## 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.
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## 2008 Commission Summary

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 411 | COD | 5.74 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 33,923,063$ | PRD | 100.26 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 33,927,863$ | COV | 11.99 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 33,156,899$ | STD | 11.75 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 82,550$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 5.67 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 80,674$ | Min | 20.00 |
| Median | 98.82 | Max | 199.24 |
| Wgt. Mean | 97.73 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 98.34 to 99.15 |
| Mean | 97.98 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 97.04 to 98.42 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 96.85 to 99.12 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 29.02 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 8.01 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 8.77 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 73,641 |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 411 | 98.82 | 5.74 | 100.26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 414 | 98.94 | 5.32 | 100.73 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 371 | 99.38 | 6.03 | 101.84 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 390 | 99.30 | 6.41 | 101.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 354 | 98.90 | 7.43 | 102.01 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 388 | 99 | 10.63 | 104.88 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 399 | 99 | 7.22 | 102.09 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 413 | 98 | 6.7 | 100.17 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 63 | COD | 5.70 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 11,618,100$ | PRD | 108.70 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 11,478,013$ | COV | 12.97 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 10,171,144$ | STD | 12.49 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 182,191$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 5.56 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 161,447$ | Min | 38.61 |
| Median | 97.62 | Max | 164.40 |
| Wgt. Mean | 88.61 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 95.78 to 98.75 |
| Mean | 96.33 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 75.44 to 101.79 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 93.24 to 99.41 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 13.12 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 6.75 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 5.95 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 183,095 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 63 | 97.62 | 5.70 | 108.70 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 60 | 98.79 | 5.48 | 100.74 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 55 | 97.92 | 7.68 | 104.90 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 62 | 98.12 | 15.58 | 107.11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 56 | 98.63 | 13.14 | 101.11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 51 | 100 | 18.69 | 103.11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 60 | 100 | 20.62 | 95.73 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 82 | 97 | 14.81 | 105.27 |

Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for York 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 York County is $99 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in York 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 York County is $98 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in York County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 69 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 51 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 43 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 60 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 59 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 41 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 27 |
| 04/01/07 то 06/30/07 | 61 |
| __Study Years__ |  |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 223 |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 188 |
| __Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 203 |
| ALL |  |

es: OTAL Adj Al Assessed Value G. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
411
$33,923,063$
$33,927,863$
$32,343,658$
82,549
78,695

1 MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN: MEAN :

95\% Median C.I.: 96.57 to 98.17
AVG.ABS.DEV: 8.24 95\% Mean C.I.: 95.13 to 97.97

| MEDIAN | MEAN |
| :---: | :---: |
| 97.42 | 96.67 |
| 98.98 | 98.42 |
| 98.70 | 98.38 |
| 98.10 | 96.84 |
| 96.81 | 98.41 |
| 96.55 | 99.18 |
| 96.92 | 96.48 |
| 90.00 | 89.76 |
| 98.44 | 97.44 |
| 95.73 | 95.49 |
| 97.63 | 98.09 |
| 97.17 | 96.55 |

CTM
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## York County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/ subclasses:

## Residential

For 2008, the county conducted a market study of the residential class of real property. Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the level of value for the residential class was at 97 percent of market value.

York County completed the following assessment actions:
> Questionnaires were sent to all residential owners in the towns of Benedict and Gresham. On-site inspections were conducted and new photographs were taken of improvements this subclass. Values were determined using market information available in these two towns since July 1, 2004.
> Several market areas inside the City of York were visually inspected and new photographs were taken. Parcels were revalued as necessary.
> In the rural residential subclass, the townships of Stewart, Thayer, M orton, and Arborville were reviewed. Physical inspections were completed, and the county took new photos of building sites. New values were established for these properties using sales information from the rural residential subclass.
> Values were equalized in the rural residential townships of West Blue, M cFadden, Hays, and Henderson as they are all the same distance from the City of York as Arborville, M orton, Thayer, and Stewart.
$>$ Values were equalized in the towns of Bradshaw, Waco, McCool Junction, and Henderson using sales information.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for York County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2008 |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | 14 |
| 8. | How are these defined? |
|  | There are 14 neighborhoods within the city limits of York, as well as York Suburban and Rural Residential. All villages define a market area. |
| 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. The suburban area is a two mile radius outside of the town of York. |


| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B} \boldsymbol{?}$ <br> limits of an incorparated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | The market significance of suburban is defined in the assessor location "Suburban" |
| 12. | Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified <br> and valued in the same manner? |
|  | Yes |

## Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 |  |  | 300 |



Exhibit 93 - Page 17

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified


PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:



## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for York County

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population.

The County made many valuation changes for 2008 because of the results of sales analyses and as part of their reappraisal cycle. The assessment actions determined by the County were applied to the class of properties and the statistics indicate that all subclasses are valued within the statutory range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range supporting the determination that this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 9 4}$ |
| 2007 | 662 | 414 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5 4}$ |
| 2006 | 599 | 371 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 9 4}$ |
| 2005 | 551 | 390 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 7 8}$ |
| 2004 | 493 | 354 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 8 1}$ |
| 2003 | 489 | 388 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 3 5}$ |
| 2002 | 529 | 399 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 4 3}$ |
| 2001 | 564 | 413 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2 3}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a reasonable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for York 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 $\mathrm{R} \& O$ 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.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 97.17 | 1.9 | $\mathbf{9 9 . 0 2}$ |  |
| 2007 | 98.70 | 4.31 | 102.96 | 98.92 |
| 2006 | 98.73 | 2.05 | 100.75 | 99.38 |
| 2005 | 98.11 | 2.6 | 100.66 | 99.30 |
| 2004 | 98.17 | 3.99 | 102.09 | 98.90 |
| 2003 | 99 | 2.33 | 101.31 | 99 |
| 2002 | 98 | 1.96 | 99.92 | 99 |
| 2001 | 96 | 3.41 | 99.27 | 98 |

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

## 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.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.01 | 2008 | 1.9 |
| 1.05 | 2007 | 4.31 |
| 1.66 | 2006 | 2.05 |
| 2.8 | 2005 | 2.6 |
| 2.94 | 2004 | 3.99 |
| 1.04 | 2003 | 2.33 |
| 2.58 | 2002 | 1.96 |
| 4.26 | 2001 | 3.41 |

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 8 . 8 2}$ | 97.73 | 97.98 |

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

## 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 | 5.74 | 100.26 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | $\mathbf{4 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 1}$ | 0 |
| Median | 97.17 | 98.82 | 1.65 |
| Wgt. Mean | 95.33 | 97.73 | 2.4 |
| Mean | 96.55 | 97.98 | 1.43 |
| COD | 8.48 | 5.74 | -2.74 |
| PRD | 101.28 | 100.26 | $-\mathbf{1 . 0 2}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 20.00 | 20.00 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 201.27 | 199.24 | $-\mathbf{2 . 0 3}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified




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

## Commercial

Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated that the level of value for the class was within the acceptable range, but commercial property in the town of Henderson was above the acceptable range.

To address the market indication commercial properties in the town of Henderson were revalued using sale information for that subclass.

In addition, the county reported the following assessment actions:

- The Farmer's Cooperatives were revalued in the towns of McCool Junction, Benedict, Gresham and Henderson.
- Multiple residences revalued in the towns of Gresham and McCool Junction.
- The County changed neighborhood boundaries north of the interstate and the rail road right of way area in the city of York resulting in value changes.
- The radio station was revalued.
- Neighborhood 1212 along Highway 34 was revalued.
- Motels were revalued in certain Market Areas.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for York County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2006 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2006 |
| 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? |
|  | In 2002 a contract appraiser utilized the income approach to value commercial properties. |
| 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? |
|  | N/A |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | There are five market areas in York County. |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | The town of York has two market areas in the commercial class of property, consisting of the interstate area south of York and the downtown area of York. All villages are combined for one market area, with the exception of Henderson. There is also a rural commercial area. |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes |


| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural <br> commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | No |


| 12. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | There is no market significance in York County |

