

## 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

75 Rock

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	29	COD	11.51
Total Sales Price	\$1,130,550	PRD	100.52
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,134,050	COV	19.28
Total Assessed Value	\$1,122,145	STD	19.18
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$39,105	Avg. Abs. Dev.	11.45
Avg. Assessed Value	\$38,695	Min	35.00
Median	99.40	Max	150.00
Wgt. Mean	98.95	95% Median C.I.	95.24 to 105.00
Mean	99.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	94.87 to 103.03
		95% Mean C.I.	92.17 to 106.76
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			8.57
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			3.93
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.98
Average Assessed Value of the Base			30,565

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	29	99.40	11.51	100.52
2007	37	97.32	10.80	102.37
2006	48	98.46	7.42	100.81
2005	51	97.65	19.90	103.47
2004	49	100.76	27.11	115.87
2003	53	99	20.93	111.55
2002	55	99	12.85	103.75
2001	63	95	49.59	129.83

## 2008 Commission Summary

75 Rock

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6	COD	11.18
Total Sales Price	\$714,062	PRD	107.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$696,062	COV	17.78
Total Assessed Value	\$655,025	STD	17.95
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$116,010	Avg. Abs. Dev.	10.48
Avg. Assessed Value	\$109,171	Min	87.41
Median	93.71	Max	135.75
Wgt. Mean	94.10	95% Median C.I.	87.41 to 135.75
Mean	100.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	89.51 to 98.69
		95% Mean C.I.	82.10 to 119.79
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			2.43
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			4.32
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			10.26
Average Assessed Value of the Base			45,921

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	6	93.71	11.18	107.27
2007	10	96.43	5.21	101.27
2006	14	97.37	5.24	100.99
2005	21	97.15	18.65	101.57
2004	20	99.90	19.88	104.58
2003	13	99	24.85	113.89
2002	11	93	25.17	100.79
2001	16	95	25.53	100.52



## 2008 Commission Summary

**75      Rock**

### Agricultural Land - Current

<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>21.23</b>
Total Sales Price	\$13,702,820	<b>PRD</b>	<b>106.89</b>
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$12,663,620	COV	29.65
Total Assessed Value	\$8,693,995	STD	21.76
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$294,503	Avg. Abs. Dev.	15.36
Avg. Assessed Value	\$202,186	Min	39.79
<b>Median</b>	<b>72.35</b>	Max	135.83
Wgt. Mean	68.65	95% Median C.I.	66.06 to 77.87
Mean	73.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	63.45 to 73.86
		95% Mean C.I.	66.88 to 79.89
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			89
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			2.02
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			8.64
Average Assessed Value of the Base			109,667

### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
<b>2008</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>72.35</b>	<b>21.23</b>	<b>106.89</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>71.21</b>	<b>20.69</b>	<b>100.38</b>
<b>2006</b>	35	78.51	17.90	103.37
<b>2005</b>	38	77.59	14.63	104.48
<b>2004</b>	39	76.88	12.96	102.21
<b>2003</b>	42	74	16.1	106.46
<b>2002</b>	39	75	26.88	118.28
<b>2001</b>	46	80	28.49	114.48



## **2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Rock 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 Rock County is 99% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Rock 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 Rock County is 100% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Rock County is not 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 Rock County is 72% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Rock County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



**PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>100</b>	COV:	20.07	95% Median C.I.:	94.04 to 107.60	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.27 to 103.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	91.75 to 106.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,185							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	13.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,696	PRD:	100.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:53

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	5	97.32	100.66	100.93	5.59	99.73	94.60	108.99	N/A	63,900	64,494
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	109.80	109.80	109.25	0.55	100.50	109.19	110.40	N/A	23,750	25,947
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	94.89	94.89	95.48	0.89	99.38	94.04	95.73	N/A	47,000	44,875
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	88.13	99.20	84.59	21.11	117.27	76.54	150.00	N/A	29,800	25,208
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	99.00	97.10	94.60	5.06	102.64	88.63	103.66	N/A	29,166	27,591
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	105.74	91.92	109.51	19.01	83.94	35.00	115.55	35.00 to 115.55	33,925	37,151
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	104.21	104.21	104.12	1.47	100.09	102.68	105.74	N/A	66,250	68,980
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	100.19	105.21	87.95	17.11	119.63	85.45	135.00	N/A	25,125	22,096
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	14	96.53	100.62	96.75	11.78	104.00	76.54	150.00	88.13 to 109.19	43,571	42,153
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	103.66	98.14	101.52	13.80	96.67	35.00	135.00	88.63 to 109.71	34,936	35,468
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	97.37	95.54	97.65	16.67	97.84	35.00	150.00	80.88 to 106.47	33,378	32,592
<u>ALL</u>											
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BASSETT	17	100.44	97.51	99.67	9.92	97.83	75.48	115.55	88.13 to 107.60	39,191	39,061
BASSETT SUB VACANT	3	135.00	131.57	123.00	9.95	106.97	109.71	150.00	N/A	1,833	2,255
BASSETT SUBURBAN	4	96.04	96.00	96.70	6.14	99.28	85.45	106.47	N/A	80,000	77,361
NEWPORT	3	109.19	104.54	105.79	4.99	98.82	94.04	110.40	N/A	20,500	21,686
NEWPORT SUB	1	95.73	95.73	95.73			95.73	95.73	N/A	80,000	76,585
NEWPORT V	1	35.00	35.00	35.00			35.00	35.00	N/A	800	280
<u>ALL</u>											
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

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	21	100.44	95.54	100.12	12.32	95.43	35.00	115.55	88.63 to 107.60	34,692	34,732
2	8	101.90	109.31	96.87	15.69	112.84	85.45	150.00	85.45 to 150.00	50,687	49,099
<u>ALL</u>											
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>100</b>	COV:	20.07	95% Median C.I.:	94.04 to 107.60	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.27 to 103.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	91.75 to 106.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,185							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	13.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,696	PRD:	100.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:53

**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	25	99.00	98.04	98.88	9.19	99.15	75.48	115.55	94.04 to 105.74	45,110	44,605
2	4	122.36	107.43	111.83	28.66	96.07	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,761
____ALL____	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696
06											
07											
____ALL____	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696
NonValid School											
____ALL____	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**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	4	122.36	107.43	111.83	28.66	96.07	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,761
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	3	95.73	98.26	96.05	3.82	102.30	94.04	105.00	N/A	33,333	32,016
1940 TO 1949	2	81.81	81.81	85.94	7.73	95.19	75.48	88.13	N/A	16,625	14,287
1950 TO 1959	6	99.72	99.56	100.77	4.82	98.80	90.67	108.99	90.67 to 108.99	29,333	29,558
1960 TO 1969	4	106.11	103.72	104.46	6.16	99.29	88.63	114.04	N/A	60,750	63,457
1970 TO 1979	4	100.00	96.04	97.35	9.11	98.65	76.54	107.60	N/A	73,250	71,307
1980 TO 1989	2	100.50	100.50	98.82	14.98	101.70	85.45	115.55	N/A	62,500	61,760
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	109.80	109.80	109.25	0.55	100.50	109.19	110.40	N/A	23,750	25,947
2000 TO Present	2	87.82	87.82	89.72	7.91	97.89	80.88	94.77	N/A	55,000	49,345
____ALL____	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>100</b>	COV:	20.07	95% Median C.I.:	94.04 to 107.60	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.27 to 103.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	91.75 to 106.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,185							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	13.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,696	PRD:	100.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:53

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	5	110.40	108.02	111.42	25.41	96.95	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,760	1,961
5000 TO 9999	2	90.24	90.24	90.55	16.36	99.65	75.48	105.00	N/A	5,875	5,320
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	7	109.71	102.94	99.49	23.43	103.47	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	2,935	2,920
10000 TO 29999	7	94.60	95.79	95.35	4.57	100.46	88.13	103.66	88.13 to 103.66	23,357	22,270
30000 TO 59999	7	108.99	99.12	99.60	12.15	99.52	76.54	115.55	76.54 to 115.55	48,857	48,660
60000 TO 99999	8	100.00	99.47	99.54	6.15	99.93	85.45	107.60	85.45 to 107.60	76,000	75,653
ALL _____											
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	6	110.06	102.60	97.22	26.53	105.54	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	2,425	2,357
5000 TO 9999	1	105.00	105.00	105.00			105.00	105.00	N/A	6,000	6,300
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	7	109.71	102.94	99.49	23.43	103.47	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	2,935	2,920
10000 TO 29999	7	94.60	95.79	95.35	4.57	100.46	88.13	103.66	88.13 to 103.66	23,357	22,270
30000 TO 59999	7	88.63	94.82	94.35	14.40	100.50	76.54	114.04	76.54 to 114.04	50,857	47,982
60000 TO 99999	8	104.21	103.23	102.69	5.38	100.53	94.77	115.55	94.77 to 115.55	74,250	76,245
ALL _____											
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**QUALITY**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	122.36	107.43	111.83	28.66	96.07	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,761
10	4	101.62	97.28	103.20	12.32	94.26	75.48	110.40	N/A	16,812	17,350
20	8	97.52	97.94	96.99	8.43	100.98	85.45	115.55	85.45 to 115.55	31,937	30,975
30	12	98.16	97.66	98.22	8.84	99.43	76.54	114.04	88.63 to 107.60	59,750	58,687
40	1	106.47	106.47	106.47			106.47	106.47	N/A	88,000	93,690
ALL _____											
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>100</b>	COV:	20.07	95% Median C.I.:	94.04 to 107.60	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.27 to 103.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	91.75 to 106.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,185							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	13.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,696	PRD:	100.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:53

