

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

84 Stanton

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	138	COD	16.95
Total Sales Price	\$11,216,136	PRD	103.52
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,225,136	COV	29.33
Total Assessed Value	\$10,100,410	STD	27.33
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$81,342	Avg. Abs. Dev.	15.92
Avg. Assessed Value	\$73,191	Min	4.64
Median	93.92	Max	270.62
Wgt. Mean	89.98	95% Median C.I.	91.44 to 96.09
Mean	93.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	86.45 to 93.51
		95% Mean C.I.	88.59 to 97.71
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			25.25
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			6.9
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			7.42
Average Assessed Value of the Base			68,043

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	138	93.92	16.95	103.52
2007	162	94.27	16.78	102.47
2006	181	94.35	14.46	102.48
2005	180	93.00	13.17	101.90
2004	171	93.90	16.14	104.26
2003	164	93	23.49	112.45
2002	189	93	27.35	112.48
2001	217	93	25.31	105.5

2008 Commission Summary

84 Stanton

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	14	COD	35.67
Total Sales Price	\$1,175,349	PRD	87.39
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,175,349	COV	42.43
Total Assessed Value	\$1,113,905	STD	35.14
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$83,954	Avg. Abs. Dev.	29.71
Avg. Assessed Value	\$79,565	Min	33.33
Median	83.29	Max	142.31
Wgt. Mean	94.77	95% Median C.I.	43.27 to 106.88
Mean	82.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	67.09 to 122.46
		95% Mean C.I.	66.19 to 99.46
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			4.26
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			7.37
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			4.85
Average Assessed Value of the Base			120,953

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	14	83.29	35.67	87.39
2007	11	65.53	42.07	99.92
2006	9	60.46	29.50	87.84
2005	6	62.25	10.24	89.22
2004	10	82.69	39.64	107.92
2003	15	95	30.14	117.89
2002	12	98	26.84	117.83
2001	26	96	40.32	99.01

2008 Commission Summary

84 Stanton

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	93	COD	18.05
Total Sales Price	\$18,087,925	PRD	101.98
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$18,087,925	COV	22.74
Total Assessed Value	\$12,235,885	STD	15.69
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$194,494	Avg. Abs. Dev.	12.49
Avg. Assessed Value	\$131,569	Min	25.54
Median	69.21	Max	110.03
Wgt. Mean	67.65	95% Median C.I.	63.90 to 72.01
Mean	68.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	64.20 to 71.09
		95% Mean C.I.	65.80 to 72.17
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			70.49
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			2.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			3.46
Average Assessed Value of the Base			116,637

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	93	69.21	18.05	101.98
2007	67	70.27	16.21	101.03
2006	74	74.72	17.54	103.37
2005	63	75.88	18.84	102.22
2004	68	76.24	19.85	99.17
2003	80	75	21.02	99.67
2002	80	77	19.01	98.89
2001	80	75	17.84	100.41

2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Stanton 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 Stanton County is 94% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Stanton 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 Stanton County is 83% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Stanton 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 Stanton County is 69% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Stanton County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen

Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	142	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.35	95% Median C.I.:	88.95 to 94.91
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,334,036	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	29.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.05 to 91.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,343,036	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.60	95% Mean C.I.:	87.90 to 97.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,030,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	79,880	COD:	17.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	70,634	PRD:	104.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:07:53

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	23	91.23	84.57	87.95	23.66	96.15	4.19	177.47	80.35 to 94.40	63,103	55,499
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	91.32	107.36	94.65	29.25	113.42	67.10	270.62	79.60 to 115.27	69,731	66,001
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	15	99.33	94.60	87.66	13.27	107.91	54.99	116.62	82.26 to 107.85	82,458	72,285
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	19	93.60	93.95	92.41	15.28	101.67	43.05	193.14	81.41 to 98.20	65,778	60,783
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	94.31	90.88	85.78	10.30	105.94	54.58	115.23	86.77 to 98.76	91,100	78,149
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	89.54	87.11	83.91	13.37	103.81	64.23	111.69	77.71 to 97.09	104,286	87,506
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	11	98.88	104.54	96.07	23.53	108.82	69.30	215.95	73.55 to 121.07	85,854	82,477
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	87.70	91.43	87.70	17.55	104.25	55.82	144.78	79.63 to 102.38	76,628	67,207
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	69	93.68	93.30	90.22	20.24	103.41	4.19	270.62	87.75 to 96.21	69,200	62,430
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	73	91.87	92.10	87.12	15.57	105.71	54.58	215.95	86.75 to 96.09	89,975	78,388
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	77	94.08	91.43	86.82	13.23	105.31	43.05	193.14	91.14 to 96.21	86,422	75,030
<u>ALL</u>											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	142	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.35	95% Median C.I.:	88.95 to 94.91
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,334,036	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	29.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.05 to 91.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,343,036	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.60	95% Mean C.I.:	87.90 to 97.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,030,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	79,880	COD:	17.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	70,634	PRD:	104.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:07:53

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
EAGLE RIDGE 1ST	1	94.00	94.00	94.00			94.00	94.00	N/A	57,500	54,050
EAGLE RIDGE SUB	3	100.61	101.81	101.77	5.49	100.04	94.13	110.70	N/A	42,266	43,016
MILLERS SUBDIVISION	1	109.87	109.87	109.87			109.87	109.87	N/A	26,000	28,565
NORFOLK	4	99.84	97.47	96.93	11.00	100.55	80.66	109.52	N/A	114,812	111,285
PILGER	21	91.14	99.45	86.56	31.13	114.89	26.44	270.62	74.36 to 102.64	36,787	31,842
RURAL	16	88.20	84.81	82.58	16.60	102.70	54.99	116.62	67.55 to 97.41	151,750	125,310
SB VALLEY	1	129.48	129.48	129.48			129.48	129.48	N/A	25,000	32,370
STANTON	47	94.40	94.79	89.01	17.67	106.50	43.05	215.95	83.47 to 98.20	73,960	65,834
WAGNER'S SUB	1	54.58	54.58	54.58			54.58	54.58	N/A	150,000	81,870
WILLERS COVE V	1	79.68	79.68	79.68			79.68	79.68	N/A	18,500	14,740
WP	3	95.84	95.58	95.53	1.70	100.06	93.00	97.90	N/A	97,800	93,425
WP 02	1	115.23	115.23	115.23			115.23	115.23	N/A	58,500	67,410
WP 03	5	87.75	91.04	90.28	9.44	100.84	77.08	103.68	N/A	74,700	67,438
WP 04	5	96.21	98.22	98.52	4.83	99.70	90.93	104.73	N/A	77,517	76,370
WP 05	8	88.78	89.66	89.39	6.25	100.30	81.52	98.88	81.52 to 98.88	85,618	76,537
WP 06	4	90.66	90.98	90.88	2.96	100.11	86.52	96.09	N/A	77,800	70,706
WP 07	2	78.65	78.65	78.50	2.89	100.18	76.37	80.92	N/A	84,350	66,217
WP 08	3	86.77	86.11	86.22	2.22	99.87	82.89	88.66	N/A	83,166	71,703
WP 09	7	100.55	102.56	101.69	10.10	100.86	87.70	121.07	87.70 to 121.07	89,364	90,874
WP 10	3	78.09	86.55	84.62	14.71	102.29	73.55	108.02	N/A	126,300	106,873
WP ROY O - 04	1	4.19	4.19	4.19			4.19	4.19	N/A	15,500	650
WP ROY-O	1	4.64	4.64	4.64			4.64	4.64	N/A	28,000	1,300
WP WB	1	86.75	86.75	86.75			86.75	86.75	N/A	110,000	95,425
WP WB 02	1	96.42	96.42	96.42			96.42	96.42	N/A	112,000	107,995
WP WB 04	1	82.42	82.42	82.42			82.42	82.42	N/A	6,000	4,945
<u>ALL</u>											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

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	68	94.05	96.23	88.57	21.64	108.65	26.44	270.62	83.47 to 97.09	62,480	55,336
2	53	91.23	89.64	90.40	13.97	99.16	4.19	129.48	86.77 to 96.09	81,868	74,009
3	21	93.93	88.85	85.10	14.48	104.41	54.99	116.62	72.26 to 99.33	131,205	111,651
<u>ALL</u>											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	142	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.35	95% Median C.I.:	88.95 to 94.91
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,334,036	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	29.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.05 to 91.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,343,036	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.60	95% Mean C.I.:	87.90 to 97.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,030,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	79,880	COD:	17.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	70,634	PRD:	104.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:07:53

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	131	93.58	94.08	88.50	16.39	106.31	43.05	270.62	88.95 to 94.99	84,204	74,519
2	11	94.00	76.01	85.83	33.60	88.56	4.19	129.48	4.64 to 110.70	28,390	24,368
____ALL____											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	140	93.29	92.27	88.37	17.62	104.42	4.19	270.62	88.66 to 94.53	80,871	71,462
06											
07	2	121.25	121.25	120.36	15.34	100.74	102.64	139.85	N/A	10,500	12,637
____ALL____											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	1	97.41	97.41	97.41			97.41	97.41	N/A	110,000	107,150
19-0058	2	88.14	88.14	85.65	12.70	102.91	76.95	99.33	N/A	96,117	82,325
19-0059											
20-0030	27	88.95	95.82	84.37	27.49	113.56	26.44	270.62	74.36 to 96.13	49,424	41,701
59-0001											
59-0002	57	91.87	89.81	90.44	14.27	99.31	4.19	129.48	87.70 to 96.09	92,535	83,685
84-0003	55	94.06	94.19	87.15	17.46	108.08	43.05	215.95	87.45 to 98.20	80,578	70,222
90-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	142	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.35	95% Median C.I.:	88.95 to 94.91
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,334,036	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	29.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.05 to 91.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,343,036	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.60	95% Mean C.I.:	87.90 to 97.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,030,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	79,880	COD:	17.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	70,634	PRD:	104.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:07:53

YEAR BUILT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	14	94.07	77.07	88.24	31.14	87.34	4.19	129.48	26.44 to 109.87		32,235	28,443
Prior TO 1860	2	65.77	65.77	64.41	17.01	102.11	54.58	76.95	N/A		133,750	86,142
1860 TO 1899	8	95.88	110.34	88.60	34.92	124.55	66.21	270.62	66.21 to 270.62		44,037	39,015
1900 TO 1919	31	85.58	93.73	85.66	23.80	109.43	55.82	215.95	79.63 to 96.09		59,506	50,971
1920 TO 1939	8	94.54	92.31	85.91	9.37	107.46	54.99	116.58	54.99 to 116.58		64,937	55,785
1940 TO 1949	2	139.93	139.93	129.85	26.83	107.76	102.38	177.47	N/A		20,500	26,620
1950 TO 1959	7	89.80	87.46	88.51	8.12	98.81	74.34	99.10	74.34 to 99.10		54,985	48,670
1960 TO 1969	9	96.21	100.13	94.89	11.70	105.53	77.08	139.85	85.92 to 115.23		70,566	66,957
1970 TO 1979	29	93.68	92.67	90.26	10.42	102.67	69.30	115.27	87.75 to 99.58		103,823	93,713
1980 TO 1989	11	92.88	93.42	93.49	7.01	99.93	80.86	115.76	82.89 to 98.76		97,109	90,785
1990 TO 1994	6	83.85	84.47	83.24	8.97	101.48	73.55	100.55	73.55 to 100.55		93,191	77,569
1995 TO 1999	10	98.34	99.33	97.93	11.93	101.43	78.09	121.07	86.75 to 111.69		103,350	101,210
2000 TO Present	5	77.71	82.92	79.21	19.08	104.68	64.41	109.08	N/A		235,000	186,138
ALL	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91		79,880	70,634

SALE PRICE *											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	4	93.29	120.91	113.16	71.26	106.85	26.44	270.62	N/A		7,000	7,921
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	4	93.29	120.91	113.16	71.26	106.85	26.44	270.62	N/A		7,000	7,921
10000 TO 29999	18	102.51	103.15	97.13	37.88	106.20	4.19	215.95	79.68 to 129.48		18,694	18,157
30000 TO 59999	30	94.05	91.72	92.52	12.67	99.14	65.20	144.78	81.41 to 95.71		43,928	40,641
60000 TO 99999	50	91.55	92.53	92.45	11.02	100.08	64.23	121.07	88.01 to 97.23		78,631	72,698
100000 TO 149999	31	92.60	88.37	88.13	11.18	100.28	54.99	109.52	83.47 to 97.37		117,737	103,758
150000 TO 249999	6	85.29	83.19	84.66	18.10	98.26	54.58	109.08	54.58 to 109.08		187,208	158,499
250000 TO 499999	3	66.97	67.88	67.98	3.91	99.85	64.41	72.26	N/A		318,666	216,628
ALL	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91		79,880	70,634

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	142	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.35	95% Median C.I.:	88.95 to 94.91
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,334,036	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	29.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.05 to 91.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,343,036	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.60	95% Mean C.I.:	87.90 to 97.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,030,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	79,880	COD:	17.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	70,634	PRD:	104.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:07:53