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 |  |  | 50 |

# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified 



# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics 



# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008 

State Stat Run


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Ra | e: $07 /$ | 2004 to 06/3 | 7 Posted | fore: 01/18 | 008 |  | VTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 63 | MEDIAN: | 98 |  | COV: | 12.97 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 95. | to 98.75 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | , 100 | WGT. MEAN: | 89 |  | STD: | 12.49 | 95\% Wgt | Mean C.I.: 75.4 | to 101.79 |  |
|  | L Adj. ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | s Pric |  | , 013 | MEAN : | 96 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 5.56 |  | Mean C.I.: 93 | 4 to 99.41 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | ,144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  | ,190 | COD : | 5.70 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 164.40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 446 | PRD : | 108.70 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 38.61 |  |  | Printed: 04/01 | 18:56:34 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 2 | 96.97 | 96.97 | 96.90 | 1.57 |  | 100.07 | 95.45 | 98.50 | N/A | 1,050 | 1,017 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 1 | 99.90 | 99.90 | 99.90 |  |  |  | 99.90 | 99.90 | N/A | 10,000 | 9,990 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 3 | 98.50 | 97.95 | 99.38 | 1.51 |  | 98.56 | 95.45 | 99.90 | N/A | 4,033 | 4,008 |
| 10000 тO | 29999 | 11 | 94.82 | 100.96 | 96.38 | 9.96 |  | 104.75 | 86.44 | 164.40 | 90.42 to 102.72 | 21,772 | 20,984 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 14 | 98.03 | 97.02 | 96.67 | 2.42 |  | 100.37 | 89.70 | 100.42 | 93.51 to 99.84 | 47,235 | 45,660 |
| 60000 тO | 99999 | 7 | 95.93 | 96.75 | 96.46 | 3.03 |  | 100.31 | 89.22 | 100.64 | 89.22 to 100.64 | 78,785 | 75,994 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 11 | 98.75 | 96.14 | 95.83 | 3.90 |  | 100.33 | 85.53 | 101.46 | 89.45 to 100.63 | 132,681 | 127,146 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 10 | 98.89 | 96.01 | 95.74 | 5.09 |  | 100.28 | 69.67 | 104.03 | 93.96 to 101.66 | 196,561 | 188,185 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 2 | 91.83 | 91.83 | 91.99 | 1.15 |  | 99.82 | 90.77 | 92.89 | N/A | 434,500 | 399,704 |
| $500000+$ |  | 5 | 96.81 | 85.45 | 81.78 | 13.82 |  | 104.49 | 38.61 | 100.31 | N/A | 1,143,900 | 935,441 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 63 | 97.62 | 96.33 | 88.61 | 5.70 |  | 108.70 | 38.61 | 164.40 | 95.78 to 98.75 | 182,190 | 161,446 |
| COST RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 14 | 96.00 | 100.01 | 94.00 | 8.35 |  | 106.39 | 85.53 | 164.40 | 90.42 to 100.00 | 53,535 | 50,325 |
| 10 |  | 9 | 98.32 | 95.51 | 96.45 | 3.94 |  | 99.02 | 86.44 | 100.59 | 89.70 to 99.65 | 58,722 | 56,638 |
| 15 |  | 4 | 94.78 | 82.72 | 59.16 | 18.79 |  | 139.82 | 38.61 | 102.72 | N/A | 568,500 | 336,346 |
| 20 |  | 36 | 98.03 | 96.61 | 96.03 | 3.58 |  | 100.60 | 69.67 | 104.03 | 95.74 to 99.77 | 220,167 | 211,429 |
| $\ldots$ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 63 | 97.62 | 96.33 | 88.61 | 5.70 |  | 108.70 | 38.61 | 164.40 | 95.78 to 98.75 | 182,190 | 161,446 |

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

## State Stat Run



## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for York County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The County reported to have made several valuation changes in the commercial class for 2008. In addition to revaluing the town of Henderson, other market areas and neighborhoods were revalued.

The opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range but price related differential is above the acceptable range. These quality statistics improved after the preliminary statistics, but fail to fall within the acceptable range.

## 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 | 137 | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 9 9}$ |
| 2007 | 131 | 60 | 45.8 |
| 2006 | 120 | 55 | 45.83 |
| 2005 | 110 | 62 | 56.36 |
| 2004 | 95 | 56 | 58.95 |
| 2003 | 94 | 51 | 54.26 |
| 2002 | 105 | 60 | 57.14 |
| 2001 | 130 | 82 | 63.08 |

COMMERCIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a reasonable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for York 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 $\mathrm{R} \& O$ 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.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 98.09 | 0.56 | 98.64 |  |
| 2007 | 98.78 | -0.99 | 97.8 | 98.79 |
| 2006 | 97.61 | -3.39 | 94.3 | 97.92 |
| 2005 | 97.83 | 4.03 | 101.78 | 98.12 |
| 2004 | 98.60 | 0.02 | 98.62 | 98.63 |
| 2003 | 99 | 1.9 | 100.88 | 100 |
| 2002 | 96 | 19.89 | 115.09 | 100 |
| 2001 | 97 | 0.62 | 97.6 | 97 |

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

## 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.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.91 | 2008 | 0.56 |
| 0.04 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 9}$ |
| 4.88 | 2006 | -3.39 |
| 0.84 | 2005 | 4.03 |
| 0.44 | 2004 | 0.02 |
| 3.88 | 2003 | 1.9 |
| 35.53 | 2002 | 19.89 |
| 13.8 | 2001 | 0.62 |

COMMERCIAL: Analysis of table IV indicates a significant difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base. Further analysis of this occurrence revealed that the revaluation of two large dollar sales strongly influenced this calculation. The revaluation of other market areas that contained large numbers of sales was also completed making the net effect larger on the sales file than on the entire valuation base.

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 3 3}$ |

COMMERCIAL: The median and mean measures of central tendency are both within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is well below the acceptable range. The differences between the mean and weighted mean suggests regressivity in the commercial assessment practices.

## 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 | 5.70 | $\mathbf{1 0 8 . 7 0}$ |
| Difference | 0 | 5.7 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range but price related differential is above the acceptable range. These quality statistics improved after the preliminary statistics, but fail to fall within the acceptable range.

## 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 | 65 | 63 | -2 |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 8 . 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 2}$ | $-\mathbf{- 0 . 4 7}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | 83.87 | $\mathbf{8 8 . 6 1}$ | 4.74 |
| Mean | 93.30 | $\mathbf{9 6 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 3}$ |
| COD | 13.63 | 5.70 | -7.93 |
| PRD | 111.24 | 108.70 | $-\mathbf{2 . 5 4}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 16.54 | 38.61 | 22.07 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 197.83 | 164.40 | -33.43 |

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

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

## Agricultural

For the 2008 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using unimproved agricultural sales, the market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be below the statutory range at $67.98 \%$. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the market areas.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, York County completed the following assessment actions:
> M arket Area boundaries were changed in the county. The county grouped similar parcels based on factors evidenced in the market such as soil type, topography, tree cover, and water availability.
> M arket Areas Two, Three, Four, Five, and Six all received per acre value increases to various land capability groupings in the Irrigated, Dry, and Grass use categories.
> The County reviewed parcels in four townships across the top of the county. Letters were sent to owners of parcels that had a house and/or outbuildings. These parcels were then physically inspected and new photographs were taken of the improvements. The county then studied the rural residential market and developed and applied values. Parcels outside of the four townships with the same classification were then updated to equalize values across the county.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new construction.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for York County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Assessor |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically <br> define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | Agricultural land is defined by location and by use. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or <br> establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1977 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 2006 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | GIS, FSA maps and physical inspections |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Assessor |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | 100\% <br> 8. |
|  | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |


| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Topography, water availability and the location of parcels in relation to urban areas <br> are all characteristics used to develop market areas in York County. |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | Yes. Special valuation exists in areas near York, specifically in areas near the <br> interstate, the new bypass, and a few other areas with potential for residential <br> growth, but no difference in value has been recognized. |

## Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85 |  |  | 85 |

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value <br> for York 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.

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in York County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Recapture Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is $75 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in York County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

# SPECIAL VALUATION SECTION <br> CORRELATION FOR <br> YORK COUNTY <br> 2008 

## I. Agricultural Land Value Correlation

Analysis of the unimproved agricultural statistics indicates that all market areas are within the acceptable range in York County. The system that the county uses to analyze and apply the values assures that all parcels within each market area have been valued uniformly and proportionately. The analysis is done within the framework of the agricultural land classification structure and the valuations are applied within the same classification structure.

The measures of central tendency rounded are: Median Ratio 73, Mean Ratio 72 and Weighted Mean Ratio 71. All measures are within the acceptable range. The measures of dispersion are: The Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) 7.35 and the Price Related Differential (PRD) 101.55. Both measures are within the acceptable range. There is no indication among the statistics that the entire class should be adjusted and there is no compelling evidence that any notable subclass within this class should be adjusted.

Giving due consideration to all of the measures, the median is considered the best indicator of the level of value for this class.

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





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


# SPECIAL VALUATION SECTION <br> CORRELATION FOR <br> YORK COUNTY 2008 

## II. Special Value Correlation

There are no sales of land receiving special valuation among the 47 qualified agricultural unimproved land parcels that make up the sales file.

