
3D	446.990	0.25%	154,210	0.17%	344.996
4D1	11,812.800	6.64%	3,543,840	3.82%	300.000
4D	5,784.920	3.25%	1,388,375	1.49%	239.999
Dry Total	177,862.770	100.00%	92,879,151	100.00%	522.195

Grass:

1G1	1,422.470	0.73%	298,739	0.73%	210.014
1G	19,966.360	10.23%	4,193,039	10.23%	210.005
2G1	6,455.920	3.31%	1,355,768	3.31%	210.003
2G	2,638.170	1.35%	554,024	1.35%	210.003
3G1	6,058.490	3.11%	1,272,324	3.11%	210.006
3G	1,268.240	0.65%	266,341	0.65%	210.008
4G1	30,102.040	15.43%	6,321,545	15.43%	210.003
4G	127,198.510	65.19%	26,711,810	65.19%	210.000
Grass Total	195,110.200	100.00%	40,973,590	100.00%	210.002

Irrigated Total	63,206.310	14.46%	50,188,860	27.27%	794.048
Dry Total	177,862.770	40.69%	92,879,151	50.46%	522.195
Grass Total	195,110.200	44.64%	40,973,590	22.26%	210.002
Waste	894.850	0.20%	22,502	0.01%	25.146
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	437,074.130	100.00%	184,064,103	100.00%	421.127

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	63,206.310	100.00%	50,188,860	100.00%
Dry Total	177,862.770	100.00%	92,879,151	100.00%
Grass Total	195,110.200	100.00%	40,973,590	100.00%
Waste	894.850	100.00%	22,502	100.00%
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%
Exempt	0.000	0.00%		
Market Area Total	437,074.130	100.00%	184,064,103	100.00%

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 73 - Red Willow

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	157.960	145,233	11,895.790	9,394,850	51,152.560	40,648,777
Dry	135.830	71,117	3,978.030	2,023,699	173,748.910	90,784,335
Grass	98.290	20,643	8,306.850	1,744,469	186,705.060	39,208,478
Waste	0.000	0	77.260	1,940	817.590	20,562
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Total	392.080	236,993	24,257.930	13,164,958	412,424.120	170,662,152

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Total Acres	% of Acres*	Total Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	63,206.310	50,188,860	63,206.310	14.46%	50,188,860	27.27%	794.048
Dry	177,862.770	92,879,151	177,862.770	40.69%	92,879,151	50.46%	522.195
Grass	195,110.200	40,973,590	195,110.200	44.64%	40,973,590	22.26%	210.002
Waste	894.850	22,502	894.850	0.20%	22,502	0.01%	25.146
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	437,074.130	184,064,103	437,074.130	100.00%	184,064,103	100.00%	421.127

* 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)**

73 Red Willow

	2007 CTL County Total	2008 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)	Percent Change	2008 Growth (New Construction Value)	% Change excl. Growth
1. Residential	250,840,770	253,445,946	2,605,176	1.04	1,591,010	0.4
2. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	22,263,626	23,328,784	1,065,158	4.78	*-----	4.78
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	273,104,396	276,774,730	3,670,334	1.34	1,591,010	0.76
5. Commercial	93,274,882	92,488,224	-786,658	-0.84	2,406,791	-3.42
6. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,570,243	9,450,788	1,880,545	24.84	239,968	21.67
8. Minerals	21,440,230	28,164,800	6,724,570	31.36	0	31.36
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	122,285,355	130,103,812	7,818,457	6.39	2,406,791	4.43
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	395,389,751	406,878,542	11,488,791	2.91	4,237,769	1.83
11. Irrigated	48,249,475	50,188,860	1,939,385	4.02		
12. Dryland	80,139,830	92,879,151	12,739,321	15.9		
13. Grassland	40,322,576	40,973,590	651,014	1.61		
14. Wasteland	132,628	22,502	-110,126	-83.03		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	168,844,509	184,064,103	15,219,594	9.01		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	564,234,260	590,942,645	26,708,385	4.73	4,237,769	3.98

*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 RED WILLOW COUNTY
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2008, 2009, AND 2010
DATE: JUNE 15, 2007

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. 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.