<b>STYLE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	4	122.36	107.43	111.83	28.66	96.07	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,761	
101	21	99.00	97.14	97.88	9.50	99.25	75.48	115.55	88.63 to 105.74	40,107	39,255	
102	1	95.73	95.73	95.73			95.73	95.73	N/A	80,000	76,585	
104	3	106.47	105.09	104.23	6.03	100.82	94.77	114.04	N/A	68,500	71,400	
<u>ALL</u>												
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696	

<b>CONDITION</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	4	122.36	107.43	111.83	28.66	96.07	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,761	
10	1	110.40	110.40	110.40			110.40	110.40	N/A	2,500	2,760	
20	4	102.05	96.15	99.34	8.02	96.79	75.48	105.00	N/A	13,562	13,472	
30	18	96.53	97.86	98.44	9.14	99.41	76.54	115.55	90.67 to 107.60	53,083	52,253	
40	2	97.30	97.30	102.10	9.42	95.30	88.13	106.47	N/A	57,750	58,962	
<u>ALL</u>												
	29	100.44	99.33	98.95	13.31	100.39	35.00	150.00	94.04 to 107.60	39,105	38,696	



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

**Residential**

For assessment year 2008 all sketches have been drawn into the Terra Scan computer system for all properties. The only other changes in the residential class will be through pickup work of new improvements or changes found due to sales verifications.

All sales were reviewed by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2008 assessment roll.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Rock County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b> Assessor and Deputy
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b> Assessor and Deputy
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b> Assessor and Deputy
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b> June 2004 Marshall-Swift
5.	<b>What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b> 2004
6.	<b>What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?</b> The assessor does not currently use the sales comparison approach.
7.	<b>Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:</b> 7 – Bassett, Bassett Suburban, Bassett Sub Vacant, Newport, Newport Sub, Newport Vacant and Rural
8.	<b>How are these defined?</b> These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town, suburban and rural. Suburban properties are everything outside the City limits up to a one mile radius.
9.	<b>Is “Assessor Location” a usable valuation identity?</b> Yes
10.	<b>Does the assessor location “suburban” mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the “suburban” location have its own market?)</b> Yes

11.	<b>What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> ( <i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	The suburban assessor locations are significant to the market as these properties have their own market and would be considered a valuation grouping. As far as the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B there is no market significance as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.
12.	<b>Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?</b>
	Yes

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
10	0	0	10

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	19.28	95% Median C.I.:	95.24 to 105.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 103.03	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.45	95% Mean C.I.:	92.17 to 106.76	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	11.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,694	PRD:	100.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:17

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	5	97.32	97.47	97.62	1.94	99.85	95.05	100.34	N/A	63,900	62,379
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	109.80	109.80	109.25	0.55	100.50	109.19	110.40	N/A	23,750	25,947
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	94.89	94.89	95.48	0.89	99.38	94.04	95.73	N/A	47,000	44,875
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	99.20	103.86	90.78	16.28	114.41	78.41	150.00	N/A	29,800	27,053
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	99.00	97.10	94.60	5.06	102.64	88.63	103.66	N/A	29,166	27,591
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	105.74	91.92	109.51	19.01	83.94	35.00	115.55	35.00 to 115.55	33,925	37,151
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	104.21	104.21	104.12	1.47	100.09	102.68	105.74	N/A	66,250	68,980
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	98.39	104.31	89.25	13.41	116.87	85.45	135.00	N/A	25,125	22,423
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	14	98.26	101.15	96.53	8.86	104.79	78.41	150.00	94.04 to 109.19	43,571	42,057
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	102.68	97.90	101.77	13.32	96.19	35.00	135.00	88.63 to 106.47	34,936	35,556
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	99.10	97.00	99.37	14.93	97.61	35.00	150.00	88.63 to 106.47	33,378	33,168
<u>ALL</u>											
	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BASSETT	17	99.20	97.97	99.13	7.51	98.84	75.48	115.55	91.27 to 105.00	39,191	38,850
BASSETT SUB VACANT	3	135.00	128.33	116.82	12.35	109.86	100.00	150.00	N/A	1,833	2,141
BASSETT SUBURBAN	4	98.83	97.40	97.92	6.08	99.46	85.45	106.47	N/A	80,000	78,336
NEWPORT	3	109.19	104.54	105.79	4.99	98.82	94.04	110.40	N/A	20,500	21,686
NEWPORT SUB	1	95.73	95.73	95.73			95.73	95.73	N/A	80,000	76,585
NEWPORT V	1	35.00	35.00	35.00			35.00	35.00	N/A	800	280
<u>ALL</u>											
	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

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	21	99.20	95.91	99.62	10.43	96.28	35.00	115.55	94.04 to 105.00	34,692	34,561
2	8	100.17	108.79	97.74	14.14	111.30	85.45	150.00	85.45 to 150.00	50,687	49,544
<u>ALL</u>											
	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	19.28	95% Median C.I.:	95.24 to 105.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 103.03	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.45	95% Mean C.I.:	92.17 to 106.76	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	11.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,694	PRD:	100.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:17

**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	23	99.00	97.61	98.45	6.99	99.14	75.48	115.55	95.05 to 102.68	46,967	46,241
2	6	109.80	106.60	108.92	22.95	97.87	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	8,966	9,766
____ALL____	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694
06											
07											
____ALL____	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694
NonValid School											
____ALL____	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**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	4	117.50	105.00	106.43	31.91	98.66	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,676
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	3	95.73	98.26	96.05	3.82	102.30	94.04	105.00	N/A	33,333	32,016
1940 TO 1949	2	83.38	83.38	88.54	9.47	94.17	75.48	91.27	N/A	16,625	14,720
1950 TO 1959	6	99.20	99.09	98.86	2.10	100.23	95.24	103.66	95.24 to 103.66	29,333	28,999
1960 TO 1969	4	106.11	103.72	104.46	6.16	99.29	88.63	114.04	N/A	60,750	63,457
1970 TO 1979	4	96.19	93.36	94.47	6.90	98.83	78.41	102.68	N/A	73,250	69,197
1980 TO 1989	2	100.50	100.50	98.82	14.98	101.70	85.45	115.55	N/A	62,500	61,760
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	109.80	109.80	109.25	0.55	100.50	109.19	110.40	N/A	23,750	25,947
2000 TO Present	2	99.77	99.77	99.93	0.57	99.84	99.20	100.34	N/A	55,000	54,960
____ALL____	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	19.28	95% Median C.I.:	95.24 to 105.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 103.03	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.45	95% Mean C.I.:	92.17 to 106.76	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	11.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,694	PRD:	100.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:17

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	5	110.40	106.08	107.56	27.17	98.63	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,760	1,893
5000 TO 9999	2	90.24	90.24	90.55	16.36	99.65	75.48	105.00	N/A	5,875	5,320
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	7	105.00	101.55	97.83	25.16	103.80	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	2,935	2,872
10000 TO 29999	7	96.78	97.20	96.99	3.33	100.22	91.27	103.66	91.27 to 103.66	23,357	22,655
30000 TO 59999	7	99.40	100.63	100.53	10.43	100.10	78.41	115.55	78.41 to 115.55	48,857	49,114
60000 TO 99999	8	98.83	98.60	98.63	5.27	99.97	85.45	106.47	85.45 to 106.47	76,000	74,956
ALL _____											
	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	6	105.20	100.98	94.88	29.30	106.43	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	2,425	2,300
5000 TO 9999	1	105.00	105.00	105.00			105.00	105.00	N/A	6,000	6,300
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	7	105.00	101.55	97.83	25.16	103.80	35.00	150.00	35.00 to 150.00	2,935	2,872
10000 TO 29999	7	96.78	97.20	96.99	3.33	100.22	91.27	103.66	91.27 to 103.66	23,357	22,655
30000 TO 59999	7	99.20	96.33	95.24	10.10	101.14	78.41	114.04	78.41 to 114.04	50,857	48,437
60000 TO 99999	8	101.51	102.36	101.75	5.17	100.60	95.05	115.55	95.05 to 115.55	74,250	75,549
ALL _____											
	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**QUALITY**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	117.50	105.00	106.43	31.91	98.66	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,676
10	4	101.62	97.28	103.20	12.32	94.26	75.48	110.40	N/A	16,812	17,350
20	8	98.61	99.17	98.04	7.09	101.16	85.45	115.55	85.45 to 115.55	31,937	31,311
30	12	99.10	97.96	97.89	5.66	100.07	78.41	114.04	95.05 to 102.68	59,750	58,488
40	1	106.47	106.47	106.47			106.47	106.47	N/A	88,000	93,690
ALL _____											
	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	19.28	95% Median C.I.:	95.24 to 105.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,130,550	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	19.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 103.03	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,134,050	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.45	95% Mean C.I.:	92.17 to 106.76	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,122,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	39,105	COD:	11.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,694	PRD:	100.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.00			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:17

<b>STYLE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	4	117.50	105.00	106.43	31.91	98.66	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,676	
101	21	99.00	97.52	97.45	7.39	100.07	75.48	115.55	94.04 to 103.66	40,107	39,083	
102	1	95.73	95.73	95.73			95.73	95.73	N/A	80,000	76,585	
104	3	106.47	106.95	106.13	4.29	100.77	100.34	114.04	N/A	68,500	72,700	
ALL	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694	