The measures of central tendency rounded are: Median Ratio 73, Mean Ratio 72 and Weighted Mean Ratio 71. All measures are within the acceptable range. The measures of dispersion are: The Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) 7.35 and the Price Related Differential (PRD) 101.55. Both measures are within the acceptable range. There is no indication among the statistics that the entire class should be adjusted and there is no compelling evidence that any notable subclass within this class should be adjusted.

Giving due consideration to all of the measures, the median is considered the best indicator of the level of value for this class.

93 - YORK COUNTY

## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED



## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

Query: 6590




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


# SPECIAL VALUATION SECTION CORRELATION FOR YORK COUNTY 2008 

## III. Recapture Value Correlation

There are no sales of land receiving special valuation among the 47 qualified agricultural unimproved land parcels in the current sales file. The recapture valuation schedule of values was prepared from the analysis of the actual market observed over time in the area deemed to be affected by influences other than agricultural market forces. Since there is no direct measure of the recapture value during the current measurement period, the county has presumably followed the law and the level of value is deemed to be 75 .


February 15, 2008

OFFICE OF
York County Assessor
Phone 402-362-4926
Fax 402-362-4735
York, Nebraska 68467
RECEIVED
FEB 202008
NEBRASMA DEPT. OF REVENUE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION

Data used to determine special value for York County Nebraska.

York County currently has three areas where special value applications have been filed. One area is along the highway 81 corridor from the interstate to the City proper. This area is almost non accessible for farming but would make an ideal residential area adjacent to the golf course. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ area is between the city limits west to the bi-pass A potential residential area could be created on the east side of York along Maine Ave between Nobes Road and $6^{\text {th }}$ st..

There have been no sales in this area during 2006-2007 for use other than agriculture. There have been no new applications for special use at this time.

Commercial sales in the first mile north of the Interstate and on the east side of 81 have been recorded at $\$ .85$ per square foot for 17 acres for the new Super Walmart and $\$ 120,000$ for lots approximately one acres in size for commercial development. In the second mile north of the interstate a tract of land 72.55 acres is size, is being offered for sale for commercial development. In 2007 two lots on the backside of the access road in the first mile north of the interstate and on the west side were sold for $\$ 110,000$.

In 2005 two parcels of farm ground were sold on the west side of the 81 corridor north of the interstate in the first mile. A 29 acre tract sold for $\$ 10,000+$ per acre and another 80 acre tract sold for $\$ 3620$. In 2006 two parcels already developed at the interstate sold for over $\$ 1,000,000$, each parcel was frontage on the service road

On the east edge of the city another area could have developed into possible residential use. There was a sale of 26 acres of grass for $\$ 4000$ per acre and another sale of 29 acres of alfalfa for a little more than $\$ 4000$. As of 1-1-2008 the City of York is considering a well field in that area which would prohibit any residential development without annexation to the city. This special use area will have to be reconsidered for 2008 valuation.

These properties however, are all typical of Market Area \#2 as they are all flat, irrigated and row crop except for the sales that would be highest and best use residential.

In 2005-2006-2007 agriculture sales have been $\$ 3600$ to 4700 an acre for irrigated land. With these sales I value that land within the special areas the same as if they were anywhere else in Market Area 2.

There have no sales in the special use area in the 2006-2007 time period. York County has no new applications for special use in the 2006-2007 period making me wonder if it is necessary to maintain the special use areas. One more year should tell if land is being sold in these areas for use other than agriculture.

Respectfully submitted,


Ann Charlton
York County Assessor

## County 93 - York



Exhibit 93 - Page 74

County 93 - York

| Total Real Property Value Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30) |  |  | cords |  | Value 1,30 | 9,327 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tot } \\ & \text { (Sum } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Growth } \\ & , \quad \& 41) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 8,914,333 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule I:Non-Agricultural Records (Com and Ind) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records Urban ${ }^{\text {Value }}$ |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
|  |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9. Comm } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 171 | 5,379,711 | 19 | 446,709 | 7 | 320,986 | 197 | 6,147,406 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10. Comm } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 638 | 17,372,434 | 35 | 1,437,419 | 28 | 1,708,440 | 701 | 20,518,293 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11. Comm } \\ & \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | 650 | 94,866,559 | 37 | 12,155,496 | 29 | 3,455,496 | 716 | 110,477,551 |  |
| 12. Comm Total \% of Total | 821 | 117,618,704 | 56 | 14,039,624 | 36 | 5,484,922 | 913 | 137,143,250 | 1,797,941 |
|  | 89.92 | 85.76 | 6.13 | 10.23 | 3.94 | 3.99 | 9.31 | 10.53 | 20.16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13. Ind } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 32,652 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32,652 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14. Ind } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 11 | 1,001,122 | 2 | 1,513,300 | 3 | 268,690 | 16 | 2,783,112 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15 . \text { Ind } \\ & \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | 11 | 9,388,866 | 3 | 19,060,146 | 3 | 2,419,293 | 17 | 30,868,305 |  |
| 16. Ind Total \% of Total | 14 | 10,422,640 | 3 | 20,573,446 | 3 | 2,687,983 | 20 | 33,684,069 | 1,639,245 |
|  | 70.00 | 30.94 | 15.00 | 61.07 | 15.00 | 7.97 | 0.20 | 2.58 | 18.38 |
| Comm+Ind Total <br> \% of Total | 835 | 128,041,344 | 59 | 34,613,070 | 39 | 8,172,905 | 933 | 170,827,319 | 3,437,186 |
|  | 89.49 | 74.95 | 6.32 | 20.26 | 4.18 | 4.78 | 9.51 | 13.11 | 38.55 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 17. Taxable } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { \% of Total } \end{gathered}$ | 5,143 | 417,871,570 | 371 | 69,288,491 | 551 | 61,593,744 | 6,065 | 548,753,805 | 7,554,915 |
|  | 84.79 | 76.14 | 6.11 | 6.31 | 9.08 | 9.73 | 61.86 | 42.13 | 84.75 |
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## County 93 - York
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## County 93 - York

Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:
Non-Agricultural Detail
Records Urban

| County 93 - York |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
| Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 37,950 | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 37,950 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 2,700 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 2,700 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 40,650 | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 40,650 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 2.920 | 3,212 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.920 | 3,212 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 4,500 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 4,500 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4 D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 7.920 | 7,712 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.920 | 7,712 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67. 3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 900 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 900 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 35.000 | 8,750 | 0.000 | 0 | 35.000 | 8,750 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 9,650 | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 9,650 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 3.070 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 3.070 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 70.920 | 58,012 | 0.000 | 0 | 70.920 | 58,012 |


| County 93 - York 200 |  |  | unty Abst | f Assessm | or Real Pr | ty, Form 45 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | SubU |  | Ru |  | Tot |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 16,744.740 | 43,536,324 | 44,985.420 | 116,962,092 | 61,730.160 | 160,498,416 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 2,285.590 | 5,599,702 | 5,464.690 | 13,388,499 | 7,750.280 | 18,988,201 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,686.160 | 3,540,936 | 3,982.090 | 8,362,389 | 5,668.250 | 11,903,325 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 394.450 | 818,485 | 979.160 | 2,031,760 | 1,373.610 | 2,850,245 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,089.400 | 2,260,509 | 3,719.350 | 7,717,657 | 4,808.750 | 9,978,166 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 536.330 | 965,394 | 1,751.760 | 3,153,168 | 2,288.090 | 4,118,562 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 194.760 | 311,616 | 567.820 | 908,512 | 762.580 | 1,220,128 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 22,931.430 | 57,032,966 | 61,450.290 | 152,524,077 | 84,381.720 | 209,557,043 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,236.790 | 2,288,067 | 2,107.310 | 3,898,529 | 3,344.100 | 6,186,596 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 348.320 | 592,144 | 328.950 | 559,215 | 677.270 | 1,151,359 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 92.000 | 142,600 | 202.000 | 313,100 | 294.000 | 455,700 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 53.620 | 79,092 | 69.230 | 102,115 | 122.850 | 181,207 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 132.180 | 185,052 | 320.390 | 448,537 | 452.570 | 633,589 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 130.390 | 149,949 | 239.080 | 274,943 | 369.470 | 424,892 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 76.440 | 76,440 | 87.400 | 87,400 | 163.840 | 163,840 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,069.740 | 3,513,344 | 3,354.360 | 5,683,839 | 5,424.100 | 9,197,183 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 134.870 | 73,931 | 94.050 | 51,680 | 228.920 | 125,611 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 37.190 | 20,455 | 30.000 | 16,500 | 67.190 | 36,955 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 54.800 | 28,500 | 49.940 | 24,970 | 104.740 | 53,470 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 45.600 | 23,100 | 43.710 | 21,855 | 89.310 | 44,955 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 143.910 | 71,955 | 124.420 | 62,210 | 268.330 | 134,165 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 102.830 | 51,415 | 115.820 | 57,910 | 218.650 | 109,325 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 402.320 | 203,810 | 321.020 | 160,760 | 723.340 | 364,570 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 921.520 | 473,166 | 778.960 | 395,885 | 1,700.480 | 869,051 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 133.460 | 53,384 | 206.610 | 82,644 | 340.070 | 136,028 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 31.930 | 12,772 | 31.930 | 12,772 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 26,056.150 | 61,072,860 | 65,822.150 | 158,699,217 | 91,878.300 | 219,772,077 |
|  |  |  |  | it 93 - Page |  |  |  |  |