General Description of Real Property in Red Willow County:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value Base</u>
Residential	4,893	59.81%	44.23%
Commercial	735	08.98%	16.43%
Agricultural	2,491	30.45%	35.08%
Mineral Interest	62	00.76%	04.26%

Agricultural Land – taxable acres:

Irrigated	61,192.04	14.07%
Dry	176,746.20	40.64%
Grass	192,040.37	44.16%
Waste	4,934.02	01.13%

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

The Red Willow County Assessor provides general supervision over the staff and directs the assessment of all property in Red Willow County. The assessor is a registered appraiser and supervises all reappraisals in the county. Drive-by reviews are done on all properties that sell. Other duties include managing the staff, preparing the budget, making decisions on the purchases and filing claims for payment of the expenses for the county assessor's office. The assessor also meets with the liaison on surveys and reports and completes all reports as required by the statutes in a timely manner. When a protest is filed the assessor views each property with the county board. All Tax Equalization and Review Commission hearings are prepared for and attended by the assessor and county attorney. Hiring new employees is handled by the assessor including interviews, setting the salary and preparing the job description for that employee. The state assessed values are verified and certified to the entities by the assessor.

The deputy assessor assists the assessor with personnel matters, including interviewing applicants for employment and helps with drive-by reviews for the sold properties. The deputy handles the valuation of all oil and gas properties in the county, processing the appraisals done by Pritchard & Abbott, preparing the personal property schedules for oil, and entering values in the computer. Spreadsheets are prepared in the computer for property sold listing all information about the sale for use in the sales studies. The homestead exemptions are prepared for mailing by the deputy, checking for sold property, deceased individuals and verifying that the information on the application is correct. The qualified sales roster is reviewed by the deputy and any changes in value because of appraisals or corrections are noted. The deputy works with the assessor to prepare materials for TERC hearings and hearings are attended with the assessor. The deputy assists the assessor with all reports and assumes the duties in the absence of the assessor.

The assistant assessor handles the real estate transfers including changing the record cards, rolodex files, computer records, and completes the green sheets. Sales books are developed for assessor's office use and for the public's use which includes pictures, lot size, sales price and general data on the property. Split-outs are completed by the assistant and she also sends out sales questionnaires on all the sold properties. She prepares spreadsheets for the agland properties. The assistant prepares leased land letters for the signatures of the land owner and improvement owner.

The assessor's clerk updates record cards and copies information to the current records. Her duties include updating the inventory report and reviews sales rosters to check the state's data entry. The clerk collects information for the certification of trusts owning agland to the Secretary of State. The annual tax exempt applications are prepared by the clerk.

The data collector/clerk collects data for the appraisal work, gets measurements of new construction, takes pictures and gathers information on new construction as well as for reappraisals. The photos in our record cards are updated as we physically inspect the property.

The entire staff is trained to handle personal property schedules including reviewing the taxpayer's depreciation worksheets. They assist real estate agents, appraisers and customers requesting information from our office. The staff helps the public with completing their homestead exemption applications and income forms. They also do data entry on the Marshall-Swift costing. We work together to print and mail notice of valuation changes. Various staff members serve on personnel and safety committees that were set up by the county board.

The county assessor, deputy assessor and assistant assessor all hold an assessor's certificate with the State of Nebraska. The assessor and deputy attend the Assessor's workshops, IAAO courses, as well as district meetings to keep informed about new legislation and the latest information. Our budget includes funds so the assistant assessor will be able to get the required hours to retain her assessor's certificate.

Red Willow County has a procedure manual in place to guide the staff in the process of the pick-up work, reappraisals, real estate transfers, homestead exemptions and all major functions of the assessor's office. The manual describes and explains these operations in detail.