<b>CONDITION</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	4	117.50	105.00	106.43	31.91	98.66	35.00	150.00	N/A	1,575	1,676	
10	1	110.40	110.40	110.40			110.40	110.40	N/A	2,500	2,760	
20	4	102.05	96.15	99.34	8.02	96.79	75.48	105.00	N/A	13,562	13,472	
30	18	98.16	98.43	98.38	6.71	100.06	78.41	115.55	95.05 to 102.68	53,083	52,222	
40	2	98.87	98.87	102.85	7.69	96.13	91.27	106.47	N/A	57,750	59,395	
ALL	29	99.40	99.47	98.95	11.51	100.52	35.00	150.00	95.24 to 105.00	39,105	38,694	





**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Both qualitative statistical measures are within their respective parameters; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for the residential class of property. The median measure will be used to describe the overall level of value for the residential property class.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

**II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used**

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>46.77</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>61.67</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>69.86</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>73.13</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>77.94</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>77.46</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>86.3</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates the percentage of sales used has significantly decreased from the previous year. Further review of the non-qualified sales reveals many sales between family members as well as substantially changed after the sale.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>100.44</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>101.87</b>	<b>99.40</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>97.17</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>99.2</b>	<b>97.32</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>96.74</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>100.06</b>	<b>98.46</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>99.79</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>105.18</b>	<b>97.65</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>101.87</b>	<b>-6.28</b>	<b>95.48</b>	<b>100.76</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>-0.77</b>	<b>98.24</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>92.88</b>	<b>20.89</b>	<b>112.28</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>93.42</b>	<b>95</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median Ratio are somewhat dissimilar but not unreasonable. There is no information available that would suggest that the median is not the best indication of the level of value for the residential class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales</b>		<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
0.25	2008	1.42
3.63	2007	2.09
8.35	2006	3.44
0.48	2005	5.4
1.32	2004	-6.28
0	2003	-0.77
15.27	2002	20.89
2.4	2001	2.66

RESIDENTIAL: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change to the assessed base reveals an approximate 1.17 point difference between the two figures. The percent change in the sales base value and the percent change in assessed base value is consistent with the reported assessment actions.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>99.40</b>	<b>98.95</b>	<b>99.47</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of central tendency are very similar and within the acceptable range for level of value. The similarity between the measures of central tendency would indicate that the level of value has been attained.



**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>11.51</b>	<b>100.52</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Both qualitative measures are within the accepted parameters indicating that the county has attained uniform assessments within the residential class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>100.44</b>	<b>99.40</b>	<b>-1.04</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>98.95</b>	<b>98.95</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>99.33</b>	<b>99.47</b>	<b>0.14</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>13.31</b>	<b>11.51</b>	<b>-1.8</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>100.39</b>	<b>100.52</b>	<b>0.13</b>
<b>Min Sales Ratio</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	<b>150.00</b>	<b>150.00</b>	<b>0</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The reported actions by the assessor that there were no overall valuation changes other than pickup work or changes found due to sales verification are confirmed in the comparison between the Preliminary Statistical Report and the R&O Analysis.



**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.41 to 137.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	714,062	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	82.71 to 113.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	696,062	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.09	95% Mean C.I.:	81.85 to 131.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	683,400						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	116,010	COD:	17.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.90		
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,900	PRD:	108.55	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:58

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	90.27	90.27	89.85	3.16	100.46	87.41	93.12	N/A	76,000	68,287
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	137.90	137.90	137.90			137.90	137.90	N/A	84,000	115,835
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	114.44	113.55	107.43	20.34	105.69	87.41	137.90	N/A	60,000	64,460
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	93.74	103.20	99.73	13.79	103.47	87.41	137.90	N/A	138,250	137,878
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BASSETT	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

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	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.41 to 137.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	714,062	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	82.71 to 113.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	696,062	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.09	95% Mean C.I.:	81.85 to 131.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	683,400						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	116,010	COD:	17.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.90		
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,900	PRD:	108.55	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:58

**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	93.12	93.12	93.12			93.12	93.12	N/A	65,000	60,530
03	5	94.35	109.27	98.70	20.20	110.71	87.41	137.90	N/A	126,212	124,574
04											
ALL	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900
NonValid School											
ALL	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	114.44	114.44	95.59	18.63	119.71	93.12	135.75	N/A	34,500	32,980
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	1	137.90	137.90	137.90			137.90	137.90	N/A	84,000	115,835
1970 TO 1979	2	89.17	89.17	89.58	1.97	99.55	87.41	90.93	N/A	113,031	101,250
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900

**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.41 to 137.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	714,062	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	82.71 to 113.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	696,062	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.09	95% Mean C.I.:	81.85 to 131.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	683,400						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	116,010	COD:	17.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.90		
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,900	PRD:	108.55	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.41		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:58:58

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	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430	
60000 TO 99999	3	93.12	106.14	106.95	18.07	99.24	87.41	137.90	N/A	78,666	84,136	
100000 TO 149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455	
250000 TO 499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105	
ALL _____												
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900	

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$ _____												
5000 TO 9999	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430	
60000 TO 99999	2	90.27	90.27	89.85	3.16	100.46	87.41	93.12	N/A	76,000	68,287	
100000 TO 149999	2	114.42	114.42	108.62	20.53	105.34	90.93	137.90	N/A	111,531	121,145	
250000 TO 499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105	
ALL _____												
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900	

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	1	93.12	93.12	93.12			93.12	93.12	N/A	65,000	60,530	
10	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430	
20	4	92.64	102.65	98.47	14.55	104.25	87.41	137.90	N/A	156,765	154,360	
ALL _____												
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	1	93.12	93.12	93.12			93.12	93.12	N/A	65,000	60,530	
343	1	137.90	137.90	137.90			137.90	137.90	N/A	84,000	115,835	
352	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455	
353	1	87.41	87.41	87.41			87.41	87.41	N/A	87,000	76,045	
406	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430	
531	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105	
ALL _____												
	6	93.74	106.58	98.18	17.17	108.55	87.41	137.90	87.41 to 137.90	116,010	113,900	

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

**Commercial**

For assessment year 2008 the assessor revalued the one motel in the county. Any changes found through pickup work and/or sales verification were updated.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Rock County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2004 Marshall-Swift
5.	<b>What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2004
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The income approach has not been utilized.
7.	<b>When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The assessor does not currently use the sales comparison approach.
8.	<b>Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?</b>
	4 – Bassett, Newport, Suburban and Rural
9.	<b>How are these defined?</b>
	These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town, suburban and rural. Suburban properties are everything outside the City limits up to one mile radius.
10.	<b>Is “Assessor Location” a usable valuation identity?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Does the assessor location “suburban” mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the “suburban” location have its own market?)</b>
	Yes



12.	<b>What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> ( <i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	The suburban assessor locations are significant to the market as these properties have their own market and would be considered a valuation grouping. As far as the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B there is no market significance as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	0	0

**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	17.78	95% Median C.I.:	87.41 to 135.75
TOTAL Sales Price:	714,062	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	17.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.51 to 98.69
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	696,062	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48	95% Mean C.I.:	82.10 to 119.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	655,025						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	116,010	COD:	11.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	109,170	PRD:	107.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.41		

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:19

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04											
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	90.24	90.24	89.83	3.13	100.46	87.41	93.06	N/A	76,000	68,267
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	104.17	104.17	104.17			104.17	104.17	N/A	84,000	87,500
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	98.62	105.10	95.61	15.07	109.92	87.41	135.75	N/A	60,000	57,366
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	93.71	94.75	94.60	4.82	100.16	87.41	104.17	N/A	138,250	130,785
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
BASSETT	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170
<u>ALL</u>											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	17.78	95% Median C.I.:	87.41 to 135.75
TOTAL Sales Price:	714,062	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	17.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.51 to 98.69
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	696,062	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48	95% Mean C.I.:	82.10 to 119.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	655,025						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	116,010	COD:	11.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	109,170	PRD:	107.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.41		

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:19

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	2	92.00	92.00	91.61	1.16	100.42	90.93	93.06	N/A	102,031	93,472
03	4	99.26	105.42	95.14	14.65	110.81	87.41	135.75	N/A	123,000	117,020
04											
ALL	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
09-0010											
75-0100	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170
NonValid School											
ALL	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	114.41	114.41	95.54	18.66	119.75	93.06	135.75	N/A	34,500	32,960
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	1	104.17	104.17	104.17			104.17	104.17	N/A	84,000	87,500
1970 TO 1979	2	89.17	89.17	89.58	1.97	99.55	87.41	90.93	N/A	113,031	101,250
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	17.78	95% Median C.I.:	87.41 to 135.75
TOTAL Sales Price:	714,062	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	17.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.51 to 98.69
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	696,062	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.48	95% Mean C.I.:	82.10 to 119.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	655,025						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	116,010	COD:	11.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	109,170	PRD:	107.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.41		

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:19

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
60000 TO 99999	3	93.06	94.88	94.93	6.00	99.95	87.41	104.17	N/A	78,666	74,678
100000 TO 149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
250000 TO 499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALL _____											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**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	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
60000 TO 99999	3	93.06	94.88	94.93	6.00	99.95	87.41	104.17	N/A	78,666	74,678
100000 TO 149999	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
250000 TO 499999	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALL _____											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	93.06	93.06	93.06			93.06	93.06	N/A	65,000	60,490
10	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
20	4	92.64	94.22	93.95	5.45	100.29	87.41	104.17	N/A	156,765	147,276
ALL _____											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	93.06	93.06	93.06			93.06	93.06	N/A	65,000	60,490
343	1	104.17	104.17	104.17			104.17	104.17	N/A	84,000	87,500
352	1	90.93	90.93	90.93			90.93	90.93	N/A	139,062	126,455
353	1	87.41	87.41	87.41			87.41	87.41	N/A	87,000	76,045
406	1	135.75	135.75	135.75			135.75	135.75	N/A	4,000	5,430
531	1	94.35	94.35	94.35			94.35	94.35	N/A	317,000	299,105
ALL _____											
	6	93.71	100.95	94.10	11.18	107.27	87.41	135.75	87.41 to 135.75	116,010	109,170