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	5	26.44	32.15	19.82	88.23	162.16	4.19	82.42	N/A	13,700	2,716
5000 TO 9999	1	104.15	104.15	104.15			104.15	104.15	N/A	6,500	6,770
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	6	34.75	44.15	27.13	93.23	162.71	4.19	104.15	4.19 to 104.15	12,500	3,391
10000 TO 29999	22	97.86	114.18	98.77	33.91	115.60	67.10	270.62	80.35 to 109.87	22,813	22,533
30000 TO 59999	28	94.03	89.99	87.60	12.56	102.72	64.23	129.48	81.41 to 95.71	50,131	43,917
60000 TO 99999	57	90.08	91.58	89.33	12.59	102.52	54.58	144.78	87.45 to 95.84	86,172	76,976
100000 TO 149999	22	96.76	93.24	91.78	8.18	101.59	70.95	115.76	92.31 to 98.38	124,027	113,830
150000 TO 249999	6	74.99	80.62	76.51	17.00	105.38	64.41	109.52	64.41 to 109.52	248,666	190,248
250000 TO 499999	1	109.08	109.08	109.08			109.08	109.08	N/A	230,000	250,885
ALL _____											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	94.07	77.75	85.73	31.86	90.69	4.19	129.48	26.44 to 109.87	24,521	21,021
20	69	91.23	96.98	89.84	19.16	107.95	55.82	270.62	86.77 to 95.84	63,588	57,126
30	57	93.60	91.21	87.63	12.92	104.09	54.58	144.78	87.70 to 97.23	106,335	93,178
40	2	90.67	90.67	87.63	20.30	103.47	72.26	109.08	N/A	275,500	241,412
ALL _____											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	88.21	73.27	84.50	37.63	86.70	4.19	129.48	26.44 to 109.87	26,858	22,696
100	4	104.62	104.60	100.72	17.80	103.85	69.30	139.85	N/A	11,500	11,582
101	57	92.60	91.67	90.62	13.87	101.15	54.58	193.14	82.89 to 95.84	85,028	77,052
102	9	93.00	100.81	80.04	26.61	125.96	64.41	177.47	72.26 to 144.78	116,660	93,369
103	2	87.73	87.73	89.19	12.14	98.36	77.08	98.38	N/A	100,250	89,415
104	32	93.98	97.11	83.38	23.34	116.46	54.99	270.62	79.63 to 98.20	81,783	68,194
111	24	93.63	94.65	94.44	7.21	100.22	82.26	121.07	87.75 to 98.76	86,180	81,388
307	2	88.14	88.14	85.65	12.70	102.91	76.95	99.33	N/A	96,117	82,325
ALL _____											
	142	93.59	92.68	88.43	17.73	104.81	4.19	270.62	88.95 to 94.91	79,880	70,634

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	142	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.35	95% Median C.I.:	88.95 to 94.91
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,334,036	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	29.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.05 to 91.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,343,036	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.60	95% Mean C.I.:	87.90 to 97.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,030,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	79,880	COD:	17.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	70,634	PRD:	104.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.19		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:07:53

CONDITION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	94.07	77.75	85.73	31.86	90.69	4.19	129.48	26.44 to 109.87	24,521	21,021
10	1	104.15	104.15	104.15			104.15	104.15	N/A	6,500	6,770
20	24	95.38	112.56	95.74	26.29	117.57	74.34	270.62	88.01 to 100.55	66,424	63,596
30	67	91.14	91.01	89.38	15.07	101.83	54.58	144.78	84.66 to 95.71	73,341	65,552
40	25	94.08	90.82	88.13	8.89	103.05	66.18	115.27	88.95 to 97.37	104,729	92,298
50	10	78.66	78.91	76.50	14.44	103.14	54.99	99.93	64.41 to 94.40	163,695	125,232
60	1	109.08	109.08	109.08			109.08	109.08	N/A	230,000	250,885
<u>ALL</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>93.59</u>	<u>92.68</u>	<u>88.43</u>	<u>17.73</u>	<u>104.81</u>	<u>4.19</u>	<u>270.62</u>	<u>88.95 to 94.91</u>	<u>79,880</u>	<u>70,634</u>

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

Residential

Current market study has been completed on all residential properties by location.

For 2008, we updated with new pricing and established a new depreciation/quality/condition table for the suburban area by Norfolk known as Woodland Park. There are 603 parcels in this area. The lots were re-valued using the square foot method rather than the front footage method that had been used in the past.

Our office has reviewed and updated the residential properties that reported change because of building permits and information sheets.

2008 Assessment Survey for Stanton County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by: Staff
2.	Valuation done by: Staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom: Listers, Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 2004 2008 Woodland Park
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 2006 2008 Woodland Park
6.	What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? 2008
7.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 14
8.	How are these defined? Assessor location by towns, rural, suburban areas
9.	Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
10.	Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) Yes

11.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	The suburban is located outside the city limits of Norfolk in a subdivision named Woodland Park.
12.	Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
	Yes

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
70	0	3	73

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	138	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	29.33	95% Median C.I.:	91.44 to 96.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,216,136	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	27.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.45 to 93.51
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,225,136	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.59 to 97.71
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,100,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,341	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,191	PRD:	103.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.64		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:49:54

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	23	93.93	86.90	90.17	22.89	96.38	4.64	177.47	80.35 to 98.56	63,103	56,898
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	11	89.11	107.26	94.06	30.20	114.03	67.10	270.62	78.23 to 115.76	72,352	68,054
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	14	92.55	91.16	87.14	17.74	104.61	54.99	120.12	66.18 to 116.58	86,491	75,369
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	19	93.60	94.63	93.32	14.39	101.41	43.05	193.14	83.12 to 99.44	65,778	61,384
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	94.31	92.46	86.90	11.77	106.40	54.58	135.33	85.32 to 99.10	91,100	79,162
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	90.37	87.66	85.03	13.35	103.09	64.23	111.60	77.71 to 97.03	107,580	91,476
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	11	101.18	99.17	101.51	9.68	97.69	69.30	123.93	86.21 to 109.52	85,854	87,152
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	18	95.45	95.24	90.80	16.49	104.89	55.82	144.78	79.63 to 103.09	80,552	73,140
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	67	93.35	93.33	90.88	20.53	102.69	4.64	270.62	88.95 to 97.23	70,267	63,861
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	71	94.49	92.99	89.33	13.56	104.10	54.58	144.78	89.80 to 98.27	91,791	81,995
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	75	93.60	91.61	87.61	13.97	104.57	43.05	193.14	90.82 to 95.71	87,780	76,905
<u>ALL</u>											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	138	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	29.33	95% Median C.I.:	91.44 to 96.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,216,136	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	27.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.45 to 93.51
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,225,136	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.59 to 97.71
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,100,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,341	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,191	PRD:	103.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.64		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:49:55

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
EAGLE RIDGE 1ST	1	94.00	94.00	94.00			94.00	94.00	N/A	57,500	54,050
EAGLE RIDGE SUB	1	94.13	94.13	94.13			94.13	94.13	N/A	40,900	38,500
NORFOLK	4	99.84	97.47	96.93	11.00	100.55	80.66	109.52	N/A	114,812	111,285
PILGER	21	85.58	97.64	86.30	33.50	113.14	26.44	270.62	73.06 to 96.13	36,787	31,747
RURAL	16	88.20	84.81	82.58	16.60	102.70	54.99	116.62	67.55 to 97.41	151,750	125,310
SB VALLEY	1	129.48	129.48	129.48			129.48	129.48	N/A	25,000	32,370
STANTON	47	94.40	92.73	88.99	14.90	104.21	43.05	177.47	83.47 to 98.38	73,960	65,816
WAGNER'S SUB	1	54.58	54.58	54.58			54.58	54.58	N/A	150,000	81,870
WILLERS COVE V	1	79.68	79.68	79.68			79.68	79.68	N/A	18,500	14,740
WP	3	92.50	96.37	95.50	5.39	100.91	90.82	105.78	N/A	97,800	93,398
WP 02	1	135.33	135.33	135.33			135.33	135.33	N/A	58,500	79,170
WP 03	5	103.40	104.04	103.21	9.12	100.80	86.21	120.12	N/A	74,700	77,099
WP 04	5	97.03	95.94	95.91	4.45	100.03	87.61	102.69	N/A	77,517	74,347
WP 05	8	88.85	89.62	89.27	7.26	100.39	81.40	104.74	81.40 to 104.74	85,618	76,430
WP 06	4	92.13	91.83	91.78	1.69	100.05	89.11	93.94	N/A	77,800	71,407
WP 07	2	103.43	103.43	103.32	1.63	100.10	101.74	105.11	N/A	84,350	87,152
WP 08	3	103.15	101.26	101.47	3.76	99.79	94.49	106.13	N/A	83,166	84,391
WP 09	7	98.67	99.46	99.07	10.61	100.39	82.49	123.93	82.49 to 123.93	89,364	88,529
WP 10	3	98.27	99.82	98.83	7.47	101.00	89.59	111.60	N/A	126,300	124,825
WP ROY O - 04	1	21.77	21.77	21.77			21.77	21.77	N/A	15,500	3,375
WP ROY-O	1	4.64	4.64	4.64			4.64	4.64	N/A	28,000	1,300
WP WB	1	101.18	101.18	101.18			101.18	101.18	N/A	110,000	111,300
WP WB 02	1	104.83	104.83	104.83			104.83	104.83	N/A	112,000	117,415
ALL											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	68	93.97	94.25	88.50	20.02	106.50	26.44	270.62	83.12 to 96.13	62,480	55,295
2	51	93.94	93.95	94.87	13.68	99.03	4.64	135.33	92.31 to 101.18	84,451	80,121
3	19	92.88	87.08	84.44	14.79	103.13	54.99	116.62	70.95 to 97.41	140,495	118,638
ALL											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	138	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	29.33	95% Median C.I.:	91.44 to 96.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,216,136	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	27.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.45 to 93.51
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,225,136	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.59 to 97.71
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,100,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,341	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,191	PRD:	103.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.64		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:49:56

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	131	93.93	94.69	90.24	15.58	104.94	43.05	270.62	92.31 to 97.03	84,204	75,982
2	7	79.68	64.31	75.47	47.47	85.21	4.64	129.48	4.64 to 129.48	27,771	20,959
____ALL____											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	136	93.87	92.74	89.92	16.78	103.13	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 94.99	82,383	74,081
06											
07	2	121.25	121.25	120.36	15.34	100.74	102.64	139.85	N/A	10,500	12,637
____ALL____											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	1	97.41	97.41	97.41			97.41	97.41	N/A	110,000	107,150
19-0058	2	88.14	88.14	85.65	12.70	102.91	76.95	99.33	N/A	96,117	82,325
19-0059											
20-0030	27	85.58	94.41	84.23	28.75	112.09	26.44	270.62	73.06 to 95.71	49,424	41,628
59-0001											
59-0002	55	93.94	93.81	94.11	14.02	99.68	4.64	135.33	92.31 to 101.57	95,318	89,705
84-0003	53	94.03	91.93	86.77	15.19	105.95	43.05	177.47	83.47 to 98.20	81,998	71,148
90-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	138	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	29.33	95% Median C.I.:	91.44 to 96.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,216,136	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	27.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.45 to 93.51
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,225,136	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.59 to 97.71
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,100,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,341	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,191	PRD:	103.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.64		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:49:56

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	10	86.84	69.59	84.08	39.69	82.76	4.64	129.48	21.77 to 102.64	33,340	28,033
Prior TO 1860	2	65.77	65.77	64.41	17.01	102.11	54.58	76.95	N/A	133,750	86,142
1860 TO 1899	8	95.88	111.91	90.38	33.29	123.83	67.10	270.62	67.10 to 270.62	44,037	39,800
1900 TO 1919	31	83.47	88.85	84.91	20.02	104.65	55.82	193.14	74.36 to 94.03	59,506	50,526
1920 TO 1939	8	94.54	92.31	85.91	9.37	107.46	54.99	116.58	54.99 to 116.58	64,937	55,785
1940 TO 1949	2	139.93	139.93	129.85	26.83	107.76	102.38	177.47	N/A	20,500	26,620
1950 TO 1959	7	89.80	87.46	88.51	8.12	98.81	74.34	99.10	74.34 to 99.10	54,985	48,670
1960 TO 1969	9	99.44	107.25	101.80	13.39	105.35	86.21	139.85	90.82 to 135.33	70,566	71,836
1970 TO 1979	29	92.91	93.26	90.59	11.10	102.95	69.30	120.12	85.32 to 99.93	103,823	94,051
1980 TO 1989	11	93.83	94.39	94.28	4.76	100.11	81.41	115.76	89.11 to 98.20	97,109	91,556
1990 TO 1994	6	102.45	99.48	99.50	5.19	99.98	82.49	106.13	82.49 to 106.13	93,191	92,726
1995 TO 1999	10	101.38	101.92	101.14	7.99	100.77	89.59	123.93	89.77 to 111.60	103,350	104,524
2000 TO Present	5	77.71	84.60	80.01	21.24	105.74	64.41	109.08	N/A	235,000	188,022
ALL	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	3	65.69	120.92	110.18	123.91	109.74	26.44	270.62	N/A	7,333	8,080
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	65.69	120.92	110.18	123.91	109.74	26.44	270.62	N/A	7,333	8,080
10000 TO 29999	17	102.38	97.15	93.30	32.24	104.12	4.64	193.14	69.30 to 129.48	18,264	17,041
30000 TO 59999	28	94.02	91.89	93.08	12.98	98.72	65.20	144.78	80.97 to 94.99	43,998	40,954
60000 TO 99999	50	94.22	95.20	95.12	10.92	100.08	64.23	123.93	91.44 to 99.44	78,631	74,796
100000 TO 149999	31	92.60	90.48	90.39	10.89	100.10	54.99	111.60	87.45 to 98.38	117,737	106,420
150000 TO 249999	6	85.29	83.19	84.66	18.10	98.26	54.58	109.08	54.58 to 109.08	187,208	158,499
250000 TO 499999	3	66.97	67.88	67.98	3.91	99.85	64.41	72.26	N/A	318,666	216,628
ALL	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	138	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	29.33	95% Median C.I.:	91.44 to 96.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,216,136	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	27.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.45 to 93.51
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,225,136	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.59 to 97.71
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,100,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,341	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,191	PRD:	103.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.64		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:49:56

