

Table of Contents

2009 Commission Summary

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions
 - VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

Commercial Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

Preliminary Statistics
Agricultural Assessment Actions
Agricultural Assessment Survey
R&O Statistics
2009 Special Valuation Methodology

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

Agricultural or Special Valuation Land

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
- III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
- IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
- V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
- VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
- VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

County Reports

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
2009 County Agricultural Land Detail
2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification**Maps**

Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM
Geo Codes
Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2009 Commission Summary

04 Banner

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	7	COD	25.72
Total Sales Price	\$525,480	PRD	109.49
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$525,480	COV	34.12
Total Assessed Value	\$427,430	STD	30.39
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$75,069	Avg. Absolute Deviation	19.43
Avg. Assessed Value	\$61,061	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$32,337
Median	76	Wgt. Mean	81
Mean	89	Max	150
Min	62.45		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	62.45 to 149.88
95% Mean C.I	60.95 to 117.17
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	60.36 to 102.32

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.18
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.45
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	14.06

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	6	84	36.48	87.06
2007	7	93	25.1	99.91
2006	8	54	31	104.51
2005	8	64	31.65	108.51

2009 Commission Summary

04 Banner

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	0	COD	0.00
Total Sales Price	\$0	PRD	0.00
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$0	COV	0.00
Total Assessed Value	\$0	STD	0.00
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$0	Avg. Absolute Deviation	0.00
Avg. Assessed Value	\$0	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$20,007
Median	0	Wgt. Mean	0
Mean	0	Max	0
Min	0		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	0.14
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.00
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.00

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	0	0	0	0
2007	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0

2009 Commission Summary

04 Banner

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	41	COD	21.17
Total Sales Price	\$7,060,384	PRD	110.03
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,060,384	COV	26.28
Total Assessed Value	\$4,579,356	STD	18.75
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$172,204	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.05
Avg. Assessed Value	\$111,692	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$77,509
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	65
Mean	71	Max	108.57
Min	44.08		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	59.97 to 78.03
95% Mean C.I	65.62 to 77.10
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	58.40 to 71.32

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	89.62
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.54
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.94

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	47	70	21.07	107.21
2007	36	70	19.65	104.23
2006	36	76	17.97	102.86
2005	29	80	18.94	110.35

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Banner County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within this Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. The resource used regarding the quality of assessment for each class of real property in this county are the performance standards issued by the International Association of Assessing Officers (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 Banner County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Banner County is not 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 Banner County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Banner County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Banner County is 71.15% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Banner County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	66	COV:	53.92	95% Median C.I.:	30.00 to 169.70
TOTAL Sales Price:	375,480	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	44.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.90 to 116.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	375,480	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.00	95% Mean C.I.:	41.45 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	311,165						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,640	COD:	42.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	169.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,452	PRD:	99.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:03

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	65.82	65.82	65.82			65.82	65.82	N/A		980	645
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	66.36	66.36	66.36			66.36	66.36	N/A		57,000	37,826
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	30.00	30.00	30.00			30.00	30.00	N/A		5,000	1,500
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	77.46	77.46	77.46			77.46	77.46	N/A		95,000	73,586
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	169.70	169.70	169.70			169.70	169.70	N/A		42,000	71,273
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08												
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	84.77	84.77	71.99	26.33	117.75	62.45	107.08	N/A		87,750	63,167
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	65.82	54.06	63.47	18.41	85.18	30.00	66.36	N/A		20,993	13,323
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	92.27	104.17	86.78	37.08	120.04	62.45	169.70	N/A		78,125	67,798
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	77.46	92.39	103.07	60.12	89.64	30.00	169.70	N/A		47,333	48,786
____ALL____												
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70		53,640	44,452

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	138.39	138.39	140.16	22.62	98.74	107.08	169.70	N/A		39,750	55,714
HARRISBURG	3	65.82	54.06	63.47	18.41	85.18	30.00	66.36	N/A		20,993	13,323
RURAL	2	69.96	69.96	68.57	10.73	102.02	62.45	77.46	N/A		116,500	79,883
____ALL____												
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70		53,640	44,452

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	5	66.36	87.79	106.26	54.54	82.62	30.00	169.70	N/A		28,496	30,279
3	2	69.96	69.96	68.57	10.73	102.02	62.45	77.46	N/A		116,500	79,883
____ALL____												
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70		53,640	44,452

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	4	92.27	104.17	86.78	37.08	120.04	62.45	169.70	N/A		78,125	67,798
2	3	65.82	54.06	63.47	18.41	85.18	30.00	66.36	N/A		20,993	13,323
____ALL____												
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70		53,640	44,452

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	66	COV:	53.92	95% Median C.I.:	30.00 to 169.70
TOTAL Sales Price:	375,480	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	44.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.90 to 116.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	375,480	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.00	95% Mean C.I.:	41.45 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	311,165						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,640	COD:	42.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	169.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,452	PRD:	99.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:04

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452
06											
07											
ALL	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452
17-0009											
62-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	4	66.09	67.32	79.74	29.36	84.41	30.00	107.08	N/A	25,120	20,031
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	77.46	77.46	77.46			77.46	77.46	N/A	95,000	73,586
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
1995 TO 1999	1	169.70	169.70	169.70			169.70	169.70	N/A	42,000	71,273
2000 TO Present											
ALL	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	66	COV:	53.92	95% Median C.I.:	30.00 to 169.70
TOTAL Sales Price:	375,480	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	44.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.90 to 116.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	375,480	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.00	95% Mean C.I.:	41.45 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	311,165						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,640	COD:	42.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	169.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,452	PRD:	99.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:04

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	65.82	65.82	65.82			65.82	65.82	N/A	980	645
5000 TO 9999	1	30.00	30.00	30.00			30.00	30.00	N/A	5,000	1,500
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	47.91	47.91	35.87	37.38	133.57	30.00	65.82	N/A	2,990	1,072
30000 TO 59999	3	107.08	114.38	109.34	32.17	104.61	66.36	169.70	N/A	45,500	49,751
60000 TO 99999	1	77.46	77.46	77.46			77.46	77.46	N/A	95,000	73,586
100000 TO 149999	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
ALL											
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	47.91	47.91	35.87	37.38	133.57	30.00	65.82	N/A	2,990	1,072
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	47.91	47.91	35.87	37.38	133.57	30.00	65.82	N/A	2,990	1,072
30000 TO 59999	2	86.72	86.72	82.52	23.48	105.09	66.36	107.08	N/A	47,250	38,990
60000 TO 99999	3	77.46	103.20	84.01	46.15	122.84	62.45	169.70	N/A	91,666	77,013
ALL											
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	66.09	67.32	79.74	29.36	84.41	30.00	107.08	N/A	25,120	20,031
20	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
30	2	123.58	123.58	105.74	37.32	116.88	77.46	169.70	N/A	68,500	72,429
ALL											
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	66.09	67.32	79.74	29.36	84.41	30.00	107.08	N/A	25,120	20,031
100	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
101	1	77.46	77.46	77.46			77.46	77.46	N/A	95,000	73,586
106	1	169.70	169.70	169.70			169.70	169.70	N/A	42,000	71,273
ALL											
	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	66	COV:	53.92	95% Median C.I.:	30.00 to 169.70
TOTAL Sales Price:	375,480	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	44.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.90 to 116.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	375,480	MEAN:	83	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.00	95% Mean C.I.:	41.45 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	311,165						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,640	COD:	42.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	169.70		
AVG. Assessed Value:	44,452	PRD:	99.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:04

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	4	66.09	67.32	79.74	29.36	84.41	30.00	107.08	N/A	25,120	20,031
30	3	77.46	103.20	84.01	46.15	122.84	62.45	169.70	N/A	91,666	77,013
ALL	7	66.36	82.70	82.87	42.19	99.79	30.00	169.70	30.00 to 169.70	53,640	44,452

**Banner County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the
following property classes/subclasses:**

Residential

Completed pickup work. All residential property within Range 56 West was reviewed for assessment year 2009.

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	The Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	September, 2007
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	The last market-derived depreciation schedule was developed in 2002.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The Cost Approach.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	Two
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By location: Harrisburg and Rural
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes, “Assessor Location” would be a usable valuation grouping.
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	No.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, dwellings on both agricultural and rural residential parcels are valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market. That is, both are valued using the same cost index and market-derived depreciation schedule.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	4	0	4

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	34.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.45 to 149.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	525,480	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.36 to 102.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	525,480	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.43	95% Mean C.I.:	60.95 to 117.17
TOTAL Assessed Value:	427,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,068	COD:	25.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.88		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,061	PRD:	109.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	62.45		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:35

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	73.98	73.98	73.98			73.98	73.98	N/A	980	725
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	72.52	72.52	73.91	4.14	98.12	69.52	75.52	N/A	106,000	78,343
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	84.98	84.98	84.98			84.98	84.98	N/A	95,000	80,734
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	149.88	149.88	149.88			149.88	149.88	N/A	42,000	62,950
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	84.77	84.77	71.99	26.33	117.75	62.45	107.08	N/A	87,750	63,167
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	73.98	73.01	73.91	2.70	98.78	69.52	75.52	N/A	70,993	52,470
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	96.03	101.10	86.41	28.51	117.00	62.45	149.88	N/A	78,125	67,504
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	117.43	117.43	104.88	27.63	111.97	84.98	149.88	N/A	68,500	71,842
____ALL____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HARRISBURG	4	90.53	100.12	104.35	31.33	95.94	69.52	149.88	N/A	34,370	35,864
RURAL	3	75.52	74.32	73.19	9.94	101.54	62.45	84.98	N/A	129,333	94,658
____ALL____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	4	90.53	100.12	104.35	31.33	95.94	69.52	149.88	N/A	34,370	35,864
3	3	75.52	74.32	73.19	9.94	101.54	62.45	84.98	N/A	129,333	94,658
____ALL____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	5	84.98	95.98	82.80	28.00	115.92	62.45	149.88	N/A	93,500	77,415
2	2	71.75	71.75	69.59	3.11	103.10	69.52	73.98	N/A	28,990	20,175
____ALL____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	34.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.45 to 149.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	525,480	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.36 to 102.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	525,480	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.43	95% Mean C.I.:	60.95 to 117.17
TOTAL Assessed Value:	427,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,068	COD:	25.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.88		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,061	PRD:	109.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	62.45		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:35