**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: With only six sales in the commercial sales file it is believed that with the diversity of the sales, the representativeness of the sample to the population is unreliable. There is no other information available that would indicate that Rock County has not met an acceptable level of value for the commercial class of property for assessment year 2008.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

**II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used**

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>37.5</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>55.56</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58.33</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>72.41</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>76.92</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>61.9</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>69.57</b>

COMMERCIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates the percentage of sales used has decreased from the previous year. Further review of the non-qualified sales reveals nothing that would indicate excessive trimming.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>93.74</b>	<b>-0.65</b>	<b>93.13</b>	<b>93.71</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>94.89</b>	<b>-0.41</b>	<b>94.5</b>	<b>96.43</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95.90</b>	<b>13.86</b>	<b>109.19</b>	<b>97.37</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>98.75</b>	<b>-0.68</b>	<b>98.08</b>	<b>97.15</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>99.45</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>102.44</b>	<b>99.90</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>99.01</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>89.37</b>	<b>-0.68</b>	<b>88.76</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>95.13</b>	<b>92</b>

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O ratio suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales</b>		<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>-11</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>-0.65</b>
<b>3.49</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>-0.41</b>
<b>-4.04</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>13.86</b>
<b>-9.84</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>-0.68</b>
<b>0.14</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>3.01</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>0.01</b>
<b>2.54</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>-0.68</b>
<b>39.29</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2.29</b>

COMMERCIAL: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change to the assessed base reveals an approximate 10.35 point difference between the two figures. As reported in the assessment actions for commercial property the assessor revalued the one motel in the county. The motel is included in the six qualified sales and is distorting the percent change in total assessed value in the sales file.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>93.71</b>	<b>94.10</b>	<b>100.95</b>

COMMERCIAL: The median and weighted mean are both within the acceptable range while the mean is slightly above. These measures are based on six qualified sales and may not be reliable.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>11.18</b>	<b>107.27</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4.27</b>

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range while the price related differential is above the range, based on six qualified sales.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>93.74</b>	<b>93.71</b>	<b>-0.03</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>98.18</b>	<b>94.10</b>	<b>-4.08</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>106.58</b>	<b>100.95</b>	<b>-5.63</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>17.17</b>	<b>11.18</b>	<b>-5.99</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>108.55</b>	<b>107.27</b>	<b>-1.28</b>
<b>Min Sales Ratio</b>	<b>87.41</b>	<b>87.41</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	<b>137.90</b>	<b>135.75</b>	<b>-2.15</b>

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for the commercial class of property. The one motel in the county was revalued for 2008 which is reflected in the qualified statistics.





**PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>60</b>	COV:	31.98	95% Median C.I.:	53.84 to 69.43	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.31 to 63.14	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	58.55 to 70.92	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,436,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,947	PRD:	110.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.54			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:59:15

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	5	85.17	90.29	88.74	13.60	101.75	69.32	110.25	N/A	134,792	119,620
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	79.85	79.85	79.85			79.85	79.85	N/A	144,000	114,980
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	5	71.68	90.78	78.64	28.01	115.44	69.43	123.05	N/A	107,620	84,636
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	4	66.61	71.20	69.32	14.14	102.71	61.03	90.54	N/A	281,500	195,126
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	51.77	51.77	55.17	15.60	93.84	43.69	59.84	N/A	121,000	66,750
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	60.44	57.92	57.93	5.21	100.00	51.94	61.39	N/A	72,000	41,706
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	59.26	63.94	59.14	10.58	108.11	55.58	74.22	N/A	313,820	185,605
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	59.53	59.53	54.37	10.35	109.48	53.37	65.69	N/A	146,800	79,820
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	53.84	53.84	53.84			53.84	53.84	N/A	174,000	93,685
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	39.98	43.37	45.19	12.71	95.96	37.44	52.68	N/A	195,666	88,428
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	47.10	48.26	51.58	11.17	93.56	40.13	57.89	N/A	629,080	324,489
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	7	53.03	53.19	55.44	19.56	95.95	35.54	75.77	35.54 to 75.77	564,922	313,182
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	15	79.85	84.67	77.22	19.86	109.64	61.03	123.05	69.43 to 101.85	165,470	127,784
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	59.55	59.67	58.01	9.86	102.86	43.69	74.22	53.37 to 65.69	193,391	112,190
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	50.52	49.85	53.09	16.57	93.89	35.54	75.77	39.98 to 54.77	491,303	260,855
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	14	65.98	72.57	68.91	23.20	105.32	43.69	123.05	59.84 to 90.54	151,578	104,450
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	55.58	56.61	55.14	15.13	102.67	37.44	74.22	39.98 to 71.67	238,518	131,512
<u>ALL</u>											
	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>60</b>	COV:	31.98	95% Median C.I.:	53.84 to 69.43	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.31 to 63.14	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	58.55 to 70.92	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,436,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,947	PRD:	110.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.54			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:59:15

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1027	1	65.69	65.69	65.69			65.69	65.69	N/A	24,000	15,765
1187	1	43.69	43.69	43.69			43.69	43.69	N/A	70,000	30,580
1189	2	83.16	83.16	77.76	8.88	106.94	75.77	90.54	N/A	370,700	288,255
1191	1	70.69	70.69	70.69			70.69	70.69	N/A	624,000	441,090
1193	1	123.05	123.05	123.05			123.05	123.05	N/A	40,000	49,220
1303	1	52.36	52.36	52.36			52.36	52.36	N/A	256,000	134,035
1305	2	83.47	83.47	51.83	41.69	161.04	48.67	118.26	N/A	441,200	228,670
397	2	86.39	86.39	66.24	27.63	130.42	62.52	110.25	N/A	128,500	85,112
489	11	65.43	66.71	60.54	15.78	110.19	43.82	85.17	51.94 to 84.88	203,410	123,150
491	1	39.15	39.15	39.15			39.15	39.15	N/A	255,000	99,820
493	4	71.59	76.07	77.71	14.94	97.89	59.26	101.85	N/A	228,325	177,433
647	4	54.31	52.82	52.58	4.33	100.46	47.10	55.58	N/A	441,650	232,225
651	5	40.13	51.33	46.48	35.17	110.43	35.54	74.22	N/A	168,020	78,100
753	1	61.03	61.03	61.03			61.03	61.03	N/A	165,000	100,700
757	4	55.29	52.38	56.22	10.94	93.17	39.98	58.96	N/A	567,425	318,982
759	2	53.20	53.20	53.10	0.32	100.19	53.03	53.37	N/A	660,800	350,870
____ALL____											
	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	22	60.74	61.86	55.02	22.78	112.43	35.54	110.25	47.10 to 71.67	209,832	115,441
2	9	70.69	76.52	64.62	31.00	118.42	43.69	123.05	48.67 to 118.26	293,088	189,393
3	12	56.74	61.18	59.02	16.93	103.66	39.98	101.85	53.03 to 71.50	450,791	266,040
____ALL____											
	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

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	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947
____ALL____											
	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>60</b>	COV:	31.98	95% Median C.I.:	53.84 to 69.43	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.31 to 63.14	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	58.55 to 70.92	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,436,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,947	PRD:	110.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.54			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:59:15

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	1	62.52	62.52	62.52			62.52	62.52	N/A	237,000	148,175	
GRASS	21	69.43	71.47	60.72	26.45	117.72	35.54	123.05	52.36 to 84.88	169,112	102,678	
GRASS-N/A	5	47.10	51.45	54.69	18.17	94.07	39.98	65.43	N/A	307,331	168,074	
IRRGTD-N/A	16	56.74	60.19	58.48	16.58	102.91	39.15	101.85	53.03 to 71.50	458,662	268,247	
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	1	62.52	62.52	62.52			62.52	62.52	N/A	237,000	148,175	
GRASS	22	69.38	71.00	60.73	25.82	116.91	35.54	123.05	52.36 to 84.88	168,925	102,588	
GRASS-N/A	4	45.40	49.05	53.93	15.89	90.96	39.98	65.43	N/A	342,914	184,917	
IRRGTD	11	57.89	60.88	58.05	14.35	104.88	43.82	101.85	52.68 to 71.68	456,104	264,754	
IRRGTD-N/A	5	53.84	58.66	59.43	20.46	98.70	39.15	75.77	N/A	464,290	275,931	
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	1	62.52	62.52	62.52			62.52	62.52	N/A	237,000	148,175	
GRASS	26	65.56	67.62	58.90	27.45	114.82	35.54	123.05	51.94 to 74.22	195,693	115,254	
IRRGTD	16	56.74	60.19	58.48	16.58	102.91	39.15	101.85	53.03 to 71.50	458,662	268,247	
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947	

<b>SCHOOL DISTRICT *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
09-0010												
75-0100	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947	
NonValid School												
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947	

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>60</b>	COV:	31.98	95% Median C.I.:	53.84 to 69.43	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.31 to 63.14	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	58.55 to 70.92	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,436,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,947	PRD:	110.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.54			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:59:16