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	5	26.44	32.32	22.65	62.28	142.67	4.64	65.69	N/A	13,800	3,126
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	5	26.44	32.32	22.65	62.28	142.67	4.64	65.69	N/A	13,800	3,126
10000 TO 29999	21	96.13	109.01	95.80	29.89	113.79	67.10	270.62	80.35 to 103.15	22,661	21,709
30000 TO 59999	26	93.80	89.27	86.92	12.09	102.70	64.23	129.48	79.63 to 94.99	50,684	44,054
60000 TO 99999	57	93.35	94.36	91.81	12.89	102.77	54.58	144.78	89.80 to 98.63	86,179	79,123
100000 TO 149999	22	98.24	95.99	94.61	6.98	101.47	70.95	115.76	92.60 to 100.02	124,009	117,320
150000 TO 249999	6	74.99	80.62	76.51	17.00	105.38	64.41	109.52	64.41 to 109.52	248,666	190,248
250000 TO 499999	1	109.08	109.08	109.08			109.08	109.08	N/A	230,000	250,885
ALL _____											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	86.84	70.24	76.74	40.45	91.53	4.64	129.48	21.77 to 106.60	22,540	17,297
20	69	93.35	96.74	91.80	17.24	105.37	55.82	270.62	88.95 to 96.13	63,588	58,376
30	57	94.99	92.92	89.37	12.79	103.97	54.58	144.78	91.14 to 98.27	106,335	95,028
40	2	90.67	90.67	87.63	20.30	103.47	72.26	109.08	N/A	275,500	241,412
ALL _____											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	61.37	61.65	73.88	61.39	83.44	4.64	129.48	4.64 to 129.48	25,550	18,877
100	4	104.62	104.60	100.72	17.80	103.85	69.30	139.85	N/A	11,500	11,582
101	57	93.60	94.01	92.82	13.65	101.28	54.58	193.14	89.80 to 97.37	85,028	78,922
102	9	93.90	103.32	83.11	24.83	124.32	64.41	177.47	72.26 to 144.78	116,660	96,952
103	2	92.29	92.29	93.13	6.59	99.10	86.21	98.38	N/A	100,250	93,365
104	32	92.54	92.38	82.86	20.50	111.49	54.99	270.62	77.71 to 97.41	81,783	67,764
111	24	95.49	97.41	97.28	8.49	100.14	81.40	123.93	91.44 to 102.69	86,180	83,836
307	2	88.14	88.14	85.65	12.70	102.91	76.95	99.33	N/A	96,117	82,325
ALL _____											
	138	93.92	93.15	89.98	16.95	103.52	4.64	270.62	91.44 to 96.09	81,341	73,191

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	138	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	29.33	95% Median C.I.:	91.44 to 96.09
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,216,136	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	27.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.45 to 93.51
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,225,136	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.59 to 97.71
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,100,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,341	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	270.62		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,191	PRD:	103.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.64		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:49:56

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	86.84	70.24	76.74	40.45	91.53	4.64	129.48	21.77 to 106.60	22,540	17,297
10	1	65.69	65.69	65.69			65.69	65.69	N/A	6,500	4,270
20	24	93.59	107.67	94.56	22.05	113.87	74.34	270.62	89.11 to 102.69	66,424	62,808
30	67	94.06	94.49	93.64	14.77	100.91	54.58	144.78	89.80 to 99.60	73,341	68,673
40	25	94.08	90.96	88.28	9.00	103.03	66.18	115.27	88.95 to 97.41	104,729	92,457
50	10	78.66	78.91	76.50	14.44	103.14	54.99	99.93	64.41 to 94.40	163,695	125,232
60	1	109.08	109.08	109.08			109.08	109.08	N/A	230,000	250,885
<u>ALL</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>93.92</u>	<u>93.15</u>	<u>89.98</u>	<u>16.95</u>	<u>103.52</u>	<u>4.64</u>	<u>270.62</u>	<u>91.44 to 96.09</u>	<u>81,341</u>	<u>73,191</u>

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The county reported that a market study was completed on all residential property by location. Woodland Park, a suburban subclass, the lot values were updated. The improvements were updated with new pricing, quality and condition review and a depreciation update. This included 603 parcels. Pick up work was also completed.

The county has utilized a reasonable percentage of available sales and did not excessively trim sales. The Trended Preliminary Median Ratio and the R&O Median Ratio are relatively close. The difference between the Percent Change to the Sales File and the Percent Change to the Assessed Value is a little over one percentage point and supports the assessment actions as well.

The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are slightly outside the acceptable parameters.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2008 assessment year. Based on the information available and the assessment practices of the county the best indicator of the level of value is the median level for the 2008 assessment year.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	229	138	60.26
2007	221	162	73.3
2006	242	181	74.79
2005	245	180	73.47
2004	240	171	71.25
2003	218	164	75.23
2002	233	189	81.12
2001	252	195	77.38

RESIDENTIAL: The analysis of sales grid indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales for the sales study were considered and indicates that the county has not excessively trimmed the residential sales. The lower number of qualified sales is a reflection of several parcels being substantially changed since the date of sale.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	93.59	3.56	96.92	93.92
2007	93.33	0.9	94.17	94.27
2006	91.86	5.16	96.6	94.35
2005	89.21	3.74	92.55	93.00
2004	90.46	3.65	93.76	93.90
2003	90	4.28	93.85	93
2002	92	2.61	94.4	93
2001	90	0.87	90.78	90

RESIDENTIAL: The Trended Preliminary Median ratio and the R& O median ratio is three points apart. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value for the residential class.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
2.54	2008	3.56
1.63	2007	0.9
4.59	2006	5.16
8.02	2005	3.74
5.7	2004	3.65
2	2003	4
3.41	2002	2.61
0.21	2001	0.87

RESIDENTIAL: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is a little over one percentage point and supports the assessment practices of the unsold and sold properties.

2008 Correlation Section for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	93.92	89.98	93.15

RESIDENTIAL: When reviewing the three measures of central tendency they are similar and supportive of the assessment actions in Stanton County. The median and mean are within the acceptable range and the weighted mean is slightly below.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	16.95	103.52
Difference	1.95	0.52

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion are only slightly outside the acceptable parameters, but not unrealistic. They support the assessment actions of the county.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	142	138	-4
Median	93.59	93.92	0.33
Wgt. Mean	88.43	89.98	1.55
Mean	92.68	93.15	0.47
COD	17.73	16.95	-0.78
PRD	104.81	103.52	-1.29
Min Sales Ratio	4.19	4.64	0.45
Max Sales Ratio	270.62	270.62	0

RESIDENTIAL: The number of sales between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics decreased by four sales. The county concentrated on the Woodland Park/Suburban subclass for the 2008 assessment year.

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:02

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	3	53.65	64.03	65.09	44.59	98.37	33.33	105.10	N/A	9,666	6,291
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05											
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	106.88	106.88	106.88			106.88	106.88	N/A	93,665	100,105
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	142.31	142.31	142.31			142.31	142.31	N/A	24,000	34,155
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	43.27	43.27	43.27			43.27	43.27	N/A	5,200	2,250
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	80.19	81.97	73.51	23.11	111.51	61.36	106.15	N/A	142,121	104,477
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	139.36	139.36	139.36			139.36	139.36	N/A	300,000	418,085
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	83.29	83.29	92.23	11.75	90.31	73.50	93.08	N/A	57,500	53,032
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	41.15	41.15	41.15			41.15	41.15	N/A	40,000	16,460
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	4	79.38	74.74	97.00	39.37	77.05	33.33	106.88	N/A	30,666	29,745
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	80.19	85.58	76.01	35.99	112.59	43.27	142.31	43.27 to 142.31	99,614	75,719
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	83.29	86.77	118.82	35.36	73.03	41.15	139.36	N/A	113,750	135,152
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	124.60	124.60	114.10	14.22	109.19	106.88	142.31	N/A	58,832	67,130
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	80.19	85.09	95.94	35.37	88.69	43.27	139.36	43.27 to 139.36	145,614	139,707
<u>ALL</u>											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
PILGER	3	43.27	60.57	65.12	55.29	93.00	33.33	105.10	N/A	8,066	5,253
RURAL	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
STANTON	10	93.97	91.65	109.37	27.95	83.80	41.15	142.31	53.65 to 139.36	81,614	89,258
<u>ALL</u>											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

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	13	93.08	84.47	108.09	31.75	78.15	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	64,642	69,872
2	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
<u>ALL</u>											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:02

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	13	93.08	85.87	95.00	30.26	90.38	33.33	142.31	53.65 to 106.88	90,011	85,511
2	1	43.27	43.27	43.27			43.27	43.27	N/A	5,200	2,250
____ALL____	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

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	99.98	99.98	99.43	6.90	100.56	93.08	106.88	N/A	101,832	101,247
03	12	69.52	79.96	93.80	43.51	85.25	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.15	80,973	75,950
04											
____ALL____	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039											
19-0058											
19-0059											
20-0030	3	43.27	60.57	65.12	55.29	93.00	33.33	105.10	N/A	8,066	5,253
59-0001											
59-0002	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
84-0003	10	93.97	91.65	109.37	27.95	83.80	41.15	142.31	53.65 to 139.36	81,614	89,258
90-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:02

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	106.88	96.50	130.48	29.97	73.96	43.27	139.36	N/A	132,955	173,480
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	3	106.15	107.32	119.70	21.61	89.66	73.50	142.31	N/A	17,333	20,748
1920 TO 1939	2	43.49	43.49	44.03	23.36	98.78	33.33	53.65	N/A	9,500	4,182
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	3	65.53	66.59	76.35	26.42	87.22	41.15	93.08	N/A	63,333	48,353
1980 TO 1989	2	83.23	83.23	62.63	26.28	132.89	61.36	105.10	N/A	172,500	108,035
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	94.86	94.86	94.86			94.86	94.86	N/A	170,484	161,725
2000 TO Present											
ALL	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	3	43.27	50.03	46.48	30.95	107.63	33.33	73.50	N/A	6,400	2,975
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	43.27	50.03	46.48	30.95	107.63	33.33	73.50	N/A	6,400	2,975
10000 TO 29999	4	105.63	101.80	111.11	21.23	91.62	53.65	142.31	N/A	16,750	18,611
30000 TO 59999	2	53.34	53.34	53.34	22.85	100.00	41.15	65.53	N/A	40,000	21,335
60000 TO 99999	1	106.88	106.88	106.88			106.88	106.88	N/A	93,665	100,105
100000 TO 149999	1	93.08	93.08	93.08			93.08	93.08	N/A	110,000	102,390
150000 TO 249999	1	94.86	94.86	94.86			94.86	94.86	N/A	170,484	161,725
250000 TO 499999	2	100.36	100.36	98.21	38.86	102.19	61.36	139.36	N/A	317,500	311,822
ALL	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:02

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	3	43.27	50.03	46.48	30.95	107.63	33.33	73.50	N/A	6,400	2,975
5000 TO 9999	1	53.65	53.65	53.65			53.65	53.65	N/A	10,000	5,365
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	4	48.46	50.94	48.94	26.08	104.09	33.33	73.50	N/A	7,300	3,572
10000 TO 29999	4	85.32	79.48	68.67	30.64	115.75	41.15	106.15	N/A	28,250	19,398
30000 TO 59999	1	142.31	142.31	142.31			142.31	142.31	N/A	24,000	34,155
100000 TO 149999	2	99.98	99.98	99.43	6.90	100.56	93.08	106.88	N/A	101,832	101,247
150000 TO 249999	2	78.11	78.11	72.66	21.44	107.50	61.36	94.86	N/A	252,742	183,642
250000 TO 499999	1	139.36	139.36	139.36			139.36	139.36	N/A	300,000	418,085
ALL _____											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	93.08	81.08	98.03	22.78	82.71	43.27	106.88	N/A	69,621	68,248
10	6	85.32	84.35	89.36	39.28	94.39	33.33	142.31	33.33 to 142.31	19,333	17,275
20	5	73.50	82.05	94.71	35.84	86.63	41.15	139.36	N/A	170,096	161,101
ALL _____											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	75.08	75.08	103.53	42.36	72.52	43.27	106.88	N/A	49,432	51,177
352	2	93.97	93.97	94.16	0.95	99.79	93.08	94.86	N/A	140,242	132,057
353	1	142.31	142.31	142.31			142.31	142.31	N/A	24,000	34,155
384	1	53.65	53.65	53.65			53.65	53.65	N/A	10,000	5,365
406	4	57.33	63.53	61.75	45.87	102.88	33.33	106.15	N/A	19,250	11,887
421	1	139.36	139.36	139.36			139.36	139.36	N/A	300,000	418,085
526	1	105.10	105.10	105.10			105.10	105.10	N/A	10,000	10,510
528	1	65.53	65.53	65.53			65.53	65.53	N/A	40,000	26,210
531	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
ALL _____											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

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

Commercial

Stanton County is currently contracted with Bill Kaiser for a complete reappraisal of all commercial properties. Bill started review and gathering information October, 2007 and is contracted for completion by April 1, 2008. We will finalize the information and add the value in 2009.