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061
06											
07											
ALL	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061
17-0009											
62-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	73.98	83.53	84.32	16.92	99.06	69.52	107.08	N/A	31,826	26,835
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	80.25	80.25	79.12	5.89	101.43	75.52	84.98	N/A	125,000	98,897
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
1995 TO 1999	1	149.88	149.88	149.88			149.88	149.88	N/A	42,000	62,950
2000 TO Present											
ALL	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	34.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.45 to 149.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	525,480	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.36 to 102.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	525,480	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.43	95% Mean C.I.:	60.95 to 117.17
TOTAL Assessed Value:	427,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,068	COD:	25.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.88		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,061	PRD:	109.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	62.45		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:35

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	1	73.98	73.98	73.98			73.98	73.98	N/A	980	725
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	73.98	73.98	73.98			73.98	73.98	N/A	980	725
30000 TO 59999	3	107.08	108.83	104.56	25.02	104.08	69.52	149.88	N/A	45,500	47,577
60000 TO 99999	1	84.98	84.98	84.98			84.98	84.98	N/A	95,000	80,734
100000 TO 149999	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
150000 TO 249999	1	75.52	75.52	75.52			75.52	75.52	N/A	155,000	117,060
ALL _____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	1	73.98	73.98	73.98			73.98	73.98	N/A	980	725
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	73.98	73.98	73.98			73.98	73.98	N/A	980	725
30000 TO 59999	2	88.30	88.30	84.42	21.27	104.59	69.52	107.08	N/A	47,250	39,890
60000 TO 99999	3	84.98	99.10	83.59	34.29	118.56	62.45	149.88	N/A	91,666	76,621
100000 TO 149999	1	75.52	75.52	75.52			75.52	75.52	N/A	155,000	117,060
ALL _____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	73.98	83.53	84.32	16.92	99.06	69.52	107.08	N/A	31,826	26,835
20	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
30	3	84.98	103.46	89.30	29.17	115.86	75.52	149.88	N/A	97,333	86,914
ALL _____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	73.98	83.53	84.32	16.92	99.06	69.52	107.08	N/A	31,826	26,835
100	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	138,000	86,180
101	2	80.25	80.25	79.12	5.89	101.43	75.52	84.98	N/A	125,000	98,897
106	1	149.88	149.88	149.88			149.88	149.88	N/A	42,000	62,950
ALL _____											
	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	34.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.45 to 149.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	525,480	WGT. MEAN:	81	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.36 to 102.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	525,480	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.43	95% Mean C.I.:	60.95 to 117.17
TOTAL Assessed Value:	427,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,068	COD:	25.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.88		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,061	PRD:	109.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	62.45		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:35

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	3	73.98	83.53	84.32	16.92	99.06	69.52	107.08	N/A	31,826	26,835
30	4	80.25	93.21	80.68	30.18	115.53	62.45	149.88	N/A	107,500	86,731
ALL	7	75.52	89.06	81.34	25.72	109.49	62.45	149.88	62.45 to 149.88	75,068	61,061

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Statistical analysis of seven qualified residential sales will be provided by the following tables. However, due to the small sample size and no other statistical evidence (Table VIII is meaningless for seven sales), it cannot be shown that the County has not complied with the level of value for the residential property class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	8	7	87.50
2008	6	6	100.00
2007	7	7	100.00
2006	10	8	80.00
2005	8	8	100.00

RESIDENTIAL:As Table II shows, the County consistently uses as many qualified residential sales as possible for the sales study. This is due to the Assessor's sales review and qualification process: All residential, commercial and agricultural sales with documentary tax stamps are verified by a mailed questionnaire to both the buyer and the seller of the property. Approximately 50-60% of the questionnaires are returned. For those questionnaires not returned, the Assessor and her staff rely on personal and taxpayer knowledge to aid in the qualification process. As shown above, this results in a substantial quantity of qualified sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	66	8.45	72	76
2008	78.23	2.48	80	83.92
2007	88	60.67	141	93
2006	54	0.00	54	54
2005	63	-0.39	62	64

RESIDENTIAL: With more than four points difference between the Trended Preliminary and the R&O medians, there is little correlation between the two figures.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 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 2008 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.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
-1.15	2009	8.45
7.32	2008	3.72
5.76	2007	60.67
0.00	2006	0.00
3.53	2005	-0.39

RESIDENTIAL: The absolute difference between the percent change to the sales file compared to the percent change to the residential base is 9.60 points, and appears to be substantial. However, a review of the 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address residential property may provide a clue to the difference: As well as completing pickup work, all residential property within Range 56 West was reviewed for assessment year 2009. This action would have a much larger effect on the residential base, than it would on the sales file, since only one rural residential sale is within Range 56 West.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	76	81	89

RESIDENTIAL:None of the three measures of central tendency is within acceptable range. Seven total qualified residential sales mean that trimming the file of outliers is pointless. The four sales within Harrisburg have the following assessed to sale price ratios: 69.52, 73.98, 107.08, and 149.88. The three rural residential sales reveal these assessed to sale price ratios: 62.45, 75.52 (the median), and 84.98. Needless to say, none of the seven sales ratios are within acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	25.72	109.49
Difference	10.72	6.49

RESIDENTIAL: According to the data displayed in Table VI, neither qualitative statistic meets standard recommendations.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	7	7	0
Median	66	76	10
Wgt. Mean	83	81	-2
Mean	83	89	6
COD	42.19	25.72	-16.47
PRD	99.79	109.49	9.70
Minimum	30.00	62.45	32.45
Maximum	169.70	149.88	-19.82

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

In order to be meaningful, statistical inferences must be based on a representative and proportionate sample of the population. If the sales are representative of the population and the sales have been appraised in a similar manner to the unsold properties, statistical inferences should be substantially the same as statistics developed from actual assessed value. This comparison is to provide additional information to the analyst in determining the reliability of the statistical inference.

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	7	7	0
Median	76	119	-43
Wgt. Mean	81	115	-34
Mean	89	121	-32
COD	25.72	7.85	17.87
PRD	109.49	104.96	4.53
Minimum	62.45	67.73	-5.28
Maximum	149.88	190.88	-41.00

Table VIII is a comparison of the R&O statistical profile (that uses the reported assessed values) to statistics generated by using the assessed value in place for the year prior to the same sale. This value is then trended by the annual percent change in the assessed base (excluding growth) for the successive years through assessment year 2009. Any county that had a number of residential sales significantly above 250 was represented in the Trended Ratio Analysis by selecting 250 sales that reflected both the composition of sales contained in the sales file and the calculated estimate of the residential population.

Since there were only seven residential sales, all were trended by the above method. As summarized in the above table, there is no correlation between the R&O and the Trended statistics. In fact, further review of each ratio indicates that there is one A/S ratio below acceptable range at 67.73, and the remaining six A/S ratios are above the upper limit of acceptable range.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	0	MEDIAN:	0	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	0	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	0	MEAN:	0	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	0						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	0	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	0.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	0	PRD:	0.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:09

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08											
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	0	MEDIAN:	0	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	0	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	0	MEAN:	0	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	0						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	0	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	0.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	0	PRD:	0.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:09

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001											
17-0009											
62-0021											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	0	MEDIAN:	0	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	0	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	0	MEAN:	0	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	0						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	0	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	0.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	0	PRD:	0.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:09

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03											
04											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

Banner County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial

The one rural commercial property that exists in Range 56 West was reviewed for 2009—this property is a “junkyard.”

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Office staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	The Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	September, 2007
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2002
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?
	It is not known by the Assessor when and if the Income Approach was ever used to establish the market value for commercial property.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The Cost Approach.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	Two
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By location: Harrisburg and Rural
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	"Assessor Location" would be a usable valuation grouping.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	None of the aforementioned subclasses exist in Banner County.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	0	0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	0	MEDIAN:	0	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	0	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	0	MEAN:	0	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	0						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	0	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	0.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	0	PRD:	0.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:42

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08											
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	_____										
	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	0	MEDIAN:	0	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	0	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	0	MEAN:	0	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	0						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	0	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	0.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	0	PRD:	0.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:42

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001											
17-0009											
62-0021											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	0	MEDIAN:	0	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	0	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	0	MEAN:	0	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	0						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	0	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	0.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	0	PRD:	0.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00		

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:42

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03											
04											
____ALL____	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0	0

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Again, only one commercial sale occurred during the sales study period, and this was not qualified because it included a residential parcel and no separate breakdown of the sale price for either component of the transaction.