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	2	87.97	87.97	85.94	25.33	102.36	65.69	110.25	N/A	22,000	18,907
100.01 TO 180.00	19	54.77	58.58	55.18	22.47	106.16	37.44	118.26	43.69 to 69.43	154,205	85,087
180.01 TO 330.00	10	78.28	78.20	69.92	24.14	111.84	35.54	123.05	58.96 to 101.85	178,066	124,503
330.01 TO 650.00	7	53.03	56.32	52.48	14.73	107.33	43.82	79.85	43.82 to 79.85	533,657	280,053
650.01 +	5	65.43	63.69	61.74	12.20	103.15	48.67	75.77	N/A	834,691	515,369
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	87.97	87.97	85.94	25.33	102.36	65.69	110.25	N/A	22,000	18,907
30000 TO 59999	2	120.66	120.66	120.66	1.98	100.00	118.26	123.05	N/A	40,000	48,262
60000 TO 99999	7	61.39	63.75	64.09	16.93	99.48	43.69	85.17	43.69 to 85.17	70,694	45,305
100000 TO 149999	5	79.85	73.41	72.64	15.93	101.07	40.13	90.54	N/A	126,080	91,580
150000 TO 249999	10	60.44	58.64	59.48	14.18	98.59	37.44	71.68	39.98 to 71.50	186,760	111,081
250000 TO 499999	8	53.03	56.08	56.12	21.03	99.94	35.54	101.85	35.54 to 101.85	284,337	159,564
500000 +	9	55.58	57.55	56.93	15.43	101.09	43.82	75.77	47.10 to 70.69	808,006	460,003
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	87.97	87.97	85.94	25.33	102.36	65.69	110.25	N/A	22,000	18,907
30000 TO 59999	10	60.92	68.00	58.22	34.92	116.80	37.44	123.05	40.13 to 118.26	77,640	45,200
60000 TO 99999	6	69.36	65.59	58.42	30.67	112.28	39.15	90.54	39.15 to 90.54	147,310	86,059
100000 TO 149999	14	60.44	61.10	58.84	14.15	103.85	35.54	79.85	52.68 to 71.67	217,585	128,020
150000 TO 249999	1	58.96	58.96	58.96			58.96	58.96	N/A	360,700	212,665
250000 TO 499999	8	60.51	63.61	59.98	24.50	106.07	43.82	101.85	43.82 to 101.85	627,307	376,234
500000 +	2	55.46	55.46	55.87	4.38	99.27	53.03	57.89	N/A	1,267,000	707,872
ALL	43	60.44	64.74	58.73	24.82	110.24	35.54	123.05	53.84 to 69.43	294,502	172,947

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

**Agricultural**

For the assessment year 2008, the assessor completed a spreadsheet analysis of the unimproved agricultural sales and made valuation adjustments accordingly. Changes were made in all three market areas to all classes.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2008 assessment roll.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Rock County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	At this time the County is in the process of developing a written policy to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359.
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The income approach has never been utilized.
6.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1986
7.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2001
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	FSA maps and aerial photos
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100% is completed and implemented of the 2001 study.
8.	<b>Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:</b>
	3

9.	<b>How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class?</b>
	By location, soil associations, topography and the market
10.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	No

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.65	95% Median C.I.:	66.06 to 77.87	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	21.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.45 to 73.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.88 to 79.89	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,693,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	21.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.83			
AVG. Assessed Value:	202,185	PRD:	106.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.79			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:26

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	5	92.84	100.02	103.16	17.67	96.96	76.47	128.05	N/A	134,792	139,048
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	79.88	79.88	79.88			79.88	79.88	N/A	144,000	115,020
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	5	89.69	102.10	93.66	20.29	109.01	75.63	135.83	N/A	107,620	100,799
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	4	69.91	74.26	71.65	10.63	103.64	65.52	91.68	N/A	281,500	201,681
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	62.53	62.53	69.07	24.83	90.53	47.00	78.05	N/A	121,000	83,572
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	63.33	60.07	60.07	6.49	100.00	52.28	64.61	N/A	72,000	43,253
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	77.87	76.12	73.48	3.87	103.60	69.60	79.91	N/A	313,820	230,589
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	69.66	69.66	67.41	3.86	103.34	66.97	72.35	N/A	146,800	98,952
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	73.48	73.48	73.48			73.48	73.48	N/A	174,000	127,850
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	46.23	51.46	54.33	17.37	94.71	42.03	66.12	N/A	195,666	106,313
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	57.71	57.97	64.20	10.25	90.30	44.18	72.59	N/A	629,080	403,850
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	7	66.06	60.72	62.19	18.95	97.65	39.79	78.05	39.79 to 78.05	564,922	351,317
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	15	89.29	92.50	85.45	18.76	108.25	65.52	135.83	75.63 to 116.60	165,470	141,398
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	70.97	68.77	71.00	11.46	96.85	47.00	79.91	63.33 to 78.05	193,391	137,312
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	57.99	58.92	62.66	19.06	94.05	39.79	78.05	45.38 to 72.59	491,303	307,828
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	14	73.66	79.49	75.76	24.02	104.92	47.00	135.83	63.33 to 91.68	151,578	114,830
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	72.35	67.98	68.52	11.75	99.22	42.03	79.91	46.23 to 79.00	238,518	163,421
<u>ALL</u>											
	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185



**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.65	95% Median C.I.:	66.06 to 77.87	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	21.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.45 to 73.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.88 to 79.89	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,693,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	21.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.83			
AVG. Assessed Value:	202,185	PRD:	106.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.79			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:26

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1027	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	24,000	17,365
1187	1	47.00	47.00	47.00			47.00	47.00	N/A	70,000	32,900
1189	2	84.08	84.08	78.53	9.04	107.07	76.48	91.68	N/A	370,700	291,102
1191	1	71.69	71.69	71.69			71.69	71.69	N/A	624,000	447,360
1193	1	135.83	135.83	135.83			135.83	135.83	N/A	40,000	54,330
1303	1	57.71	57.71	57.71			57.71	57.71	N/A	256,000	147,745
1305	2	82.72	82.72	48.77	45.14	169.63	45.38	120.06	N/A	441,200	215,152
397	2	91.06	91.06	69.49	28.05	131.04	65.52	116.60	N/A	128,500	89,297
489	11	78.05	73.46	71.16	11.86	103.23	52.28	92.84	58.27 to 86.16	203,410	144,757
491	1	50.53	50.53	50.53			50.53	50.53	N/A	255,000	128,845
493	4	89.49	95.32	97.41	15.15	97.85	74.23	128.05	N/A	228,325	222,400
647	4	69.19	67.24	65.87	6.21	102.08	57.11	73.48	N/A	441,650	290,927
651	5	44.18	56.48	51.47	33.75	109.72	39.79	79.91	N/A	168,020	86,482
753	1	68.13	68.13	68.13			68.13	68.13	N/A	165,000	112,410
757	4	69.36	65.70	70.86	13.74	92.72	46.23	77.87	N/A	567,425	402,086
759	2	66.52	66.52	66.25	0.68	100.40	66.06	66.97	N/A	660,800	437,770
____ALL____											
	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	22	74.56	69.74	65.42	18.70	106.59	39.79	116.60	57.11 to 79.00	209,832	137,278
2	9	72.35	79.80	64.91	31.06	122.94	45.38	135.83	47.00 to 120.06	293,088	190,245
3	12	69.19	75.26	73.24	17.32	102.77	46.23	128.05	66.06 to 89.29	450,791	330,137
____ALL____											
	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185

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	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185
____ALL____											
	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.65	95% Median C.I.:	66.06 to 77.87	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	21.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.45 to 73.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.88 to 79.89	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,693,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	21.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.83			
AVG. Assessed Value:	202,185	PRD:	106.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.79			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:26

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	1	65.52	65.52	65.52			65.52	65.52	N/A	237,000	155,275	
GRASS	21	75.63	75.59	62.77	25.51	120.42	39.79	135.83	57.71 to 86.16	169,112	106,155	
GRASS-N/A	5	57.11	59.30	64.70	18.54	91.66	46.23	78.05	N/A	307,331	198,834	
IRRGTD-N/A	16	73.04	75.38	72.43	14.40	104.07	50.53	128.05	66.12 to 78.05	458,662	332,205	
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	1	65.52	65.52	65.52			65.52	65.52	N/A	237,000	155,275	
GRASS	22	73.99	75.25	63.01	25.35	119.43	39.79	135.83	57.71 to 86.16	168,925	106,439	
GRASS-N/A	4	52.06	57.10	64.28	20.14	88.82	46.23	78.05	N/A	342,914	220,440	
IRRGTD	11	72.59	77.29	73.65	14.80	104.94	58.27	128.05	66.12 to 89.69	456,104	335,939	
IRRGTD-N/A	5	73.48	71.17	69.78	13.39	101.99	50.53	89.29	N/A	464,290	323,992	
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY-N/A	1	65.52	65.52	65.52			65.52	65.52	N/A	237,000	155,275	
GRASS	26	72.02	72.46	63.35	25.90	114.37	39.79	135.83	57.11 to 79.88	195,693	123,977	
IRRGTD	16	73.04	75.38	72.43	14.40	104.07	50.53	128.05	66.12 to 78.05	458,662	332,205	
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185	

<b>SCHOOL DISTRICT *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
09-0010												
75-0100	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185	
NonValid School												
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185	

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.65	95% Median C.I.:	66.06 to 77.87	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,702,820	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	21.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.45 to 73.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,663,620	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.88 to 79.89	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,693,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,502	COD:	21.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.83			
AVG. Assessed Value:	202,185	PRD:	106.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.79			