For the current year our office has added any new construction or changes reported by building permits and/or information sheets.

2008 Assessment Survey for Stanton County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Kaiser Appraisal – general Wayne Kubert for Nucor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraisers
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisers
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	1988
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	1998
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
7.	When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
	Sales comparison done yearly. In the process of updated pricing to be completed and put on in 2009.
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
	3
9.	How are these defined?
	Stanton, Pilger and Rural
10.	Is “Assessor Location” a usable valuation identity?
	yes
11.	Does the assessor location “suburban” mean something other than rural commercial? (<i>that is, does the “suburban” location have its own market?</i>)
	No

12.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
5	0	0	5

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:00

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	3	53.65	64.03	65.09	44.59	98.37	33.33	105.10	N/A	9,666	6,291
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05											
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	106.88	106.88	106.88			106.88	106.88	N/A	93,665	100,105
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	142.31	142.31	142.31			142.31	142.31	N/A	24,000	34,155
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	43.27	43.27	43.27			43.27	43.27	N/A	5,200	2,250
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	80.19	81.97	73.51	23.11	111.51	61.36	106.15	N/A	142,121	104,477
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	139.36	139.36	139.36			139.36	139.36	N/A	300,000	418,085
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	83.29	83.29	92.23	11.75	90.31	73.50	93.08	N/A	57,500	53,032
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	41.15	41.15	41.15			41.15	41.15	N/A	40,000	16,460
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	4	79.38	74.74	97.00	39.37	77.05	33.33	106.88	N/A	30,666	29,745
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	80.19	85.58	76.01	35.99	112.59	43.27	142.31	43.27 to 142.31	99,614	75,719
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	83.29	86.77	118.82	35.36	73.03	41.15	139.36	N/A	113,750	135,152
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	124.60	124.60	114.10	14.22	109.19	106.88	142.31	N/A	58,832	67,130
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	80.19	85.09	95.94	35.37	88.69	43.27	139.36	43.27 to 139.36	145,614	139,707
<u>ALL</u>											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
PILGER	3	43.27	60.57	65.12	55.29	93.00	33.33	105.10	N/A	8,066	5,253
RURAL	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
STANTON	10	93.97	91.65	109.37	27.95	83.80	41.15	142.31	53.65 to 139.36	81,614	89,258
<u>ALL</u>											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

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	13	93.08	84.47	108.09	31.75	78.15	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	64,642	69,872
2	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
<u>ALL</u>											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:00

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	13	93.08	85.87	95.00	30.26	90.38	33.33	142.31	53.65 to 106.88	90,011	85,511
2	1	43.27	43.27	43.27			43.27	43.27	N/A	5,200	2,250
____ALL____	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

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	99.98	99.98	99.43	6.90	100.56	93.08	106.88	N/A	101,832	101,247
03	12	69.52	79.96	93.80	43.51	85.25	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.15	80,973	75,950
04											
____ALL____	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039											
19-0058											
19-0059											
20-0030	3	43.27	60.57	65.12	55.29	93.00	33.33	105.10	N/A	8,066	5,253
59-0001											
59-0002	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
84-0003	10	93.97	91.65	109.37	27.95	83.80	41.15	142.31	53.65 to 139.36	81,614	89,258
90-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:00

YEAR BUILT *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	106.88	96.50	130.48	29.97	73.96	43.27	139.36	N/A	132,955	173,480
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	3	106.15	107.32	119.70	21.61	89.66	73.50	142.31	N/A	17,333	20,748
1920 TO 1939	2	43.49	43.49	44.03	23.36	98.78	33.33	53.65	N/A	9,500	4,182
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	3	65.53	66.59	76.35	26.42	87.22	41.15	93.08	N/A	63,333	48,353
1980 TO 1989	2	83.23	83.23	62.63	26.28	132.89	61.36	105.10	N/A	172,500	108,035
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	94.86	94.86	94.86			94.86	94.86	N/A	170,484	161,725
2000 TO Present											
ALL	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	3	43.27	50.03	46.48	30.95	107.63	33.33	73.50	N/A	6,400	2,975
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	43.27	50.03	46.48	30.95	107.63	33.33	73.50	N/A	6,400	2,975
10000 TO 29999	4	105.63	101.80	111.11	21.23	91.62	53.65	142.31	N/A	16,750	18,611
30000 TO 59999	2	53.34	53.34	53.34	22.85	100.00	41.15	65.53	N/A	40,000	21,335
60000 TO 99999	1	106.88	106.88	106.88			106.88	106.88	N/A	93,665	100,105
100000 TO 149999	1	93.08	93.08	93.08			93.08	93.08	N/A	110,000	102,390
150000 TO 249999	1	94.86	94.86	94.86			94.86	94.86	N/A	170,484	161,725
250000 TO 499999	2	100.36	100.36	98.21	38.86	102.19	61.36	139.36	N/A	317,500	311,822
ALL	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	83	COV:	42.43	95% Median C.I.:	43.27 to 106.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,175,349	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	35.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.09 to 122.46
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,175,349	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.71	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 99.46
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,113,905						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	83,953	COD:	35.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	79,564	PRD:	87.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.33		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:00

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	3	43.27	50.03	46.48	30.95	107.63	33.33	73.50	N/A	6,400	2,975
5000 TO 9999	1	53.65	53.65	53.65			53.65	53.65	N/A	10,000	5,365
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	4	48.46	50.94	48.94	26.08	104.09	33.33	73.50	N/A	7,300	3,572
10000 TO 29999	4	85.32	79.48	68.67	30.64	115.75	41.15	106.15	N/A	28,250	19,398
30000 TO 59999	1	142.31	142.31	142.31			142.31	142.31	N/A	24,000	34,155
100000 TO 149999	2	99.98	99.98	99.43	6.90	100.56	93.08	106.88	N/A	101,832	101,247
150000 TO 249999	2	78.11	78.11	72.66	21.44	107.50	61.36	94.86	N/A	252,742	183,642
250000 TO 499999	1	139.36	139.36	139.36			139.36	139.36	N/A	300,000	418,085
ALL _____											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	93.08	81.08	98.03	22.78	82.71	43.27	106.88	N/A	69,621	68,248
10	6	85.32	84.35	89.36	39.28	94.39	33.33	142.31	33.33 to 142.31	19,333	17,275
20	5	73.50	82.05	94.71	35.84	86.63	41.15	139.36	N/A	170,096	161,101
ALL _____											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	75.08	75.08	103.53	42.36	72.52	43.27	106.88	N/A	49,432	51,177
352	2	93.97	93.97	94.16	0.95	99.79	93.08	94.86	N/A	140,242	132,057
353	1	142.31	142.31	142.31			142.31	142.31	N/A	24,000	34,155
384	1	53.65	53.65	53.65			53.65	53.65	N/A	10,000	5,365
406	4	57.33	63.53	61.75	45.87	102.88	33.33	106.15	N/A	19,250	11,887
421	1	139.36	139.36	139.36			139.36	139.36	N/A	300,000	418,085
526	1	105.10	105.10	105.10			105.10	105.10	N/A	10,000	10,510
528	1	65.53	65.53	65.53			65.53	65.53	N/A	40,000	26,210
531	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	335,000	205,560
ALL _____											
	14	83.29	82.82	94.77	35.67	87.39	33.33	142.31	43.27 to 106.88	83,953	79,564

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The county is aware that the commercial class of property has been an issue for several years. The county has contracted with Bill Kaiser to complete a reappraisal of the commercial class of property. The project was started in October, 2007. The information is not complete to implement for the 2008 assessment year so the county plans to utilize the reappraisal in 2009.

The county did complete the pickup work for the commercial class for 2008.

Analysis of the tables indicated that a reasonable percentage of available sales were utilized. The relationship of the remaining tables is somewhat distorted due to the fact that of the 14 sales 10 of them are located in the village of Stanton. A more realistic reflection of the analysis would be to consider the assessor location of Stanton when determining the level of value for the county.

There are only 14 sales in the commercial class. At this time, I do not feel it will benefit the county to make any changes to the class as a whole to achieve a level of value within the acceptable range. Ten of those sales are located in the village of Stanton and indicate a median level of assessment at 93.97%. Since the majority of the sales are located in the village of Stanton it is my opinion that the median level for the commercial class would be 94%.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	26	14	53.85
2007	25	11	44
2006	18	9	50
2005	15	6	40
2004	19	10	52.63
2003	27	15	55.56
2002	25	12	48
2001	32	17	53.12

COMMERCIAL: The analysis of the sales grid indicates that a reasonable percentage of the available sales for the commercial class were considered when determining the valuation process for the 2008 assessment year. Of the 14 qualified sales 10 of them are in one assessor location and would have a direct influence of the level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	83.29	-8.43	76.27	83.29
2007	65.53	0.34	65.76	65.53
2006	65.78	-0.67	65.34	60.46
2005	62.25	-0.08	62.2	62.25
2004	71.50	0.22	71.65	82.69
2003	95	0.02	95.02	95
2002	98	-0.21	97.79	98
2001	95	0.56	95.53	95

COMMERCIAL: The Trended Preliminary Median Ratio and the R&O Median Ratio are not a true representation of the level of value for the commercial class. The village of Stanton represents 71% of the sales file base and the median level for that is 93.97% which would be a more realistic level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2008	-8.43
10.4	2007	0.34
2.92	2006	-0.67
0	2005	-0.08
0	2004	0.22
0	2003	0
0	2002	-0.21
4.4	2001	0.56

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the change in total assessed value to the sales file and the change in assessed value supports the assessment actions in the county.

2008 Correlation Section for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	83.29	94.77	82.82

COMMERCIAL: The median and the mean ratios are all statistically outside the acceptable parameters. The only measure of central tendency within is the weighted mean. Based on the fact that ten of the fourteen sales are located in the assessor location of Stanton, the measures are not reliable and the level of value of Stanton with a median of 93.97, weighted mean of 109.37 and a mean of 84.4. Considering this fact, the measure to establish the level of value is best represented in the assessor location of Stanton and would be 94%.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	35.67	87.39
Difference	15.67	-10.61

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are well outside the acceptable level.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	14	14	0
Median	83.29	83.29	0
Wgt. Mean	94.77	94.77	0
Mean	82.82	82.82	0
COD	35.67	35.67	0
PRD	87.39	87.39	0
Min Sales Ratio	33.33	33.33	0
Max Sales Ratio	142.31	142.31	0

COMMERCIAL: Table VII indicates that one sale was removed from the sales file following the preliminary statistics. That one sale was considered substantially changed. The county has reported minimal changes for the 2008 assessment year with plans to have a completed reappraisal of the commercial class in place in 2009.