With the lack of any qualified commercial sales, there is no available statistical evidence to suggest that Banner County is not in compliance with the level of value or recommended quality of assessment for the commercial property class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	1	0	0.00
2008	1	0	0.00
2007	1	0	0.00
2006	0	0	
2005	0	0	0.00

COMMERCIAL: There was only one commercial transaction that occurred within the parameters of the sales study (July 14, 2005). It was not deemed qualified by the Assessor since it was comprised of both a residential and a commercial component. No price breakdown for the two types of property was provided.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	0	0.00	0	0
2008	0	26.80	0	0
2007	0	0.00	0	0
2006	0	0.00	0	0
2005	0	0.00	0	0

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 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 2008 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.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0.00	2009	0.00
0.00	2008	42.96
0.00	2007	0.00
0.00	2006	0.00
0.00	2005	0.00

COMMERCIAL:No analysis is possible, since there were no qualified commercial sales, nor were assessment actions taken to address this property class for assessment year 2009.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	0	0	0

COMMERCIAL:There were no qualified commercial sales that occurred during the timeframe of the sales study, and thus there is no available statistical evidence that would suggest that Banner County is not in compliance with overall level of value for this property class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	0.00	0.00
Difference	0.00	-98.00

COMMERCIAL: Since there were no qualified commercial sales that occurred during the timeframe of the sale study, there is no available statistical evidence to suggest that the County quality of assessment does not meet the recommended standards for the COD and the PRD.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	0	0	0
Median	0	0	0
Wgt. Mean	0	0	0
Mean	0	0	0
COD	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maximum	0.00	0.00	0.00

COMMERCIAL:No assessment actions were taken to address the very small commercial property class within Banner County for 2009. No qualified commercial sales occurred during the timeframe of the sales study period.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.87	95% Median C.I.:	57.46 to 76.17	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,448,804	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.73 to 69.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,448,804	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.10	95% Mean C.I.:	63.16 to 73.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,754,759							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,528	COD:	21.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,661	PRD:	107.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.84			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:27

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	42.80	42.80	42.80			42.80	42.80	N/A	25,000	10,700
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	65.33	63.81	55.65	18.76	114.65	45.64	78.22	45.64 to 78.22	225,362	125,421
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	95.25	93.44	94.59	12.07	98.78	71.76	108.57	71.76 to 108.57	140,994	133,373
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	83.16	83.16	83.16			83.16	83.16	N/A	112,000	93,144
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	73.89	73.35	60.37	23.80	121.49	54.06	91.55	N/A	403,775	243,767
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	71.21	71.99	72.59	7.92	99.17	59.23	86.19	59.23 to 86.19	149,488	108,519
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	50.54	53.64	50.71	22.09	105.77	36.84	76.77	N/A	149,572	75,852
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	71.86	62.56	71.34	16.86	87.70	45.09	77.96	N/A	37,637	26,850
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	82.02	82.02	81.10	20.28	101.13	65.39	98.65	N/A	63,500	51,501
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	52.83	57.51	52.87	20.16	108.78	44.37	82.36	44.37 to 82.36	156,393	82,680
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	75.94	74.26	67.85	21.83	109.44	42.80	108.57	54.75 to 92.56	178,257	120,954
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	69.37	67.57	62.68	18.56	107.81	36.84	91.55	54.06 to 83.16	207,140	129,830
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	64.68	63.22	58.50	21.51	108.07	44.37	98.65	45.10 to 77.96	96,427	56,410
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	76.17	76.19	65.63	20.23	116.10	45.64	108.57	56.75 to 91.55	230,314	151,148
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	69.37	63.82	64.22	16.77	99.38	36.84	86.19	45.10 to 76.54	116,616	74,891
<u>ALL</u>											
	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.87	95% Median C.I.:	57.46 to 76.17	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,448,804	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.73 to 69.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,448,804	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.10	95% Mean C.I.:	63.16 to 73.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,754,759							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,528	COD:	21.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,661	PRD:	107.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.84			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:27

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1951	2	51.28	51.28	57.27	12.05	89.55	45.10	57.46	N/A		386,352	221,252
1953	1	44.08	44.08	44.08			44.08	44.08	N/A		259,312	114,293
1955	2	43.69	43.69	46.85	15.68	93.25	36.84	50.54	N/A		168,276	78,844
2223	1	77.96	77.96	77.96			77.96	77.96	N/A		83,840	65,362
2225	3	71.86	63.53	70.03	15.37	90.73	42.80	75.94	N/A		54,725	38,322
2229	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A		24,000	16,330
2231	1	48.23	48.23	48.23			48.23	48.23	N/A		256,000	123,481
2233	6	74.72	75.59	71.76	18.53	105.35	54.06	108.57	54.06 to 108.57		289,304	207,590
2235	1	86.19	86.19	86.19			86.19	86.19	N/A		157,000	135,318
2237	2	81.67	81.67	79.89	20.80	102.22	64.68	98.65	N/A		67,000	53,526
2239	6	74.49	70.09	69.31	14.66	101.13	47.97	90.31	47.97 to 90.31		89,437	61,989
2241	3	97.94	87.89	76.56	17.31	114.80	57.43	108.30	N/A		115,912	88,743
2243	1	82.36	82.36	82.36			82.36	82.36	N/A		62,075	51,128
2245	6	51.91	56.58	53.08	19.69	106.60	44.37	73.91	44.37 to 73.91		304,331	161,532
2511	1	45.09	45.09	45.09			45.09	45.09	N/A		12,245	5,521
2515	1	76.77	76.77	76.77			76.77	76.77	N/A		96,000	73,697
2517	3	69.37	73.72	76.04	16.02	96.95	59.23	92.56	N/A		110,408	83,955
2519	3	83.16	82.69	80.66	7.29	102.52	73.37	91.55	N/A		82,166	66,276
2521	1	65.39	65.39	65.39			65.39	65.39	N/A		67,000	43,814
ALL												
	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17		165,528	105,661

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17		165,528	105,661
ALL												
	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17		165,528	105,661

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17		165,528	105,661
ALL												
	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17		165,528	105,661

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.87	95% Median C.I.:	57.46 to 76.17	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,448,804	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.73 to 69.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,448,804	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.10	95% Mean C.I.:	63.16 to 73.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,754,759							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,528	COD:	21.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,661	PRD:	107.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.84			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:27

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)											
04-0001	44	71.49	69.08	63.86	20.77	108.16	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.54	169,012	107,937
17-0009	1	45.09	45.09	45.09			45.09	45.09	N/A	12,245	5,521
62-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
10.01 TO 30.00	1	45.09	45.09	45.09			45.09	45.09	N/A	12,245	5,521
30.01 TO 50.00	2	43.95	43.95	43.55	2.62	100.92	42.80	45.10	N/A	18,552	8,079
50.01 TO 100.00	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	24,000	16,330
100.01 TO 180.00	10	68.63	67.50	63.74	14.98	105.91	36.84	91.55	59.23 to 76.54	58,272	37,141
180.01 TO 330.00	13	78.22	80.99	80.18	11.65	101.01	56.75	108.30	73.37 to 92.56	91,199	73,127
330.01 TO 650.00	11	50.54	61.60	57.37	28.72	107.39	44.08	97.94	44.37 to 90.31	184,314	105,732
650.01 +	7	57.46	68.27	62.34	27.73	109.51	45.64	108.57	45.64 to 108.57	511,381	318,803
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
DRY	7	75.94	70.20	69.86	21.79	100.49	45.09	97.94	45.09 to 97.94	77,354	54,042
DRY-N/A	8	73.09	71.86	69.05	9.11	104.07	44.37	86.19	44.37 to 86.19	94,241	65,071
GRASS	21	64.68	65.25	62.82	25.88	103.87	36.84	108.57	48.23 to 78.22	189,372	118,961
GRASS-N/A	7	68.04	70.88	60.45	18.95	117.27	54.06	108.30	54.06 to 108.30	279,050	168,678
IRRGTD-N/A	2	75.90	75.90	79.27	21.96	95.74	59.23	92.56	N/A	111,612	88,474
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
DRY	9	75.94	72.33	73.51	18.83	98.39	45.09	97.94	47.97 to 91.55	88,275	64,894
DRY-N/A	6	72.33	69.22	62.85	9.06	110.13	44.37	77.96	44.37 to 77.96	83,488	52,469
GRASS	24	65.04	66.84	62.42	25.99	107.07	36.84	108.57	49.07 to 78.22	200,267	125,012
GRASS-N/A	4	63.40	65.60	60.39	15.54	108.62	54.06	81.53	N/A	280,938	169,660
IRRGTD	1	59.23	59.23	59.23			59.23	59.23	N/A	89,000	52,712
IRRGTD-N/A	1	92.56	92.56	92.56			92.56	92.56	N/A	134,225	124,236
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.87	95% Median C.I.:	57.46 to 76.17	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,448,804	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.73 to 69.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,448,804	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.10	95% Mean C.I.:	63.16 to 73.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,754,759							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	165,528	COD:	21.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	105,661	PRD:	107.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.84			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:27

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	15	73.37	71.08	69.39	15.60	102.44	44.37	97.94	56.75 to 77.96	86,360	59,924
GRASS	28	65.04	66.66	62.04	24.45	107.45	36.84	108.57	54.06 to 76.77	211,791	131,390
IRRGTD	2	75.90	75.90	79.27	21.96	95.74	59.23	92.56	N/A	111,612	88,474
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	4	45.10	50.26	51.82	14.00	96.98	42.80	68.04	N/A	18,337	9,502
30000 TO 59999	8	76.36	79.43	78.82	12.08	100.77	59.97	108.30	59.97 to 108.30	44,415	35,009
60000 TO 99999	11	73.37	69.63	68.69	15.71	101.37	36.84	98.65	56.75 to 82.36	80,365	55,200
100000 TO 149999	6	79.55	81.79	82.32	11.86	99.35	69.37	97.94	69.37 to 97.94	111,523	91,806
150000 TO 249999	8	53.99	63.43	61.78	28.60	102.67	44.37	90.31	44.37 to 90.31	191,124	118,068
250000 TO 499999	4	46.94	61.63	61.23	35.73	100.65	44.08	108.57	N/A	287,940	176,307
500000 +	4	56.11	59.37	58.46	8.85	101.56	54.06	71.21	N/A	696,555	407,211
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	45.10	45.10	45.09	0.01	100.00	45.09	45.10	N/A	12,174	5,490
1 TO 9999	2	45.10	45.10	45.09	0.01	100.00	45.09	45.10	N/A	12,174	5,490
10000 TO 29999	3	68.04	60.90	62.12	14.24	98.04	42.80	71.86	N/A	28,000	17,393
30000 TO 59999	14	74.49	73.39	69.89	18.81	105.00	36.84	108.30	59.23 to 91.55	59,785	41,786
60000 TO 99999	10	73.64	69.46	66.31	10.99	104.74	44.37	83.16	47.97 to 77.96	114,580	75,983
100000 TO 149999	9	57.43	67.51	62.15	32.17	108.62	44.08	97.94	48.23 to 92.56	196,109	121,880
150000 TO 249999	2	67.97	67.97	60.10	32.86	113.11	45.64	90.31	N/A	262,600	157,809
250000 TO 499999	5	57.46	69.21	63.06	24.70	109.76	54.06	108.57	N/A	613,494	386,841
ALL	45	71.21	68.54	63.83	21.21	107.38	36.84	108.57	57.46 to 76.17	165,528	105,661