## County 93 - York <br> 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 | 9.420 | 18,369 | 1,563.400 | 3,048,631 | 18,202.720 | 35,495,316 | 19,775.540 | 38,562,316 |
| 46. 1A | 2.000 | 4,450 | 580.080 | 1,290,678 | 21,529.390 | 47,902,922 | 22,111.470 | 49,198,050 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 346.740 | 676,144 | 3,277.220 | 6,390,581 | 3,623.960 | 7,066,725 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 67.130 | 117,478 | 6,308.700 | 11,040,235 | 6,375.830 | 11,157,713 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 331.570 | 571,959 | 10,176.120 | 17,553,819 | 10,507.690 | 18,125,778 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 412.340 | 690,671 | 5,000.600 | 8,376,015 | 5,412.940 | 9,066,686 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 88.490 | 132,735 | 3,501.500 | 5,252,250 | 3,589.990 | 5,384,985 |
| 53. Total | 11.420 | 22,819 | 3,389.750 | 6,528,296 | 67,996.250 | 132,011,138 | 71,397.420 | 138,562,253 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 13.000 | 25,350 | 572.650 | 1,116,672 | 3,546.440 | 6,915,563 | 4,132.090 | 8,057,585 |
| 55.1D | 27.110 | 46,765 | 136.140 | 234,842 | 5,651.710 | 9,749,211 | 5,814.960 | 10,030,818 |
| 56. 2D1 | 7.000 | 10,500 | 86.320 | 129,480 | 793.090 | 1,189,635 | 886.410 | 1,329,615 |
| 57. 2D | 9.110 | 11,843 | 17.000 | 22,100 | 2,893.070 | 3,760,991 | 2,919.180 | 3,794,934 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 144.570 | 202,398 | 3,704.580 | 5,186,412 | 3,849.150 | 5,388,810 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 145.380 | 196,263 | 1,980.430 | 2,673,583 | 2,125.810 | 2,869,846 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 25,000 | 1,020.240 | 1,275,304 | 1,040.240 | 1,300,304 |
| 62. Total | 56.220 | 94,458 | 1,122.060 | 1,926,755 | 19,589.560 | 30,750,699 | 20,767.840 | 32,771,912 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.360 | 14,616 | 329.820 | 197,892 | 354.180 | 212,508 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 47.810 | 28,686 | 900.020 | 537,012 | 947.830 | 565,698 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 12.010 | 6,005 | 272.750 | 136,375 | 284.760 | 142,380 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 30.070 | 15,035 | 716.090 | 357,470 | 746.160 | 372,505 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 55.000 | 27,500 | 1,543.480 | 768,508 | 1,598.480 | 796,008 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 74.270 | 31,565 | 1,635.570 | 695,786 | 1,709.840 | 727,351 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 415.680 | 176,666 | 6,994.930 | 2,976,211 | 7,410.610 | 3,152,877 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 659.200 | 300,073 | 12,392.660 | 5,669,254 | 13,051.860 | 5,969,327 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 121.440 | 31,110 | 1,626.260 | 397,147 | 1,747.700 | 428,257 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.130 | 8,933 | 24.130 | 8,933 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 320.000 |  | 320.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 67.640 | 117,277 | 5,292.450 | 8,786,234 | 101,628.860 | 168,837,171 | 106,988.950 | 177,740,682 |

## County 93 - York <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
4

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,537.410 | 15,036,043 | 49,685.040 | 114,255,292 | 56,222.450 | 129,291,335 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,678.440 | 3,860,412 | 13,784.470 | 31,704,281 | 15,462.910 | 35,564,693 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 749.610 | 1,517,961 | 4,814.000 | 9,747,907 | 5,563.610 | 11,265,868 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 428.290 | 867,288 | 2,547.130 | 5,155,742 | 2,975.420 | 6,023,030 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 886.320 | 1,506,744 | 9,084.520 | 15,443,684 | 9,970.840 | 16,950,428 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 416.100 | 707,370 | 4,686.760 | 7,967,442 | 5,102.860 | 8,674,812 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 306.960 | 460,440 | 2,484.920 | 3,727,380 | 2,791.880 | 4,187,820 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 11,003.130 | 23,956,258 | 87,086.840 | 188,001,728 | 98,089.970 | 211,957,986 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 809.210 | 1,577,962 | 5,154.030 | 10,050,367 | 5,963.240 | 11,628,329 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 378.390 | 700,022 | 2,369.410 | 4,383,412 | 2,747.800 | 5,083,434 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 34.500 | 56,925 | 506.540 | 835,792 | 541.040 | 892,717 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 117.000 | 181,350 | 645.830 | 1,001,037 | 762.830 | 1,182,387 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 219.690 | 307,566 | 1,849.730 | 2,589,622 | 2,069.420 | 2,897,188 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 70.000 | 91,000 | 995.560 | 1,294,228 | 1,065.560 | 1,385,228 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 91.370 | 100,507 | 437.730 | 481,503 | 529.100 | 582,010 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,720.160 | 3,015,332 | 11,958.830 | 20,635,961 | 13,678.990 | 23,651,293 |


| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 53.030 | 33,145 | 313.080 | 195,678 | 366.110 | 228,823 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 70.000 | 43,750 | 354.590 | 221,619 | 424.590 | 265,369 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 34.000 | 18,700 | 151.430 | 83,287 | 185.430 | 101,987 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 80.300 | 44,165 | 228.490 | 125,670 | 308.790 | 169,835 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 143.630 | 78,997 | 974.330 | 534,484 | 1,117.960 | 613,481 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 48.160 | 21,673 | 594.010 | 267,310 | 642.170 | 288,983 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 495.080 | 222,787 | 1,478.100 | 665,149 | 1,973.180 | 887,936 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 924.200 | 463,217 | 4,094.030 | 2,093,197 | 5,018.230 | 2,556,414 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 103.720 | 36,302 | 638.680 | 223,464 | 742.400 | 259,766 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 2,400 | 57.360 | 30,808 | 65.360 | 33,208 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 13,759.210 | 27,473,509 | 103,835.740 | 210,985,158 | 117,594.950 | 238,458,667 |


| County 93 - York 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  | Market Area: 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 59.290 | 115,616 | 205.720 | 401,154 | 905.160 | 1,765,062 | 1,170.170 | 2,281,832 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 271.070 | 487,926 | 2,214.800 | 3,986,640 | 2,485.870 | 4,474,566 |
| 47. 2A1 | 1.000 | 1,675 | 9.190 | 15,393 | 105.290 | 176,361 | 115.480 | 193,429 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 25,245 | 267.250 | 396,866 | 284.250 | 422,111 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 111.000 | 149,850 | 696.230 | 939,911 | 807.230 | 1,089,761 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 18.000 | 19,440 | 291.000 | 314,280 | 309.000 | 333,720 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 73.970 | 73,970 | 173.560 | 173,560 | 247.530 | 247,530 |
| 53. Total | 60.290 | 117,291 | 705.950 | 1,172,978 | 4,653.290 | 7,752,680 | 5,419.530 | 9,042,949 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.810 | 82,458 | 932.290 | 1,678,122 | 978.100 | 1,760,580 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 77.510 | 139,518 | 1,482.960 | 2,669,328 | 1,560.470 | 2,808,846 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.560 | 3,456 | 45.700 | 61,695 | 48.260 | 65,151 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 1,350 | 480.060 | 648,082 | 481.060 | 649,432 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 60.000 | 72,000 | 1,112.280 | 1,334,736 | 1,172.280 | 1,406,736 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 8,450 | 304.500 | 197,925 | 317.500 | 206,375 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 28.970 | 18,831 | 218.610 | 142,097 | 247.580 | 160,928 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 228.850 | 326,063 | 4,576.400 | 6,731,985 | 4,805.250 | 7,058,048 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 1.160 | 580 | 2.000 | 1,000 | 50.000 | 25,000 | 53.160 | 26,580 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 7,000 | 255.690 | 127,845 | 269.690 | 134,845 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 6,800 | 17.000 | 6,800 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 2,800 | 250.250 | 100,100 | 257.250 | 102,900 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 36.000 | 14,400 | 349.670 | 139,868 | 385.670 | 154,268 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 2,800 | 199.000 | 79,600 | 206.000 | 82,400 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 157.000 | 70,650 | 2,270.190 | 1,021,591 | 2,427.190 | 1,092,241 |
| 71. Total | 1.160 | 580 | 223.000 | 98,650 | 3,391.800 | 1,500,804 | 3,615.960 | 1,600,034 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 12.330 | 2,466 | 460.630 | 91,663 | 472.960 | 94,129 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 900 | 6.000 | 900 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 72.310 |  | 72.310 |  |
| 75. Total | 61.450 | 117,871 | 1,170.130 | 1,600,157 | 13,088.120 | 16,078,032 | 14,319.700 | 17,796,060 |
|  |  |  | Exhi | 93-Page |  |  |  |  |