The 2007 budget for the Red Willow County Assessor's office is \$ 207,046.00

B. Cadastral Maps

The Red Willow County Assessor's office has cadastral maps that were made in May 1985. The staff maintains and keeps these maps current by drawing the split-outs on the soil map when property is sold. Our city and village maps were made in 1967. We had maps drawn of the new subdivisions. The county surveyor assists us with any questions concerning surveys or questions about the cadastral maps.

C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards in the assessor's office include owner's name and mailing address, the address of the property, legal description, classification codes, tax district codes and lot size. Property information including square foot and all physical components of the improvements, quality, condition, sketches and photos are included in the record card. All record cards are updated from information recorded with the county clerk, clerk of the district court and county court. The record cards are kept current due to the number of requests for information by the public. We now have a guest computer that is used by the public to access all information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

We are currently using Terra Scan software for our CAMA as well as our administrative package. We have a contract with GIS Workshop Inc. for our GIS software & website.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Real property in Red Willow County is divided into three groups: residential, commercial and agricultural. In Red Willow County, reappraisals are usually done annually on a rotating basis. We continually study our statistics so we can also focus on the areas that are falling below the required level of value.

All improved properties are inspected at the time of a reappraisal. Current data is checked for accuracy, notes are made as to the condition and a photograph is taken of each improvement. Interior updates are verified with the owner if possible. Otherwise we leave a door hanger at each property asking them to contact our office. If additional information is needed to complete the pricing we follow up with a phone call. The interior of our commercial property was inspected at the time of our reappraisal by Great Plains Appraisal.

On new construction we make an inspection of the improvement, we measure and determine the quality of the improvement and collect all the data at the site. If the property is not entirely done upon inspection, a follow-up review takes place at the end of the year. The owner is then contacted by phone or letter to confirm the percent of completion. The Marshall-Swift table of completion is used to determine the percent finished.

The pickup work in Red Willow County is continuous. Building permits are provided by the McCook city office as well as the village of Indianola. The other villages have no offices so permits are not available. Information about new improvements is seldom reported. We complete the pickup work as time permits throughout the year and follow-up with a check of the partially completed improvements right before the end of the year.

Depreciation tables are developed by analyzing the sales in a neighborhood. We gather facts and create a spreadsheet with all the sales information. We have built the sales information in our Terra Scan system so we can study the statistics annually.

Red Willow County uses the income analysis on commercial property only. An outside appraisal company is hired to assist us with our commercial appraisals. Knoche Appraisal is hired on an hourly basis at the determination of the County Assessor. A market analysis is completed on a yearly basis.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2007

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	93.71	16.86	105.81
Commercial	97.38	20.97	106.64
Agricultural	71.69	26.81	108.15

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2007 Reports & Opinions.

All reports are completed and filed in a timely manner usually being completed by the assessor with the assistance of the deputy assessor. These reports include the abstract, the personal property abstract, the certification of values, the school district taxable value report, the tax roll and the certificate of taxes levied. There are also tax list corrections filed throughout the year. The Red Willow County Assessor's office prepares the real estate and personal property tax statements for the county treasurer.

The Red Willow County Assessor's office accepts homestead exemption applications from February 1st thru June 30th of each year. We refer to statute 77-3510 thru 77-3528 as a guideline when questions arise. We prepare the applications prior to mailing them out in February, checking for sold property, deceased individuals and making sure information on the application is complete and correct. We assist the applicants with the homestead application and income forms that are provided by the department. We file

the applications with the Nebraska Department of Revenue by August 1st of each year.

Personal property schedules are to be filed with our office between January 1st and May 1st of each year. Personal property regulation 20 is used for assistance when questions arise. Schedules are mailed to each individual or company that filed the previous year. If they have not filed two weeks before the May 1st deadline we send a second reminder notice. We also notify all new business and property owners. Penalties on personal property are applied to late filings as the law permits. The personal property abstract is filed by June 15th.