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	52	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	29.69	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 75.94	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,742,682	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.41 to 69.37	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,742,682	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.60	95% Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 75.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,541,957							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	168,128	COD:	21.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	144.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	106,576	PRD:	110.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:37

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	42.80	42.80	42.80			42.80	42.80	N/A		25,000	10,700
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	71.98	71.98	72.64			71.98	71.98	N/A		65,650	47,690
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	70.48	64.55	58.40	15.45	110.52	45.64	78.22	49.07 to 76.17		238,675	139,395
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	92.56	92.10	93.91	11.96	98.07	71.76	108.57	71.76 to 108.57		131,388	123,384
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	83.16	83.16	83.16			83.16	83.16	N/A		112,000	93,144
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	90.31	87.56	60.61	27.57	144.48	54.06	144.44	N/A		323,920	196,313
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	71.21	71.47	72.83	7.59	98.14	59.23	86.19	65.06 to 76.54		152,993	111,421
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	50.54	53.64	50.71	22.09	105.77	36.84	76.77	N/A		149,572	75,852
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	58.48	58.22	46.71	27.34	124.63	36.50	77.96	36.50 to 77.96		110,411	51,577
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	82.02	82.02	81.10	20.28	101.13	65.39	98.65	N/A		63,500	51,501
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	52.83	57.51	52.87	20.16	108.78	44.37	82.36	44.37 to 82.36		156,393	82,680
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	74.93	74.47	68.91	19.73	108.06	42.80	108.57	56.75 to 84.04		175,469	120,924
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	70.29	71.62	63.71	21.56	112.43	36.84	144.44	59.23 to 76.77		192,820	122,838
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	61.06	61.31	52.58	24.45	116.60	36.50	98.65	45.09 to 77.96		123,416	64,896
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	77.19	79.39	66.53	22.06	119.33	45.64	144.44	57.46 to 91.55		218,154	145,134
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	68.71	63.04	60.69	17.46	103.88	36.50	86.19	50.54 to 73.37		139,363	84,576
____ALL____												
	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94		168,128	106,576

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	52	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	29.69	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 75.94	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,742,682	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.41 to 69.37	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,742,682	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.60	95% Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 75.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,541,957							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	168,128	COD:	21.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	144.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	106,576	PRD:	110.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:37

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1951	3	57.46	82.33	57.77	57.63	142.51	45.10	144.44	N/A	259,068	149,668
1953	1	44.08	44.08	44.08			44.08	44.08	N/A	259,312	114,293
1955	2	43.69	43.69	46.85	15.68	93.25	36.84	50.54	N/A	168,276	78,844
2223	1	77.96	77.96	77.96			77.96	77.96	N/A	83,840	65,362
2225	4	57.33	56.78	45.45	29.87	124.92	36.50	75.94	N/A	159,614	72,544
2229	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	24,000	16,330
2231	1	48.23	48.23	48.23			48.23	48.23	N/A	256,000	123,481
2233	7	71.21	74.86	71.92	16.81	104.09	54.06	108.57	54.06 to 108.57	297,285	213,818
2235	1	86.19	86.19	86.19			86.19	86.19	N/A	157,000	135,318
2237	2	81.67	81.67	79.89	20.80	102.22	64.68	98.65	N/A	67,000	53,526
2239	6	74.49	70.09	69.31	14.66	101.13	47.97	90.31	47.97 to 90.31	89,437	61,989
2241	4	84.96	83.91	75.94	22.61	110.50	57.43	108.30	N/A	103,347	78,480
2243	1	82.36	82.36	82.36			82.36	82.36	N/A	62,075	51,128
2245	6	51.91	56.58	53.08	19.69	106.60	44.37	73.91	44.37 to 73.91	304,331	161,532
2511	1	45.09	45.09	45.09			45.09	45.09	N/A	12,245	5,521
2515	1	76.77	76.77	76.77			76.77	76.77	N/A	96,000	73,697
2517	6	71.82	74.09	75.93	13.27	97.57	59.23	92.56	59.23 to 92.56	122,582	93,079
2519	3	83.16	82.69	80.66	7.29	102.52	73.37	91.55	N/A	82,166	66,276
2521	1	65.39	65.39	65.39			65.39	65.39	N/A	67,000	43,814
ALL											
	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
(blank)										Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576
ALL											
	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	71.98	67.45	60.39	14.26	111.70	36.50	84.04	N/A	248,875	150,284
2	47	71.21	70.08	63.89	22.68	109.70	36.84	144.44	59.23 to 76.17	159,538	101,926
ALL											
	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	52	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	29.69	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 75.94	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,742,682	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.41 to 69.37	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,742,682	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.60	95% Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 75.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,541,957							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	168,128	COD:	21.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	144.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	106,576	PRD:	110.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:37

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001	51	71.76	70.32	63.42	21.43	110.88	36.50	144.44	64.68 to 75.94	171,185	108,557
17-0009	1	45.09	45.09	45.09			45.09	45.09	N/A	12,245	5,521
62-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	94.77	94.77	71.79	52.42	132.01	45.09	144.44	N/A	8,372	6,010
30.01 TO 50.00	2	43.95	43.95	43.55	2.62	100.92	42.80	45.10	N/A	18,552	8,079
50.01 TO 100.00	2	70.01	70.01	71.41	2.81	98.04	68.04	71.98	N/A	44,825	32,010
100.01 TO 180.00	11	65.39	67.28	63.83	14.34	105.40	36.84	91.55	59.23 to 76.54	57,066	36,426
180.01 TO 330.00	14	79.88	81.21	80.53	11.11	100.85	56.75	108.30	73.37 to 92.56	89,953	72,436
330.01 TO 650.00	11	50.54	61.60	57.37	28.72	107.39	44.08	97.94	44.37 to 90.31	184,314	105,732
650.01 +	10	63.97	65.91	61.30	25.37	107.52	36.50	108.57	45.64 to 86.19	468,464	287,190
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	74.26	70.08	71.27	18.96	98.34	45.09	97.94	47.97 to 91.55	96,889	69,050
DRY-N/A	9	72.80	67.93	56.65	13.67	119.91	36.50	86.19	44.37 to 77.96	136,467	77,309
GRASS	23	65.39	69.51	63.33	29.92	109.76	36.84	144.44	49.07 to 82.36	176,307	111,658
GRASS-N/A	9	69.37	70.96	62.59	15.26	113.38	54.06	108.30	57.43 to 81.53	262,686	164,402
IRRGTD-N/A	2	75.90	75.90	79.27	21.96	95.74	59.23	92.56	N/A	111,612	88,474
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	11	74.26	71.84	73.53	17.08	97.71	45.09	97.94	47.97 to 91.55	102,273	75,201
DRY-N/A	7	71.86	64.54	50.25	14.84	128.45	36.50	77.96	36.50 to 77.96	139,315	70,003
GRASS	27	68.04	70.48	63.51	27.54	110.98	36.84	144.44	50.54 to 82.36	193,697	123,016
GRASS-N/A	5	69.37	66.87	61.07	12.11	109.51	54.06	81.53	N/A	237,881	145,266
IRRGTD	1	59.23	59.23	59.23			59.23	59.23	N/A	89,000	52,712
IRRGTD-N/A	1	92.56	92.56	92.56			92.56	92.56	N/A	134,225	124,236
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	52	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	29.69	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 75.94	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,742,682	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.41 to 69.37	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,742,682	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.60	95% Mean C.I.:	64.20 to 75.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,541,957							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	168,128	COD:	21.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	144.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	106,576	PRD:	110.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:16:37

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	18	73.09	69.00	62.72	16.55	110.02	36.50	97.94	56.75 to 76.54	116,678	73,179
GRASS	32	68.71	69.92	63.06	24.98	110.88	36.84	144.44	54.75 to 78.22	200,601	126,492
IRRGTD	2	75.90	75.90	79.27	21.96	95.74	59.23	92.56	N/A	111,612	88,474
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	144.44	144.44	144.44			144.44	144.44	N/A	4,500	6,500
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	144.44	144.44	144.44			144.44	144.44	N/A	4,500	6,500
10000 TO 29999	4	45.10	50.26	51.82	14.00	96.98	42.80	68.04	N/A	18,337	9,502
30000 TO 59999	9	76.17	77.83	77.28	12.39	100.72	59.97	108.30	65.06 to 91.55	44,480	34,372
60000 TO 99999	13	73.37	70.92	70.19	14.55	101.04	36.84	98.65	59.23 to 82.36	78,724	55,257
100000 TO 149999	6	79.55	81.79	82.32	11.86	99.35	69.37	97.94	69.37 to 97.94	111,523	91,806
150000 TO 249999	8	53.99	63.43	61.78	28.60	102.67	44.37	90.31	44.37 to 90.31	191,124	118,068
250000 TO 499999	7	48.23	61.11	59.62	37.64	102.49	36.50	108.57	36.50 to 108.57	322,391	192,215
500000 +	4	56.11	59.37	58.46	8.85	101.56	54.06	71.21	N/A	696,555	407,211
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	3	45.10	78.21	60.59	73.43	129.08	45.09	144.44	N/A	9,616	5,826
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	45.10	78.21	60.59	73.43	129.08	45.09	144.44	N/A	9,616	5,826
10000 TO 29999	4	66.55	61.94	63.15	12.04	98.09	42.80	71.86	N/A	32,250	20,364
30000 TO 59999	15	72.80	73.30	70.09	18.04	104.57	36.84	108.30	59.97 to 82.36	60,176	42,179
60000 TO 99999	11	73.91	70.78	67.51	11.20	104.85	44.37	84.04	47.97 to 83.16	110,868	74,844
100000 TO 149999	9	57.43	67.51	62.15	32.17	108.62	44.08	97.94	48.23 to 92.56	196,109	121,880
150000 TO 249999	4	59.95	61.68	54.84	34.37	112.47	36.50	90.31	N/A	321,250	176,178
250000 TO 499999	6	63.97	69.42	64.04	21.88	108.41	54.06	108.57	54.06 to 108.57	568,774	364,231
ALL	52	71.49	69.83	63.39	21.82	110.16	36.50	144.44	59.97 to 75.94	168,128	106,576

Banner County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural

For assessment year 2009, the Assessor implemented the 2008 soil conversion. Coupled with this was a complete review of the values and these were set to closer match 75% of the market.