| County 93 - York 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Proper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area:Rural |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Acres }}{ }^{\text {Total }}$ | Value |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |  |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,725.450 | 12,522,448 | 4,725.450 | 12,522,448 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,019.310 | 5,149,242 | 2,019.310 | 5,149,242 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 365.640 | 895,819 | 365.640 | 895,819 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 123.020 | 301,399 | 123.020 | 301,399 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 928.910 | 2,090,049 | 928.910 | 2,090,049 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 97.500 | 180,375 | 97.500 | 180,375 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.000 | 35,200 | 22.000 | 35,200 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 8,281.830 | 21,174,532 | 8,281.830 | 21,174,532 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 606.370 | 1,334,014 | 606.370 | 1,334,014 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 200.260 | 420,546 | 200.260 | 420,546 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 45,600 | 24.000 | 45,600 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 26,600 | 14.000 | 26,600 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 91.420 | 159,985 | 91.420 | 159,985 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.000 | 69,700 | 41.000 | 69,700 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 977.050 | 2,056,445 | 977.050 | 2,056,445 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,200 | 2.000 | 1,200 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 600 | 1.000 | 600 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 79.880 | 43,934 | 79.880 | 43,934 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 4,700 | 9.000 | 4,700 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 91.880 | 50,434 | 91.880 | 50,434 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 21.000 | 6,300 | 21.000 | 6,300 |
| 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 | 9,371.760 | 23,287,711 | 9,371.760 | 23,287,711 |
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| County 93 - York |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: | 21 |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.650 | 30,713 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.650 | 30,713 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 13.650 | 30,713 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.650 | 30,713 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 28.310 | 52,374 | 0.000 | 0 | 28.310 | 52,374 |
| 55. 1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 28.310 | 52,374 | 0.000 | 0 | 28.310 | 52,374 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 83,087 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 83,087 |
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| County 93 - York |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Tota <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.000 | 162,800 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.000 | 162,800 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 37,600 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 37,600 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 30,750 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 30,750 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 55.000 | 103,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 55.000 | 103,000 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.040 | 24,646 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.040 | 24,646 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 5,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 5,000 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 139.040 | 363,796 | 0.000 | 0 | 139.040 | 363,796 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 9,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 9,000 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67. 3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 27,000 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 27,000 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 29.960 | 77,130 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.960 | 77,130 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 113,130 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.960 | 113,130 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 5.500 | 1,100 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.500 | 1,100 |
| 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 | 186.500 | 478,026 | 0.000 | 0 | 186.500 | 478,026 |
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## County 93 - York

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

| Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 71.710 | 140,110 | 38,411.840 | 89,771,424 | 229,468.500 | 501,464,155 | 267,952.050 | 591,375,689 |
| 77.Dry Land | 56.220 | 94,458 | 5,466.910 | 9,549,724 | 40,456.200 | 65,858,929 | 45,979.330 | 75,503,111 |
| 78.Grass | 1.160 | 580 | 2,875.730 | 1,542,424 | 20,749.330 | 9,709,574 | 23,626.220 | 11,252,578 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 379.450 | 125,262 | 2,953.180 | 801,218 | 3,332.630 | 926,480 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 2,400 | 119.420 | 53,413 | 127.420 | 55,813 |
| 81.Exempt | 3.070 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 392.310 | 0 | 395.380 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 129.090 | 235,148 | 47,141.930 | 100,991,234 | 293,746.630 | 577,887,289 | 341,017.650 | 679,113,671 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 23.000 | 92.00\% | 37,950 | 93.36\% | 1,650.000 |
| 2A1 | 2.000 | 8.00\% | 2,700 | 6.64\% | 1,350.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 25.000 | 100.00\% | 40,650 | 100.00\% | 1,626.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 2.920 | 36.87\% | 3,212 | 41.65\% | 1,100.000 |
| 2D1 | 5.000 | 63.13\% | 4,500 | 58.35\% | 900.000 |
| 2D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 7.920 | 100.00\% | 7,712 | 100.00\% | 973.737 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 3.000 | $7.89 \%$ | 900 | $9.33 \%$ | 300.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G | 35.000 | $92.11 \%$ | 8,750 | $90.67 \%$ | 250.000 |
| Grass Total | 38.000 | $100.00 \%$ | 9,650 | $100.00 \%$ | 253.947 |
| Irigated Total | 25.000 | $35.25 \%$ | 40,650 | $70.07 \%$ | $1,626.000$ |
| Dry Total | 7.920 | $11.17 \%$ | 7,712 | $13.29 \%$ | 973.737 |
| Grass Total | 38.000 | $53.58 \%$ | 9,650 | $16.63 \%$ | 253.947 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 3.070 | $4.33 \%$ |  |  | 8 |
| Market Area Total | 70.920 | $100.00 \%$ | 58,012 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 25.000 | $0.01 \%$ | 40,650 | $0.01 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 7.920 | $0.02 \%$ | 7,712 | $0.01 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 38.000 | $0.16 \%$ | 9,650 | $0.09 \%$ |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 3.070 | $0.78 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 70.920 | $0.02 \%$ | 58,012 | $0.01 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 93 - York

Market Area:

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |
| 1, |
| 2A1 |
| 2A Acres* |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $84,381.720$ | $31.49 \%$ | $209,557,043$ | $35.44 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $5,424.100$ | $11.80 \%$ | $9,197,183$ | $12.18 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $1,700.480$ | $7.20 \%$ | 869,051 | $7.72 \%$ |
| Waste | 340.070 | $10.20 \%$ | 136,028 | $14.68 \%$ |
| Other | 31.930 | $25.06 \%$ | 12,772 | $22.88 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $91,878.300$ | $26.94 \%$ | $219,772,077$ | $32.36 \%$ |
| Exhibit 93-Page 90 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | $19,775.540$ | $27.70 \%$ | $38,562,316$ | $27.83 \%$ | $1,950.000$ |
| 1A | $22,111.470$ | $30.97 \%$ | $49,198,050$ | $35.51 \%$ | $2,225.001$ |
| 2A1 | $3,623.960$ | $5.08 \%$ | $7,066,725$ | $5.10 \%$ | $1,950.000$ |
| 2A | $6,375.830$ | $8.93 \%$ | $11,157,713$ | $8.05 \%$ | $1,750.001$ |
| 3A1 | $10,507.690$ | $14.72 \%$ | $18,125,778$ | $13.08 \%$ | $1,725.001$ |
| 3A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | $5,412.940$ | $7.58 \%$ |  | $6,066,686$ | $6.54 \%$ |
| 4A | $3,589.990$ | $5.03 \%$ | $5,384,985$ | $3.89 \%$ | $1,675.002$ |
| Irrigated Total | $71,397.420$ | $100.00 \%$ | $138,562,253$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,500.000$ |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  | $1,940.717$ |
| 1D1 | $4,132.090$ | $19.90 \%$ | $8,057,585$ | $24.59 \%$ | $1,950.002$ |
| 1D | $5,814.960$ | $28.00 \%$ | $10,030,818$ | $30.61 \%$ | $1,725.002$ |
| 2D1 | 886.410 | $4.27 \%$ | $1,329,615$ | $4.06 \%$ | $1,500.000$ |
| 2D | $2,919.180$ | $14.06 \%$ | $3,794,934$ | $11.58 \%$ | $1,300.000$ |
| 3D1 | $3,849.150$ | $18.53 \%$ | $5,388,810$ | $16.44 \%$ | $1,400.000$ |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 354.180 | 2.71\% | 212,508 | 3.56\% | 600.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1G | 947.830 | 7.26\% | 565,698 | 9.48\% | 596.834 |
| 2G1 | 284.760 | 2.18\% | 142,380 | 2.39\% | 500.000 |
| 2G | 746.160 | 5.72\% | 372,505 | 6.24\% | 499.229 |
| 3G1 | 1,598.480 | 12.25\% | 796,008 | 13.33\% | 497.978 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 1,709.840 | 13.10\% | 727,351 | 12.18\% | 425.391 |
| 4G | 7,410.610 | 56.78\% | 3,152,877 | 52.82\% | 425.454 |
| Grass Total | 13,051.860 | 100.00\% | 5,969,327 | 100.00\% | 457.354 |
| Irrigated Total | 71,397.420 | 66.73\% | 138,562,253 | 77.96\% | 1,940.717 |
| Dry Total | 20,767.840 | 19.41\% | 32,771,912 | 18.44\% | 1,578.012 |
| Grass Total | 13,051.860 | 12.20\% | 5,969,327 | 3.36\% | 457.354 |
| Waste | 1,747.700 | 1.63\% | 428,257 | 0.24\% | 245.040 |
| Other | 24.130 | 0.02\% | 8,933 | 0.01\% | 370.203 |
| Exempt | 320.000 | 0.30\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 106,988.950 | 100.00\% | 177,740,682 | 100.00\% | 1,661.299 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $71,397.420$ | $26.65 \%$ | $138,562,253$ | $23.43 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $20,767.840$ | $45.17 \%$ | $32,771,912$ | $43.40 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $13,051.860$ | $55.24 \%$ | $5,969,327$ | $53.05 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,747.700$ | $52.44 \%$ | 428,257 | $46.22 \%$ |
| Other | 24.130 | $18.94 \%$ | 8,933 | $16.01 \%$ |
| Exempt | 320.000 | $80.93 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $106,988.950$ | $31.37 \%$ | $177,740,682$ | $26.17 \%$ |
| Exhibit 93-Page 91 |  |  |  |  |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:
Average Assessed Value*