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:	94	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	23.27	95% Median C.I.:	61.41 to 69.48	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,642,395	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	15.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.18 to 67.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,642,395	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.19	95% Mean C.I.:	62.66 to 68.85	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,009,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	198,323	COD:	18.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.82			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,764	PRD:	102.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.27			

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:24

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	3	82.99	81.88	81.20	2.94	100.83	77.66	84.98	N/A	110,250	89,523
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	69.94	73.47	71.63	15.23	102.57	61.41	92.59	N/A	298,466	213,793
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	15	70.21	65.45	65.35	9.48	100.16	41.96	75.93	61.41 to 72.50	218,678	142,896
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	9	84.36	77.32	72.17	12.47	107.13	53.07	90.29	56.48 to 89.58	150,064	108,307
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	70.67	70.67	71.55	4.00	98.77	67.84	73.50	N/A	183,000	130,932
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	74.06	75.14	79.83	16.32	94.13	46.71	103.82	46.71 to 103.82	212,958	170,009
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	57.09	60.58	55.40	20.01	109.34	43.72	81.53	43.72 to 81.53	230,804	127,866
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	68.88	63.09	64.52	15.58	97.79	44.10	76.29	N/A	139,750	90,163
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	56.25	56.48	55.48	5.68	101.80	52.88	60.55	N/A	185,266	102,791
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	61.06	62.84	56.26	25.64	111.69	40.38	93.83	40.38 to 93.83	224,700	126,415
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	21	55.55	59.23	61.17	22.45	96.84	25.27	92.34	51.54 to 65.22	191,608	117,200
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	62.36	63.68	59.92	15.18	106.26	48.19	86.22	49.52 to 84.43	185,328	111,057
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	31	71.63	71.52	68.91	13.70	103.78	41.96	92.59	66.78 to 77.66	198,560	136,837
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	68.88	67.45	67.25	17.05	100.30	43.72	103.82	52.14 to 77.09	206,445	138,826
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	42	59.04	60.65	59.53	19.38	101.88	25.27	93.83	53.78 to 64.83	194,087	115,535
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	34	70.25	71.18	70.74	13.84	100.61	41.96	103.82	67.84 to 75.93	197,071	139,416
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	58.81	60.80	56.56	19.46	107.50	40.38	93.83	51.14 to 68.88	207,378	117,289
<u>ALL</u>											
	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

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:	94	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	23.27	95% Median C.I.:	61.41 to 69.48	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,642,395	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	15.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.18 to 67.66	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,642,395	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.19	95% Mean C.I.:	62.66 to 68.85	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,009,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	198,323	COD:	18.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.82			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,764	PRD:	102.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.27			

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:24

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1503	10	65.34	66.63	66.58	19.81	100.07	28.12	92.07	46.71 to 89.58	149,195	99,341	
1505	9	70.22	67.76	70.07	10.37	96.71	54.53	81.53	55.44 to 75.93	179,512	125,781	
1507	13	72.50	73.17	70.67	13.89	103.54	51.37	93.83	61.41 to 90.29	198,355	140,173	
1545	3	65.01	60.53	56.72	18.36	106.70	40.38	76.19	N/A	200,500	113,733	
1547	6	55.61	55.15	56.17	20.03	98.20	25.27	77.09	25.27 to 77.09	172,473	96,872	
1549	6	67.51	69.42	66.74	19.16	104.01	51.54	88.18	51.54 to 88.18	186,403	124,410	
1783	7	77.89	75.95	74.67	19.14	101.72	51.14	103.82	51.14 to 103.82	229,383	171,278	
1785	7	53.07	55.65	53.61	15.44	103.80	43.70	70.21	43.70 to 70.21	316,678	169,768	
1787	11	53.69	59.07	59.52	21.69	99.24	41.96	92.34	44.50 to 80.89	223,757	133,177	
1829	8	60.58	59.76	60.58	10.87	98.65	49.52	77.66	49.52 to 77.66	181,828	110,153	
1831	4	75.91	75.76	71.91	10.48	105.36	66.78	84.43	N/A	182,500	131,227	
1833	10	68.11	67.22	65.48	14.32	102.66	44.10	85.05	48.19 to 84.36	173,305	113,481	
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	59	64.83	64.00	62.96	20.35	101.66	25.27	103.82	55.55 to 70.21	205,866	129,603	
2	22	66.23	66.06	64.86	14.58	101.85	44.10	85.05	59.79 to 76.29	178,076	115,497	
3	13	72.50	73.17	70.67	13.89	103.54	51.37	93.83	61.41 to 90.29	198,355	140,173	
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764	

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	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764	
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	34	67.59	68.36	67.92	14.59	100.65	46.71	93.83	63.55 to 72.50	173,837	118,073	
DRY-N/A	38	62.20	63.94	61.79	18.11	103.48	40.38	92.34	59.79 to 69.48	211,471	130,676	
GRASS	6	74.91	69.60	74.03	29.48	94.02	28.12	103.82	28.12 to 103.82	144,499	106,965	
GRASS-N/A	10	56.30	60.92	59.49	26.86	102.41	25.27	92.07	48.19 to 88.91	198,400	118,024	
IRRGTD	1	53.07	53.07	53.07			53.07	53.07	N/A	345,000	183,105	
IRRGTD-N/A	5	72.65	69.32	68.30	15.00	101.50	53.07	86.33	N/A	300,003	204,896	
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764	

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:	94	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	23.27	95% Median C.I.:	61.41 to 69.48	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,642,395	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	15.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.18 to 67.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,642,395	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.19	95% Mean C.I.:	62.66 to 68.85	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,009,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	198,323	COD:	18.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.82			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,764	PRD:	102.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.27			

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:24

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	52	65.57	65.98	64.69	15.32	101.99	41.96	93.83	61.80 to 70.22	182,717	118,201
DRY-N/A	20	65.90	66.17	63.75	19.17	103.80	40.38	92.34	55.44 to 77.09	222,254	141,685
GRASS	10	70.21	70.22	68.91	24.55	101.90	28.12	103.82	49.60 to 92.07	189,899	130,856
GRASS-N/A	6	51.70	54.10	53.94	25.29	100.29	25.27	88.91	25.27 to 88.91	158,666	85,579
IRRGTD	3	53.07	54.27	54.09	2.25	100.32	53.07	56.66	N/A	352,568	190,708
IRRGTD-N/A	3	77.89	78.96	80.71	5.85	97.82	72.65	86.33	N/A	262,437	211,820
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	71	65.46	65.72	64.28	16.18	102.24	40.38	93.83	61.80 to 69.04	195,489	125,654
DRY-N/A	1	88.18	88.18	88.18			88.18	88.18	N/A	66,600	58,730
GRASS	16	61.82	64.17	63.91	29.90	100.41	25.27	103.82	49.60 to 86.22	178,187	113,877
IRRGTD	6	64.66	66.61	65.45	19.09	101.77	53.07	86.33	53.07 to 86.33	307,502	201,264
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	8	64.69	63.89	59.39	22.24	107.59	43.70	85.05	43.70 to 85.05	181,256	107,640
19-0058	13	58.81	58.64	57.74	15.43	101.55	41.96	82.99	49.52 to 66.78	180,515	104,238
19-0059	1	64.23	64.23	64.23			64.23	64.23	N/A	360,000	231,240
20-0030	17	72.50	71.68	69.15	17.04	103.66	44.50	93.83	61.41 to 90.29	215,979	149,352
59-0001	6	81.13	81.39	83.15	12.46	97.88	65.68	103.82	65.68 to 103.82	206,080	171,362
59-0002	13	65.14	64.28	64.83	17.01	99.15	28.12	89.58	54.57 to 84.98	139,079	90,163
84-0003	36	66.43	63.90	62.08	17.03	102.94	25.27	92.07	55.55 to 70.22	215,818	133,974
90-0595											
NonValid School											
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

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:	94	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	23.27	95% Median C.I.:	61.41 to 69.48	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,642,395	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	15.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.18 to 67.66	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,642,395	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.19	95% Mean C.I.:	62.66 to 68.85	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,009,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	198,323	COD:	18.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	103.82			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,764	PRD:	102.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.27			

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:08:24

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	3	46.71	45.62	48.18	24.21	94.69	28.12	62.04	N/A	46,258	22,288
30.01 TO 50.00	13	55.55	62.50	59.68	19.47	104.71	44.10	89.58	51.54 to 72.50	78,440	46,816
50.01 TO 100.00	39	67.34	67.15	65.33	17.55	102.78	25.27	93.83	60.55 to 76.29	147,428	96,320
100.01 TO 180.00	29	65.01	65.24	62.75	16.57	103.96	40.38	92.59	56.66 to 71.63	277,865	174,363
180.01 TO 330.00	8	69.74	72.52	68.33	24.49	106.14	43.72	103.82	43.72 to 103.82	397,008	271,281
330.01 TO 650.00	2	70.21	70.21	70.21	0.00	100.00	70.21	70.21	N/A	250,000	175,530
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

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 \$											
30000 TO 59999	4	58.60	58.72	59.59	36.37	98.55	28.12	89.58	N/A	41,376	24,656
60000 TO 99999	15	62.04	68.12	67.47	21.71	100.96	49.61	92.07	53.78 to 84.98	80,106	54,047
100000 TO 149999	20	73.23	69.35	69.71	17.41	99.48	25.27	93.83	58.81 to 79.95	125,214	87,288
150000 TO 249999	30	65.75	65.73	66.01	14.18	99.58	41.96	103.82	61.36 to 69.48	200,920	132,619
250000 TO 499999	23	61.80	63.44	62.59	18.47	101.37	40.38	92.59	53.07 to 70.21	334,224	209,175
500000 +	2	53.04	53.04	53.50	17.57	99.13	43.72	62.36	N/A	528,110	282,565
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

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	37.42	37.42	36.04	24.84	103.82	28.12	46.71	N/A	36,988	13,330
30000 TO 59999	18	59.04	62.88	59.35	22.23	105.94	25.27	89.58	53.69 to 72.50	79,881	47,411
60000 TO 99999	15	65.46	65.06	62.29	17.91	104.45	41.96	92.07	54.53 to 76.19	133,316	83,041
100000 TO 149999	25	67.34	67.92	64.96	18.02	104.55	40.38	93.83	60.55 to 77.66	175,168	113,795
150000 TO 249999	30	66.00	67.07	64.36	15.94	104.21	43.72	103.82	61.41 to 70.22	300,136	193,154
250000 TO 499999	4	69.74	72.04	71.22	13.03	101.15	62.36	86.33	N/A	436,871	311,156
ALL	94	65.34	65.75	64.42	18.66	102.06	25.27	103.82	61.41 to 69.48	198,323	127,764

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

Agricultural

Throughout the year this office has plans of beginning its whole county inspection/update by the process that includes viewing all properties one precinct at a time until all twelve precincts are completed. We would like to (as time, man-power and good weather allows) review three precincts a year in our agricultural areas and then continue this routine for future years.

This office will continue updating values in each market area following the market study on sales for the current study period.

We will update all ag properties each year as determined by building permits, information sheets and personal reporting to this office. We work closely with our Zoning Administrator in obtaining all information on construction within the county.

2008 Assessment Survey for Stanton County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The listers gather information and office does the pricing
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	As the main source of income derived from the property
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1981, Conversion 8/23/95
7.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	1981
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	FSA Maps
b.	By whom?
	Office Staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:
	3

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

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
41	0	0	41

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:	93	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	22.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.90 to 72.01	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,087,925	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 71.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,087,925	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.80 to 72.17	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,235,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,493	COD:	18.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,568	PRD:	101.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.54			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:09

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	3	85.09	85.47	84.53	3.40	101.11	81.33	90.00	N/A	110,250	93,196
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	70.33	72.89	71.28	13.50	102.26	60.32	90.60	N/A	298,466	212,748
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	15	70.45	67.20	67.54	10.17	99.50	46.91	85.12	60.81 to 73.38	218,678	147,694
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	9	87.53	78.91	73.27	13.14	107.70	53.07	94.37	60.65 to 91.47	150,064	109,955
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	78.36	78.36	79.37	4.17	98.72	75.09	81.62	N/A	183,000	145,255
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	78.13	79.94	84.43	13.84	94.69	52.11	110.03	52.11 to 110.03	212,958	179,793
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	59.21	63.92	58.87	19.32	108.58	49.10	88.64	49.10 to 88.64	230,804	135,873
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	71.36	66.03	67.46	16.16	97.88	46.07	80.66	N/A	139,750	94,275
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	61.39	61.90	61.11	4.52	101.29	58.83	65.99	N/A	185,266	113,215
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	63.75	65.68	59.08	25.25	111.16	42.74	92.17	42.74 to 92.17	224,700	132,760
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	21	60.01	62.81	65.19	23.34	96.34	25.54	100.31	52.89 to 71.67	191,608	124,919
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	66.67	68.29	62.59	14.43	109.11	49.05	88.20	53.47 to 85.95	148,414	92,889
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	31	70.75	73.10	70.44	14.83	103.79	46.91	94.37	67.47 to 81.33	198,560	139,857
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	75.09	71.70	71.47	16.73	100.31	46.07	110.03	54.73 to 80.66	206,445	147,555
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	41	63.36	64.48	63.20	19.52	102.02	25.54	100.31	57.20 to 69.21	185,297	117,112
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	34	73.51	73.96	73.64	14.58	100.44	46.91	110.03	69.06 to 78.74	197,071	145,113
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	63.36	64.34	60.14	18.17	106.98	42.74	92.17	54.08 to 71.36	207,378	124,725
<u>ALL</u>											
	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

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:	93	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	22.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.90 to 72.01	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,087,925	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 71.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,087,925	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.80 to 72.17	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,235,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,493	COD:	18.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,568	PRD:	101.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.54			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:10