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	The Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The Assessor
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	<p>Banner County makes the following distinctions between agricultural and rural residential land:</p> <p>“One of the following criteria will have to be met before the parcel will be classified as rural agland residential:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Income derived from the use of the land whether by animal or crop production. 2. Land enrolled in a federal or state program whereby payments are received for removing such land from agricultural production. 3. Land leased to another person for agricultural use. 4. Parcel is occupied by a person who owns or operates other land that qualifies as agricultural land. <p>“Owners of parcels less than 40 acres will be sent a questionnaire asking for the criteria that would apply for the rural agland classification. If no reply is received, the parcel will be classified as rural residential as of March 19th of each year. Owners will be notified that they may be asked to provide documentation to support their requested classification.</p> <p>Rural Residential Values: Rural Agland Residential Values: Home site: \$5,000 for one acre Home site: \$5,000 for one acre Remaining acres: \$500 per acre Farm site: \$500 per acre Remaining acres: Valued according to soil type & use.</p>
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	It is unknown when the last time the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of agricultural land.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	The soil survey is dated 1994, and the 2008 conversion was implemented for assessment year 2009.

8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	The county land use was completed three years ago (the cycle of land use and rural improvement review is three years—1/3 of the County per year).
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection and FSA maps.
b.	By whom?
	Office staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	Two-thirds of the land use study is complete at this time.
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	None
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	N/A
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes
a.	If yes, list.
	The land classes themselves are more appropriate for valuation: irrigated, dry and grass.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Between the acceptable range of 69 to 75% of market value.
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	0	0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.28	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 78.03	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,060,384	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 71.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,060,384	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.05	95% Mean C.I.:	65.62 to 77.10	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,579,356							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	172,204	COD:	21.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	111,691	PRD:	110.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.08			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:59

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	57.32	62.16	55.17	19.65	112.67	45.64	78.22	45.64 to 78.22	251,153	138,553
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	105.65	98.44	100.61	8.93	97.84	71.76	108.57	N/A	134,242	135,064
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	84.95	84.95	84.95			84.95	84.95	N/A	112,000	95,144
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	76.11	76.69	62.10	25.62	123.49	54.06	100.47	N/A	403,775	250,739
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	71.15	72.17	71.66	5.52	100.71	65.61	79.06	65.61 to 79.06	148,236	106,233
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	59.97	66.89	58.76	28.43	113.83	44.08	99.99	N/A	149,572	87,891
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	67.38	62.92	68.02	15.00	92.50	45.10	75.20	N/A	40,269	27,393
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	84.26	84.26	83.46	17.09	100.96	69.86	98.65	N/A	63,500	52,995
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	55.84	59.38	55.02	16.34	107.93	48.23	82.36	48.23 to 82.36	156,393	86,040
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	75.05	77.28	67.72	24.64	114.10	45.64	108.57	54.75 to 105.65	202,440	137,099
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	71.15	72.45	64.65	18.60	112.07	44.08	100.47	59.97 to 84.95	210,274	135,934
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	65.72	64.57	59.93	18.80	107.73	45.10	98.65	48.28 to 75.20	97,439	58,400
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	75.94	77.59	66.00	23.93	117.56	45.64	108.57	54.75 to 100.47	244,493	161,370
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	69.56	67.63	66.02	15.65	102.44	44.08	99.99	53.25 to 78.03	114,914	75,863
____ALL____	_____										
	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.28	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 78.03	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,060,384	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 71.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,060,384	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.05	95% Mean C.I.:	65.62 to 77.10	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,579,356							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	172,204	COD:	21.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	111,691	PRD:	110.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.08			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:59

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1951	2	52.71	52.71	60.08	14.44	87.73	45.10	60.32	N/A	386,352	232,129
1953	1	44.08	44.08	44.08			44.08	44.08	N/A	259,312	114,293
1955	2	75.27	75.27	63.85	32.85	117.87	50.54	99.99	N/A	168,276	107,452
2223	1	67.38	67.38	67.38			67.38	67.38	N/A	97,000	65,362
2225	2	74.81	74.81	75.37	1.52	99.25	73.67	75.94	N/A	69,587	52,450
2229	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	24,000	16,330
2231	1	48.23	48.23	48.23			48.23	48.23	N/A	256,000	123,481
2233	5	71.21	74.41	70.66	20.44	105.30	54.06	108.57	N/A	312,214	220,611
2237	2	82.19	82.19	80.46	20.03	102.14	65.72	98.65	N/A	67,000	53,909
2239	5	75.20	70.35	69.86	17.38	100.71	48.28	91.90	N/A	98,360	68,713
2241	3	97.94	87.89	76.56	17.31	114.80	57.43	108.30	N/A	115,912	88,743
2243	1	82.36	82.36	82.36			82.36	82.36	N/A	62,075	51,128
2245	6	54.50	58.27	54.13	15.81	107.66	45.64	74.15	45.64 to 74.15	304,331	164,721
2511	1	53.25	53.25	53.25			53.25	53.25	N/A	12,245	6,521
2515	1	79.87	79.87	79.87			79.87	79.87	N/A	96,000	76,675
2517	3	71.08	80.78	83.62	18.78	96.60	65.61	105.65	N/A	110,408	92,323
2519	3	84.95	87.82	84.68	8.81	103.71	78.03	100.47	N/A	82,166	69,577
2521	1	69.86	69.86	69.86			69.86	69.86	N/A	67,000	46,803
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.28	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 78.03	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,060,384	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 71.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,060,384	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.05	95% Mean C.I.:	65.62 to 77.10	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,579,356							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	172,204	COD:	21.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	111,691	PRD:	110.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.08			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:59

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001	40	71.15	71.82	64.88	21.05	110.69	44.08	108.57	60.32 to 78.03	176,203	114,320
17-0009	1	53.25	53.25	53.25			53.25	53.25	N/A	12,245	6,521
62-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	53.25	53.25	53.25			53.25	53.25	N/A	12,245	6,521
30.01 TO 50.00	1	45.10	45.10	45.10			45.10	45.10	N/A	12,104	5,459
50.01 TO 100.00	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	24,000	16,330
100.01 TO 180.00	9	73.67	76.62	76.25	14.11	100.48	59.97	100.47	65.61 to 99.99	59,766	45,572
180.01 TO 330.00	12	79.05	82.16	81.80	14.08	100.44	57.32	108.30	71.08 to 98.65	85,333	69,806
330.01 TO 650.00	11	54.25	62.67	58.46	25.94	107.22	44.08	97.94	48.23 to 91.90	184,314	107,741
650.01 +	6	57.54	65.76	61.88	24.81	106.26	45.64	108.57	45.64 to 108.57	570,445	353,009
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	6	66.63	72.20	70.37	28.89	102.60	48.28	100.47	48.28 to 100.47	82,776	58,249
DRY-N/A	7	73.67	71.34	67.44	7.54	105.78	54.25	79.06	54.25 to 79.06	87,155	58,773
GRASS	20	70.54	70.14	64.69	23.88	108.43	44.08	108.57	50.54 to 82.36	197,590	127,818
GRASS-N/A	6	64.18	69.87	59.70	19.63	117.03	54.06	108.30	54.06 to 108.30	296,433	176,978
IRRGTD-N/A	2	85.63	85.63	89.69	23.38	95.48	65.61	105.65	N/A	111,612	100,100
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	75.94	73.03	71.61	22.12	101.99	48.28	100.47	48.28 to 100.47	84,665	60,628
DRY-N/A	6	72.72	70.22	65.46	7.92	107.28	54.25	79.06	54.25 to 79.06	85,681	56,085
GRASS	23	69.86	71.28	64.42	24.07	110.65	44.08	108.57	54.75 to 82.36	207,887	133,923
GRASS-N/A	3	57.43	60.86	56.69	9.88	107.35	54.06	71.08	N/A	316,333	179,335
IRRGTD	1	65.61	65.61	65.61			65.61	65.61	N/A	89,000	58,395
IRRGTD-N/A	1	105.65	105.65	105.65			105.65	105.65	N/A	134,225	141,805
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.28	95% Median C.I.:	59.97 to 78.03	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,060,384	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 71.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,060,384	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.05	95% Mean C.I.:	65.62 to 77.10	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,579,356							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	172,204	COD:	21.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	111,691	PRD:	110.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.08			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:57:59