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | $56,222.450$ | $57.32 \%$ | $129,291,335$ | $61.00 \%$ | $2,299.638$ |
| 1A | $15,462.910$ | $15.76 \%$ | $35,564,693$ | $16.78 \%$ | $2,300.000$ |
| 2A1 | $5,563.610$ | $5.67 \%$ | $11,265,868$ | $5.32 \%$ | $2,024.920$ |
| 2A | $2,975.420$ | $3.03 \%$ | $6,023,030$ | $2.84 \%$ | $2,024.262$ |
| 3A1 | $9,970.840$ | $10.16 \%$ | $16,950,428$ | $8.00 \%$ | $1,700.000$ |
| 3A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | $5,102.860$ | $5.20 \%$ | $8,674,812$ | $4.09 \%$ | $1,699.990$ |
| 4A | $2,791.880$ | $2.85 \%$ | $4,187,820$ | $1.98 \%$ | $1,500.000$ |
| Irrigated Total | $98,089.970$ | $100.00 \%$ | $211,957,986$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,160.852$ |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  | $1,950.001$ |
| 1D1 | $5,963.240$ | $43.59 \%$ | $11,628,329$ | $49.17 \%$ | $1,850.001$ |
| 1D | $2,747.800$ | $20.09 \%$ | $5,083,434$ | $21.49 \%$ | $1,650.001$ |
| 2D1 | 541.040 | $3.96 \%$ | 892,717 | $3.77 \%$ | $1,550.000$ |
| 2D | 762.830 | $5.58 \%$ | $1,182,387$ | $5.00 \%$ | $1,400.000$ |
| 3D1 | $2,069.420$ | $15.13 \%$ | $2,897,188$ | $12.25 \%$ | 0. |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| 4D1 | $1,065.560$ | $7.79 \%$ | $1,385,228$ | $5.86 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4D | 529.100 | $3.87 \%$ | 582,010 | $2.46 \%$ | $1,300.000$ |
| Dry Total | $13,678.990$ | $100.00 \%$ | $23,651,293$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,100.000$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 366.110 | $7.30 \%$ | 228,823 | $8.95 \%$ | 625.011 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 424.590 | $8.46 \%$ | 265,369 | $10.38 \%$ | 625.000 |
| 2G1 | 185.430 | $3.70 \%$ | 101,987 | $3.99 \%$ | 550.002 |
| 2G | 308.790 | $6.15 \%$ | 169,835 | $6.64 \%$ | 550.001 |
| 3G1 | $1,117.960$ | $22.28 \%$ | 613,481 | $24.00 \%$ | 548.750 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 642.170 | $12.80 \%$ | 288,983 | $11.30 \%$ | 450.010 |
| 4G | $1,973.180$ | $39.32 \%$ | 887,936 | $34.73 \%$ | 450.002 |
| Grass Total | $5,018.230$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,556,414$ | $100.00 \%$ | 509.425 |
| Irrigated Total | $98,089.970$ | $83.41 \%$ | $211,957,986$ | $88.89 \%$ | $2,160.852$ |
| Dry Total | $13,678.990$ | $11.63 \%$ | $23,651,293$ | $9.92 \%$ | $1,729.023$ |
| Grass Total | $5,018.230$ | $4.27 \%$ | $2,556,414$ | $1.07 \%$ | 509.425 |
| Waste | 742.400 | $0.63 \%$ | 259,766 | $0.11 \%$ | 349.900 |
| Other | 65.360 | $0.06 \%$ | 33,208 | $0.01 \%$ | 508.078 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 2 |
| Market Area Total | $117,594.950$ | $100.00 \%$ | $238,458,667$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $98,089.970$ | $36.61 \%$ | $211,957,986$ | $35.84 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $13,678.990$ | $29.75 \%$ | $23,651,293$ | $31.32 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $5,018.230$ | $21.24 \%$ | $2,556,414$ | $22.72 \%$ |
| Waste | 742.400 | $22.28 \%$ | 259,766 | $28.04 \%$ |
| Other | 65.360 | $51.29 \%$ | 33,208 | $59.50 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $117,594.950$ | $34.48 \%$ | $238,458,667$ | $35.11 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area: $\quad 5$

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 1,170.170 | 21.59\% | 2,281,832 | 25.23\% | 1,950.000 |
| 1A | 2,485.870 | 45.87\% | 4,474,566 | 49.48\% | 1,800.000 |
| 2A1 | 115.480 | 2.13\% | 193,429 | 2.14\% | 1,675.000 |
| 2A | 284.250 | 5.24\% | 422,111 | 4.67\% | 1,484.999 |
| 3A1 | 807.230 | 14.89\% | 1,089,761 | 12.05\% | 1,350.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 309.000 | 5.70\% | 333,720 | 3.69\% | 1,080.000 |
| 4A | 247.530 | 4.57\% | 247,530 | 2.74\% | 1,000.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 5,419.530 | 100.00\% | 9,042,949 | 100.00\% | 1,668.585 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 978.100 | 20.35\% | 1,760,580 | 24.94\% | 1,800.000 |
| 1D | 1,560.470 | 32.47\% | 2,808,846 | 39.80\% | 1,800.000 |
| 2D1 | 48.260 | 1.00\% | 65,151 | 0.92\% | 1,350.000 |
| 2D | 481.060 | 10.01\% | 649,432 | 9.20\% | 1,350.002 |
| 3D1 | 1,172.280 | 24.40\% | 1,406,736 | 19.93\% | 1,200.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 317.500 | 6.61\% | 206,375 | 2.92\% | 650.000 |
| 4D | 247.580 | 5.15\% | 160,928 | 2.28\% | 650.004 |
| Dry Total | 4,805.250 | 100.00\% | 7,058,048 | 100.00\% | 1,468.820 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 53.160 | 1.47\% | 26,580 | 1.66\% | 500.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1G | 269.690 | 7.46\% | 134,845 | 8.43\% | 500.000 |
| 2G1 | 17.000 | 0.47\% | 6,800 | 0.42\% | 400.000 |
| 2G | 257.250 | 7.11\% | 102,900 | 6.43\% | 400.000 |
| 3G1 | 385.670 | 10.67\% | 154,268 | 9.64\% | 400.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 206.000 | 5.70\% | 82,400 | 5.15\% | 400.000 |
| 4G | 2,427.190 | 67.12\% | 1,092,241 | 68.26\% | 450.002 |
| Grass Total | 3,615.960 | 100.00\% | 1,600,034 | 100.00\% | 442.492 |
| Irrigated Total | 5,419.530 | 37.85\% | 9,042,949 | 50.81\% | 1,668.585 |
| Dry Total | 4,805.250 | 33.56\% | 7,058,048 | 39.66\% | 1,468.820 |
| Grass Total | 3,615.960 | 25.25\% | 1,600,034 | 8.99\% | 442.492 |
| Waste | 472.960 | 3.30\% | 94,129 | 0.53\% | 199.021 |
| Other | 6.000 | 0.04\% | 900 | 0.01\% | 150.000 |
| Exempt | 72.310 | 0.50\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 14,319.700 | 100.00\% | 17,796,060 | 100.00\% | 1,242.767 |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $5,419.530$ | $2.02 \%$ | $9,042,949$ | $1.53 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $4,805.250$ | $10.45 \%$ | $7,058,048$ | $9.35 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $3,615.960$ | $15.30 \%$ | $1,600,034$ | $14.22 \%$ |
| Waste | 472.960 | $14.19 \%$ | 94,129 | $10.16 \%$ |
| Other | 6.000 | $4.71 \%$ | 900 | $1.61 \%$ |
| Exempt | 72.310 | $18.29 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $14,319.700$ | $4.20 \%$ | $17,796,060$ | $2.62 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 4,725.450 | 57.06\% | 12,522,448 | 59.14\% | 2,650.001 |
| 1A | 2,019.310 | 24.38\% | 5,149,242 | 24.32\% | 2,550.000 |
| 2A1 | 365.640 | 4.41\% | 895,819 | 4.23\% | 2,450.002 |
| 2A | 123.020 | 1.49\% | 301,399 | 1.42\% | 2,450.000 |
| 3A1 | 928.910 | 11.22\% | 2,090,049 | 9.87\% | 2,250.001 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 97.500 | 1.18\% | 180,375 | 0.85\% | 1,850.000 |
| 4A | 22.000 | 0.27\% | 35,200 | 0.17\% | 1,600.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 8,281.830 | 100.00\% | 21,174,532 | 100.00\% | 2,556.745 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 606.370 | 62.06\% | 1,334,014 | 64.87\% | 2,200.000 |
| 1D | 200.260 | 20.50\% | 420,546 | 20.45\% | 2,100.000 |
| 2D1 | 24.000 | 2.46\% | 45,600 | 2.22\% | 1,900.000 |
| 2D | 14.000 | 1.43\% | 26,600 | 1.29\% | 1,900.000 |
| 3D1 | 91.420 | 9.36\% | 159,985 | 7.78\% | 1,750.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 41.000 | 4.20\% | 69,700 | 3.39\% | 1,700.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 977.050 | 100.00\% | 2,056,445 | 100.00\% | 2,104.748 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 2.000 | $2.18 \%$ | 1,200 | $2.38 \%$ | 600.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 1.000 | $1.09 \%$ | 600 | $1.19 \%$ | 600.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 79.880 | $86.94 \%$ | 43,934 | $87.11 \%$ | 550.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 9.000 | $9.80 \%$ | 4,700 | $9.32 \%$ | 522.222 |
| 4G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 91.880 | $100.00 \%$ | 50,434 | $100.00 \%$ | 548.911 |
|  | $8,281.830$ | $88.37 \%$ | $21,174,532$ | $90.93 \%$ | $2,556.745$ |
| Irrigated Total | 977.050 | $10.43 \%$ | $2,056,445$ | $8.83 \%$ | $2,104.748$ |
| Dry Total | 91.880 | $0.98 \%$ | 50,434 | $0.22 \%$ | 548.911 |
| Grass Total | 21.000 | $0.22 \%$ | 6,300 | $0.03 \%$ | 300.000 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 2 |
| Exempt | $9,371.760$ | $100.00 \%$ | $23,287,711$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $8,281.830$ | $3.09 \%$ | $21,174,532$ | $3.58 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 977.050 | $2.12 \%$ | $2,056,445$ | $2.72 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 91.880 | $0.39 \%$ | 50,434 | $0.45 \%$ |
| Waste | 21.000 | $0.63 \%$ | 6,300 | $0.68 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $9,371.760$ | $2.75 \%$ | $23,287,711$ | $3.43 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:
21

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 13.650 | 100.00\% | 30,713 | 100.00\% | 2,250.036 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2 A 1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 13.650 | 100.00\% | 30,713 | 100.00\% | 2,250.036 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 28.310 | 100.00\% | 52,374 | 100.00\% | 1,850.017 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 28.310 | 100.00\% | 52,374 | 100.00\% | 1,850.017 |


| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $2 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G 1$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |


| Irrigated Total | 13.650 | $32.53 \%$ | 30,713 | $36.96 \%$ | $2,250.036$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 28.310 | $67.47 \%$ | 52,374 | $63.04 \%$ | $1,850.017$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,980.147$ |
| Market Area Total | 41.960 | $100.00 \%$ | 83,087 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 13.650 | $0.01 \%$ | 30,713 | $0.01 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 28.310 | $0.06 \%$ | 52,374 | $0.07 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 41.960 | $0.01 \%$ | 83,087 | $0.01 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 69.550 | 97.20\% | 156,488 | 97.57\% | 2,250.007 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 2.000 | 2.80\% | 3,900 | 2.43\% | 1,950.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 71.550 | 100.00\% | 160,388 | 100.00\% | 2,241.621 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 71.550 | 100.00\% | 160,388 | 100.00\% | 2,241.621 |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 71.550 | 100.00\% | 160,388 | 100.00\% | 2,241.621 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 71.550 | $0.03 \%$ | 160,388 | $0.03 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 71.550 | $0.02 \%$ | 160,388 | $0.02 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 93 - York
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 138.010 | 50.85\% | 460,228 | 54.20\% | 3,334.743 |
| 1A | 80.570 | 29.69\% | 218,597 | 25.74\% | 2,713.131 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 39.000 | 14.37\% | 115,150 | 13.56\% | 2,952.564 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 11.000 | 4.05\% | 44,000 | 5.18\% | 4,000.000 |
| 4A | 2.800 | 1.03\% | 11,200 | 1.32\% | 4,000.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 271.380 | 100.00\% | 849,175 | 100.00\% | 3,129.099 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 136.800 | 90.70\% | 327,793 | 95.19\% | 2,396.147 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 3.910 | 2.59\% | 5,767 | 1.67\% | 1,474.936 |
| 3D1 | 7.000 | 4.64\% | 7,350 | 2.13\% | 1,050.000 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 2.120 | 1.41\% | 2,438 | 0.71\% | 1,150.000 |
| 4D | 1.000 | 0.66\% | 1,000 | 0.29\% | 1,000.000 |
| Dry Total | 150.830 | 100.00\% | 344,348 | 100.00\% | 2,283.020 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 7.000 | 10.32\% | 6,700 | 7.93\% | 957.142 |
| 1G | 3.000 | 4.42\% | 1,350 | 1.60\% | 450.000 |
| 2G1 | 3.510 | 5.17\% | 14,032 | 16.60\% | 3,997.720 |
| 2G | 8.100 | 11.94\% | 11,100 | 13.13\% | 1,370.370 |
| 3G1 | 2.000 | 2.95\% | 900 | 1.06\% | 450.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 13.700 | 20.19\% | 5,480 | 6.48\% | 400.000 |
| 4G | 30.540 | 45.01\% | 44,976 | 53.20\% | 1,472.691 |
| Grass Total | 67.850 | 100.00\% | 84,538 | 100.00\% | 1,245.954 |
| Irrigated Total | 271.380 | 55.04\% | 849,175 | 66.40\% | 3,129.099 |
| Dry Total | 150.830 | 30.59\% | 344,348 | 26.92\% | 2,283.020 |
| Grass Total | 67.850 | 13.76\% | 84,538 | 6.61\% | 1,245.954 |
| Waste | 3.000 | 0.61\% | 900 | 0.07\% | 300.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 493.060 | 100.00\% | 1,278,961 | 100.00\% | 2,593.925 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 271.380 | $0.10 \%$ | 849,175 | $0.14 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 150.830 | $0.33 \%$ | 344,348 | $0.46 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 67.850 | $0.29 \%$ | 84,538 | $0.75 \%$ |
| Waste | 3.000 | $0.09 \%$ | 900 | $0.10 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 493.060 | $0.14 \%$ | $1,278,961$ | $0.19 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 93 - York
Market Area:
24

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 45.000 | 32.36\% | 162,800 | 44.75\% | 3,617.777 |
| 1D | 14.000 | 10.07\% | 37,600 | 10.34\% | 2,685.714 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 14.000 | 10.07\% | 30,750 | 8.45\% | 2,196.428 |
| 3D1 | 55.000 | 39.56\% | 103,000 | 28.31\% | 1,872.727 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 9.040 | 6.50\% | 24,646 | 6.77\% | 2,726.327 |
| 4D | 2.000 | 1.44\% | 5,000 | 1.37\% | 2,500.000 |
| Dry Total | 139.040 | 100.00\% | 363,796 | 100.00\% | 2,616.484 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 3.000 | $7.15 \%$ | 9,000 | $7.96 \%$ | $3,000.000$ |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 9.000 | $21.45 \%$ | 27,000 | $23.87 \%$ | $3,000.000$ |
| $3 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G | 29.960 | $71.40 \%$ | 77,130 | $68.18 \%$ | $2,574.432$ |
| Grass Total | 41.960 | $100.00 \%$ | 113,130 | $100.00 \%$ | $2,696.139$ |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 139.040 | $74.55 \%$ | 363,796 | $76.10 \%$ | $2,616.484$ |
| Grass Total | 41.960 | $22.50 \%$ | 113,130 | $23.67 \%$ | $2,696.139$ |
| Waste | 5.500 | $2.95 \%$ | 1,100 | $0.23 \%$ | 200.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $2,563.142$ |
| Market Area Total | 186.500 | $100.00 \%$ | 478,026 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 139.040 | $0.30 \%$ | 363,796 | $0.48 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 41.960 | $0.18 \%$ | 113,130 | $1.01 \%$ |
| Waste | 5.500 | $0.17 \%$ | 1,100 | $0.12 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 186.500 | $0.05 \%$ | 478,026 | $0.07 \%$ |
| Exhibit 93 - Page 98 |  |  |  |  |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 93 - York

| AgLand | Acres | Urban |  |  | SubUrban <br> Acres |  | Value |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Total | 129.090 | 235,148 | $47,141.930$ | $100,991,234$ | $293,746.630$ | $577,887,289$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| AgLand | Total <br> Acres | Value | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 267,952.050 | 591,375,689 | 267,952.050 | 78.57\% | 591,375,689 | 87.08\% | 2,207.020 |
| Dry | 45,979.330 | 75,503,111 | 45,979.330 | 13.48\% | 75,503,111 | 11.12\% | 1,642.109 |
| Grass | 23,626.220 | 11,252,578 | 23,626.220 | 6.93\% | 11,252,578 | 1.66\% | 476.275 |
| Waste | 3,332.630 | 926,480 | 3,332.630 | 0.98\% | 926,480 | 0.14\% | 278.002 |
| Other | 127.420 | 55,813 | 127.420 | 0.04\% | 55,813 | 0.01\% | 438.023 |
| Exempt | 395.380 | 0 | 395.380 | 0.12\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |


| Total | $341,017.650$ | $679,113,671$ | $341,017.650$ | $100.00 \%$ | $679,113,671$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,991.432$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* 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)

|  | 2007 CTL <br> County Total | 2008 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2008 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 365,949,985 | 377,052,179 | 11,102,194 | 3.03 | 4,117,729 | 1.91 |
| 2. Recreational | 874,307 | 874,307 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 44,585,205 | 46,810,525 | 2,225,320 | 4.99 | *---------- | 4.99 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 411,409,497 | 424,737,011 | 13,327,514 | 3.24 | 4,117,729 | 2.24 |
| 5. Commercial | 134,691,895 | 137,143,250 | 2,451,355 | 1.82 | 1,797,941 | 0.49 |
| 6. Industrial | 31,759,780 | 33,684,069 | 1,924,289 | 6.06 | 1,639,245 | 0.9 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 26,519,472 | 27,601,326 | 1,081,854 | 4.08 | 1,359,418 | -1.05 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 192,971,147 | 198,428,645 | 5,457,498 | 2.83 | 3,437,186 | 1.05 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 604,380,644 | 623,165,656 | 18,785,012 | 3.11 | 8,914,333 | 1.63 |
| 11. Irrigated | 518,783,839 | 591,375,689 | 72,591,850 | 13.99 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 70,902,994 | 75,503,111 | 4,600,117 | 6.49 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 8,822,207 | 11,252,578 | 2,430,371 | 27.55 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 858,428 | 926,480 | 68,052 | 7.93 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 122,075 | 122,075 | -66,262 | -54.28 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 599,489,543 | 679,113,671 | 79,624,128 | 13.28 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,203,870,187 | 1,302,279,327 | 98,409,140 | 8.17 | 8,914,333 | 7.43 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
## 2007 Plan of Assessment for York County Assessment Years 2007-2008,2008-2009,2009-2010 <br> Filed with York County Board

Assessment levels for the year 2007 for York County are 99 \% for Residential, $99 \%$ for Commercial and Industrial and 73\% for Agricultural.

Real property in the County of York as per the 2007 County Abstract total $\$ 1,206,022,134$ for 9765 total parcels.

| Residential | 5077 | $\$ 367,267,888$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Commercial | 913 | $\$ 135,653,571$ |
| Industrial | 20 | $\$ 31,759,780$ |
| Recreational | 24 | $\$ 874,307$ |
| TIF | 452 | $\$ 26,518,303$ |
| Exempt | 533 |  |
| Agricultural | 3731 | $\$ 670,466,591$ |

266,371.64 acres irrigated
47,496.72 acres dry
23,727.37 acres grass
3,357.63 acres waste
197.42 acres other

The Assessor's office has a staff of assessor, deputy, real estate clerk and general clerk. All pickup work is done by the staff and no outside companies are used except for the ethanol plant update every two years. This plant is so unique that I as the assessor donot feel comfortable placing a value onthat property. This plant will be updated for the tax year 2008 and another plant is in the process of construction and will be added as necessary.

Cadastral maps are kept current by the real estate clerk as well as all transfers of ownership and splits in property descriptions. The deputy is also maintaining those changes of ownership in the GIS program.

I maintain a sales file for all property sold in the county and develop the depreciation study for each year of revaluation. A percentage factor is not generally used to determine vaslue of property. Market value and comparison property is the method used to value property. The county uses Terra Scan computer service to develop the CAMA package. The assessor's office is currently bringing the GIS aerial map making up to date and making changes in the property lines. The SANBORN company did not get all property lines transferred from the Cadastral maps correctly. This is a time consuming process. The GIS hard drive crashed the first part of July 2007 and we lost all changes to the image data. Terra Scan has created a backup program for saving the image or map data.

For 2007-2008 commercial and industrial property will be kept current with the market. Currently there aren't any transactions in that market. There is some e new construction that will have to be put on the tax roll. Properties in Henderson and Waco will be updated with new pictures and measurements where necessary. After the protests for 2007, I see that the houses constructed after 1995 need to be updated and equalized. Agricultural property will be checked and we are beginning to draw a sketch of the improvements on all sites. Letters were sent to all properties with improvements in July 2007. They were asked to check the list of improvements and make any corrections.

Letters were sent to property owners in Gresham, Benedict, and Thayer asking for any updates done to their property. These villages will be updated for 2008. This will be the first tier of the county contacted for my examination of the county per the new statute. This would be 12-1,12-2,12-3 and 12-4,the villages of Gresham, Benedict, and Thayer.

The examination will include the letters sent for verification of the properties a visual examination of the improvements and also a visual of the agricultural properties both by FSA map and drive by.

For 2009 the office is hoping to have the GIS corrections all made and available to the public on the WEB. Agricultural building sites will be updated and sketches made for the property record card. The new ethanol plant at Bradshaw should be in construction and will be added to the tax roll as it is built. The next tier of the county, 11-1,11-2,11-3.11-4 will be contacted by letter. This will be the villages of Waco and Bradshaw.

For the tax year 2010, the third tier will be examined. This would be $10-1,10-2,10-3$, and $10-4$. The City of York will be included in this tier along with the 2009 examination.

In any of the years, properties will be updated by the sales of that type of property. Office staff will be kept updated on the changes of the laws and policies and procedures sent down by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue.

This is the three year plan of assessment required by law to be submitted to the County Board pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263 Section 9.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for York County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | 1 |
|  | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | 2 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | \$212,074 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | N/A-Part of total general budget |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | \$212,074 |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | \$4,000 for the revaluation of ethanol plants |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | \$1,000 |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | N/A |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | N/A |
|  |  |


| 13. | Total budget |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | $\$ 212,074$ |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | Yes, A minimal amount |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | TerraScan |
| 2. | CAMA software |
|  | TerraScan |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
|  | Yes |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | The Assessor's Office |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | Yes |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | Assessor |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | TerraScan |
|  |  |

## 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? |
|  | Benedict, Bradshaw, Gresham, Henderson, McCool Junction, Waco, and York. |


| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 2001 |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | None |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | The County contracts through TerraScan for administrative, CAMA, and GIS <br> packages. |

## 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 York County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875227.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


[^0]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7.