Printed: 03/31/2008 18:59:26

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	2	94.47	94.47	92.47	23.42	102.17	72.35	116.60	N/A	22,000	20,342
100.01 TO 180.00	19	66.97	68.02	67.06	21.44	101.43	42.03	120.06	50.53 to 78.05	154,205	103,416
180.01 TO 330.00	10	82.58	87.58	81.49	23.41	107.47	39.79	135.83	68.13 to 128.05	178,066	145,108
330.01 TO 650.00	7	65.52	64.88	63.87	9.26	101.58	57.11	79.88	57.11 to 79.88	533,657	340,827
650.01 +	5	72.59	68.84	68.33	10.32	100.75	45.38	78.05	N/A	834,691	570,305
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	94.47	94.47	92.47	23.42	102.17	72.35	116.60	N/A	22,000	20,342
30000 TO 59999	2	127.95	127.95	127.94	6.16	100.00	120.06	135.83	N/A	40,000	51,177
60000 TO 99999	7	64.61	66.99	67.15	17.49	99.76	47.00	86.16	47.00 to 86.16	70,694	47,471
100000 TO 149999	5	79.88	77.52	76.78	15.36	100.96	44.18	92.84	N/A	126,080	96,800
150000 TO 249999	10	73.86	70.31	71.26	15.21	98.67	42.03	89.69	46.23 to 89.29	186,760	133,084
250000 TO 499999	8	66.55	69.48	69.66	23.95	99.74	39.79	128.05	39.79 to 128.05	284,337	198,066
500000 +	9	69.60	66.14	66.27	11.49	99.80	45.38	78.05	57.11 to 76.48	808,006	535,475
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	94.47	94.47	92.47	23.42	102.17	72.35	116.60	N/A	22,000	20,342
30000 TO 59999	9	64.61	75.87	67.71	35.19	112.05	44.18	135.83	47.00 to 120.06	68,488	46,375
60000 TO 99999	4	66.19	66.53	60.79	33.83	109.44	42.03	91.68	N/A	124,715	75,810
100000 TO 149999	10	74.97	69.59	65.03	15.55	107.01	39.79	92.84	50.53 to 79.88	191,570	124,575
150000 TO 249999	7	68.78	74.37	73.28	11.34	101.49	65.52	89.69	65.52 to 89.69	239,357	175,393
250000 TO 499999	8	74.09	74.11	68.40	21.60	108.36	45.38	128.05	45.38 to 128.05	576,694	394,439
500000 +	3	69.60	69.42	69.82	3.13	99.43	66.06	72.59	N/A	1,099,866	767,890
ALL	43	72.35	73.38	68.65	21.23	106.89	39.79	135.83	66.06 to 77.87	294,502	202,185



**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the statistical profile reveals that all three measures of central tendency are within or round to within the acceptable range, and the median and mean only fractionally differ in value. The median will be used to describe the overall level of value for the agricultural property class. Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above their respective ranges. The hypothetical removal of outlier sales would bring the COD into range, but fails to move the PRD into acceptable range. The county has used an acceptable portion of the available sales. The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for the agricultural class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

**II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used**

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>58.11</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>54.29</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>54.69</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>47.5</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>46.99</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>53.85</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>56.52</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>65.71</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates the percentage of sales used has increased from the previous year. It should be considered that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>60.44</b>	<b>11.93</b>	<b>67.65</b>	<b>72.35</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>67.06</b>	<b>9.65</b>	<b>73.53</b>	<b>71.21</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>71.87</b>	<b>7.92</b>	<b>77.56</b>	<b>78.51</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>73.82</b>	<b>5.35</b>	<b>77.77</b>	<b>77.59</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>74.18</b>	<b>6.22</b>	<b>78.79</b>	<b>76.88</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>9.87</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>72.57</b>	<b>6.85</b>	<b>77.54</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>12.23</b>	<b>81.93</b>	<b>75</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Trended Preliminary Median Ratio and the R&O Median Ratio are slightly spread apart, but not unreasonable. The assessor was very aggressive in valuing agricultural land for 2008. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class.



**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales</b>		<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>18.03</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>11.93</b>
<b>8.26</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>9.65</b>
<b>8.96</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>7.92</b>
<b>1.29</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>5.35</b>
<b>12.36</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>6.22</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>9.87</b>
<b>12.19</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>6.85</b>
<b>6.46</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>12.23</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is 6.1%. As noted in Table III the assessor was very aggressive in valuing agricultural land. The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an effect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base.

## 2008 Correlation Section for Rock 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 Rock County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>72.35</b>	<b>68.65</b>	<b>73.38</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: All three measures of central tendency are within or round to within the acceptable range, the median and mean correlate very closely.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>21.23</b>	<b>106.89</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>3.89</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the acceptable range while the price related differential is 3.89 points above the range. The removal of outlier sales would bring the COD into range, but fails to move the PRD into acceptable range.

**2008 Correlation Section  
for Rock County**

---

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

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

	<b>Preliminary Statistics</b>	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>60.44</b>	<b>72.35</b>	<b>11.91</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>58.73</b>	<b>68.65</b>	<b>9.92</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>64.74</b>	<b>73.38</b>	<b>8.64</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>24.82</b>	<b>21.23</b>	<b>-3.59</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>110.24</b>	<b>106.89</b>	<b>-3.35</b>
<b>Min Sales Ratio</b>	<b>35.54</b>	<b>39.79</b>	<b>4.25</b>
<b>Max Sales Ratio</b>	<b>123.05</b>	<b>135.83</b>	<b>12.78</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for the agricultural unimproved class of property. All three market areas had new land values for 2008 in all classes.



**County 75 - Rock**

<b>Total Real Property Value</b> (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	<b>Records</b> 3,009	<b>Value</b> 262,828,320	<b>Total Growth</b> 747,878 (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	66	100,315	37	117,065	3	9,030	106	226,410	
2. Res Improv Land	458	903,765	95	480,865	48	446,235	601	1,830,865	
3. Res Improvements	468	11,975,065	95	5,835,905	62	2,514,175	625	20,325,145	
4. Res Total	534	12,979,145	132	6,433,835	65	2,969,440	731	22,382,420	177,378
% of Total	73.05	57.98	18.05	28.74	8.89	13.26	24.29	8.51	23.71
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	3	78,000	3	78,000	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	6	65,780	6	65,780	
8. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	6	143,780	6	143,780	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	***	***	0.19	0.05	0.00
Res+Rec Total	534	12,979,145	132	6,433,835	71	3,113,220	737	22,526,200	177,378
% of Total	72.45	57.61	17.91	28.56	9.63	13.82	24.49	8.57	23.71



**County 75 - Rock**

<b>Total Real Property Value</b> (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	<b>Records</b> 3,009	<b>Value</b> 262,828,320	<b>Total Growth</b> 747,878 (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	15	59,970	5	185,570	5	39,475	25	285,015	
10. Comm Improv Land	79	365,235	11	122,555	15	183,400	105	671,190	
11. Comm Improvements	80	3,525,970	12	443,410	22	1,457,430	114	5,426,810	
12. Comm Total	95	3,951,175	17	751,535	27	1,680,305	139	6,383,015	1,380
% of Total	68.34	61.90	12.23	11.77	19.42	26.32	4.61	2.42	0.18
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	95	3,951,175	17	751,535	27	1,680,305	139	6,383,015	1,380
% of Total	68.34	61.90	12.23	11.77	19.42	26.32	4.61	2.42	0.18
17. Taxable Total	629	16,930,320	149	7,185,370	98	4,793,525	876	28,909,215	178,758
% of Total	71.80	58.56	17.00	22.25	11.18	10.76	29.11	10.99	23.90

**County 75 - Rock**

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

**Schedule II: Tax Increment Financing (TIF)**

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>22. Total Sch II</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records**

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

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

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	48	10	186	<b>244</b>

**Schedule V: Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	24	1,512,020	1,741	170,345,820	1,765	171,857,840
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	10	565,590	356	47,891,765	366	48,457,355
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	10	218,550	358	13,385,360	368	13,603,910
<b>30. Ag-Total Taxable</b>							<b>2,133</b>	<b>233,919,105</b>

**County 75 - Rock**

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

**Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:**

Non-Agricultural Detail	Urban			SubUrban			Growth Value
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	2	2.000	8,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	2		114,730	
<b>34. HomeSite Total</b>							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	5	152.760	86,550	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	10	303.160	190,740	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	10		103,820	
<b>38. FarmSite Total</b>							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			28.760		
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	6	6.000	24,000	6	6.000	24,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	260	316.000	1,261,000	262	318.000	1,269,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	265		8,267,210	267		8,381,940	569,120
<b>34. HomeSite Total</b>				<b>273</b>	<b>324.000</b>	<b>9,674,940</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	14	151.000	286,500	19	303.760	373,050	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	322	1,162.580	2,092,580	332	1,465.740	2,283,320	
37. FarmSite Improv	330		5,118,150	340		5,221,970	0
<b>38. FarmSite Total</b>				<b>359</b>	<b>1,769.500</b>	<b>7,878,340</b>	
39. Road & Ditches		3,020.020			3,048.780		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		8.000	0		8.000	0	
<b>41. Total Section VI</b>				<b>632</b>	<b>5,150.280</b>	<b>17,553,280</b>	<b>569,120</b>

**Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:**

Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	897.000	233,085	10	897.000	233,085

**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 75 - Rock

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	75.000	82,500	271.680	320,740	346.680	403,240
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	82.000	86,100	82.000	86,100
48. 2A	0.000	0	40.000	42,000	724.000	788,130	764.000	830,130
49. 3A1	0.000	0	89.000	86,775	2,329.780	2,388,445	2,418.780	2,475,220
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,919.000	2,974,725	2,919.000	2,974,725
51. 4A1	0.000	0	38.000	36,100	6,202.000	6,180,035	6,240.000	6,216,135
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	456.000	463,980	456.000	463,980
53. Total	0.000	0	242.000	247,375	12,984.460	13,202,155	13,226.460	13,449,530
<b>Dryland:</b>								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	48.400	21,780	48.400	21,780
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	164.000	69,700	164.000	69,700
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	54.000	21,600	54.000	21,600
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	409.000	163,600	409.000	163,600
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	130.000	48,750	130.000	48,750
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	48.000	18,000	48.000	18,000
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	853.400	343,430	853.400	343,430
<b>Grass:</b>								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	622.000	279,900	18,115.920	8,148,335	18,737.920	8,428,235
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	181.000	76,580	181.000	76,580
66. 2G	0.000	0	216.000	84,240	11,326.780	4,416,940	11,542.780	4,501,180
67. 3G1	0.000	0	1,678.960	638,005	59,267.220	22,518,580	60,946.180	23,156,585
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	10,284.360	3,500,340	10,284.360	3,500,340
69. 4G1	0.000	0	263.000	63,120	37,649.100	9,200,915	37,912.100	9,264,035
70. 4G	0.000	0	33.000	7,590	17,834.000	4,156,870	17,867.000	4,164,460
71. Total	0.000	0	2,812.960	1,072,855	154,658.380	52,018,560	157,471.340	53,091,415
72. Waste	0.000	0	82.000	8,200	2,994.000	299,400	3,076.000	307,600
73. Other	0.000	0	18.000	8,100	611.000	275,150	629.000	283,250
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		941.630		941.630	
75. Total	0.000	0	3,154.960	1,336,530	172,101.240	66,138,695	175,256.200	67,475,225

County 75 - Rock

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 2

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	122.000	88,320	122.000	88,320
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	655.870	457,105	655.870	457,105
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,094.790	775,455	1,094.790	775,455
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	610.400	442,540	610.400	442,540
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,930.870	2,679,795	3,930.870	2,679,795
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	526.500	366,325	526.500	366,325
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,940.430	4,809,540	6,940.430	4,809,540
<b>Dryland:</b>								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	19.000	5,510	19.000	5,510
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	825	3.000	825
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	44.000	11,000	44.000	11,000
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	66.000	17,335	66.000	17,335
<b>Grass:</b>								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	14,245.000	4,695,450	14,245.000	4,695,450
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	11,617.130	3,812,775	11,617.130	3,812,775
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	50,496.210	15,626,470	50,496.210	15,626,470
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,109.600	532,250	2,109.600	532,250
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	90,727.730	21,374,940	90,727.730	21,374,940
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	154,553.500	33,032,235	154,553.500	33,032,235
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	323,749.170	79,074,120	323,749.170	79,074,120
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,274.000	827,400	8,274.000	827,400
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	895.000	412,100	895.000	412,100
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		3,582.570		3,582.570	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	339,924.600	85,140,495	339,924.600	85,140,495

County 75 - Rock

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 3

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	314.000	408,200	314.000	408,200
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	26.000	33,800	26.000	33,800
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	334.000	434,200	334.000	434,200
49. 3A1	0.000	0	22.000	28,600	3,384.430	4,399,760	3,406.430	4,428,360
50. 3A	0.000	0	61.000	79,300	11,295.940	14,632,320	11,356.940	14,711,620
51. 4A1	0.000	0	9.000	11,700	9,837.850	12,789,205	9,846.850	12,800,905
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	303.000	378,750	303.000	378,750
53. Total	0.000	0	92.000	119,600	25,495.220	33,076,235	25,587.220	33,195,835
<b>Dryland:</b>								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	440.000	198,000	440.000	198,000
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3.000	1,350	3.000	1,350
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	466.000	209,700	466.000	209,700
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	804.000	361,800	804.000	361,800
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	549.000	233,325	549.000	233,325
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	237.000	100,725	237.000	100,725
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,499.000	1,104,900	2,499.000	1,104,900
<b>Grass:</b>								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	306.000	137,700	751.000	332,350	1,057.000	470,050
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	6.000	2,700	6.000	2,700
66. 2G	0.000	0	99.000	44,550	455.000	204,750	554.000	249,300
67. 3G1	0.000	0	217.050	82,480	6,049.570	2,296,465	6,266.620	2,378,945
68. 3G	0.000	0	66.000	23,760	16,185.060	5,844,670	16,251.060	5,868,430
69. 4G1	0.000	0	149.000	44,700	30,925.150	9,346,945	31,074.150	9,391,645
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	33,481.000	10,896,400	33,481.000	10,896,400
71. Total	0.000	0	837.050	333,190	87,852.780	28,924,280	88,689.830	29,257,470
72. Waste	0.000	0	3.000	300	201.500	20,150	204.500	20,450
73. Other	0.000	0	6.000	2,700	375.000	168,750	381.000	171,450
74. Exempt	0.000		15.000		643.960		658.960	
75. Total	0.000	0	938.050	455,790	116,423.500	63,294,315	117,361.550	63,750,105

County 75 - Rock

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 4

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
<b>Dryland:</b>								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
<b>Grass:</b>								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		4.000		0.000		4.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	334.000	366,975	45,420.110	51,087,930	45,754.110	51,454,905
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,418.400	1,465,665	3,418.400	1,465,665
78.Grass	0.000	0	3,650.010	1,406,045	566,260.330	160,016,960	569,910.340	161,423,005
79.Waste	0.000	0	85.000	8,500	11,469.500	1,146,950	11,554.500	1,155,450
80.Other	0.000	0	24.000	10,800	1,881.000	856,000	1,905.000	866,800
81.Exempt	0.000	0	19.000	0	5,168.160	0	5,187.160	0
<b>82.Total</b>	0.000	0	4,093.010	1,792,320	628,449.340	214,573,505	<b>632,542.350</b>	<b>216,365,825</b>



## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 75 - Rock

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	346.680	2.62%	403,240	3.00%	1,163.147
2A1	82.000	0.62%	86,100	0.64%	1,050.000
2A	764.000	5.78%	830,130	6.17%	1,086.557
3A1	2,418.780	18.29%	2,475,220	18.40%	1,023.334
3A	2,919.000	22.07%	2,974,725	22.12%	1,019.090
4A1	6,240.000	47.18%	6,216,135	46.22%	996.175
4A	456.000	3.45%	463,980	3.45%	1,017.500
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>13,226.460</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>13,449,530</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,016.865</b>

**Dry:**

1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	48.400	5.67%	21,780	6.34%	450.000
2D1	164.000	19.22%	69,700	20.30%	425.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	54.000	6.33%	21,600	6.29%	400.000
3D	409.000	47.93%	163,600	47.64%	400.000
4D1	130.000	15.23%	48,750	14.20%	375.000
4D	48.000	5.62%	18,000	5.24%	375.000
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>853.400</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>343,430</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>402.425</b>

**Grass:**

1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	18,737.920	11.90%	8,428,235	15.87%	449.795
2G1	181.000	0.11%	76,580	0.14%	423.093
2G	11,542.780	7.33%	4,501,180	8.48%	389.956
3G1	60,946.180	38.70%	23,156,585	43.62%	379.951
3G	10,284.360	6.53%	3,500,340	6.59%	340.355
4G1	37,912.100	24.08%	9,264,035	17.45%	244.355
4G	17,867.000	11.35%	4,164,460	7.84%	233.081
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>157,471.340</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>53,091,415</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>337.149</b>

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>13,226.460</b>	<b>7.55%</b>	<b>13,449,530</b>	<b>19.93%</b>	<b>1,016.865</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>853.400</b>	<b>0.49%</b>	<b>343,430</b>	<b>0.51%</b>	<b>402.425</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>157,471.340</b>	<b>89.85%</b>	<b>53,091,415</b>	<b>78.68%</b>	<b>337.149</b>
Waste	3,076.000	1.76%	307,600	0.46%	100.000
Other	629.000	0.36%	283,250	0.42%	450.317
Exempt	941.630	0.54%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>175,256.200</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>67,475,225</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>385.009</b>

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

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>13,226.460</b>	<b>28.91%</b>	<b>13,449,530</b>	<b>26.14%</b>	
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>853.400</b>	<b>24.96%</b>	<b>343,430</b>	<b>23.43%</b>	
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>157,471.340</b>	<b>27.63%</b>	<b>53,091,415</b>	<b>32.89%</b>	
Waste	3,076.000	26.62%	307,600	26.62%	
Other	629.000	33.02%	283,250	32.68%	
Exempt	941.630	18.15%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>175,256.200</b>	<b>27.71%</b>	<b>67,475,225</b>	<b>31.19%</b>	

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 75 - Rock

Market Area: 2

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	122.000	1.76%	88,320	1.84%	723.934
2A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A	655.870	9.45%	457,105	9.50%	696.944
3A1	1,094.790	15.77%	775,455	16.12%	708.313
3A	610.400	8.79%	442,540	9.20%	725.000
4A1	3,930.870	56.64%	2,679,795	55.72%	681.730
4A	526.500	7.59%	366,325	7.62%	695.773
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>6,940.430</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,809,540</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>692.974</b>

**Dry:**

1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	19.000	28.79%	5,510	31.79%	290.000
3D	3.000	4.55%	825	4.76%	275.000
4D1	44.000	66.67%	11,000	63.46%	250.000
4D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>66.000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>17,335</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>262.651</b>

**Grass:**

1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	14,245.000	4.40%	4,695,450	5.94%	329.620
2G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G	11,617.130	3.59%	3,812,775	4.82%	328.202
3G1	50,496.210	15.60%	15,626,470	19.76%	309.458
3G	2,109.600	0.65%	532,250	0.67%	252.299
4G1	90,727.730	28.02%	21,374,940	27.03%	235.594
4G	154,553.500	47.74%	33,032,235	41.77%	213.726
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>323,749.170</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>79,074,120</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>244.245</b>

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>6,940.430</b>	<b>2.04%</b>	<b>4,809,540</b>	<b>5.65%</b>	<b>692.974</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>66.000</b>	<b>0.02%</b>	<b>17,335</b>	<b>0.02%</b>	<b>262.651</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>323,749.170</b>	<b>95.24%</b>	<b>79,074,120</b>	<b>92.87%</b>	<b>244.245</b>
Waste	8,274.000	2.43%	827,400	0.97%	100.000
Other	895.000	0.26%	412,100	0.48%	460.446
Exempt	3,582.570	1.05%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>339,924.600</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>85,140,495</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>250.468</b>

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

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>6,940.430</b>	<b>15.17%</b>	<b>4,809,540</b>	<b>9.35%</b>	
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>66.000</b>	<b>1.93%</b>	<b>17,335</b>	<b>1.18%</b>	
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>323,749.170</b>	<b>56.81%</b>	<b>79,074,120</b>	<b>48.99%</b>	
Waste	8,274.000	71.61%	827,400	71.61%	
Other	895.000	46.98%	412,100	47.54%	
Exempt	3,582.570	69.07%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>339,924.600</b>	<b>53.74%</b>	<b>85,140,495</b>	<b>39.35%</b>	

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 75 - Rock

Market Area: **3**

<b>Irrigated:</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>% of Acres*</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>% of Value*</b>	<b>Average Assessed Value*</b>
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	314.000	1.23%	408,200	1.23%	1,300.000
2A1	26.000	0.10%	33,800	0.10%	1,300.000
2A	334.000	1.31%	434,200	1.31%	1,300.000
3A1	3,406.430	13.31%	4,428,360	13.34%	1,300.000
3A	11,356.940	44.39%	14,711,620	44.32%	1,295.385
4A1	9,846.850	38.48%	12,800,905	38.56%	1,300.000
4A	303.000	1.18%	378,750	1.14%	1,250.000
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>25,587.220</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>33,195,835</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,297.359</b>

**Dry:**

1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	440.000	17.61%	198,000	17.92%	450.000
2D1	3.000	0.12%	1,350	0.12%	450.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	466.000	18.65%	209,700	18.98%	450.000
3D	804.000	32.17%	361,800	32.75%	450.000
4D1	549.000	21.97%	233,325	21.12%	425.000
4D	237.000	9.48%	100,725	9.12%	425.000
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>2,499.000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,104,900</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>442.136</b>

**Grass:**

1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	1,057.000	1.19%	470,050	1.61%	444.701
2G1	6.000	0.01%	2,700	0.01%	450.000
2G	554.000	0.62%	249,300	0.85%	450.000
3G1	6,266.620	7.07%	2,378,945	8.13%	379.621
3G	16,251.060	18.32%	5,868,430	20.06%	361.110
4G1	31,074.150	35.04%	9,391,645	32.10%	302.233
4G	33,481.000	37.75%	10,896,400	37.24%	325.450
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>88,689.830</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>29,257,470</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>329.885</b>

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>25,587.220</b>	<b>21.80%</b>	<b>33,195,835</b>	<b>52.07%</b>	<b>1,297.359</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>2,499.000</b>	<b>2.13%</b>	<b>1,104,900</b>	<b>1.73%</b>	<b>442.136</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>88,689.830</b>	<b>75.57%</b>	<b>29,257,470</b>	<b>45.89%</b>	<b>329.885</b>
Waste	204.500	0.17%	20,450	0.03%	100.000
Other	381.000	0.32%	171,450	0.27%	450.000
Exempt	658.960	0.56%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>117,361.550</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>63,750,105</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>543.194</b>

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

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>25,587.220</b>	<b>55.92%</b>	<b>33,195,835</b>	<b>64.51%</b>	
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>2,499.000</b>	<b>73.10%</b>	<b>1,104,900</b>	<b>75.39%</b>	
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>88,689.830</b>	<b>15.56%</b>	<b>29,257,470</b>	<b>18.12%</b>	
Waste	204.500	1.77%	20,450	1.77%	
Other	381.000	20.00%	171,450	19.78%	
Exempt	658.960	12.70%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>117,361.550</b>	<b>18.55%</b>	<b>63,750,105</b>	<b>29.46%</b>	

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 75 - Rock

Market Area: 4

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Dry:</b>					
1D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4D1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4D	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Grass:</b>					
1G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
1G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
2G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
3G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4G1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4G	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<hr/>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>
Waste	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	4.000	***.***%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.000</b>

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

<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	
Waste	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	4.000	0.08%			
<b>Market Area Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

### County 75 - Rock

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	0.000	0	334.000	366,975	45,420.110	51,087,930
Dry	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,418.400	1,465,665
Grass	0.000	0	3,650.010	1,406,045	566,260.330	160,016,960
Waste	0.000	0	85.000	8,500	11,469.500	1,146,950
Other	0.000	0	24.000	10,800	1,881.000	856,000
Exempt	0.000	0	19.000	0	5,168.160	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,093.010</b>	<b>1,792,320</b>	<b>628,449.340</b>	<b>214,573,505</b>

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Acres	% of Acres*	Total Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	45,754.110	51,454,905	45,754.110	7.23%	51,454,905	23.78%	1,124.596
Dry	3,418.400	1,465,665	3,418.400	0.54%	1,465,665	0.68%	428.757
Grass	569,910.340	161,423,005	569,910.340	90.10%	161,423,005	74.61%	283.242
Waste	11,554.500	1,155,450	11,554.500	1.83%	1,155,450	0.53%	100.000
Other	1,905.000	866,800	1,905.000	0.30%	866,800	0.40%	455.013
Exempt	5,187.160	0	5,187.160	0.82%	0	0.00%	0.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>632,542.350</b>	<b>216,365,825</b>	<b>632,542.350</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>216,365,825</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>342.057</b>

\* Department of Property Assessment & Taxation Calculates

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

75 Rock

	<b>2007 CTL County Total</b>	<b>2008 Form 45 County Total</b>	<b>Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>2008 Growth (New Construction Value)</b>	<b>% Change excl. Growth</b>
1. Residential	21,891,930	22,382,420	490,490	2.24	177,378	1.43
2. Recreational	143,780	143,780	0	0	0	0
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	9,417,190	9,674,940	257,750	2.74	*-----	2.74
<b>4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>31,452,900</b>	<b>32,201,140</b>	<b>748,240</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>177,378</b>	<b>1.81</b>
5. Commercial	6,423,465	6,383,015	-40,450	-0.63	1,380	-0.65
6. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,287,365	7,878,340	590,975	8.11	569,120	0.3
8. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>13,710,830</b>	<b>14,261,355</b>	<b>550,525</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>1,380</b>	<b>4.01</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>45,163,730</b>	<b>46,462,495</b>	<b>1,298,765</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>747,878</b>	<b>1.22</b>
11. Irrigated	40,531,880	51,454,905	10,923,025	26.95		
12. Dryland	1,492,565	1,465,665	-26,900	-1.8		
13. Grassland	149,263,630	161,423,005	12,159,375	8.15		
14. Wasteland	1,155,550	1,155,450	-100	-0.01		
15. Other Agland	860,590	860,590	6,210	0.72		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>193,304,215</b>	<b>216,365,825</b>	<b>23,061,610</b>	<b>11.93</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)</b>	<b>238,467,945</b>	<b>262,828,320</b>	<b>24,360,375</b>	<b>10.22</b>	<b>747,878</b>	<b>9.9</b>

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

**2007 Plan of Assessment for Rock County  
Assessment Years 2008, 2009, and 2010**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 80% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 80% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344 and 80% of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Rock County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Residential	728	23.72%	9.17%
Commercial	140	4.56%	2.69%
Industrial	-	-	-
Recreational	6	.19%	0.06%
Agricultural	2195	71.53%	88.08%
Special Value	-	-	-

Agricultural land - taxable acres 632,672

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

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	97.00	10.80	102.37
Commercial	Insufficient Sales		
Agricultural Land	71.00	20.69	100.38

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

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Years 2008, 2009 & 2010:**

For the year 2007-08 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law.

For the year 2008-09 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law. Hopefully land use over the county will be reviewed.

For the year 2009-10 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law.

This information is provided to the best of my knowledge with the information I have at this time. If anything changes in the future we will address it in an appropriate manner. I reserve the right to change, alter or simply not achieve any or all portions of the plan due to time, resources or any other unforeseen problem.



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

1. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
2. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 357 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
3. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
4. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
5. Homestead Exemptions; administer 126 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

11. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
12. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education: Assessor and Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification

Respectfully submitted:

Gene Schaaf  
Rock County Assessor

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Rock County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$66,812
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$4,220
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	Same as above
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$1,000
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$500
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$0
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	\$0
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$66,812
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	No

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	Terra Scan

3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Bassett
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	None
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	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 Rock County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5975.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.

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



## Valuation History Charts