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1503	10	71.43	71.62	72.28	18.95	99.08	29.88	96.80	52.11 to 94.37	149,195	107,844	
1505	9	77.52	74.95	77.64	10.12	96.54	60.01	88.64	61.84 to 85.12	179,512	139,367	
1507	13	70.45	71.69	69.34	13.67	103.40	51.37	92.17	60.32 to 88.02	198,355	137,531	
1545	3	67.38	64.15	59.78	19.58	107.31	42.74	82.32	N/A	200,500	119,856	
1547	6	59.96	58.94	59.31	20.80	99.37	25.54	79.41	25.54 to 79.41	172,473	102,295	
1549	5	73.38	72.77	72.59	18.77	100.26	52.89	91.47	N/A	112,790	81,871	
1783	7	78.74	79.53	77.35	19.76	102.81	53.56	110.03	53.56 to 110.03	229,383	177,437	
1785	7	54.08	58.10	56.21	13.65	103.37	48.32	70.75	48.32 to 70.75	316,678	177,997	
1787	11	59.42	64.45	65.08	20.88	99.03	46.91	100.31	49.35 to 86.96	223,757	145,622	
1829	8	62.50	62.32	63.23	11.59	98.57	51.11	81.33	51.11 to 81.33	181,828	114,963	
1831	4	78.38	77.94	74.32	9.67	104.88	69.06	85.95	N/A	182,500	135,625	
1833	10	70.53	70.02	68.11	14.85	102.79	46.07	89.25	49.05 to 87.53	173,305	118,041	
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	58	68.96	68.50	67.34	20.38	101.73	25.54	110.03	60.65 to 73.38	199,855	134,575	
2	22	69.13	68.66	67.45	14.48	101.79	46.07	89.25	61.09 to 80.66	178,076	120,119	
3	13	70.45	71.69	69.34	13.67	103.40	51.37	92.17	60.32 to 88.02	198,355	137,531	
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568	

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	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568	
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	34	71.10	72.24	72.25	13.01	99.99	51.37	94.37	66.55 to 77.52	173,837	125,592	
DRY-N/A	37	65.99	67.22	64.96	17.89	103.49	42.74	100.31	60.65 to 73.64	202,201	131,342	
GRASS	6	77.63	72.86	77.48	29.90	94.04	29.88	110.03	29.88 to 110.03	144,499	111,963	
GRASS-N/A	10	59.00	63.22	61.39	27.69	102.99	25.54	96.80	49.05 to 96.13	198,400	121,788	
IRRGTD	1	53.07	53.07	53.07			53.07	53.07	N/A	345,000	183,105	
IRRGTD-N/A	5	73.38	69.92	68.88	15.21	101.51	53.56	87.27	N/A	300,003	206,657	
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568	

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:	93	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	22.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.90 to 72.01	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,087,925	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 71.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,087,925	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.80 to 72.17	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,235,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,493	COD:	18.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,568	PRD:	101.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.54			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:10

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	52	70.08	69.44	68.29	14.44	101.68	46.07	94.37	65.99 to 72.57	182,717	124,779
DRY-N/A	19	69.06	70.14	67.89	18.60	103.32	42.74	100.31	60.01 to 85.95	204,769	139,015
GRASS	10	70.75	72.96	71.31	25.72	102.30	29.88	110.03	52.01 to 96.80	189,899	135,424
GRASS-N/A	6	52.87	56.64	56.24	27.87	100.70	25.54	96.13	25.54 to 96.13	158,666	89,236
IRRGTD	3	53.56	54.43	54.29	2.23	100.27	53.07	56.66	N/A	352,568	191,391
IRRGTD-N/A	3	78.74	79.80	81.57	5.88	97.83	73.38	87.27	N/A	262,437	214,071
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	70	69.46	69.31	68.06	15.41	101.85	42.74	100.31	65.99 to 72.11	190,361	129,555
DRY-N/A	1	91.47	91.47	91.47			91.47	91.47	N/A	66,600	60,920
GRASS	16	65.21	66.84	66.28	29.72	100.84	25.54	110.03	51.11 to 90.00	178,187	118,104
IRRGTD	6	65.02	67.11	65.93	19.51	101.80	53.07	87.27	53.07 to 87.27	307,502	202,731
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	8	66.69	66.59	62.15	22.20	107.14	46.07	89.25	46.07 to 89.25	181,256	112,651
19-0058	13	61.09	61.90	61.35	14.47	100.90	46.91	85.09	51.11 to 69.06	180,515	110,751
19-0059	1	66.48	66.48	66.48			66.48	66.48	N/A	360,000	239,340
20-0030	17	70.45	71.80	69.86	17.63	102.78	49.35	100.31	60.32 to 88.02	215,979	150,887
59-0001	6	83.01	84.40	85.96	12.70	98.19	69.21	110.03	69.21 to 110.03	206,080	177,145
59-0002	13	70.84	69.56	70.67	15.76	98.43	29.88	94.37	61.84 to 88.20	139,079	98,280
84-0003	35	70.75	68.01	65.83	17.57	103.30	25.54	96.80	59.42 to 76.25	206,143	135,713
90-0595											
NonValid School											
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

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:	93	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	22.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.90 to 72.01	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,087,925	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 71.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,087,925	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.49	95% Mean C.I.:	65.80 to 72.17	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,235,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,493	COD:	18.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,568	PRD:	101.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.54			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:50:10

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	3	52.11	48.56	50.71	21.62	95.76	29.88	63.68	N/A	46,258	23,456
30.01 TO 50.00	13	61.84	65.20	62.27	17.63	104.72	46.07	94.37	52.89 to 76.25	78,440	48,841
50.01 TO 100.00	39	70.53	70.38	68.47	16.20	102.79	25.54	96.80	63.90 to 78.74	147,428	100,944
100.01 TO 180.00	29	67.38	68.20	65.43	17.80	104.24	42.74	96.13	58.83 to 76.36	277,865	181,800
180.01 TO 330.00	7	85.12	79.70	75.06	20.55	106.19	49.10	110.03	49.10 to 110.03	374,513	281,107
330.01 TO 650.00	2	70.75	70.75	70.75	0.00	100.00	70.75	70.75	N/A	250,000	176,870
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

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 \$											
30000 TO 59999	4	64.18	63.15	64.02	34.52	98.64	29.88	94.37	N/A	41,376	26,491
60000 TO 99999	15	66.28	70.74	70.15	19.29	100.84	51.11	96.80	57.93 to 88.20	80,106	56,193
100000 TO 149999	20	76.54	72.46	72.70	15.41	99.67	25.54	92.17	63.36 to 82.32	125,214	91,027
150000 TO 249999	30	69.46	69.58	69.91	14.16	99.53	46.91	110.03	65.99 to 73.38	200,920	140,466
250000 TO 499999	23	60.81	65.92	65.12	20.21	101.22	42.74	100.31	54.08 to 71.67	334,224	217,658
500000 +	1	49.10	49.10	49.10			49.10	49.10	N/A	501,750	246,350
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

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	41.00	41.00	39.34	27.11	104.20	29.88	52.11	N/A	36,988	14,552
30000 TO 59999	14	60.63	62.18	58.04	20.66	107.14	25.54	94.37	51.11 to 76.25	79,324	46,040
60000 TO 99999	17	67.47	71.38	67.57	19.47	105.64	46.91	96.80	60.01 to 88.64	119,828	80,967
100000 TO 149999	26	70.12	69.59	66.92	14.55	103.99	42.74	92.17	63.90 to 78.74	173,431	116,064
150000 TO 249999	30	69.91	69.84	66.64	16.45	104.81	49.05	110.03	60.32 to 74.17	296,580	197,637
250000 TO 499999	4	86.19	86.18	84.88	8.83	101.53	72.01	100.31	N/A	364,918	309,737
ALL	93	69.21	68.98	67.65	18.05	101.98	25.54	110.03	63.90 to 72.01	194,493	131,568

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The county found that the individual market areas were in need of some review. The county completed an analysis and concluded that each market area needed some adjustments. Therefore, the result is that the median level is within the acceptable level of value as well as the quality of assessment practices.

The tables indicate that the county utilized a reasonable percentage of sales. The Trended Preliminary Ratio is relatively close to the calculated overall median. The percentage point difference between the % Change to the Sales File and the % Change to the Assessed value base is reasonable. The median is on the lower edge of the acceptable range, the mean when rounded would also be on the lower edge of the acceptable range and the weighted mean is slightly below the range. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both well within the acceptable range. The analysis of the changes in statistics due to assessor action reflects the assessment actions implemented in the county for the 2008 assessment year.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2008 assessment year. Based on the assessment practices of Stanton County it is believed that the median level of value is the most reliable indicator of the level of value for the agricultural class.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	187	93	49.73
2007	146	67	45.89
2006	153	74	48.37
2005	143	63	44.06
2004	151	68	45.03
2003	146	80	54.79
2002	183	110	60.11
2001	171	105	61.4

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percentage of sales used gives a historical background that there have been sufficient sales utilized to establish a reliable background for the sales file.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	65.34	4.55	68.31	69.21
2007	69.69	4.99	73.17	70.27
2006	66.06	12.21	74.13	74.72
2005	67.95	12.12	76.19	75.88
2004	61.52	24.74	76.74	76.24
2003	74	0.8	74.06	75
2002	71	4.74	74.37	77
2001	77	0.24	77.18	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Trended Preliminary Ratio is relatively close to the indicated R&O Median Ratio. There is not information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
6.16	2008	4.55
8.63	2007	4.99
14.18	2006	12.21
7.62	2005	12.12
28.16	2004	24.74
2	2003	1
7.84	2002	4.74
0	2001	0.24

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is relatively close and supports the assessment practices of the unsold and sold properties.

2008 Correlation Section for Stanton 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 Stanton County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	69.21	67.65	68.98

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median is the only measure of central tendency within the acceptable range. The mean when rounded would meet the range. However, the weighted mean is slightly below the acceptable range.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	18.05	101.98
Difference	0	0

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both well within the acceptable range, giving support that the agricultural property class is valued uniformly and proportionate.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Stanton County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	94	93	-1
Median	65.34	69.21	3.87
Wgt. Mean	64.42	67.65	3.23
Mean	65.75	68.98	3.23
COD	18.66	18.05	-0.61
PRD	102.06	101.98	-0.08
Min Sales Ratio	25.27	25.54	0.27
Max Sales Ratio	103.82	110.03	6.21

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Review of Table VII indicates that the county improved the quality of assessment. The county through the preliminary statistics found that the individual market areas needed to be reviewed. The county has improved the quality of statistics and the above table is reflective of the assessment actions for 2008.

County 84 - Stanton

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 5,447	Value 538,953,540	Total Growth 6,535,750 (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	121	438,795	123	1,162,530	14	174,915	258	1,776,240	
2. Res Improv Land	747	4,098,085	688	9,665,185	182	2,613,870	1,617	16,377,140	
3. Res Improvements	788	41,020,725	770	58,548,470	184	18,364,305	1,742	117,933,500	
4. Res Total	909	45,557,605	893	69,376,185	198	21,153,090	2,000	136,086,880	3,034,505
% of Total	45.45	33.47	44.65	50.97	9.90	15.54	36.71	25.25	46.42
5. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res+Rec Total	909	45,557,605	893	69,376,185	198	21,153,090	2,000	136,086,880	3,034,505
% of Total	45.45	33.47	44.65	50.97	9.90	15.54	36.71	25.25	46.42

County 84 - Stanton

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 5,447	Value 538,953,540	Total Growth 6,535,750 (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	21	59,840	2	39,490	5	46,345	28	145,675	
10. Comm Improv Land	122	617,665	7	163,690	12	73,595	141	854,950	
11. Comm Improvements	122	4,070,100	7	998,765	19	716,405	148	5,785,270	
12. Comm Total	143	4,747,605	9	1,201,945	24	836,345	176	6,785,895	2,108,350
% of Total	81.25	69.96	5.11	17.71	13.63	12.32	3.23	1.25	32.25
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	5	69,215	5	69,215	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	0	0	8	362,490	8	362,490	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	9	15,763,445	9	15,763,445	
16. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	14	16,195,150	14	16,195,150	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	***	***	0.25	3.00	0.00
Comm+Ind Total	143	4,747,605	9	1,201,945	38	17,031,495	190	22,981,045	2,108,350
% of Total	75.26	20.65	4.73	5.23	20.00	74.11	3.48	4.26	32.25
17. Taxable Total	1,052	50,305,210	902	70,578,130	236	38,184,585	2,190	159,067,925	5,142,855
% of Total	48.03	31.62	41.18	43.61	10.77	13.29	40.20	29.51	78.68

County 84 - Stanton

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
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

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		
25. Mineral Interest Total	0	0	0	0		

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	106	15	132	253

Schedule V: Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	2,231	216,332,225	2,231	216,332,225
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	955	113,583,900	955	113,583,900
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,026	49,969,490	1,026	49,969,490
30. Ag-Total Taxable							3,257	379,885,615

County 84 - Stanton

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:

Non-Agricultural Detail	Urban			SubUrban			Growth Value
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	0		0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	0		0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			0.000		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	1.000	3,180	1	1.000	3,180	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	702	719.640	2,288,455	702	719.640	2,288,455	
33. HomeSite Improvements	729		29,185,140	729		29,185,140	553,615
34. HomeSite Total				730	720.640	31,476,775	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
37. FarmSite Improv	931		20,784,350	931		20,784,350	839,280
38. FarmSite Total				931	0.000	20,784,350	
39. Road & Ditches		6,593.220			6,593.220		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,661	7,313.860	52,261,125	1,392,895