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	13	73.67	71.73	68.75	16.12	104.34	48.28	100.47	54.25 to 79.06	85,134	58,531
GRASS	26	68.95	70.08	63.14	23.21	110.99	44.08	108.57	54.75 to 79.87	220,400	139,163
IRRGTD	2	85.63	85.63	89.69	23.38	95.48	65.61	105.65	N/A	111,612	100,100
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	53.25	55.46	58.55	14.36	94.72	45.10	68.04	N/A	16,116	9,436
30000 TO 59999	7	78.22	82.13	81.21	14.43	101.13	59.97	108.30	59.97 to 108.30	44,357	36,023
60000 TO 99999	11	74.15	76.27	76.01	13.86	100.34	57.32	99.99	65.61 to 98.65	81,561	61,995
100000 TO 149999	6	80.44	84.55	85.52	14.45	98.87	71.08	105.65	71.08 to 105.65	111,523	95,376
150000 TO 249999	6	52.40	58.58	57.54	17.71	101.81	48.28	91.90	48.28 to 91.90	199,539	114,807
250000 TO 499999	4	46.94	61.63	61.23	35.73	100.65	44.08	108.57	N/A	287,940	176,307
500000 +	4	57.54	60.08	59.24	9.87	101.42	54.06	71.21	N/A	696,555	412,649
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	49.18	49.18	49.20	8.29	99.95	45.10	53.25	N/A	12,174	5,990
1 TO 9999	2	49.18	49.18	49.20	8.29	99.95	45.10	53.25	N/A	12,174	5,990
10000 TO 29999	2	70.86	70.86	71.38	3.97	99.26	68.04	73.67	N/A	29,500	21,058
30000 TO 59999	12	76.71	78.40	75.96	16.66	103.20	57.32	108.30	65.61 to 98.65	58,464	44,411
60000 TO 99999	10	75.05	75.14	73.48	11.48	102.27	48.28	99.99	67.38 to 84.95	105,827	77,757
100000 TO 149999	8	52.40	63.40	57.89	29.43	109.51	44.08	105.65	44.08 to 105.65	203,064	117,558
150000 TO 249999	2	68.77	68.77	60.61	33.63	113.46	45.64	91.90	N/A	262,600	159,161
250000 TO 499999	5	60.32	69.78	63.76	23.53	109.44	54.06	108.57	N/A	613,494	391,191
ALL	41	71.08	71.36	64.86	21.17	110.03	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 78.03	172,204	111,691

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	46	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	60.32 to 78.12	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,135,884	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.81 to 70.99	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,135,884	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.12	95% Mean C.I.:	65.90 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,239,385							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	176,867	COD:	21.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,899	PRD:	110.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.64			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:58:11

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	57.32	62.16	55.17	19.65	112.67	45.64	78.22	45.64 to 78.22	251,153	138,553	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	101.80	96.41	99.16	10.90	97.23	71.76	108.57	71.76 to 108.57	124,452	123,403	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	86.42	86.42	86.79	1.70	99.57	84.95	87.89	N/A	149,500	129,753	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	76.11	76.69	62.10	25.62	123.49	54.06	100.47	N/A	403,775	250,739	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	71.15	72.15	72.98	6.27	98.86	65.61	79.06	65.61 to 79.06	152,802	111,512	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	59.97	66.89	58.76	28.43	113.83	44.08	99.99	N/A	149,572	87,891	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	60.32	58.54	45.91	22.45	127.50	36.64	75.20	36.64 to 75.20	113,558	52,139	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	84.26	84.26	83.46	17.09	100.96	69.86	98.65	N/A	63,500	52,995	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	55.84	59.38	55.02	16.34	107.93	48.23	82.36	48.23 to 82.36	156,393	86,040	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	13	75.94	77.96	68.28	23.52	114.18	45.64	108.57	54.75 to 105.65	192,676	131,561	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	19	71.21	73.22	66.78	17.78	109.64	44.08	100.47	60.32 to 84.95	204,441	136,527	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	61.58	62.57	53.53	22.00	116.89	36.64	98.65	48.23 to 75.20	124,765	66,790	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	78.22	78.59	67.27	22.13	116.81	45.64	108.57	57.32 to 97.94	232,573	156,461	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	68.04	66.47	62.01	16.84	107.18	36.64	99.99	53.25 to 78.03	139,559	86,546	
____ALL____	_____											
	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899	

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	46	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	60.32 to 78.12	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,135,884	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.81 to 70.99	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,135,884	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.12	95% Mean C.I.:	65.90 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,239,385							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	176,867	COD:	21.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,899	PRD:	110.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.64			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:58:11

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1951	2	52.71	52.71	60.08	14.44	87.73	45.10	60.32	N/A	386,352	232,129
1953	1	44.08	44.08	44.08			44.08	44.08	N/A	259,312	114,293
1955	2	75.27	75.27	63.85	32.85	117.87	50.54	99.99	N/A	168,276	107,452
2223	1	67.38	67.38	67.38			67.38	67.38	N/A	97,000	65,362
2225	3	73.67	62.08	45.35	17.78	136.91	36.64	75.94	N/A	206,391	93,590
2229	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	24,000	16,330
2231	1	48.23	48.23	48.23			48.23	48.23	N/A	256,000	123,481
2233	5	71.21	74.41	70.66	20.44	105.30	54.06	108.57	N/A	312,214	220,611
2237	2	82.19	82.19	80.46	20.03	102.14	65.72	98.65	N/A	67,000	53,909
2239	5	75.20	70.35	69.86	17.38	100.71	48.28	91.90	N/A	98,360	68,713
2241	3	97.94	87.89	76.56	17.31	114.80	57.43	108.30	N/A	115,912	88,743
2243	1	82.36	82.36	82.36			82.36	82.36	N/A	62,075	51,128
2245	6	54.50	58.27	54.13	15.81	107.66	45.64	74.15	45.64 to 74.15	304,331	164,721
2511	1	53.25	53.25	53.25			53.25	53.25	N/A	12,245	6,521
2515	1	79.87	79.87	79.87			79.87	79.87	N/A	96,000	76,675
2517	6	74.60	78.78	80.67	15.03	97.65	65.61	105.65	65.61 to 105.65	123,287	99,461
2519	4	86.42	87.84	86.07	7.34	102.06	78.03	100.47	N/A	108,375	93,273
2521	1	69.86	69.86	69.86			69.86	69.86	N/A	67,000	46,803
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899
AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899
STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	4	82.17	72.22	61.17	18.06	118.07	36.64	87.89	N/A	257,625	157,581
2	42	70.47	71.24	64.87	21.02	109.82	44.08	108.57	60.32 to 75.94	169,175	109,739
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	46	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	60.32 to 78.12	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,135,884	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.81 to 70.99	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,135,884	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.12	95% Mean C.I.:	65.90 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,239,385							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	176,867	COD:	21.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,899	PRD:	110.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.64			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:58:11

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
04-0001	45	71.21	71.72	64.42	21.14	111.34	36.64	108.57	65.61 to 78.12	180,525	116,285
17-0009	1	53.25	53.25	53.25			53.25	53.25	N/A	12,245	6,521
62-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	53.25	53.25	53.25			53.25	53.25	N/A	12,245	6,521
30.01 TO 50.00	1	45.10	45.10	45.10			45.10	45.10	N/A	12,104	5,459
50.01 TO 100.00	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	24,000	16,330
100.01 TO 180.00	10	71.77	75.56	75.46	14.10	100.13	59.97	100.47	65.61 to 99.99	58,290	43,985
180.01 TO 330.00	13	79.87	82.48	82.11	13.48	100.45	57.32	108.30	71.08 to 98.65	84,576	69,444
330.01 TO 650.00	12	55.84	64.78	60.94	28.12	106.29	44.08	97.94	48.28 to 87.89	184,538	112,460
650.01 +	8	57.54	63.66	60.11	27.62	105.92	36.64	108.57	36.64 to 108.57	523,833	314,865
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	70.97	72.17	72.82	22.47	99.10	48.28	100.47	48.28 to 100.47	103,707	75,524
DRY-N/A	8	72.72	67.00	53.88	13.05	124.36	36.64	79.06	36.64 to 79.06	136,261	73,410
GRASS	22	72.68	71.68	66.10	23.05	108.43	44.08	108.57	50.54 to 86.22	191,559	126,628
GRASS-N/A	6	64.18	69.87	59.70	19.63	117.03	54.06	108.30	54.06 to 108.30	296,433	176,978
IRRGTD-N/A	2	85.63	85.63	89.69	23.38	95.48	65.61	105.65	N/A	111,612	100,100
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	75.94	72.82	73.36	18.98	99.26	48.28	100.47	53.25 to 97.94	102,850	75,455
DRY-N/A	7	71.76	65.42	51.54	13.87	126.93	36.64	79.06	36.64 to 79.06	142,012	73,197
GRASS	25	71.21	72.54	65.62	23.58	110.56	44.08	108.57	59.97 to 84.95	201,756	132,387
GRASS-N/A	3	57.43	60.86	56.69	9.88	107.35	54.06	71.08	N/A	316,333	179,335
IRRGTD	1	65.61	65.61	65.61			65.61	65.61	N/A	89,000	58,395
IRRGTD-N/A	1	105.65	105.65	105.65			105.65	105.65	N/A	134,225	141,805
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	46	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	60.32 to 78.12	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,135,884	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	18.76	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.81 to 70.99	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,135,884	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.12	95% Mean C.I.:	65.90 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,239,385							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	176,867	COD:	21.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	108.57			
AVG. Assessed Value:	113,899	PRD:	110.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.64			