Our real estate transfers are completed and sent to the department once a month. The assistant assessor works the 521's, changes all the necessary records, completes the green sheets and develops the sales books. A questionnaire is sent to both the buyer and seller for all classes of property. The sales are reviewed promptly with a drive by inspection. At that time we are checking the quality, condition, neighborhood and other factors that may have affected the sale.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Statistics for all neighborhoods will be generated and studied for all residential sales. It will be determined at that time if there are any problem areas.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

We are in the process of reviewing all commercial property, including physical inspections, collection of rental information, new costing and depreciation tables.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

For agland we are in the process of identifying land use on GIS. We plan to print new maps and contact each land owner to verify our current information. All agricultural sales will be plotted so we can study the market and also to determine if we need to develop market areas.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009

All statistics will be reviewed for residential and commercial. We will identify the problem areas and determine at that time if percentage adjustments or updates in costing will be needed.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

We plan to complete on-site inspection for all McCook residential properties. Our office will review statistics for each class of property to discover problem areas that may require a review to establish uniformity.

Detailed Breakdown of functions performed by the assessor's office, but no limited to:

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates and 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 and 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 1,120 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 449 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing-management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates-management of school district and other tax entity

boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed. Prepare tax statements for the county treasurer.
11. Tax List Corrections-prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization-attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests-assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals-prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization-attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education-attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Deputy Assessor and Assistant Assessor are required to obtain 15 hours per year of continued education to maintain the assessor's certification.

Conclusion:

The current budget includes salary for staff to complete in-house appraisals for all residential and ag appraisals. The budget also includes an amount for physical inspections for commercial property that are completed by our in-house appraisal staff.

The standard expenses budgeted including telephone, postage, equipment and supplies increase as the cost of these items inflates.

Our current budget includes a line item for reappraisal. This covers expenses for oil and gas appraisal, Knoche Appraisal for commercial updates and guidance on depreciation tables for other classes of property. This line also includes expenses for fuel costs for sales reviews and on-site inspections for all appraisals.

Our budget also contains a line item for the geographical information system. The setup fees as well as annual costs are included in the lines.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra K. Kotschwar
Red Willow County Assessor

Date

PRIOR YEAR'S STATISTICAL CORRELATION

RESIDENTIAL

ASSESSMENT YEAR	R & O MEDIAN	AGGREGATE	COD	PRD
2001	95	93	18.78	101.72
2002	94	92	17.01	103.62
2003	95	93	18	104.00
2004	97.22	95.74	19.70	107.19
2005	97.42	95.18	15.14	106.19
2006	95.98	93.17	17.25	106.94

COMMERCIAL

2001	100	105	21.43	107.09
2002	98	97	17.54	102.80
2003	96	95	17.00	94.00
2004	96	97.08	24.31	99.09
2005	96.09	97.01	25.75	99.38
2006	96.09	95.96	20.11	95.57

AG-LAND

2001	75	73	14.83	101.29
2002	75	74	15.78	100.43
2003	76	75	15.00	102.00
2004	74	74.95	19.24	103.65
2005	76.33	76.38	15.56	102.21
2006	75.82	73.70	18.79	103.26

2008 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	The Red Willow County Assessor is a registered appraiser.
3.	Other full-time employees
	4
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$ 207,046
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$ 24,000 is dedicated to software for the GIS system. The treasurer and assessor share a computer budget out of the general fund for TerraScan contracts and equipment.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$ 207,046
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$ 16,000
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$ 3,550
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	None

12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$ 207,046
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$ 16,935.62

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software
	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes – Will keep city and villages updated and utilize the GIS for the agricultural maps.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Office staff.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes - GIS Workshop
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	The assessor and staff.
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes, but does not include the villages.

3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	The City of McCook.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	October 16, 2001.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	A contracted appraiser will be hired on an as need basis to assist with real property appraisals. Pritchard & Abbott have been contracted to do the oil and gas mineral appraisals.
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

- Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.
- One copy to the Red Willow County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5951.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

Valuation History Charts