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	19	1,889.880	823,145	19	1,889.880	823,145

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 84 - Stanton

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	2,179.390	4,413,330	2,179.390	4,413,330
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,366.360	4,259,460	2,366.360	4,259,460
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,195.960	9,093,125	5,195.960	9,093,125
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,361.700	4,958,690	3,361.700	4,958,690
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,600.650	8,121,105	5,600.650	8,121,105
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,613.910	8,234,390	6,613.910	8,234,390
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,225.520	2,325,710	2,225.520	2,325,710
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	331.330	243,530	331.330	243,530
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	27,874.820	41,649,340	27,874.820	41,649,340
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,603.750	7,207,520	3,603.750	7,207,520
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	14,827.530	27,061,710	14,827.530	27,061,710
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,628.330	12,968,205	7,628.330	12,968,205
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,965.970	5,750,820	3,965.970	5,750,820
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	9,873.470	13,083,495	9,873.470	13,083,495
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	18,893.930	21,351,820	18,893.930	21,351,820
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	25,047.240	26,700,130	25,047.240	26,700,130
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,976.130	1,383,300	1,976.130	1,383,300
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	85,816.350	115,507,000	85,816.350	115,507,000
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	321.170	449,635	321.170	449,635
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,024.430	4,188,955	3,024.430	4,188,955
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,065.370	4,107,625	3,065.370	4,107,625
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,848.800	2,458,980	1,848.800	2,458,980
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	6,172.130	7,561,545	6,172.130	7,561,545
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	9,939.180	8,034,430	9,939.180	8,034,430
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,657.720	10,413,530	13,657.720	10,413,530
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,045.330	6,097,455	8,045.330	6,097,455
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	46,074.130	43,312,155	46,074.130	43,312,155
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	11,440.230	1,144,075	11,440.230	1,144,075
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		62.140		62.140	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	171,205.530	201,612,570	171,205.530	201,612,570

County 84 - Stanton

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	190.670	406,130	190.670	406,130
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	203.800	383,135	203.800	383,135
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	112.110	204,035	112.110	204,035
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	15.620	24,600	15.620	24,600
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	108.700	164,140	108.700	164,140
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	497.120	643,770	497.120	643,770
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	454.820	486,655	454.820	486,655
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	43.700	33,650	43.700	33,650
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,626.540	2,346,115	1,626.540	2,346,115
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,237.030	6,328,395	3,237.030	6,328,395
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	10,733.860	20,931,945	10,733.860	20,931,945
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,924.100	5,058,770	2,924.100	5,058,770
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	406.740	634,520	406.740	634,520
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,704.100	3,948,000	2,704.100	3,948,000
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	14,711.920	21,333,025	14,711.920	21,333,025
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	17,462.750	23,138,725	17,462.750	23,138,725
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	413.230	343,010	413.230	343,010
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	52,593.730	81,716,390	52,593.730	81,716,390
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	276.100	349,275	276.100	349,275
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,484.370	1,796,160	1,484.370	1,796,160
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,748.870	3,284,985	2,748.870	3,284,985
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	95.380	85,840	95.380	85,840
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	456.180	399,230	456.180	399,230
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,948.650	1,519,985	1,948.650	1,519,985
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,495.530	2,622,005	3,495.530	2,622,005
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	716.690	404,945	716.690	404,945
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	11,221.770	10,462,425	11,221.770	10,462,425
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,248.230	93,685	1,248.230	93,685
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	66,690.270	94,618,615	66,690.270	94,618,615

County 84 - Stanton

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	600.060	1,278,125	600.060	1,278,125
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	226.780	426,350	226.780	426,350
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	306.990	558,735	306.990	558,735
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	338.850	533,705	338.850	533,705
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	77.100	116,420	77.100	116,420
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	245.290	317,645	245.290	317,645
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2.410	1,855	2.410	1,855
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,797.480	3,232,835	1,797.480	3,232,835
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,460.890	2,921,810	1,460.890	2,921,810
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	3,892.780	7,201,830	3,892.780	7,201,830
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,386.960	2,496,570	1,386.960	2,496,570
57. 2D	0.000	0	0.000	0	299.400	479,060	299.400	479,060
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,632.810	3,817,680	2,632.810	3,817,680
59. 3D	0.000	0	0.000	0	7,180.040	8,975,165	7,180.040	8,975,165
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	706.240	759,335	706.240	759,335
61. 4D	0.000	0	0.000	0	86.610	64,965	86.610	64,965
62. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	17,645.730	26,716,415	17,645.730	26,716,415
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	33.050	38,840	33.050	38,840
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	276.680	304,390	276.680	304,390
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	246.090	252,280	246.090	252,280
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	26.200	24,235	26.200	24,235
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	139.600	115,200	139.600	115,200
68. 3G	0.000	0	0.000	0	682.960	508,885	682.960	508,885
69. 4G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	68.450	42,530	68.450	42,530
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	192.600	113,620	192.600	113,620
71. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,665.630	1,399,980	1,665.630	1,399,980
72. Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	587.090	44,075	587.090	44,075
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
75. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	21,695.930	31,393,305	21,695.930	31,393,305

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	31,298.840	47,228,290	31,298.840	47,228,290
77.Dry Land	0.000	0	0.000	0	156,055.810	223,939,805	156,055.810	223,939,805
78.Grass	0.000	0	0.000	0	58,961.530	55,174,560	58,961.530	55,174,560
79.Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,275.550	1,281,835	13,275.550	1,281,835
80.Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
81.Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	62.140	0	62.140	0
82.Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	259,591.730	327,624,490	259,591.730	327,624,490

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 84 - Stanton

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	2,179.390	7.82%	4,413,330	10.60%	2,025.029
1A	2,366.360	8.49%	4,259,460	10.23%	1,800.005
2A1	5,195.960	18.64%	9,093,125	21.83%	1,750.037
2A	3,361.700	12.06%	4,958,690	11.91%	1,475.054
3A1	5,600.650	20.09%	8,121,105	19.50%	1,450.029
3A	6,613.910	23.73%	8,234,390	19.77%	1,245.010
4A1	2,225.520	7.98%	2,325,710	5.58%	1,045.018
4A	331.330	1.19%	243,530	0.58%	735.007
Irrigated Total	27,874.820	100.00%	41,649,340	100.00%	1,494.156
Dry:					
1D1	3,603.750	4.20%	7,207,520	6.24%	2,000.005
1D	14,827.530	17.28%	27,061,710	23.43%	1,825.098
2D1	7,628.330	8.89%	12,968,205	11.23%	1,700.005
2D	3,965.970	4.62%	5,750,820	4.98%	1,450.041
3D1	9,873.470	11.51%	13,083,495	11.33%	1,325.116
3D	18,893.930	22.02%	21,351,820	18.49%	1,130.088
4D1	25,047.240	29.19%	26,700,130	23.12%	1,065.990
4D	1,976.130	2.30%	1,383,300	1.20%	700.004
Dry Total	85,816.350	100.00%	115,507,000	100.00%	1,345.978
Grass:					
1G1	321.170	0.70%	449,635	1.04%	1,399.990
1G	3,024.430	6.56%	4,188,955	9.67%	1,385.039
2G1	3,065.370	6.65%	4,107,625	9.48%	1,340.009
2G	1,848.800	4.01%	2,458,980	5.68%	1,330.041
3G1	6,172.130	13.40%	7,561,545	17.46%	1,225.111
3G	9,939.180	21.57%	8,034,430	18.55%	808.359
4G1	13,657.720	29.64%	10,413,530	24.04%	762.464
4G	8,045.330	17.46%	6,097,455	14.08%	757.887
Grass Total	46,074.130	100.00%	43,312,155	100.00%	940.053
Irrigated Total	27,874.820	16.28%	41,649,340	20.66%	1,494.156
Dry Total	85,816.350	50.12%	115,507,000	57.29%	1,345.978
Grass Total	46,074.130	26.91%	43,312,155	21.48%	940.053
Waste	11,440.230	6.68%	1,144,075	0.57%	100.004
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	62.140	0.04%			
Market Area Total	171,205.530	100.00%	201,612,570	100.00%	1,177.605

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	27,874.820	89.06%	41,649,340	88.19%	
Dry Total	85,816.350	54.99%	115,507,000	51.58%	
Grass Total	46,074.130	78.14%	43,312,155	78.50%	
Waste	11,440.230	86.18%	1,144,075	89.25%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	62.140	100.00%			
Market Area Total	171,205.530	65.95%	201,612,570	61.54%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 84 - Stanton

Market Area: **2**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	190.670	11.72%	406,130	17.31%	2,130.015
1A	203.800	12.53%	383,135	16.33%	1,879.955
2A1	112.110	6.89%	204,035	8.70%	1,819.953
2A	15.620	0.96%	24,600	1.05%	1,574.903
3A1	108.700	6.68%	164,140	7.00%	1,510.027
3A	497.120	30.56%	643,770	27.44%	1,294.999
4A1	454.820	27.96%	486,655	20.74%	1,069.994
4A	43.700	2.69%	33,650	1.43%	770.022
Irrigated Total	1,626.540	100.00%	2,346,115	100.00%	1,442.396

Dry:

1D1	3,237.030	6.15%	6,328,395	7.74%	1,955.000
1D	10,733.860	20.41%	20,931,945	25.62%	1,950.085
2D1	2,924.100	5.56%	5,058,770	6.19%	1,730.026
2D	406.740	0.77%	634,520	0.78%	1,560.013
3D1	2,704.100	5.14%	3,948,000	4.83%	1,460.005
3D	14,711.920	27.97%	21,333,025	26.11%	1,450.050
4D1	17,462.750	33.20%	23,138,725	28.32%	1,325.033
4D	413.230	0.79%	343,010	0.42%	830.070
Dry Total	52,593.730	100.00%	81,716,390	100.00%	1,553.728

Grass:

1G1	276.100	2.46%	349,275	3.34%	1,265.030
1G	1,484.370	13.23%	1,796,160	17.17%	1,210.048
2G1	2,748.870	24.50%	3,284,985	31.40%	1,195.031
2G	95.380	0.85%	85,840	0.82%	899.979
3G1	456.180	4.07%	399,230	3.82%	875.158
3G	1,948.650	17.36%	1,519,985	14.53%	780.019
4G1	3,495.530	31.15%	2,622,005	25.06%	750.102
4G	716.690	6.39%	404,945	3.87%	565.021
Grass Total	11,221.770	100.00%	10,462,425	100.00%	932.332

Irrigated Total	1,626.540	2.44%	2,346,115	2.48%	1,442.396
Dry Total	52,593.730	78.86%	81,716,390	86.36%	1,553.728
Grass Total	11,221.770	16.83%	10,462,425	11.06%	932.332
Waste	1,248.230	1.87%	93,685	0.10%	75.054
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	66,690.270	100.00%	94,618,615	100.00%	1,418.776

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	1,626.540	5.20%	2,346,115	4.97%	
Dry Total	52,593.730	33.70%	81,716,390	36.49%	
Grass Total	11,221.770	19.03%	10,462,425	18.96%	
Waste	1,248.230	9.40%	93,685	7.31%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	66,690.270	25.69%	94,618,615	28.88%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 84 - Stanton

Market Area: **3**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	600.060	33.38%	1,278,125	39.54%	2,129.995
1A	226.780	12.62%	426,350	13.19%	1,880.015
2A1	306.990	17.08%	558,735	17.28%	1,820.043
2A	338.850	18.85%	533,705	16.51%	1,575.047
3A1	77.100	4.29%	116,420	3.60%	1,509.987
3A	245.290	13.65%	317,645	9.83%	1,294.977
4A1	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
4A	2.410	0.13%	1,855	0.06%	769.709
Irrigated Total	1,797.480	100.00%	3,232,835	100.00%	1,798.537

Dry:

1D1	1,460.890	8.28%	2,921,810	10.94%	2,000.020
1D	3,892.780	22.06%	7,201,830	26.96%	1,850.048
2D1	1,386.960	7.86%	2,496,570	9.34%	1,800.030
2D	299.400	1.70%	479,060	1.79%	1,600.066
3D1	2,632.810	14.92%	3,817,680	14.29%	1,450.040
3D	7,180.040	40.69%	8,975,165	33.59%	1,250.016
4D1	706.240	4.00%	759,335	2.84%	1,075.179
4D	86.610	0.49%	64,965	0.24%	750.086
Dry Total	17,645.730	100.00%	26,716,415	100.00%	1,514.044

Grass:

1G1	33.050	1.98%	38,840	2.77%	1,175.189
1G	276.680	16.61%	304,390	21.74%	1,100.151
2G1	246.090	14.77%	252,280	18.02%	1,025.153
2G	26.200	1.57%	24,235	1.73%	925.000
3G1	139.600	8.38%	115,200	8.23%	825.214
3G	682.960	41.00%	508,885	36.35%	745.116
4G1	68.450	4.11%	42,530	3.04%	621.329
4G	192.600	11.56%	113,620	8.12%	589.927
Grass Total	1,665.630	100.00%	1,399,980	100.00%	840.510

Irrigated Total	1,797.480	8.28%	3,232,835	10.30%	1,798.537
Dry Total	17,645.730	81.33%	26,716,415	85.10%	1,514.044
Grass Total	1,665.630	7.68%	1,399,980	4.46%	840.510
Waste	587.090	2.71%	44,075	0.14%	75.073
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	21,695.930	100.00%	31,393,305	100.00%	1,446.967

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	1,797.480	5.74%	3,232,835	6.85%	
Dry Total	17,645.730	11.31%	26,716,415	11.93%	
Grass Total	1,665.630	2.82%	1,399,980	2.54%	
Waste	587.090	4.42%	44,075	3.44%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	0.000	0.00%			
Market Area Total	21,695.930	8.36%	31,393,305	9.58%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 84 - Stanton

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	0.000	0	0.000	0	31,298.840	47,228,290
Dry	0.000	0	0.000	0	156,055.810	223,939,805
Grass	0.000	0	0.000	0	58,961.530	55,174,560
Waste	0.000	0	0.000	0	13,275.550	1,281,835
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	62.140	0
Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	259,591.730	327,624,490

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Total Acres	% of Acres*	Total Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	31,298.840	47,228,290	31,298.840	12.06%	47,228,290	14.42%	1,508.946
Dry	156,055.810	223,939,805	156,055.810	60.12%	223,939,805	68.35%	1,434.998
Grass	58,961.530	55,174,560	58,961.530	22.71%	55,174,560	16.84%	935.772
Waste	13,275.550	1,281,835	13,275.550	5.11%	1,281,835	0.39%	96.556
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	62.140	0	62.140	0.02%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	259,591.730	327,624,490	259,591.730	100.00%	327,624,490	100.00%	1,262.075

* 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)**

84 Stanton

	2007 CTL County Total	2008 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)	Percent Change	2008 Growth (New Construction Value)	% Change excl. Growth
1. Residential	128,482,805	136,086,880	7,604,075	5.92	3,034,505	3.56
2. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	31,612,305	31,476,775	-135,530	-0.43	*-----	-0.43
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	160,095,110	167,563,655	7,468,545	4.67	3,034,505	2.77
5. Commercial	6,598,385	6,785,895	187,510	2.84	2,108,350	-29.11
6. Industrial	16,195,150	16,195,150	0	0	0	0
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	18,239,025	20,784,350	2,545,325	13.96	1,392,895	6.32
8. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	41,032,560	43,765,395	2,732,835	6.66	2,947,630	-0.52
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	201,127,670	211,329,050	10,201,380	5.07	6,535,750	1.82
11. Irrigated	46,580,510	47,228,290	647,780	1.39		
12. Dryland	211,334,245	223,939,805	12,605,560	5.96		
13. Grassland	54,162,970	55,174,560	1,011,590	1.87		
14. Wasteland	1,281,770	1,281,835	65	0.01		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	313,359,495	327,624,490	14,264,995	4.55		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	514,487,165	538,953,540	24,466,375	4.76	6,535,750	3.49

*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 Stanton County
Assessment Years 2008, 2009 and 2010
June 15, 2007**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the Assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the County Assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the Assessor shall present the plan to the County Board of Equalization and the Assessor may amend the plan 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) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land: and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75% 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 2006)

General Description of Real Property in Stanton County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	1,988	36.61 %	24.96 %
Commercial	175	3.22 %	1.29 %
Industrial	14	.257 %	3.15 %
Recreational	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Agricultural	3,253	59.91 %	70.60 %
Special Value	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

***includes Game and Parks

Agricultural land consists of 259,840 taxable acres. 70% of Stanton County is agricultural and of that 60.2 % consists primarily of dryland, 11.81 % irrigated, 22.93 % grassland and 5.06 % wasteland.

New property: For assessment year 2007, an estimated 89 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

Current Resources

A. Staff/Budget Training

1. The Assessors Office consists of three full time employees-County Assessor, Deputy Assessor and Office Clerk. The Assessor and Deputy have maintained Assessor Certificates since 1978.
2. The Assessors Office has a part time appraiser, Bill Kaiser, for commercial properties and a part time appraiser, Wayne Kubert, for industrial properties (Nucor Steel).
3. The Assessors Office has two part time employees for assistance with listing work each year. These employees assist with the measuring process and confirming the information needed to complete the pricing for Residential and Agricultural improvements.
4. The Assessor and Deputy continue with required educational classes each year to accumulate 60 credit hours each four year period in order to keep their certification updated and current.
5. The 2006/2007 budget for the Assessors Office was \$98,420. The appraisal portion of this budget was \$7,000. Due to limited full time staff and budget, the appraisal and reappraisal of property within Stanton County is a slow and ongoing process.

B. Cadastral Maps

The County Assessors office maintains a set of Cadastral maps pursuant to Reg. 10-004.03. The office staff keeps the maps updated by ownerships. The Cadastral maps are dated 1963. The County is in the process of implementing the AutoCad mapping computer program. At this time the City of Stanton, Village of Pilger and Woodland Park have been completed. It is the intention of the office to replace all Cadastral maps within the County. The mapping process is an extended and limited project due to funding and staff. The project is being completed within the office without any outside sources hired to do the updating.

C. Property Record Cards

The Assessors Office maintains Property Record Cards pursuant to Reg. 10-004. The property record cards contain all of the required information concerning ownership, legal description, classification codes, measurements, building inventory and valuation. The office staff maintains and updates the Property Record Cards.

D. Computer Software

Administrative software and Personal Property software used within the office is contracted with MIPS/County Solutions. The GIS software used is AutoCad. The Assessors Office is using CAMA computer pricing software for the re-evaluation of all improvements for Residential, Commercial and Agricultural properties. This is also an in-house project which will be completed over an extended period of time due to lack of staff and funding. At this time, the City of Stanton and Village of Pilger residential properties have been revalued with updated photos and computer drawings, and rural residential have been revalued, along with completion of computer sketches.

E. Stanton County does not have a Web based site for property record information access at this time.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Pick Up Work

Pursuant to Reg. 50-001.06, pick up work or new construction is an ongoing process within the County. New construction is located with permits and information sheets completed by property owners. Some improvements are found from drive by reviews. Pick up work on new construction or alterations/updates are started the mid-month of September with completed work deadlines set for March 1.

B. Sales Review

Pursuant to Reg. 12-003, the Real Estate Transfer Statements (521's) are completed and filed with the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on a monthly basis. Upon receipt of the 521, the Deputy Assessor completes the supplemental information forms.

The Assessor and Deputy determine if the sale is an arm's length transaction and qualify it for use in the sales file. The county completes a review of the sales for the residential class only. The County had previously relied on the Dept. of Property Assessment and Taxation reviewer to complete the review on the commercial and agricultural classes of property. This process has been eliminated and this office must rely on different methods to review these properties. Since Stanton County is a small county and familiar to the Assessor and Deputy, some information is readily available for certain properties. Some assistance has been provided from the Commissioners and also the taxpayers. Due to limited staff and funds, to hire a reviewer is not feasible, and limited time due to other office duties, in house reviewers are not possible at this time. The Assessor would like to develop some type of review plan, but at this time one is not in place. The office has sales file books with the 521 copies and information attachments available for the public to view. We also have a sales file map of agricultural sales by precinct available. In regard to qualifying a sale, the county considers the 12 "no" reasons listed in Statute 77-1371, one of it's tools in deciding if a sale can be used. The county defines actual or market value for the Sale's Review process as the most probable price between willing buyer and seller on an open market. Documentation will be made concerning changing market influences in the County. Adjustments may be made to the sale if Personal Property is found to be part of the sale price.

C. Real Estate

The Assessors office purchased the CAMA computer pricing software and began the process of repricing all improvements for residential, commercial and agricultural properties. The CAMA program allows this office to update the sketches for all properties. The sketches are being implemented into the program along with the pricing. The process of updating photos and a visual review of each property was also started. Information questionnaires are mailed for completion to each property owner as the review process progresses throughout the County.

1. Residential

The Assessor did a visual inspection review of residential properties in the Village of Pilger and the City of Stanton. New photos of each property were taken and added to the property record card. Questionnaires mailed earlier to each owner were utilized for completion of more detailed/updated information. The lots were re-valued, changing to the square foot method. At this time, updated pricing with the new photos for the City of Stanton and the Village of Pilger are being used. The Rural Residential have also had updated pricing and photos. Questionnaires were mailed to property owners of Woodland Park and the review process has started for this Suburban development in Stanton County.

2. Agricultural

- a. The County developed market areas in 2000 due to sales of agricultural land. Land use was verified in 1981. Land use had always been an ongoing analysis. The Assessor obtains land use maps from the FSA to review with the property record cards.
- b. The last county wide physical reappraisal was conducted in 1981. A visual inspection, review of agricultural improvements and updated

- computer pricing, along with new photos is planned. This lengthy process is planned within a six year mandated period of time.
- c. The County developed a third market area in 2006 due to sales of agricultural land.

The revaluing with updated computer pricing and review process has been an ongoing project for Stanton County. This is an in house project with limited time, staff and budget. Each year market studies are performed for each type of property-residential, commercial and agricultural. With the help of our State Liaison we use the market and sales ratio studies to assist us in determining the market value of Stanton County properties. Once the market and sales ratio studies have been completed, the valuations of each type of property are set. After the values are set, the Abstract of Assessment certified, the Assessor then certifies the completion of the assessment roll to the County Clerk. The Assessor runs a Public Notice in the local newspaper of the certification. A Notice of Valuation Change is mailed to each property owner with an increase or decrease in value. The Assessor mails assessment/sales ratio statistics (as determined by TERC) to media and also will display the statistics in the Assessor's office.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2007:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD**</u>	<u>PRD***</u>
Residential	94	16.78	102.47
Commercial*	NA	NA	NA
Agricultural Land	70	16.21	101.03

*Commercial sales are insufficient to provide reliable statistical studies.

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 Year 2008:

Residential

Complete visual review of remaining Woodland Park properties, reprice remaining lots there by the square footage method and implement current computer pricing. Send out questionnaires to the remaining suburban properties for updating information and continue review process on those. Will review and update 158 mobile homes in the County and take pictures for our records. We will pick up new improvements/additions for the year and conduct our yearly market and sales ratio study of all residential properties.

Agricultural

Pick up new improvements or additions and conduct market and sales ratio study of all agricultural property.

Commercial

Begin review of 179 commercial properties, as this hasn't been done for quite some time. Pick up new improvements or additions and conduct market and sales ratio study of all commercial properties.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential

Complete any remaining residential property updates with the valuation done by CAMA software. Pick up new improvements and additions and conduct market and sales ratio study of the residential property.

Agricultural

Begin the review process of agricultural properties and price them with the CAMA program. Pick up new improvements and additions and conduct market and sales ratio study on all agricultural properties.

Commercial

Complete review and new value process for remaining commercial properties. Pick up new improvements and additions and conduct market and sales ratio study of all commercial property.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

Residential

Pick up new improvements or additions and conduct market and sales ratio study of all residential properties.

Agricultural

Continue the review process of agricultural properties and value with the CAMA program.

Pick up new improvements and additions and conduct market and sales ratio study for all agricultural properties.

Commercial

Pick up new improvements and additions and conduct market and sales ratio study on all commercial properties.

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

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates and ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulations:
 - a. Abstracts (Real Estate and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to P A & T rosters and annual Assessed value update w/abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable value report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Educational Lands and Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government owned property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property- administer annual filing of 811 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions- administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property-annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax and value.

6. Homestead Exemptions- administer 205 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by P A & T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax districts and Tax Rates-management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information: input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax Lists- prepare and certify tax lists to County Treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections-prepare tax list correction documents for County Board of Equalization approval.
11. County Board of Equalization-attend County Board of Equalization meetings for meetings for valuation protests-assemble and provide information.
12. TERC Appeals-prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings for TERC, to defend county valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization-attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education- Assessor and/or Appraisal Education; attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain Assessor certification and/or appraiser license. Minimum of 60 credit hours per 4 years.

In order for the Assessor to do a complete and thorough job of locating and fairly and equitable valuing property for tax purposes, it takes time, staff and budget. The Stanton County Assessor has always had and continues to have a good working relationship with the Stanton County Board of Commissioners. They have always given support to this office. Due to ongoing tight budget restraints, it is hard for this office to hire additional employees to help with the updating and revaluing of real property in Stanton County. Although Stanton County is not a large county compared to some others, we have only three full time staff members and it is a large workload for three people to try and revalue the entire county and still complete regular full time duties within the office.

Respectfully submitted:

Stanton County Assessor

June 15, 2007

2008 Assessment Survey for Stanton County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	1 (Part time, commercial and industrial)
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	2
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$101,720
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$650.00
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$7,000
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$0
12.	Other miscellaneous funds

13.	Total budget
	\$101,720
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$5,302.81

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Pilger and Stanton

4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1998

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Contracted for commercial with Bill Kaiser and Wayne Kubert
2.	Other services
	N/A

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 Stanton County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5135.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

Valuation History Charts