Printed: 03/28/2009 12:58:11

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	16	72.72	69.58	62.06	17.49	112.11	36.64	100.47	54.25 to 78.12	119,984	74,467
GRASS	28	70.47	71.29	64.20	22.83	111.04	44.08	108.57	57.43 to 82.36	214,032	137,417
IRRGTD	2	85.63	85.63	89.69	23.38	95.48	65.61	105.65	N/A	111,612	100,100
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	53.25	55.46	58.55	14.36	94.72	45.10	68.04	N/A	16,116	9,436
30000 TO 59999	8	76.71	80.11	79.29	14.86	101.04	59.97	108.30	59.97 to 108.30	44,437	35,233
60000 TO 99999	12	76.09	77.10	76.80	13.70	100.38	57.32	99.99	65.72 to 86.22	81,056	62,253
100000 TO 149999	6	80.44	84.55	85.52	14.45	98.87	71.08	105.65	71.08 to 105.65	111,523	95,376
150000 TO 249999	7	54.25	62.77	61.64	23.52	101.83	48.28	91.90	48.28 to 91.90	197,748	121,886
250000 TO 499999	6	46.94	60.21	57.62	38.55	104.51	36.64	108.57	36.64 to 108.57	319,960	184,349
500000 +	4	57.54	60.08	59.24	9.87	101.42	54.06	71.21	N/A	696,555	412,649
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	49.18	49.18	49.20	8.29	99.95	45.10	53.25	N/A	12,174	5,990
1 TO 9999	2	49.18	49.18	49.20	8.29	99.95	45.10	53.25	N/A	12,174	5,990
10000 TO 29999	3	68.04	69.24	69.06	3.75	100.26	66.01	73.67	N/A	34,666	23,940
30000 TO 59999	12	76.71	78.40	75.96	16.66	103.20	57.32	108.30	65.61 to 98.65	58,464	44,411
60000 TO 99999	11	75.94	76.15	74.32	11.54	102.46	48.28	99.99	67.38 to 86.22	103,070	76,606
100000 TO 149999	8	52.40	63.40	57.89	29.43	109.51	44.08	105.65	44.08 to 105.65	203,064	117,558
150000 TO 249999	5	78.12	68.04	59.69	24.96	113.98	36.64	91.90	N/A	296,040	176,710
250000 TO 499999	5	60.32	69.78	63.76	23.53	109.44	54.06	108.57	N/A	613,494	391,191
ALL	46	71.15	71.32	64.40	21.25	110.75	36.64	108.57	60.32 to 78.12	176,867	113,899

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The subsequent tables and accompanying narratives will show that regarding the measures of central tendency, both the median and the mean are within range (and statistically identical). Either could be used as the overall point estimate for agricultural land level of value. The weighted mean is below acceptable range, and does not positively respond to the removal of extreme outlying sales. The Trended Preliminary median provides rather strong support for the overall median. The Minimally Improved (Minimal Non-Ag) statistical profile mirrors that of the Agricultural Unimproved for measures of central tendency.

At first glance, both the COD and the PRD appear to be outside of their respective standard recommendations. However, the removal of extreme outliers would bring the coefficient of dispersion within range at 19.93. This action would fail to move the price-related differential within standard recommendations. Again, the Minimally Improved (Minimal Non-Ag) qualitative statistics are quite similar. The trimmed COD for the minimally improved would likewise fall within standard recommendations.

The Minimal Non-Ag statistical profile adds an additional five sales, approximately 1783.53 MLU>95% acres (two MLU>95% Dry, two MLU>95% Grass, and a Dry-N/A. This means that the heading Majority Land Use>95% in the Minimal Non-Ag profile indicates that the dry and grass land classes are within acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	53	41	77.36
2008	58	47	81.03
2007	46	36	78.26
2006	45	36	80.00
2005	42	29	69.05

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:As shown in Table II, Banner County uses a significant portion of agricultural sales, and does not excessively trim the sales sample. More importantly is the fact that agricultural sales are (like the residential property class) verified and qualified for use in the sales file based on the response to a mailed questionnaire.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	71	1.38	72	71
2008	61.12	13.51	69	70.22
2007	70	-0.77	69	70
2006	75	-0.11	75	76
2005	70	13.25	79	80

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table III indicates that there is slightly less than one point difference between the Trended Preliminary and the R&O medians (0.98), and thus each figure provides strong support for the other.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 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 2008 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.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
1.69	2009	1.38
16.70	2008	11.49
-0.16	2007	-0.77
15.96	2006	-0.11
14.33	2005	13.25

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in assessed value (excluding growth) is statistically insignificant (0.31), and indicates that there is no appreciable difference between the assessment of the sold versus the unsold commercial property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71	65	71

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range?the median and the mean?and either could be used to describe the overall level of value for agricultural land. The weighted mean is below the lower limits of acceptable range, and the removal of outlying sales would fail to bring it within range (in fact, it would fall one point lower). As shown in Table III, the Trended Preliminary median also provides strong support for the overall median.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	21.17	110.03
Difference	1.17	7.03

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Neither qualitative statistic appears to be in compliance with standard recommendations. However, the removal of extreme outliers would bring the coefficient of dispersion within range at 19.93. This action would fail to move the price-related differential within standard recommendations.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Banner County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	45	41	-4
Median	71	71	0
Wgt. Mean	64	65	1
Mean	69	71	2
COD	21.21	21.17	-0.04
PRD	107.38	110.03	2.65
Minimum	36.84	44.08	7.24
Maximum	108.57	108.57	0.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference of four sales between the Preliminary and the R&O statistics is due to these being verified as substantially changed, and were coded accordingly. For assessment year 2009, the Assessor implemented the 2008 soil conversion. Coupled with this was a complete review of the values and these were set to closer match 75% of the market.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,787

Value : 139,421,341

Growth 255,625

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	27	17,339	0	0	2	5,200	29	22,539	
02. Res Improve Land	43	277,178	0	0	21	265,076	64	542,254	
03. Res Improvements	43	1,410,012	0	0	22	1,064,904	65	2,474,916	
04. Res Total	70	1,704,529	0	0	24	1,335,180	94	3,039,709	22,190
% of Res Total	74.47	56.08	0.00	0.00	25.53	43.92	5.26	2.18	8.68
05. Com UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	3	3,000	3	3,000	
06. Com Improve Land	2	3,025	0	0	3	8,206	5	11,231	
07. Com Improvements	2	140,476	0	0	5	45,367	7	185,843	
08. Com Total	2	143,501	0	0	8	56,573	10	200,074	0
% of Com Total	20.00	71.72	0.00	0.00	80.00	28.28	0.56	0.14	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	70	1,704,529	0	0	24	1,335,180	94	3,039,709	22,190
% of Res & Rec Total	74.47	56.08	0.00	0.00	25.53	43.92	5.26	2.18	8.68
Com & Ind Total	2	143,501	0	0	8	56,573	10	200,074	0
% of Com & Ind Total	20.00	71.72	0.00	0.00	80.00	28.28	0.56	0.14	0.00
17. Taxable Total	72	1,848,030	0	0	32	1,391,753	104	3,239,783	22,190
% of Taxable Total	69.23	57.04	0.00	0.00	30.77	42.96	5.82	2.32	8.68

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	71	11,237,710	71	11,237,710	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	71	11,237,710	71	11,237,710	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	9	1	5	15

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,190	75,245,252	1,190	75,245,252
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	368	30,364,639	368	30,364,639
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	422	19,333,957	422	19,333,957
30. Ag Total							1,612	124,943,848

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	6	6.00	38,000	6	6.00	38,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	249	294.00	1,998,711	249	294.00	1,998,711	
33. HomeSite Improvements	258	0.00	15,415,954	258	0.00	15,415,954	217,207
34. HomeSite Total				264	300.00	17,452,665	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	55	142.89	70,689	55	142.89	70,689	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	341	1,552.68	1,141,479	341	1,552.68	1,141,479	
37. FarmSite Improvements	385	0.00	3,918,003	385	0.00	3,918,003	16,228
38. FarmSite Total				440	1,695.57	5,130,171	
39. Road & Ditches	0	3,223.14	0	0	3,223.14	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				704	5,218.71	22,582,836	233,435

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	2,474.17	392,557	10	2,474.17	392,557

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

* LB 968 (2006) for tax year 2009 and forward there will be no Recapture value.

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	2,314.20	8.95%	1,619,940	12.56%	700.00
47. 2A1	1,447.21	5.60%	984,100	7.63%	680.00
48. 2A	7,805.43	30.19%	3,902,715	30.27%	500.00
49. 3A1	247.62	0.96%	121,334	0.94%	490.00
50. 3A	5,667.98	21.92%	2,777,316	21.54%	490.00
51. 4A1	6,139.10	23.74%	2,701,205	20.95%	440.00
52. 4A	2,233.75	8.64%	787,118	6.10%	352.38
53. Total	25,855.29	100.00%	12,893,728	100.00%	498.69
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	27,290.01	23.56%	6,958,333	27.28%	254.98
56. 2D1	10,261.80	8.86%	2,503,881	9.82%	244.00
57. 2D	40,157.46	34.67%	9,356,697	36.69%	233.00
58. 3D1	4,274.08	3.69%	901,836	3.54%	211.00
59. 3D	15,335.43	13.24%	2,913,757	11.42%	190.00
60. 4D1	14,069.97	12.15%	2,293,422	8.99%	163.00
61. 4D	4,430.80	3.83%	576,032	2.26%	130.01
62. Total	115,819.55	100.00%	25,503,958	100.00%	220.20
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	13,228.40	4.14%	3,599,791	5.68%	272.13
65. 2G1	5,792.34	1.81%	1,495,422	2.36%	258.17
66. 2G	51,681.17	16.19%	12,432,603	19.61%	240.56
67. 3G1	4,858.10	1.52%	1,160,720	1.83%	238.92
68. 3G	41,970.93	13.15%	9,342,339	14.74%	222.59
69. 4G1	69,046.78	21.63%	12,944,873	20.42%	187.48
70. 4G	132,616.40	41.55%	22,420,389	35.37%	169.06
71. Total	319,194.12	100.00%	63,396,137	100.00%	198.61
Irrigated Total	25,855.29	5.50%	12,893,728	12.60%	498.69
Dry Total	115,819.55	24.66%	25,503,958	24.92%	220.20
Grass Total	319,194.12	67.95%	63,396,137	61.93%	198.61
Waste	6,255.74	1.33%	156,510	0.15%	25.02
Other	2,609.10	0.56%	410,679	0.40%	157.40
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	469,733.79	100.00%	102,361,012	100.00%	217.91

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	25,855.29	12,893,728	25,855.29	12,893,728
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	115,819.55	25,503,958	115,819.55	25,503,958
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	319,194.12	63,396,137	319,194.12	63,396,137
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	6,255.74	156,510	6,255.74	156,510
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,609.10	410,679	2,609.10	410,679
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	469,733.79	102,361,012	469,733.79	102,361,012

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	25,855.29	5.50%	12,893,728	12.60%	498.69
Dry Land	115,819.55	24.66%	25,503,958	24.92%	220.20
Grass	319,194.12	67.95%	63,396,137	61.93%	198.61
Waste	6,255.74	1.33%	156,510	0.15%	25.02
Other	2,609.10	0.56%	410,679	0.40%	157.40
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	469,733.79	100.00%	102,361,012	100.00%	217.91

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

04 Banner

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	2,782,430	3,039,709	257,279	9.25%	22,190	8.45%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	17,273,778	17,452,665	178,887	1.04%	217,207	-0.22%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	20,056,208	20,492,374	436,166	2.17%	239,397	0.98%
05. Commercial	200,074	200,074	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,022,450	5,130,171	107,721	2.14%	16,228	1.82%
08. Minerals	9,637,200	11,237,710	1,600,510	16.61	0	16.61
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	14,859,724	16,567,955	1,708,231	11.50%	16,228	11.39%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	34,915,932	37,060,329	2,144,397	6.14%	255,625	5.41%
11. Irrigated	11,908,268	12,893,728	985,460	8.28%		
12. Dryland	25,658,232	25,503,958	-154,274	-0.60%		
13. Grassland	62,828,934	63,396,137	567,203	0.90%		
14. Wasteland	157,544	156,510	-1,034	-0.66%		
15. Other Agland	410,408	410,679	271	0.07%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	100,963,386	102,361,012	1,397,626	1.38%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	135,879,318	139,421,341	3,542,023	2.61%	255,625	2.42%

2009 Plan of Assessment for Banner County, Nebraska Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011

Date: June 3, 2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property for 2008 are as follows:

- (1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land
- (2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land (as amended by LB 968); and
- (3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 80% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

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

General Description of Real Property in Banner County

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Value	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	96	5.27%	2,545,055	2.13%
Commercial	10	0.55%	193,042	0.16%
Recreational	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Agricultural	1602	88.02%	109,250,410	91.47%
Mineral Interest - Producing	102	5.60%	7,153,750	5.99%
Game & Parks	10	0.55%	292,820	0.25%
Special Value	0	0.00%		0.00%
	1820		119,435,077	

Agricultural land – taxable acres

Other pertinent facts: county is predominately agricultural consisting of the following sub classes

Irrigation	25,290.59 acres
Dry crop	119,153.43 acres
Grass & CRP	315,865.79 acres
Waste	6,289.66 acres
Other (feedlot & shelterbelt)	2,711.84 acres

Total of 469,311.31 acres with a value of 88,791,199

New property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 3 information statements were filed for new property construction within the county, however 4 parcels were on the pickup list

For more information see 2008 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey

Current Resources

A. Staff/Budget/Training

Presently have 2 employees – One regular part time employed since February of 2006 and one full time employed since December 2007

The 2008 budget for the assessor's office was \$ 36990 plus \$5100 included in Miscellaneous General for Appraisal (which includes pickup

work and oil and gas appraisal) Since this is an ex/officio office there are also amounts budgeted in the clerk, clerk of the district court, and election budget for the salaries of employees, etc.

Training – Both employees have attended Class 101 and one employee has passed the assessor's test.. Plans are to alternate attending courses in the next year

B Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos

Cadastral maps are in a large book which is updated periodically. Aerial photos with individual mylar overlays containing ownership information, land use, and soil types are approximately 20 years old. The aerial photos are updated as deeds are filed

C Property Record Cards – new cards were prepared for the 2006 year.

For strictly ag land parcels, the land valuation sheets are printed on the new MIPS program and placed behind the property record card in a plastic page protector.

Property Records Cards for parcels with improvements are a manila folder with the property record card imprinted on the front. A listing of each individual building with values for each year is permanently attached to the back of the manila folder. Each building is numbered on the site photo. A small snapshot in a photo sleeve has a corresponding number . This number is also noted on the MIPS improvement printouts and the yearly listing as mentioned.

House sketches, house photos, and farm site sketches have been updated in the MIPS CAMA

D We received a grant for an ESRI software and instructions in August of 2005. At the present time we have the maps and the ownership overlays completed in the GIS program. We have networked the GIS program with the MIPS real estate administrative program. The company that is working with the GIS program has completed the overlays for land use and are attempting to import the new soil conversion.

E Web based – property record information access – There are no plans at this time to supply this information through a web site.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.

Since this is an ex/officio office the deeds and Form 521's are processed as they are filed. A copy of the 521 is filed in a notebook with a copy of the deed and agland inventory sheets if applicable. At the time the 521's are processed a form letter is sent to the seller and the buyer requesting information concerning the sale.

Information statements are not filed on a regular basis – discovery of new improvements is usually through personal observation of county officials or other reports

B Data Collection

All parcels were reviewed for the 2005 year. One third of the improvements were physically reviewed for 2008. Photos were taken for any improvements missed in previous reviews and any new improvements.

Market data is obtained from the Form 521 and the questionnaire mailed to buyers and sellers.

C Review assessment sales ratio studies

Market data is entered on an Excel spreadsheet with formulas which figure average selling price, median, COD, and PRD for irrigated, dry crop, grass, CRP, shelterbelts, waste, and sites. All sales (improved sales are used with the value of improvements being subtracted from the assessed value and also the selling price) are used in these computations. With time permitting the above studies are also computed with the unimproved sales only.

D Approaches to Value

- 1 Market approach; sales comparison – Used for agland sales. Have had an increasing number of sales in recent years so that sales comparison approach is more accurate than previous years. Strictly residential sales are still limited. Usually the agland sales where purchaser is actually occupying home are also included in the residential sales for computations.
- 2 Cost approach; cost manual used and date of manual and latest depreciation study- The Marshall Swift costing manual for 2007 available in conjunction with the MIPS CAMA program were used for 2008. Depreciation was figured on the 8 qualified sales and the current depreciation schedules were checked with these figures.
- 3 Income Approach, income and expense data collection – Because of the wide variety of rental and lease arrangements on agland,

this method is not an accurate measure of value. Banner County also has few rental houses available for any kind of an income study.

4. Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value – sales are plotted on a large map using different colors for each years sales. This is used to determine if market areas would be appropriate. Banner County does not have zoning at the present time so special value is not a consideration
- E Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation – statements are attached to the property record card explaining the method used for final valuations
- F Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions – New values for the current year are reported on the Assessed Value Update
- G Notices and Public Relations. Change of value notices are sent to every landowner in Banner County irregardless if the value changed or not. In the past we have included a printout of the land valuation groups and acres, value, etc. However, because of a computer problem we not longer do this -a notice is included with the COV telling the landowner that if they so requested we would furnish this information.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2008:

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	84%	36.48	87.06
Commercial	no sales		
Agricultural Land	72%	20.72	108.24

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2008 Reports & Opinions

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009

Residential – The improvements located in the two middle ranges (excluding Harrisburg) will be reviewed. Since both employees have taken the Basic 101 course and will be taking the Residential quality and condition workshop, the work will probably be done by employees. If time permits new photos will be taken of the houses in the other 4 ranges and will be used for a photo array to help determine quality.

Commercial - Commercial properties that are located in the middle two ranges will be reviewed at the same time as the residential and farm buildings.

Agricultural Land – The local FSA office has closed and most of the farm records are being processed through the Scottsbluff Office which makes it difficult to obtain maps. We are going to concentrate on getting the GIS program updated to the point that we can use it for land use checking.

Special Value – Agland - no special value anticipated

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

Residential – The improvements in the east two ranges will be reviewed. The same problem of who will be the data collector as the previous year

Commercial – Commercial property in the east two ranges will be reviewed at the same time as the rural residential and farm outbuildings

Agricultural Land- The local FSA office has closed and most of the farm records are being processed through the Scottsbluff Office which makes it difficult to obtain maps. We are going to concentrate on getting the GIS program updated to the point that we can use it for land use checking

Special Value – Agland – no special value anticipated

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential – The improvements in the west two ranges will be reviewed.

Commercial – Commercial property in the west two ranges will be reviewed at the same time as the rural residential and farm outbuildings

Agricultural Land- The local FSA office has closed and most of the farm records are being processed through the Scottsbluff Office which makes it difficult to obtain maps. We are going to concentrate on getting the GIS program updated to the point that we can use it for land use checking

Special Value – Agland – no special value anticipated

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

1. Record Maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:

- a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Educational Lands & Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
- 3 Personal Property; administer annual filing of 200 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required
- 4 Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
- 5 Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer 25 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
- 7 Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
- 8 Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process
9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
- 10 Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval
- 11 County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information. Since this is an ex/officio office, we also take minutes of the CBOE meeting, and complete the Form 422 and mail to protestor
- 12 TERC appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation

13 TERC State wide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC

14 Education: Assessor and or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification . The 2 employees have both attended Class 101 and hopefully will attend a measurement class in the next year. One employee has successfully passed the assessor's test. The other employee will take the test this fall. The assessor and all employees will take the ESRI classes for the GIS program

Conclusion:

The 2009-2010 budget request will be approximately the same as the previous year. I am going to increase the request for implementing the GIS program so that we can proceed faster with the implementation. However, Banner County is at the statutory limit for budget and with the increase in expense for fuel, repairs, and etc for the road department, I don't know if this will be approved.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor's signature _____ Date: _____

2009 Assessment Survey for Banner County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	One—and she is part time
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	None
3.	Other full-time employees
	One—office staff
4.	Other part-time employees
	Only the Deputy
5.	Number of shared employees
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$40,495
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	None
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$40,495
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	None
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$ 1,500
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$10,000—from the Miscellaneous General Fund
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$50,495
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	New MIPS
2.	CAMA software
	New MIPS
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes

4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes—ESRI; County has the ownership and property ID overlay.
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	New MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	No
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	N/A
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	N/A
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	N/A

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	The real property valuation work is performed “in-house” at present. Pritchard and Abbott is used for oil and gas appraisal.
2.	Other services
	New MIPS for Administrative, CAMA and personal property software.

Certification

This is to certify that the 2009 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

One copy to the Banner County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts