

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

06 Boone

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	170	COD	23.05
Total Sales Price	\$12,436,854	PRD	107.90
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$12,436,854	COV	38.57
Total Assessed Value	\$11,895,845	STD	39.81
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$73,158	Avg. Absolute Deviation	22.34
Avg. Assessed Value	\$69,976	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$54,467
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	96
Mean	103	Max	330
Min	37.50		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.00 to 99.39
95% Mean C.I	97.23 to 109.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.74 to 98.56

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.54
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.92
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	10.17

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	142	96	22.19	108.51
2007	114	96	27.34	114.97
2006	109	96	25.43	112.18
2005	100	97	22.75	108.19

2009 Commission Summary

06 Boone

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	33	COD	32.80
Total Sales Price	\$1,232,325	PRD	104.92
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,207,325	COV	55.84
Total Assessed Value	\$1,195,875	STD	58.03
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$36,586	Avg. Absolute Deviation	31.94
Avg. Assessed Value	\$36,239	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$65,794
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	99
Mean	104	Max	358
Min	28		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.42 to 107.36
95% Mean C.I	84.12 to 123.72
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.82 to 113.28

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.84
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.32

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	28	99	25.84	105.39
2007	20	92	35.78	104.11
2006	19	94	44.95	109.11
2005	21	99	29.46	115.16

2009 Commission Summary

06 Boone

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	56	COD	30.76
Total Sales Price	\$15,830,034	PRD	111.11
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$15,830,034	COV	38.23
Total Assessed Value	\$11,638,000	STD	31.22
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$282,679	Avg. Absolute Deviation	22.75
Avg. Assessed Value	\$207,821	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$239,363
Median	74	Wgt. Mean	74
Mean	82	Max	158.33
Min	27.41		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.63 to 83.40
95% Mean C.I	73.51 to 89.86
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	67.38 to 79.66

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	83.26
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.89

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	60	75	21.45	109.35
2007	64	72	16.98	108.17
2006	63	74	14.97	105.01
2005	70	77	15.12	103.86

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Boone 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 Boone County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Boone County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Boone County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Boone 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 Boone County is 74.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Boone County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	171	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.79	95% Median C.I.:	90.35 to 98.59
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,448,086	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	42.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.80 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,448,086	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.39	95% Mean C.I.:	94.25 to 106.85
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,177,620						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,795	COD:	27.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,366	PRD:	111.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.51		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:27

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	20	101.62	101.10	95.33	22.45	106.05	56.57	201.73	88.21 to 109.54		64,225	61,226
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	94.36	92.47	92.12	9.13	100.38	69.69	104.97	79.54 to 103.18		80,836	74,465
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	22	94.78	106.09	94.85	24.60	111.85	62.76	294.10	84.94 to 113.86		59,795	56,716
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	34	93.51	101.84	91.05	26.10	111.85	37.50	329.85	84.59 to 103.02		103,592	94,320
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	33	97.03	104.05	96.41	29.53	107.92	45.00	225.44	88.01 to 110.13		60,745	58,567
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	92.86	104.41	90.29	34.32	115.64	51.90	230.67	65.92 to 130.39		58,707	53,006
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	79.64	77.52	74.81	13.44	103.62	52.07	100.53	61.69 to 87.82		63,528	47,526
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	19	98.59	101.76	75.23	33.76	135.26	15.51	267.33	71.59 to 118.44		78,464	59,032
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	87	94.36	101.56	92.68	23.38	109.58	37.50	329.85	90.83 to 101.13		80,590	74,693
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	84	91.35	99.51	86.07	31.45	115.61	15.51	267.33	85.46 to 101.29		64,723	55,706
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	108	94.09	103.83	92.92	28.55	111.74	37.50	329.85	90.39 to 99.39		73,682	68,467
____ALL____												
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59		72,795	65,366

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
ACREAGE	31	98.93	106.48	96.93	15.29	109.86	72.27	203.68	94.18 to 103.02		124,265	120,447
ALBION	79	89.52	94.92	85.42	25.33	111.12	15.51	230.67	84.59 to 94.00		86,614	73,986
CEDAR RAPIDS	18	101.53	112.10	101.14	34.02	110.84	56.57	294.10	80.38 to 113.86		28,516	28,841
PETERSBURG	12	98.45	107.72	100.16	48.42	107.55	37.50	329.85	48.00 to 124.13		14,338	14,361
PRIMROSE	4	100.00	105.30	102.11	28.14	103.12	69.38	151.81	N/A		13,575	13,861
ST. EDWARD	27	92.79	98.64	84.04	26.74	117.37	58.00	267.33	73.59 to 104.53		37,540	31,550
____ALL____												
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59		72,795	65,366

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	139	90.81	99.20	86.50	30.06	114.68	15.51	329.85	87.02 to 95.77		61,516	53,213
2	13	96.67	96.50	95.30	5.70	101.26	84.87	116.07	90.22 to 101.47		165,076	157,325
3	19	101.76	113.21	99.11	19.92	114.22	72.27	203.68	98.21 to 109.54		92,170	91,351
____ALL____												
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59		72,795	65,366

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:	171	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.79	95% Median C.I.:	90.35 to 98.59
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,448,086	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	42.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.80 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,448,086	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.39	95% Mean C.I.:	94.25 to 106.85
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,177,620						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,795	COD:	27.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,366	PRD:	111.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.51		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:27

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	158	94.88	102.42	89.93	26.36	113.90	15.51	329.85	91.89 to 99.47	78,197	70,318
2	13	79.64	77.81	72.34	31.43	107.55	37.50	175.00	48.00 to 94.00	7,149	5,171
____ALL____											
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	169	93.78	100.57	89.75	27.33	112.06	15.51	329.85	90.22 to 98.59	73,373	65,849
06											
07	2	99.22	99.22	102.25	3.85	97.04	95.40	103.05	N/A	24,000	24,540
____ALL____											
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018	1	175.00	175.00	175.00			175.00	175.00	N/A	240	420
06-0001	113	92.05	96.51	88.38	24.69	109.20	15.51	329.85	88.21 to 98.21	90,846	80,289
06-0006	26	101.87	116.89	108.96	35.42	107.27	56.57	294.10	87.82 to 115.05	31,061	33,845
06-0017	31	94.03	99.17	89.08	24.30	111.33	58.00	267.33	79.64 to 102.60	44,341	39,500
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013											
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

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:	171	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.79	95% Median C.I.:	90.35 to 98.59
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,448,086	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	42.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.80 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,448,086	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.39	95% Mean C.I.:	94.25 to 106.85
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,177,620						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,795	COD:	27.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,366	PRD:	111.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.51		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:27

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	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	3	81.19	95.23	86.09	17.96	110.62	80.38	124.13	N/A	10,521	9,058
1900 TO 1919	54	92.66	100.20	85.22	31.53	117.58	52.07	294.10	84.59 to 103.72	50,451	42,994
1920 TO 1939	25	102.60	109.04	96.92	26.41	112.51	61.69	267.33	81.41 to 112.68	53,493	51,843
1940 TO 1949	4	115.66	106.77	94.65	20.07	112.81	58.69	137.08	N/A	41,500	39,278
1950 TO 1959	5	87.87	83.42	84.07	9.28	99.23	58.77	94.18	N/A	95,080	79,931
1960 TO 1969	8	102.74	136.28	106.07	43.36	128.48	75.77	329.85	75.77 to 329.85	60,875	64,569
1970 TO 1979	26	99.43	107.23	98.18	19.87	109.21	70.60	198.96	90.39 to 105.96	72,875	71,552
1980 TO 1989	8	92.99	86.07	85.77	11.13	100.36	64.60	98.59	64.60 to 98.59	141,812	121,625
1990 TO 1994	1	92.05	92.05	92.05			92.05	92.05	N/A	150,000	138,075
1995 TO 1999	10	97.75	94.16	92.03	11.90	102.32	64.59	110.13	71.47 to 109.54	115,750	106,520
2000 TO Present	13	90.22	83.47	83.59	13.82	99.86	15.51	105.02	75.42 to 96.67	214,207	179,058
ALL	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

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	8	85.50	110.12	100.02	62.27	110.09	37.50	267.33	37.50 to 267.33	2,717	2,718
5000 TO 9999	9	95.40	99.09	98.35	30.18	100.76	45.00	163.00	62.81 to 143.04	6,318	6,213
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	17	87.00	104.28	98.81	46.89	105.54	37.50	267.33	58.00 to 143.04	4,623	4,568
10000 TO 29999	36	108.50	128.12	121.15	41.77	105.75	51.90	329.85	93.78 to 137.07	18,655	22,600
30000 TO 59999	38	101.78	102.62	102.24	19.21	100.37	53.05	198.96	88.59 to 110.13	43,557	44,532
60000 TO 99999	32	91.80	89.40	88.63	15.97	100.87	58.69	118.82	77.47 to 101.76	75,531	66,940
100000 TO 149999	24	87.27	83.45	83.61	17.00	99.82	52.07	115.94	71.47 to 96.28	122,687	102,573
150000 TO 249999	22	91.36	84.53	83.99	13.89	100.64	15.51	105.02	74.50 to 95.87	183,963	154,507
250000 TO 499999	2	93.44	93.44	93.22	3.45	100.24	90.22	96.67	N/A	317,000	295,510
ALL	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

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:	171	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.79	95% Median C.I.:	90.35 to 98.59
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,448,086	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	42.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.80 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,448,086	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.39	95% Mean C.I.:	94.25 to 106.85
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,177,620						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,795	COD:	27.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,366	PRD:	111.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.51		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:27

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	9	84.00	83.78	72.18	38.76	116.07	37.50	175.00	45.00 to 124.13	3,193	2,305
5000 TO 9999	10	96.27	116.57	100.02	44.10	116.54	56.57	267.33	62.81 to 163.00	7,386	7,388
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	19	87.00	101.04	92.22	44.00	109.56	37.50	267.33	58.00 to 124.13	5,400	4,980
10000 TO 29999	33	94.00	103.37	91.31	33.88	113.20	51.90	294.10	76.56 to 111.04	22,673	20,704
30000 TO 59999	47	100.53	109.28	87.82	32.76	124.44	15.51	329.85	87.87 to 104.53	51,184	44,948
60000 TO 99999	35	97.03	95.50	89.35	19.03	106.88	52.07	198.96	84.87 to 103.72	84,317	75,333
100000 TO 149999	23	93.02	90.85	89.10	10.87	101.96	64.59	115.94	87.02 to 98.59	141,043	125,676
150000 TO 249999	12	93.88	92.38	91.81	9.06	100.63	74.50	105.02	81.98 to 101.76	196,875	180,742
250000 TO 499999	2	93.44	93.44	93.22	3.45	100.24	90.22	96.67	N/A	317,000	295,510
ALL											
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
20	23	99.47	110.48	96.79	34.11	114.14	56.57	267.33	80.38 to 124.13	36,431	35,261
30	106	93.88	101.16	87.66	26.74	115.40	15.51	329.85	88.61 to 98.93	77,846	68,241
40	28	97.63	96.01	93.38	12.93	102.82	58.77	130.63	89.67 to 104.80	116,196	108,502
ALL											
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
101	108	95.82	102.59	90.76	22.97	113.04	15.51	329.85	92.20 to 99.47	85,666	77,746
102	16	79.69	96.88	79.00	45.61	122.64	52.07	294.10	56.76 to 113.86	76,306	60,279
104	32	91.41	100.12	91.09	27.41	109.92	59.73	225.44	77.95 to 109.27	56,415	51,386
106	1	118.82	118.82	118.82			118.82	118.82	N/A	65,000	77,230
ALL											
	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59	72,795	65,366

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:	171	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.79	95% Median C.I.:	90.35 to 98.59
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,448,086	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	42.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.80 to 93.78
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,448,086	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.39	95% Mean C.I.:	94.25 to 106.85
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,177,620						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,795	COD:	27.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,366	PRD:	111.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.51		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:27

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18		7,495	6,779
10	3	101.57	109.66	107.17	15.33	102.32	90.35	137.07	N/A		25,000	26,793
20	25	103.05	112.70	98.72	38.69	114.16	53.05	267.33	72.42 to 119.56		28,491	28,127
30	76	96.40	105.00	92.31	27.28	113.75	55.47	329.85	88.80 to 103.31		64,540	59,577
40	42	93.78	93.55	89.83	14.63	104.15	52.07	161.13	88.61 to 99.39		112,430	100,991
50	11	90.83	81.51	79.31	15.04	102.78	15.51	105.02	67.86 to 95.87		175,336	139,058
ALL	171	93.99	100.55	89.79	27.02	111.98	15.51	329.85	90.35 to 98.59		72,795	65,366

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

Residential:

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that included the qualified residential sales that occurred from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2008. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. The county also completes the pick-up of new construction of the residential property.

Annually, the county conducts their pick-up work in a timely manner.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. During 2008, the county has continued the inspection and review of all ag residences and improvements. It was not completed as planned for use in 2009, but will be finished and revalued for 2010. The town of Albion was inspected in an off-site (drive-by) process. New digital photos were taken of all the houses as well.

For 2009, the county reviewed all of the parcels in Albion, and revalued numerous individual subclasses identified during the market analysis. Each parcel was updated. Cedar Rapids has tended to be at a higher level of value than the other towns for the past several years. There are mostly older homes and the value does not seem to be increasing. The preliminary statistics for 2009 indicated that the level of value exceeded 100% so the town will be adjusted slightly downward.

2009 Assessment Survey for Boone County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Lister
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and Contract Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract Lister
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Albion has a depreciation schedule developed for use in 2009, the acreages depreciation schedule were developed for use in 2008. The remaining residential depreciation schedules began use in 2002.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Boone County's primary approach is the Sales Comparison Approach. They break their sales data into an indication of dollars per square foot, and apply the results to the comparable residential parcels. The Cost Approach is also produced and is correlated with the Sales Comparison results to produce a better value. Elements of the Cost Approach are useful to determine comparability when applying both approaches.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	6 -Assessor Locations
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The areas that are in place in Boone County are the 5 towns, Albion, Cedar Rapids, Petersburg, Primrose and St. Edward. The residential parcels outside the town limits are considered rural and titled Acreage. These areas are identified in the "Assessor Location" section of the residential statistics.

9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
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 <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No; these parcels are typically valued with the rural residential or the ag residential, not with the adjacent town. The suburban location, as it is defined has no locational homogeneity and thus is an inappropriate stratum for adjustment for either the county or in the Statewide Equalization process.
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?
	No, but it is the county’s goal to do so. The rural residences were revalued in 2008, and the ag residences and improvements were last valued in the late 1990’s and updated in 1996. The ag residences and improvements have been undergoing an inspection process and were to be revalued for 2009. Since the inspection process has not quite been completed, this subclass will not be revalued until 2010.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
116	0	0	116

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	170	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	38.57	95% Median C.I.:	94.00 to 99.39
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,436,854	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	39.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.74 to 98.56
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,436,854	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	97.23 to 109.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,895,845						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,157	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,975	PRD:	107.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.50		

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:10

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	20	99.09	104.07	98.99	25.13	105.12	56.57	256.13	86.34 to 109.54	64,225	63,579
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	94.36	91.80	91.41	10.14	100.43	70.32	103.82	72.58 to 103.18	80,836	73,889
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	22	97.58	108.59	98.17	24.71	110.62	65.36	294.10	85.22 to 113.86	59,795	58,701
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	34	97.44	106.57	96.60	22.30	110.32	37.50	329.85	93.02 to 103.02	103,592	100,073
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	33	98.93	106.18	100.42	26.69	105.73	45.00	259.00	93.28 to 110.13	60,745	61,002
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	94.71	105.96	93.10	29.75	113.82	51.90	230.67	82.89 to 130.39	58,707	54,655
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	86.45	86.19	88.95	10.92	96.90	58.00	114.91	79.64 to 93.46	63,528	56,510
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	18	99.43	100.23	89.98	17.71	111.39	64.60	151.19	89.44 to 115.05	82,200	73,966
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	87	97.62	104.64	96.68	22.11	108.24	37.50	329.85	94.18 to 101.47	80,590	77,911
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	83	94.91	101.71	94.32	24.27	107.83	45.00	259.00	90.35 to 100.27	65,367	61,657
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	108	97.44	106.76	97.33	25.50	109.68	37.50	329.85	94.71 to 101.13	73,682	71,717
____ALL____											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ACREAGE	31	98.93	106.49	96.93	15.28	109.86	72.27	203.68	94.18 to 103.02	124,265	120,450
ALBION	78	96.97	103.12	96.18	19.56	107.22	51.90	259.00	93.28 to 100.19	87,581	84,233
CEDAR RAPIDS	18	97.83	111.01	100.77	35.89	110.16	56.57	294.10	80.38 to 113.86	28,516	28,736
PETERSBURG	12	98.45	107.72	100.16	48.42	107.55	37.50	329.85	48.00 to 124.13	14,338	14,361
PRIMROSE	4	100.00	105.30	102.11	28.14	103.12	69.38	151.81	N/A	13,575	13,861
ST. EDWARD	27	92.79	92.19	83.53	19.78	110.37	58.00	143.04	73.59 to 102.60	37,540	31,356
____ALL____											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

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	138	95.19	102.46	95.03	25.13	107.83	37.50	329.85	91.54 to 99.28	61,881	58,803
2	13	96.67	96.50	95.30	5.70	101.26	84.87	116.07	90.22 to 101.47	165,076	157,325
3	19	101.76	113.22	99.12	19.91	114.22	72.27	203.68	98.21 to 109.54	92,170	91,356
____ALL____											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	170	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	38.57	95% Median C.I.:	94.00 to 99.39
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,436,854	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	39.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.74 to 98.56
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,436,854	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	97.23 to 109.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,895,845						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,157	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,975	PRD:	107.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.50		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:10

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	156	98.22	105.39	95.83	22.01	109.98	56.57	329.85	94.91 to 100.27	79,108	75,806
2	14	81.82	78.89	72.99	29.58	108.09	37.50	175.00	48.00 to 94.00	6,852	5,001
____ALL____											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	168	96.91	103.26	95.62	23.28	107.98	37.50	329.85	93.78 to 99.39	73,743	70,516
06											
07	2	99.22	99.22	102.25	3.85	97.04	95.40	103.05	N/A	24,000	24,540
____ALL____											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018	1	175.00	175.00	175.00			175.00	175.00	N/A	240	420
06-0001	112	97.10	101.69	95.34	19.77	106.66	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 98.96	91,557	87,289
06-0006	26	101.87	118.52	111.41	37.77	106.38	56.57	294.10	84.94 to 115.05	31,061	34,605
06-0017	31	93.00	93.55	88.70	18.56	105.46	58.00	143.04	79.64 to 102.18	44,341	39,332
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013											
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	170	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	38.57	95% Median C.I.:	94.00 to 99.39
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,436,854	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	39.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.74 to 98.56
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,436,854	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	97.23 to 109.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,895,845						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,157	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,975	PRD:	107.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.50		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:10

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	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	3	81.19	95.23	86.09	17.96	110.62	80.38	124.13	N/A	10,521	9,058
1900 TO 1919	54	98.83	107.16	95.79	25.70	111.86	56.57	294.10	94.21 to 104.53	50,451	48,328
1920 TO 1939	24	93.85	103.46	96.08	22.28	107.68	71.18	256.13	85.22 to 102.60	55,254	53,085
1940 TO 1949	4	115.66	107.86	96.53	19.13	111.74	63.03	137.08	N/A	41,500	40,058
1950 TO 1959	5	87.87	84.24	84.87	10.21	99.26	58.77	94.91	N/A	95,080	80,690
1960 TO 1969	8	104.54	135.75	109.66	35.63	123.80	95.40	329.85	95.40 to 329.85	60,875	66,752
1970 TO 1979	26	99.16	106.00	97.39	20.66	108.84	70.32	198.96	88.59 to 103.18	72,875	70,976
1980 TO 1989	8	92.99	89.25	89.31	9.74	99.93	64.60	103.82	64.60 to 103.82	141,812	126,650
1990 TO 1994	1	108.39	108.39	108.39			108.39	108.39	N/A	150,000	162,585
1995 TO 1999	10	102.25	98.30	96.38	8.08	101.99	64.59	110.13	93.78 to 109.54	115,750	111,562
2000 TO Present	13	96.67	96.03	95.36	7.67	100.70	82.58	122.34	88.61 to 102.10	214,207	204,265
ALL	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

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	8	85.50	88.33	75.97	36.79	116.27	37.50	175.00	37.50 to 175.00	2,717	2,064
5000 TO 9999	9	95.40	99.09	98.35	30.18	100.76	45.00	163.00	62.81 to 143.04	6,318	6,213
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	17	87.00	94.03	92.16	35.10	102.03	37.50	175.00	58.00 to 124.13	4,623	4,261
10000 TO 29999	35	103.18	130.50	124.02	46.48	105.22	51.90	329.85	93.78 to 130.63	18,867	23,399
30000 TO 59999	38	101.78	104.76	104.65	17.29	100.11	60.17	198.96	95.77 to 113.06	43,557	45,581
60000 TO 99999	32	97.15	93.85	93.08	11.99	100.82	63.03	134.08	88.98 to 100.19	75,531	70,307
100000 TO 149999	24	93.37	89.65	90.02	10.51	99.59	58.77	115.94	82.89 to 98.59	122,687	110,443
150000 TO 249999	22	93.98	93.50	93.42	10.09	100.09	64.59	122.34	88.61 to 101.76	183,963	171,855
250000 TO 499999	2	93.44	93.44	93.22	3.45	100.24	90.22	96.67	N/A	317,000	295,510
ALL	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	170	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	38.57	95% Median C.I.:	94.00 to 99.39
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,436,854	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	39.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.74 to 98.56
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,436,854	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	97.23 to 109.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,895,845						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,157	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,975	PRD:	107.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.50		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:11

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	10	85.50	84.70	74.15	35.33	114.23	37.50	175.00	45.00 to 124.13	3,174	2,353
5000 TO 9999	9	90.35	99.82	92.94	30.45	107.40	56.57	163.00	62.81 to 143.04	7,873	7,317
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	19	87.00	91.86	87.13	33.45	105.44	37.50	175.00	58.00 to 119.56	5,400	4,705
10000 TO 29999	31	94.36	105.22	96.13	31.28	109.46	51.90	294.10	80.38 to 111.04	21,677	20,838
30000 TO 59999	42	101.78	117.31	100.03	32.50	117.27	58.77	329.85	92.86 to 113.06	45,251	45,264
60000 TO 99999	38	98.46	100.67	96.24	14.95	104.60	70.32	198.96	92.79 to 103.31	79,934	76,928
100000 TO 149999	22	94.11	93.11	92.38	7.35	100.80	64.59	115.94	92.20 to 98.93	135,909	125,547
150000 TO 249999	16	98.75	96.92	96.22	8.61	100.72	74.50	122.34	88.61 to 103.02	193,762	186,436
250000 TO 499999	2	93.44	93.44	93.22	3.45	100.24	90.22	96.67	N/A	317,000	295,510
ALL											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
20	23	98.60	105.98	102.86	23.15	103.03	56.57	198.96	93.00 to 115.05	36,431	37,471
30	105	98.21	107.21	96.92	22.95	110.61	60.17	329.85	94.03 to 101.74	78,480	76,062
40	28	95.69	93.19	90.75	13.09	102.69	58.77	130.63	85.22 to 101.47	116,196	105,446
ALL											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
101	107	98.59	103.16	95.75	18.42	107.74	56.60	329.85	94.36 to 101.13	86,361	82,687
102	16	96.08	103.86	90.64	32.74	114.58	56.57	294.10	64.52 to 113.86	76,306	69,165
104	32	95.41	108.44	97.47	24.71	111.26	65.36	259.00	88.98 to 108.94	56,415	54,985
106	1	134.08	134.08	134.08			134.08	134.08	N/A	65,000	87,155
ALL											
	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

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:	170	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	38.57	95% Median C.I.:	94.00 to 99.39
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,436,854	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	39.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.74 to 98.56
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,436,854	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	97.23 to 109.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,895,845						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,157	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	329.85		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,975	PRD:	107.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.50		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:11

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	14	81.82	88.73	90.45	41.59	98.10	37.50	230.67	48.00 to 102.18	7,495	6,779
10	3	101.57	109.66	107.17	15.33	102.32	90.35	137.07	N/A	25,000	26,793
20	24	99.87	111.37	107.28	30.16	103.81	56.57	259.00	90.75 to 115.05	29,211	31,338
30	76	98.82	108.10	95.54	25.59	113.15	56.60	329.85	94.03 to 103.31	64,540	61,662
40	42	95.61	95.79	93.65	11.15	102.29	63.03	138.60	90.22 to 98.96	112,430	105,287
50	11	94.97	96.59	96.44	8.06	100.15	82.58	122.34	84.41 to 104.97	175,336	169,092
ALL	170	96.91	103.21	95.65	23.05	107.90	37.50	329.85	94.00 to 99.39	73,157	69,975

2009 Correlation Section for Boone County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the residential class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the residential class indicates that the median ratio is 97% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 23.05 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 107.90 is not in the acceptable range.

In this report are several stratifications that can be reviewed and analyzed: Under the stratification of Assessor Location; each of the named strata are likely to be relevant subclasses because they are assessor defined and should have both locational and organizational integrity. There are two other stratifications that may be of interest in the residential class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments. The biggest problem that is common to both is that none of the sub strata in either stratification are related to a common location. The most important factor relating to value is and always has been location. The second but equally important problem is that assessors and appraisers rarely organize an analysis or valuation project according to those criteria. That means that some parts of each of these groupings are probably being reviewed, updated or appraised at different times and with different sets of considerations. Among the Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, the members of the urban group contain all of the individual towns scattered throughout the county and each subject to their own economic conditions. Suburban is similar with the same locational and economic disparity. Rural gathers everything else together as a catchall and then is often used to predict the valuation of agricultural houses. The grouping called rural may relate to the agricultural houses in some counties or in some parts of counties, but that is best left to the judgment of local experts. Nothing that is contained in the residential R&O Statistics can define those relationships. That leaves Assessor Location as the only stratification that is defined and supported by the assessor. Assessor Location will be the only stratification from which adjustment recommendations will be offered. Other groups with a reasonable number of sales and questionable statistics will be pointed out in order to be thorough but likely not recommended for adjustment.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. Under the stratification of Location: Urban, Suburban & Rural; the substratum #3 Rural, with 19 sales has a median ratio of 101.76% which is outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. Under the stratification of Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL; the substratum #2, Unimproved, with 14 sales has a median ratio of 81.82% which is outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. No recommendation for adjustment has been made to either group because neither is considered a relevant subclass to use for an adjustment. A breakdown of the stratum will demonstrate that there is no locational integrity and is unlikely to be valued as a separate subclass in typical assessment operations. Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value of the class and probably each relevant subclass.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	245	170	69.39
2008	233	142	60.94
2007	208	114	54.81
2006	216	109	50.46
2005	202	100	49.50

RESIDENTIAL: Table II is indicative that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone 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	94	3.31	97	97
2008	86.44	10.15	95	96.08
2007	95	1.22	97	96
2006	96	-0.12	96	96
2005	96	1.10	97	97

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and assessed population in a similar manner. The county has a strong recent history of very similar changes in the two statistics that are recorded in this table. That suggests a pattern of good assessment practices is ongoing in this property type. This also indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone 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)
9.3	2009	3.31
17.60	2008	10.15
1.66	2007	1.22
4.11	2006	-0.12
9.02	2005	1.10

RESIDENTIAL: The difference between the percent change in the sales file and percent change in the abstract is significant. Table IV indicates about a 6% difference, an amount that might be construed as disparate treatment of the sales and the assessed base.

For 2009, the residential assessment actions describe a minor downward adjustment to the town of Cedar Rapids, a small town, (population 407), and a parcel by parcel off-site review and update of Albion, the county seat, (population 1,799). There was obviously a different procedure deemed necessary for each circumstance. The statistical comparison made to represent the change in the assessed base is a comparison of the change to the most recent sales in the file. The action taken by the assessor was taken to sold and unsold parcels that existed across the sales file, in two selected towns. It is neither difficult to imagine nor uncommon in actual practice that a slight bias could occur when encountering sold parcels during the reviews. It is probable that the sale prices were known to the reviewer. It is also probable that recently sold houses had been updated or rehabilitated near the time of the sale. The described actions were not disparate treatment, rather the outflow of a proactive well planned assessment action. The statistics were a result of a methodology that is more effective if the actions are merely adjustments or no assessment action at all. That was clearly not the case in Boone County residential property in 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	96	103

RESIDENTIAL: The median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range, while the mean is above the range. The mean was calculated above the acceptable range largely based on a few high ratios, and most of the high ratios occurred on lower price sales. Approximately 30% of the sales in this class sold for less than \$30,000. It only takes a few high ratios to have a noticeable impact on the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by these outliers, and in this class, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	23.05	107.90
Difference	8.05	4.90

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone County**

RESIDENTIAL: In this class of property, both the coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are outside the acceptable range. The interpretation of high CODs and PRDs is the class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. Like many counties with similar demographics, the county has done a statistically respectable job on residences which sold for \$30,000 or more. They struggle with the lower cost parcels. While, it would be good to have better indicators of uniform valuation, the positive view is that these sales have not been trimmed or selectively revalued. Taking into account the presence of small dollar sales and the population range of towns from 69 to 1,799, it is difficult to manage the quality statistics in databases with these characteristics. It might be said that there is typically very little organized market structure in small villages and the balance between supply and demand is more coincidence than market forces. A review of the assessment actions reveals a very proactive assessment process for 2009. Even though the quality of the residential valuation may be considered less than acceptable, the assessment practices are solid and consistent in spite of the measured COD and PRD.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	171	170	-1
Median	94	97	3
Wgt. Mean	90	96	6
Mean	101	103	2
COD	27.02	23.05	-3.97
PRD	111.98	107.90	-4.08
Minimum	15.51	37.50	21.99
Maximum	329.85	329.85	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of changes made to the sold property after the date of the sale that were deemed to have a substantial impact on the assessed value. Any such sales were removed from the qualified sales roster. The other changes are consistent with the assessment actions taken in this class of property. All of changes between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were favorable or at worst neutral.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	170	158	12
Median	97	96	1
Wgt. Mean	96	94	2
Mean	103	108	-5
COD	23.05	31.50	-8.45
PRD	107.90	115.09	-7.19
Minimum	37.50	50.78	-13.28
Maximum	329.85	371.53	-41.68

There are numerous small dollar sales in this sample (just under 10% below \$10,000) which accounts for a large portion of the outlier ratios and consequently inferior quality statistics. The maximum ratio alone adds about 2% to the mean ratio. The data gathering is done in such a way that some sales that might be substantially changed are wrongly included and others that should be included are not discovered. With that in mind, it is not surprising that the quality statistics are inferior to the R&O Statistics. In Boone County, the median and weighted mean are in the acceptable range but nothing else is. This table lends fair support for the R&O Statistics, as they parallel each other. The trended statistics on their own suggest that perhaps the level of value is very similar to the level that the R&O Statistics suggest. The quality of assessment may also not be represented by either of the two sets of statistics, rather exists somewhere in between. Since this is the first year preparing these statistics, no precedence exists from which one might draw any strong conclusions.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:35

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	4	101.37	95.88	92.83	8.83	103.29	75.20	105.59	N/A	19,000	17,637
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	119.49	112.08	100.40	7.88	111.63	94.25	122.50	N/A	61,666	61,915
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	83.42	93.78	86.00	38.41	109.05	49.53	137.44	N/A	32,855	28,255
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	96.27	98.04	88.11	21.23	111.28	70.05	129.60	N/A	27,450	24,186
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	46.44	46.44	46.44			46.44	46.44	N/A	8,000	3,715
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	101.99	104.41	106.10	7.04	98.41	97.07	116.58	N/A	25,500	27,055
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	87.38	87.38	87.27	4.66	100.13	83.31	91.46	N/A	36,000	31,417
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	92.31	116.51	146.51	72.57	79.53	28.13	229.09	N/A	34,166	50,056
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	70.26	70.26	90.41	51.42	77.71	34.13	106.38	N/A	128,375	116,062
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	108.23	143.94	110.30	59.25	130.50	67.50	357.50	N/A	26,200	28,899
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	7	104.07	102.82	98.20	10.91	104.71	75.20	122.50	75.20 to 122.50	37,285	36,613
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	97.23	94.66	91.12	24.65	103.88	46.44	137.44	63.12 to 129.60	27,433	24,996
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	91.88	115.38	104.87	56.20	110.02	28.13	357.50	67.50 to 108.56	46,854	49,135
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	85.17	95.68	86.84	31.79	110.17	49.53	137.44	63.12 to 135.41	30,452	26,446
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	94.69	98.84	114.21	32.22	86.54	28.13	229.09	46.44 to 116.58	28,450	32,494
____ALL____											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
ALBION	20	93.28	90.36	91.03	17.50	99.26	34.13	135.41	77.92 to 106.38	47,741	43,456
CEDAR RAPIDS	5	122.50	166.54	140.91	45.66	118.18	98.67	357.50	N/A	13,900	19,587
PETERSBURG	2	156.20	156.20	167.09	46.66	93.48	83.31	229.09	N/A	43,500	72,685
PRIMROSE	1	129.60	129.60	129.60			129.60	129.60	N/A	2,500	3,240
ST. EDWARD	5	49.53	69.53	85.78	60.16	81.06	28.13	119.49	N/A	18,700	16,040
____ALL____											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:35

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	31	97.39	106.10	101.39	32.52	104.64	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 108.23	30,663	31,088
2	1	34.13	34.13	34.13			34.13	34.13	N/A	56,750	19,370
3	1	106.38	106.38	106.38			106.38	106.38	N/A	200,000	212,755
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	28	101.37	108.60	100.66	31.81	107.89	28.13	357.50	85.17 to 108.23	39,993	40,257
2	5	77.92	77.74	78.46	30.50	99.08	46.44	122.50	N/A	17,500	13,731
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018											
06-0001	22	93.28	96.34	97.38	23.02	98.94	34.13	229.09	77.92 to 106.59	47,355	46,113
06-0006	6	126.05	160.38	140.52	37.92	114.13	98.67	357.50	98.67 to 357.50	12,000	16,862
06-0017	5	49.53	69.53	85.78	60.16	81.06	28.13	119.49	N/A	18,700	16,040
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013											
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:35

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	7	92.31	107.89	133.49	48.77	80.82	46.44	229.09	46.44 to 229.09	20,928	27,938
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	83.31	83.31	83.31			83.31	83.31	N/A	37,000	30,825
1900 TO 1919	4	106.09	102.97	102.29	4.19	100.67	91.46	108.23	N/A	28,812	29,471
1920 TO 1939	5	97.39	145.95	102.94	70.20	141.79	70.05	357.50	N/A	17,610	18,127
1940 TO 1949	4	92.04	82.93	94.51	38.15	87.74	28.13	119.49	N/A	26,375	24,927
1950 TO 1959	1	97.07	97.07	97.07			97.07	97.07	N/A	23,000	22,325
1960 TO 1969	3	107.36	106.66	107.42	1.39	99.30	104.07	108.56	N/A	31,166	33,478
1970 TO 1979	6	91.92	95.36	96.37	19.72	98.96	63.12	135.41	63.12 to 135.41	66,962	64,529
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	94.25	94.25	94.25			94.25	94.25	N/A	140,000	131,945
1995 TO 1999	1	34.13	34.13	34.13			34.13	34.13	N/A	56,750	19,370
2000 TO Present											
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

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	2	126.05	126.05	127.57	2.82	98.81	122.50	129.60	N/A	1,750	2,232
5000 TO 9999	4	93.49	147.73	148.92	106.69	99.20	46.44	357.50	N/A	8,125	12,100
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	126.05	140.50	146.85	53.69	95.68	46.44	357.50	46.44 to 357.50	6,000	8,810
10000 TO 29999	11	98.67	93.99	94.87	18.85	99.07	28.13	135.41	67.50 to 116.58	20,025	18,997
30000 TO 59999	13	91.46	97.58	98.55	29.41	99.02	34.13	229.09	70.05 to 108.56	40,465	39,879
60000 TO 99999	1	83.42	83.42	83.42			83.42	83.42	N/A	85,000	70,910
100000 TO 149999	1	94.25	94.25	94.25			94.25	94.25	N/A	140,000	131,945
150000 TO 249999	1	106.38	106.38	106.38			106.38	106.38	N/A	200,000	212,755
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:35

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	4	86.02	87.02	62.61	45.38	138.99	46.44	129.60	N/A	4,750	2,973
5000 TO 9999	2	47.82	47.82	44.34	41.17	107.84	28.13	67.50	N/A	17,000	7,537
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	58.52	73.95	50.89	55.68	145.32	28.13	129.60	28.13 to 129.60	8,833	4,495
10000 TO 29999	13	97.39	112.37	85.87	40.59	130.87	34.13	357.50	70.05 to 135.41	24,409	20,959
30000 TO 59999	10	106.98	101.18	101.18	10.15	100.00	77.92	119.49	83.31 to 116.58	36,200	36,627
60000 TO 99999	1	83.42	83.42	83.42			83.42	83.42	N/A	85,000	70,910
100000 TO 149999	2	161.67	161.67	129.73	41.70	124.62	94.25	229.09	N/A	95,000	123,245
150000 TO 249999	1	106.38	106.38	106.38			106.38	106.38	N/A	200,000	212,755
ALL											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	85.12	94.04	112.33	51.15	83.72	28.13	229.09	28.13 to 229.09	44,687	50,197
10	23	98.67	110.25	97.24	27.37	113.38	63.12	357.50	85.17 to 108.56	32,872	31,965
20	2	70.75	70.75	63.03	51.76	112.23	34.13	107.36	N/A	46,875	29,547
ALL											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	92.31	109.86	105.66	60.72	103.98	28.13	357.50	46.44 to 122.50	38,980	41,188
340	1	83.31	83.31	83.31			83.31	83.31	N/A	37,000	30,825
344	1	105.59	105.59	105.59			105.59	105.59	N/A	12,250	12,935
353	9	94.25	99.81	91.56	20.79	109.01	70.05	137.44	75.20 to 129.60	44,450	40,700
390	1	119.49	119.49	119.49			119.49	119.49	N/A	44,000	52,575
406	3	107.36	113.28	111.50	11.90	101.60	97.07	135.41	N/A	26,758	29,835
408	2	101.37	101.37	100.66	2.66	100.71	98.67	104.07	N/A	19,000	19,125
492	1	97.39	97.39	97.39			97.39	97.39	N/A	11,500	11,200
528	1	63.12	63.12	63.12			63.12	63.12	N/A	42,500	26,825
532	1	91.46	91.46	91.46			91.46	91.46	N/A	35,000	32,010
ALL											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

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:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:35

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	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238
04											
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

2009 Assessment Survey for Boone County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contract appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract lister
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2000
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach less depreciation derived from the market is used. A sales comparison approach not been used in Boone County.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	There are 6 Commercial Assessor Locations identified in Boone County. The assessor has not identified any other separate neighborhoods in the Commercial appraisal system.
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The areas that are in place in Boone County are the 5 towns, Albion, Cedar Rapids, Petersburg, Primrose and St. Edward. The commercial parcels outside the town limits are considered rural. These areas are identified in the "Assessor Location" section of the commercial statistics.

10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	The Commercial Assessor Locations are considered the best groupings to make broad adjustments or adjustments in the Statewide Equalization process. The sales file does not contain sufficient detail to make any other adjustments. Any other strata would not be reflect a common location and should only be undertaken by the county after detailed analysis.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	In some instances, there is sufficient data to make internal adjustments to some of the more predominant occupancies, or to groupings of similar occupancies. Typically, it is uncommon to have sufficient data within a 3 year measurement period to initiate an adjustment to most of the occupancies. It is more typical to monitor occupancies or groups and make changes based on observed trends, or to identify them for inspection and revaluation. The occupancy code statistics as presented in the R&O give no indication about the location or condition of the individual sales, and those are the two of the most important details in judging value.
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>)
	Suburban is a one mile radius around each city or village and the property is typically valued with the rural commercial property. Each town including their suburban area could have its own market, but they are more appropriately grouped using Assessor Location. The suburban location, as it is defined has no locational homogeneity and thus is an inappropriate stratum for adjustment for either the county or in the Statewide Equalization process.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
30	0	0	30

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:20

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	4	101.37	95.88	92.83	8.83	103.29	75.20	105.59	N/A		19,000	17,637
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	119.49	112.08	100.40	7.88	111.63	94.25	122.50	N/A		61,666	61,915
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	83.42	93.78	86.00	38.41	109.05	49.53	137.44	N/A		32,855	28,255
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	96.27	98.04	88.11	21.23	111.28	70.05	129.60	N/A		27,450	24,186
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	46.44	46.44	46.44			46.44	46.44	N/A		8,000	3,715
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	101.99	104.41	106.10	7.04	98.41	97.07	116.58	N/A		25,500	27,055
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	87.38	87.38	87.27	4.66	100.13	83.31	91.46	N/A		36,000	31,417
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	92.31	116.51	146.51	72.57	79.53	28.13	229.09	N/A		34,166	50,056
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	70.26	70.26	90.41	51.42	77.71	34.13	106.38	N/A		128,375	116,062
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	108.23	143.94	110.30	59.25	130.50	67.50	357.50	N/A		26,200	28,899
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	7	104.07	102.82	98.20	10.91	104.71	75.20	122.50	75.20 to 122.50		37,285	36,613
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	97.23	94.66	91.12	24.65	103.88	46.44	137.44	63.12 to 129.60		27,433	24,996
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	91.88	115.38	104.87	56.20	110.02	28.13	357.50	67.50 to 108.56		46,854	49,135
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	85.17	95.68	86.84	31.79	110.17	49.53	137.44	63.12 to 135.41		30,452	26,446
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	94.69	98.84	114.21	32.22	86.54	28.13	229.09	46.44 to 116.58		28,450	32,494
____ALL____												
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36		36,585	36,238

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ALBION	20	93.28	90.36	91.03	17.50	99.26	34.13	135.41	77.92 to 106.38		47,741	43,456
CEDAR RAPIDS	5	122.50	166.54	140.91	45.66	118.18	98.67	357.50	N/A		13,900	19,587
PETERSBURG	2	156.20	156.20	167.09	46.66	93.48	83.31	229.09	N/A		43,500	72,685
PRIMROSE	1	129.60	129.60	129.60			129.60	129.60	N/A		2,500	3,240
ST. EDWARD	5	49.53	69.53	85.78	60.16	81.06	28.13	119.49	N/A		18,700	16,040
____ALL____												
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36		36,585	36,238

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:20

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	31	97.39	106.10	101.39	32.52	104.64	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 108.23	30,663	31,088
2	1	34.13	34.13	34.13			34.13	34.13	N/A	56,750	19,370
3	1	106.38	106.38	106.38			106.38	106.38	N/A	200,000	212,755
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	28	101.37	108.60	100.66	31.81	107.89	28.13	357.50	85.17 to 108.23	39,993	40,257
2	5	77.92	77.74	78.46	30.50	99.08	46.44	122.50	N/A	17,500	13,731
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018											
06-0001	22	93.28	96.34	97.38	23.02	98.94	34.13	229.09	77.92 to 106.59	47,355	46,113
06-0006	6	126.05	160.38	140.52	37.92	114.13	98.67	357.50	98.67 to 357.50	12,000	16,862
06-0017	5	49.53	69.53	85.78	60.16	81.06	28.13	119.49	N/A	18,700	16,040
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013											
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 33 **MEDIAN: 97** COV: 55.84 95% Median C.I.: 83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price: 1,232,325 WGT. MEAN: 99 STD: 58.03 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 1,207,325 MEAN: 104 AVG.ABS.DEV: 31.94 95% Mean C.I.: 84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value: 1,195,875
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 36,585 COD: 32.80 MAX Sales Ratio: 357.50
AVG. Assessed Value: 36,238 PRD: 104.92 MIN Sales Ratio: 28.13

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:20

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	7	92.31	107.89	133.49	48.77	80.82	46.44	229.09	46.44 to 229.09	20,928	27,938
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	83.31	83.31	83.31			83.31	83.31	N/A	37,000	30,825
1900 TO 1919	4	106.09	102.97	102.29	4.19	100.67	91.46	108.23	N/A	28,812	29,471
1920 TO 1939	5	97.39	145.95	102.94	70.20	141.79	70.05	357.50	N/A	17,610	18,127
1940 TO 1949	4	92.04	82.93	94.51	38.15	87.74	28.13	119.49	N/A	26,375	24,927
1950 TO 1959	1	97.07	97.07	97.07			97.07	97.07	N/A	23,000	22,325
1960 TO 1969	3	107.36	106.66	107.42	1.39	99.30	104.07	108.56	N/A	31,166	33,478
1970 TO 1979	6	91.92	95.36	96.37	19.72	98.96	63.12	135.41	63.12 to 135.41	66,962	64,529
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	94.25	94.25	94.25			94.25	94.25	N/A	140,000	131,945
1995 TO 1999	1	34.13	34.13	34.13			34.13	34.13	N/A	56,750	19,370
2000 TO Present											
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

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	2	126.05	126.05	127.57	2.82	98.81	122.50	129.60	N/A	1,750	2,232
5000 TO 9999	4	93.49	147.73	148.92	106.69	99.20	46.44	357.50	N/A	8,125	12,100
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	126.05	140.50	146.85	53.69	95.68	46.44	357.50	46.44 to 357.50	6,000	8,810
10000 TO 29999	11	98.67	93.99	94.87	18.85	99.07	28.13	135.41	67.50 to 116.58	20,025	18,997
30000 TO 59999	13	91.46	97.58	98.55	29.41	99.02	34.13	229.09	70.05 to 108.56	40,465	39,879
60000 TO 99999	1	83.42	83.42	83.42			83.42	83.42	N/A	85,000	70,910
100000 TO 149999	1	94.25	94.25	94.25			94.25	94.25	N/A	140,000	131,945
150000 TO 249999	1	106.38	106.38	106.38			106.38	106.38	N/A	200,000	212,755
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 33 **MEDIAN: 97** COV: 55.84 95% Median C.I.: 83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price: 1,232,325 WGT. MEAN: 99 STD: 58.03 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 1,207,325 MEAN: 104 AVG.ABS.DEV: 31.94 95% Mean C.I.: 84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value: 1,195,875
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 36,585 COD: 32.80 MAX Sales Ratio: 357.50
AVG. Assessed Value: 36,238 PRD: 104.92 MIN Sales Ratio: 28.13

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:20

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	4	86.02	87.02	62.61	45.38	138.99	46.44	129.60	N/A	4,750	2,973
5000 TO 9999	2	47.82	47.82	44.34	41.17	107.84	28.13	67.50	N/A	17,000	7,537
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	58.52	73.95	50.89	55.68	145.32	28.13	129.60	28.13 to 129.60	8,833	4,495
10000 TO 29999	13	97.39	112.37	85.87	40.59	130.87	34.13	357.50	70.05 to 135.41	24,409	20,959
30000 TO 59999	10	106.98	101.18	101.18	10.15	100.00	77.92	119.49	83.31 to 116.58	36,200	36,627
60000 TO 99999	1	83.42	83.42	83.42			83.42	83.42	N/A	85,000	70,910
100000 TO 149999	2	161.67	161.67	129.73	41.70	124.62	94.25	229.09	N/A	95,000	123,245
150000 TO 249999	1	106.38	106.38	106.38			106.38	106.38	N/A	200,000	212,755
ALL											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	85.12	94.04	112.33	51.15	83.72	28.13	229.09	28.13 to 229.09	44,687	50,197
10	23	98.67	110.25	97.24	27.37	113.38	63.12	357.50	85.17 to 108.56	32,872	31,965
20	2	70.75	70.75	63.03	51.76	112.23	34.13	107.36	N/A	46,875	29,547
ALL											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	92.31	109.86	105.66	60.72	103.98	28.13	357.50	46.44 to 122.50	38,980	41,188
340	1	83.31	83.31	83.31			83.31	83.31	N/A	37,000	30,825
344	1	105.59	105.59	105.59			105.59	105.59	N/A	12,250	12,935
353	9	94.25	99.81	91.56	20.79	109.01	70.05	137.44	75.20 to 129.60	44,450	40,700
390	1	119.49	119.49	119.49			119.49	119.49	N/A	44,000	52,575
406	3	107.36	113.28	111.50	11.90	101.60	97.07	135.41	N/A	26,758	29,835
408	2	101.37	101.37	100.66	2.66	100.71	98.67	104.07	N/A	19,000	19,125
492	1	97.39	97.39	97.39			97.39	97.39	N/A	11,500	11,200
528	1	63.12	63.12	63.12			63.12	63.12	N/A	42,500	26,825
532	1	91.46	91.46	91.46			91.46	91.46	N/A	35,000	32,010
ALL											
	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

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:	33	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	55.84	95% Median C.I.:	83.42 to 107.36
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,232,325	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	58.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.82 to 113.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,207,325	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	84.12 to 123.72
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,195,875						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,585	COD:	32.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	357.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,238	PRD:	104.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.13		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:20

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	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238
04											
ALL	33	97.39	103.92	99.05	32.80	104.92	28.13	357.50	83.42 to 107.36	36,585	36,238

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the commercial class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the commercial class indicates that the median ratio is 97% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 32.80 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 104.92 is not in the acceptable range.

Analysis of the statistics prepared for the commercial class presents few opportunities to do any subclass analysis or recommendations for adjustment to a relevant subclass. No matter how sales are grouped in the commercial class, there are problems identifying relevant subclasses. These statistics have all of the problems of locational and organizational integrity that the residential statistics plus at least two more. First, there are never very many commercial sales even using a three year study. Second, commercial property is a collection of income producing land and structures that have little or no economic connection to each other. In the end, the only relevant stratification presented in the R&O is the Assessor Location, and even it is weak as an appraisal class. It is assessor defined and usually has locational integrity and to some extent organizational integrity if the assessor or appraiser recognizes the individual economic conditions that exist among the various uses grouped into the commercial class. At least, the assessor is likely to review, appraise and adjust the properties as they are grouped under Assessor Location in the same general time frame. Among commercial properties, there are simply less sales and more subclasses making subclass analysis and adjustment typically ill advised.

Beside Assessor Location; there are two other stratifications that have been of interest in the commercial class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%.

Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and probably each relevant subclass.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	60	33	55.00
2008	55	28	50.91
2007	47	20	42.55
2006	48	19	39.58
2005	58	21	36.21

COMMERCIAL: Table II is indicative that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone 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	97	-0.83	96	97
2008	94.41	3.15	97	99.13
2007	92	0.83	93	92
2006	94	-58.14	39	94
2005	99	-0.14	99	99

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and assessed population in a similar manner. The county has a strong recent history of very similar changes in the two statistics that are recorded in this table. That suggests a pattern of good assessment practices is ongoing in this property type. The only exception is in 2006, which may be due to the reclassification of all confinement livestock feeding facilities as agricultural parcels. This table indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone 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	2009	-0.83
9.48	2008	3.15
0.00	2007	0.83
0.00	2006	-58.14
0.00	2005	-0.14

COMMERCIAL: The assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property indicate that no subclasses were changed for 2009. The statistics reported in the table are consistent showing no measurable change to either the sold parcels or the assessed base.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	99	104

COMMERCIAL: The median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range, while the mean is above the range. The mean was calculated above the acceptable range largely based on a few high ratios, and most of the high ratios occurred on lower price sales. Nearly 20% of the 33 sales in this class sold for less than \$10,000. It only takes a few high ratios to have a noticeable impact on the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by these outliers, and in this class, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	32.80	104.92
Difference	12.80	1.92

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone County

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is well above the range and the price related differential is notably above the acceptable range as well. This is supposed to indicate that this class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. That said, commercial quality statistics (good or bad), in low population counties are both more a coincidence of the data than good indicators of assessment performance. Before making any blanket statements about the assessment uniformity of the overall county, certain demographics should be mentioned. First, the commercial property is represented by sales in extremely diverse locations, including the county seat, several villages and rural locations. Among the 33 qualified commercial sales, there were 9 different occupancy codes listed, each with the potential to be operating in a different economic environment. It might be said that there is very little organized market structure that is common to all of the far reaching locations or to all of the different property uses. With all of these variables, the commercial class is far too small to make either realistic adjustments or profound statements about the quality of assessment. It is difficult to manage the quality statistics in databases with these characteristics. Some may be tempted to trim unwieldy sales or selectively revalue sold properties, but Boone County does neither. Considering all of these variables and the size of the sample, there is little chance that the COD and the PRD tell much about the actual quality of assessment. In 2009, Boone County did not undertake any revaluation of commercial property. As evidenced in Table IV, they tend to inspect regularly but update the commercial property values intermittently rather than annually. This is possible since there is little market activity to support frequent changes, and little growth in much of the Boone County market. Under those circumstances it is actually prudent for the county to follow a cautious update processes

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	33	33	0
Median	97	97	0
Wgt. Mean	99	99	0
Mean	104	104	0
COD	32.80	32.80	0.00
PRD	104.92	104.92	0.00
Minimum	28.13	28.13	0.00
Maximum	357.50	357.50	0.00

COMMERCIAL: There was no designated assessment action to this class of property reported for 2009. The Preliminary and R&O measurements are essentially the same.

**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:	56	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	36.17	95% Median C.I.:	49.93 to 65.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	22.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.22 to 60.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	55.59 to 67.22	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,843,280							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	157,915	PRD:	109.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:58

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	106.98	106.98	106.98			106.98	106.98	N/A		96,000	102,705
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	63.89	63.89	63.23	2.50	101.04	62.29	65.49	N/A		243,534	153,992
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	61.51	64.20	63.63	17.70	100.91	46.29	100.09	46.29 to 100.09		351,221	223,466
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	73.44	79.46	79.99	19.39	99.34	57.87	104.88	N/A		190,961	152,751
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	47.38	47.38	47.38	64.61	100.01	16.77	77.99	N/A		152,500	72,250
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	67.14	64.40	58.87	12.23	109.38	47.39	77.97	47.39 to 77.97		264,606	155,776
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	69.28	69.43	59.89	33.62	115.92	40.09	114.44	40.09 to 114.44		319,508	191,352
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	104.23	104.23	103.14	1.51	101.05	102.65	105.80	N/A		54,444	56,152
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	69.86	69.86	69.86			69.86	69.86	N/A		73,200	51,135
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	49.93	49.58	48.91	17.14	101.37	27.54	63.57	27.54 to 63.57		242,748	118,740
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	44.08	42.04	41.16	6.68	102.13	36.60	45.43	N/A		477,000	196,340
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	43.95	44.02	45.14	18.04	97.53	16.77	62.70	38.89 to 55.93		354,336	159,939
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	65.49	72.10	68.53	21.62	105.21	46.29	106.98	57.87 to 92.65		266,428	182,580
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	68.94	68.69	59.64	27.87	115.17	16.77	114.44	48.76 to 81.31		254,340	151,692
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	21	45.43	46.82	45.51	19.35	102.87	16.77	69.86	42.54 to 54.67		321,276	146,225
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	66.64	66.21	63.73	20.10	103.89	16.77	104.88	56.94 to 74.58		265,236	169,033
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	58.77	65.60	56.91	34.53	115.26	27.54	114.44	46.67 to 81.40		246,521	140,302
_____ALL_____												
	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49		282,679	157,915

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:	56	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	36.17	95% Median C.I.:	49.93 to 65.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	22.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.22 to 60.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	55.59 to 67.22	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,843,280							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	157,915	PRD:	109.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:58

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1767	3	68.71	69.62	69.62	4.37	100.00	65.57	74.58	N/A	112,000	77,976
1769	4	51.81	53.85	52.19	13.24	103.18	46.29	65.49	N/A	313,900	163,822
1771	3	44.53	49.80	48.67	13.58	102.33	43.37	61.51	N/A	460,233	224,003
1843	6	44.61	48.85	44.44	20.07	109.92	36.60	77.97	36.60 to 77.97	377,166	167,603
1845	2	46.36	46.36	47.94	13.52	96.69	40.09	52.62	N/A	279,250	133,875
1847	1	49.93	49.93	49.93			49.93	49.93	N/A	65,481	32,695
1849	1	106.98	106.98	106.98			106.98	106.98	N/A	96,000	102,705
2051	1	45.43	45.43	45.43			45.43	45.43	N/A	231,000	104,940
2053	4	65.38	65.22	63.76	6.02	102.29	60.28	69.86	N/A	286,903	182,940
2055	2	75.24	75.24	72.25	8.07	104.13	69.17	81.31	N/A	203,758	147,225
2057	6	57.10	61.64	54.49	22.18	113.12	43.40	102.65	43.40 to 102.65	497,898	271,314
2131	7	47.39	67.15	57.04	53.94	117.73	38.89	114.44	38.89 to 114.44	329,789	188,107
2133	7	67.71	61.31	58.99	35.65	103.92	16.77	105.80	16.77 to 105.80	186,589	110,070
2335	3	73.44	78.73	77.24	21.34	101.93	57.87	104.88	N/A	94,666	73,116
2337	4	52.34	48.94	47.30	19.44	103.48	27.54	63.57	N/A	125,608	59,408
2341	2	82.18	82.18	81.41	21.79	100.94	64.27	100.09	N/A	350,075	285,005
____ALL____											
	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	42	53.65	59.04	53.51	33.23	110.32	16.77	114.44	46.67 to 62.70	267,975	143,397
2	4	67.14	68.59	68.38	4.55	100.30	65.49	74.58	N/A	120,000	82,058
3	10	63.64	68.47	60.86	23.62	112.50	43.40	102.65	46.59 to 100.09	409,505	249,234
____ALL____											
	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

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	2	43.54	43.54	43.78	2.29	99.45	42.54	44.53	N/A	412,000	180,357
2	54	60.90	62.06	56.53	28.25	109.79	16.77	114.44	50.00 to 65.57	277,889	157,084
____ALL____											
	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

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:	56	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	36.17	95% Median C.I.:	49.93 to 65.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	22.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.22 to 60.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	55.59 to 67.22	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,843,280							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	157,915	PRD:	109.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:58

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
02-0018	2	58.72	58.72	58.45	4.75	100.46	55.93	61.51	N/A		410,350	239,855
06-0001	28	57.10	60.60	53.89	26.67	112.45	36.60	114.44	46.59 to 65.57		322,547	173,831
06-0006	19	63.57	63.62	60.66	32.03	104.88	16.77	105.80	47.39 to 81.40		182,256	110,551
06-0017	3	64.27	69.25	63.26	29.40	109.48	43.40	100.09	N/A		446,716	282,586
39-0010												
39-0055												
59-0013	4	44.61	51.93	46.64	23.29	111.34	40.54	77.97	N/A		293,750	137,010
59-0080												
63-0001												
NonValid School												
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49		282,679	157,915

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
0.01 TO 10.00	1	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A		3,500	3,280
10.01 TO 30.00	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A		16,800	17,775
30.01 TO 50.00	2	52.30	52.30	52.33	4.53	99.95	49.93	54.67	N/A		66,240	34,662
50.01 TO 100.00	14	52.78	52.84	47.71	38.64	110.75	16.77	102.65	27.54 to 77.97		176,386	84,146
100.01 TO 180.00	33	61.51	63.05	57.31	23.73	110.02	40.09	114.44	48.76 to 67.71		319,667	183,186
180.01 TO 330.00	4	69.33	66.97	59.80	28.92	112.00	36.60	92.65	N/A		553,106	330,757
330.01 TO 650.00	1	46.29	46.29	46.29			46.29	46.29	N/A		446,400	206,655
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49		282,679	157,915

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	6	50.16	50.65	49.43	14.08	102.48	40.54	63.57	40.54 to 63.57		251,418	124,265
DRY-N/A	8	64.06	63.16	59.10	25.76	106.86	36.60	92.65	36.60 to 92.65		209,813	124,005
GRASS	5	68.71	75.03	66.58	26.41	112.70	50.00	104.88	N/A		75,188	50,060
GRASS-N/A	11	65.49	56.19	52.10	35.77	107.84	16.77	106.98	16.77 to 81.40		170,740	88,962
IRRGTD	7	64.27	72.85	67.96	21.50	107.20	48.76	102.65	48.76 to 102.65		324,778	220,708
IRRGTD-N/A	19	55.93	59.27	53.38	26.60	111.05	38.89	114.44	44.08 to 67.71		427,130	227,989
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49		282,679	157,915

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:	56	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	36.17	95% Median C.I.:	49.93 to 65.49	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	22.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.22 to 60.51	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	55.59 to 67.22	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,843,280							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	157,915	PRD:	109.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:58

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	52.62	55.67	53.39	21.61	104.26	36.60	92.65	40.54 to 74.58	245,910	131,293
DRY-N/A	3	73.44	65.61	60.87	14.77	107.79	45.43	77.97	N/A	160,666	97,801
GRASS	9	65.57	67.60	56.02	26.16	120.68	40.09	104.88	46.29 to 93.71	138,500	77,586
GRASS-N/A	7	65.49	54.97	52.66	43.01	104.39	16.77	106.98	16.77 to 106.98	143,940	75,800
IRRGTD	24	58.77	60.88	56.11	24.79	108.51	38.89	114.44	46.59 to 64.27	419,511	235,367
IRRGTD-N/A	2	87.49	87.49	71.09	20.94	123.07	69.17	105.80	N/A	160,325	113,967
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

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	14	53.65	57.80	54.52	23.76	106.01	36.60	92.65	42.54 to 74.58	227,644	124,116
GRASS	16	65.53	62.08	54.52	33.53	113.87	16.77	106.98	40.09 to 81.40	140,880	76,805
IRRGTD	25	60.28	61.21	56.49	23.79	108.36	38.89	114.44	46.67 to 64.27	414,885	234,359
IRRGTD-N/A	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	16,800	17,775
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

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	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
10000 TO 29999	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	16,800	17,775
60000 TO 99999	8	73.91	78.10	80.57	27.08	96.93	49.93	106.98	49.93 to 106.98	76,096	61,311
100000 TO 149999	7	65.57	67.03	66.24	9.92	101.20	50.00	81.31	50.00 to 81.31	122,874	81,392
150000 TO 249999	12	52.32	55.10	56.83	43.43	96.95	16.77	114.44	27.54 to 77.99	195,192	110,930
250000 TO 499999	20	58.11	58.23	57.68	21.88	100.96	38.89	100.09	46.29 to 64.27	377,176	217,547
500000 +	7	44.53	45.59	46.69	8.48	97.65	36.60	57.25	36.60 to 57.25	636,428	297,125
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

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:	56	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	36.17	95% Median C.I.:	49.93 to 65.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	22.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.22 to 60.51	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	55.59 to 67.22	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,843,280							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	157,915	PRD:	109.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:17:58

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	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
10000 TO 29999	3	16.77	46.45	21.42	176.96	216.88	16.77	105.80	N/A	107,266	22,971
30000 TO 59999	5	54.67	51.97	46.85	18.39	110.93	27.54	69.86	N/A	84,932	39,793
60000 TO 99999	11	68.71	72.26	67.34	20.73	107.31	40.09	104.88	50.00 to 102.65	119,609	80,540
100000 TO 149999	10	46.56	56.93	50.51	33.67	112.71	38.89	106.98	38.89 to 77.99	233,800	118,098
150000 TO 249999	18	60.90	59.91	55.88	20.57	107.22	36.60	114.44	46.67 to 67.71	390,288	218,099
250000 TO 499999	7	55.93	63.68	59.02	31.08	107.89	43.40	100.09	43.40 to 100.09	481,596	284,241
500000 +	1	57.25	57.25	57.25			57.25	57.25	N/A	1,030,000	589,715
ALL	56	59.08	61.40	55.86	29.09	109.91	16.77	114.44	49.93 to 65.49	282,679	157,915

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:	64	MEDIAN:	56	COV:	37.01	95% Median C.I.:	47.39 to 63.57	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,119,914	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.83 to 58.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,119,914	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.10	95% Mean C.I.:	53.90 to 64.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,312,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	298,748	COD:	30.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,129	PRD:	109.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:18:10

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	1	106.98	106.98	106.98			106.98	106.98	N/A	96,000	102,705
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	63.89	63.89	63.23	2.50	101.04	62.29	65.49	N/A	243,534	153,992
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	61.51	64.20	63.63	17.70	100.91	46.29	100.09	46.29 to 100.09	351,221	223,466
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	73.44	79.46	79.99	19.39	99.34	57.87	104.88	N/A	190,961	152,751
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	47.38	47.38	47.38	64.61	100.01	16.77	77.99	N/A	152,500	72,250
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	67.14	64.40	58.87	12.23	109.38	47.39	77.97	47.39 to 77.97	264,606	155,776
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	57.25	67.13	58.32	37.81	115.11	40.09	114.44	40.54 to 93.71	339,199	197,816
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	104.23	104.23	103.14	1.51	101.05	102.65	105.80	N/A	54,444	56,152
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	69.86	69.86	69.86			69.86	69.86	N/A	73,200	51,135
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	48.81	49.15	48.70	16.32	100.92	27.54	63.57	27.54 to 63.57	237,014	115,425
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	37.99	42.84	41.26	22.58	103.83	26.73	71.44	26.73 to 71.44	380,305	156,901
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	12	43.95	43.90	45.17	15.94	97.18	16.77	62.70	38.89 to 50.00	409,042	184,779
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	65.49	72.10	68.53	21.62	105.21	46.29	106.98	57.87 to 92.65	266,428	182,580
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	68.71	67.74	58.80	28.01	115.19	16.77	114.44	48.74 to 81.31	265,882	156,350
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	44.98	46.06	44.97	19.85	102.42	16.77	71.44	40.91 to 49.93	340,712	153,221
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	66.64	66.21	63.73	20.10	103.89	16.77	104.88	56.94 to 74.58	265,236	169,033
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	55.96	63.78	55.88	34.39	114.14	27.54	114.44	46.67 to 81.31	256,549	143,359
_____ALL_____											
	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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:	64	MEDIAN:	56	COV:	37.01	95% Median C.I.:	47.39 to 63.57	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,119,914	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.83 to 58.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,119,914	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.10	95% Mean C.I.:	53.90 to 64.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,312,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	298,748	COD:	30.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,129	PRD:	109.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:18:10

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1767	3	68.71	69.62	69.62	4.37	100.00	65.57	74.58	N/A	112,000	77,976
1769	4	51.81	53.85	52.19	13.24	103.18	46.29	65.49	N/A	313,900	163,822
1771	3	44.53	49.80	48.67	13.58	102.33	43.37	61.51	N/A	460,233	224,003
1843	6	44.61	48.85	44.44	20.07	109.92	36.60	77.97	36.60 to 77.97	377,166	167,603
1845	2	46.36	46.36	47.94	13.52	96.69	40.09	52.62	N/A	279,250	133,875
1847	1	49.93	49.93	49.93			49.93	49.93	N/A	65,481	32,695
1849	1	106.98	106.98	106.98			106.98	106.98	N/A	96,000	102,705
2051	1	45.43	45.43	45.43			45.43	45.43	N/A	231,000	104,940
2053	5	62.29	59.69	58.81	12.99	101.50	37.58	69.86	N/A	283,478	166,724
2055	3	69.17	59.07	64.00	26.30	92.30	26.73	81.31	N/A	166,360	106,471
2057	7	56.94	59.42	54.02	21.78	110.00	43.40	102.65	43.40 to 102.65	454,894	245,730
2127	1	45.68	45.68	47.82			45.68	45.68	N/A	770,415	368,430
2129	2	44.83	44.83	45.72	8.73	98.03	40.91	48.74	N/A	545,725	249,525
2131	7	47.39	67.15	57.04	53.94	117.73	38.89	114.44	38.89 to 114.44	329,789	188,107
2133	8	69.57	62.57	60.33	31.02	103.72	16.77	105.80	16.77 to 105.80	180,968	109,171
2335	3	73.44	78.73	77.24	21.34	101.93	57.87	104.88	N/A	94,666	73,116
2337	5	50.00	46.75	42.03	21.08	111.24	27.54	63.57	N/A	246,121	103,445
2341	2	82.18	82.18	81.41	21.79	100.94	64.27	100.09	N/A	350,075	285,005
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	45	52.62	58.37	52.50	33.67	111.18	16.77	114.44	46.29 to 62.70	275,434	144,600
2	4	67.14	68.59	68.38	4.55	100.30	65.49	74.58	N/A	120,000	82,058
3	15	56.94	59.52	55.67	28.05	106.91	26.73	102.65	45.68 to 69.17	416,357	231,801
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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	10	43.54	44.23	44.48	16.25	99.43	26.73	71.44	37.58 to 48.74	411,388	182,971
2	54	60.90	62.06	56.53	28.25	109.79	16.77	114.44	50.00 to 65.57	277,889	157,084
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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:	64	MEDIAN:	56	COV:	37.01	95% Median C.I.:	47.39 to 63.57	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,119,914	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.83 to 58.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,119,914	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.10	95% Mean C.I.:	53.90 to 64.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,312,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	298,748	COD:	30.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,129	PRD:	109.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:18:10

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018	2	58.72	58.72	58.45	4.75	100.46	55.93	61.51	N/A	410,350	239,855
06-0001	33	49.93	57.47	52.08	30.09	110.34	26.73	114.44	45.68 to 63.01	341,046	177,624
06-0006	21	63.57	62.77	57.31	31.49	109.53	16.77	105.80	47.39 to 77.99	206,317	118,235
06-0017	3	64.27	69.25	63.26	29.40	109.48	43.40	100.09	N/A	446,716	282,586
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013	5	46.11	50.77	46.67	18.03	108.77	40.54	77.97	N/A	274,375	128,053
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
10.01 TO 30.00	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	16,800	17,775
30.01 TO 50.00	3	49.93	43.78	42.09	18.65	104.02	26.73	54.67	N/A	74,682	31,430
50.01 TO 100.00	15	47.69	52.39	47.64	40.13	109.96	16.77	102.65	38.89 to 69.86	177,752	84,685
100.01 TO 180.00	38	58.61	60.98	55.00	25.60	110.88	37.58	114.44	47.39 to 65.57	336,316	184,961
180.01 TO 330.00	5	57.25	62.72	56.71	32.06	110.60	36.60	92.65	N/A	596,568	338,292
330.01 TO 650.00	1	46.29	46.29	46.29			46.29	46.29	N/A	446,400	206,655
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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	50.16	50.65	49.43	14.08	102.48	40.54	63.57	40.54 to 63.57	251,418	124,265
DRY-N/A	10	63.06	62.28	58.86	24.95	105.82	36.60	92.65	45.43 to 77.97	201,700	118,714
GRASS	6	63.29	66.98	58.88	34.94	113.76	26.73	104.88	26.73 to 104.88	77,917	45,877
GRASS-N/A	12	55.89	54.64	50.30	42.58	108.62	16.77	106.98	27.54 to 81.31	178,993	90,037
IRRGTD	7	64.27	72.85	67.96	21.50	107.20	48.76	102.65	48.76 to 102.65	324,778	220,708
IRRGTD-N/A	23	47.39	56.50	51.18	28.45	110.40	37.99	114.44	44.08 to 61.51	465,457	238,211
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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:	64	MEDIAN:	56	COV:	37.01	95% Median C.I.:	47.39 to 63.57	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,119,914	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.83 to 58.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,119,914	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.10	95% Mean C.I.:	53.90 to 64.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,312,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	298,748	COD:	30.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,129	PRD:	109.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:18:10

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	12	51.28	54.87	52.95	21.39	103.63	36.60	92.65	42.54 to 63.57	241,824	128,037
DRY-N/A	4	72.44	67.07	63.55	11.92	105.55	45.43	77.97	N/A	155,905	99,070
GRASS	10	61.72	63.52	54.05	31.30	117.51	26.73	104.88	40.09 to 93.71	133,807	72,324
GRASS-N/A	8	51.54	52.80	49.51	54.59	106.64	16.77	106.98	16.77 to 106.98	159,670	79,058
IRRGTD	27	55.93	58.84	54.07	25.99	108.83	37.99	114.44	44.53 to 63.01	440,292	238,054
IRRGTD-N/A	3	69.17	73.55	54.66	28.97	134.56	45.68	105.80	N/A	363,688	198,788
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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	53.65	57.92	54.82	23.74	105.65	36.60	92.65	45.43 to 73.44	220,344	120,795
GRASS	18	61.68	58.75	51.84	37.67	113.35	16.77	106.98	37.58 to 81.31	145,301	75,317
IRRGTD	29	55.93	58.75	54.05	25.64	108.69	37.99	114.44	45.68 to 63.01	446,971	241,588
IRRGTD-N/A	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	16,800	17,775
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
10000 TO 29999	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	16,800	17,775
60000 TO 99999	9	69.86	72.39	73.60	32.33	98.36	26.73	106.98	49.93 to 104.88	77,814	57,272
100000 TO 149999	8	67.14	67.58	67.15	9.57	100.65	50.00	81.31	50.00 to 81.31	125,217	84,077
150000 TO 249999	13	47.69	54.41	56.06	44.23	97.06	16.77	114.44	27.54 to 77.99	195,321	109,491
250000 TO 499999	21	55.93	57.25	56.99	23.21	100.46	37.58	100.09	43.37 to 64.27	372,062	212,038
500000 +	11	44.53	44.77	45.80	8.56	97.74	36.60	57.25	37.99 to 48.74	640,458	293,358
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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:	64	MEDIAN:	56	COV:	37.01	95% Median C.I.:	47.39 to 63.57	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,119,914	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.83 to 58.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,119,914	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.10	95% Mean C.I.:	53.90 to 64.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,312,275							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	298,748	COD:	30.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.44			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,129	PRD:	109.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.77			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:18:10

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	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	93.71	93.71	93.71			93.71	93.71	N/A	3,500	3,280
10000 TO 29999	4	21.75	41.52	22.71	113.78	182.81	16.77	105.80	N/A	103,341	23,470
30000 TO 59999	5	54.67	51.97	46.85	18.39	110.93	27.54	69.86	N/A	84,932	39,793
60000 TO 99999	12	67.14	70.08	64.67	22.25	108.36	40.09	104.88	50.00 to 81.31	126,048	81,514
100000 TO 149999	12	46.56	56.53	50.40	34.12	112.16	37.58	106.98	38.89 to 73.44	229,116	115,476
150000 TO 249999	18	60.90	59.91	55.88	20.57	107.22	36.60	114.44	46.67 to 67.71	390,288	218,099
250000 TO 499999	11	46.59	56.28	52.62	28.95	106.95	37.99	100.09	40.91 to 92.65	541,928	285,160
500000 +	1	57.25	57.25	57.25			57.25	57.25	N/A	1,030,000	589,715
ALL	64	56.44	59.28	53.93	30.30	109.90	16.77	114.44	47.39 to 63.57	298,748	161,129

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

Agricultural:

The county closely monitored agricultural sales throughout 2008 to determine if the strong upward trend of the past 2 years would continue. They concluded that the market continued to be strong, and that land values would have to be increased.

Annually, the county conducts their pick-up work in a timely manner.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. The main target of the inspection done during 2008 was the agricultural residences and improvements. This process has taken two years and was completed, but not in time to prepare updated valuations for use in 2009.

The 3 market areas all experienced increases to part or all classes for 2009. Area 2 had all of the CRP acres adjusted. Areas 1 and 3 experienced individual adjustments on virtually all of the LCG subclasses. The changes were increases and significant. In Areas 1 and 3 the preliminary level of value was in the low to mid 50%^s, and was moved to the low 70%^s. Area 2 changes were more modest.

2009 Assessment Survey for Boone County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract lister
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract lister
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?
	Parcels less than 20 acres cannot qualify as agricultural.
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?
	The income approach is not currently used to value agricultural land. The assessor does not know when or if it was used in the past.
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?
	1989 -The soil survey will be updated for use in 2010.
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Contract lister annually reviews FSA information for land use changes. Additionally, the county makes physical inspections when needed, reviews NRD registrations and maps, and recently has used the web soil survey as a source document for land use inspection. Beginning in 2008, the county has used a software program named Agri-Data. This uses relatively current photo base that is useful to identify land use and land use changes.

b.	By whom?
	Contract lister
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	The county has identified 3 market areas for the valuation of agricultural land.
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	The areas are defined by topography and similar soil characteristics.
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 or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	N/A
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	N/A
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No; -The agricultural land sale analysis has not identified any value differences due to non-agricultural influences.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
*			131

*Among the agricultural parcels, most pick-up work originates from permits, but other sources contribute to the discovery of the new construction.

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:	56	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 83.40	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	31.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.38 to 79.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.75	95% Mean C.I.:	73.51 to 89.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,638,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	30.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	207,821	PRD:	111.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:48

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	150.94	150.94	150.94			150.94	150.94	N/A		96,000	144,900
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	71.53	71.53	74.00	8.44	96.67	65.49	77.57	N/A		243,534	180,205
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	81.58	84.34	83.57	13.72	100.92	67.63	121.42	67.63 to 121.42		351,221	293,505
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	101.53	113.18	112.14	23.99	100.93	85.63	155.47	N/A		190,961	214,136
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	63.79	63.79	63.79	57.03	100.00	27.41	100.16	N/A		152,500	97,275
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	74.02	77.16	73.77	15.21	104.60	60.80	101.65	60.80 to 101.65		264,606	195,206
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	90.47	94.50	78.95	35.65	119.69	50.35	145.37	50.35 to 145.37		319,508	252,251
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	147.91	147.91	140.70	7.05	105.12	137.48	158.33	N/A		54,444	76,600
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	100.34	100.34	100.34			100.34	100.34	N/A		73,200	73,450
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	72.84	66.99	65.34	14.34	102.53	38.43	85.55	38.43 to 85.55		242,748	158,605
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	57.33	57.07	55.70	6.32	102.46	51.51	62.38	N/A		477,000	265,710
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	56.27	58.69	59.24	19.89	99.07	27.41	82.70	50.59 to 74.46		354,336	209,924
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	85.63	96.68	90.84	24.44	106.43	65.49	155.47	77.57 to 121.42		266,428	242,035
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	79.02	89.83	77.21	35.90	116.35	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 107.46		254,340	196,370
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	21	62.28	63.21	60.47	20.33	104.52	27.41	100.34	53.77 to 73.35		321,276	194,288
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	84.47	86.42	83.65	22.03	103.30	27.41	155.47	68.54 to 100.16		265,236	221,882
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	74.59	90.06	75.61	37.82	119.12	38.43	158.33	63.29 to 114.17		246,521	186,383
____ALL____												
	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40		282,679	207,821

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:	56	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 83.40	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	31.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.38 to 79.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.75	95% Mean C.I.:	73.51 to 89.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,638,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	30.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	207,821	PRD:	111.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:48

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1767	3	73.39	72.19	72.19	2.77	100.00	68.54	74.64	N/A	112,000	80,855
1769	4	70.10	69.76	70.14	4.56	99.46	65.49	73.35	N/A	313,900	220,158
1771	3	57.40	63.94	62.46	14.02	102.37	55.14	79.28	N/A	460,233	287,450
1843	6	57.34	63.34	58.07	19.99	109.08	50.35	101.65	50.35 to 101.65	377,166	219,013
1845	2	65.80	65.80	66.44	3.81	99.04	63.29	68.31	N/A	279,250	185,530
1847	1	65.64	65.64	65.64			65.64	65.64	N/A	65,481	42,985
1849	1	150.94	150.94	150.94			150.94	150.94	N/A	96,000	144,900
2051	1	62.38	62.38	62.38			62.38	62.38	N/A	231,000	144,100
2053	4	81.60	84.81	80.59	10.02	105.24	75.70	100.34	N/A	286,903	231,206
2055	2	100.72	100.72	97.41	6.69	103.40	93.98	107.46	N/A	203,758	198,482
2057	6	77.53	82.60	71.97	23.50	114.78	57.41	137.48	57.41 to 137.48	497,898	358,330
2131	7	60.80	91.75	76.34	62.14	120.19	50.59	145.37	50.59 to 145.37	329,789	251,757
2133	7	86.62	85.26	79.43	38.78	107.33	27.41	158.33	27.41 to 158.33	186,589	148,215
2335	3	101.53	114.22	110.33	22.92	103.52	85.67	155.47	N/A	94,666	104,450
2337	4	73.65	67.82	65.94	16.54	102.86	38.43	85.55	N/A	125,608	82,820
2341	2	103.48	103.48	102.71	17.34	100.75	85.53	121.42	N/A	350,075	359,560
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	42	73.10	80.67	71.39	33.74	113.00	27.41	158.33	62.38 to 85.55	267,975	191,311
2	4	70.97	70.52	70.18	4.93	100.48	65.49	74.64	N/A	120,000	84,217
3	10	84.47	90.40	79.76	22.23	113.35	57.41	137.48	62.28 to 121.42	409,505	326,606
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

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	2	55.59	55.59	56.02	3.27	99.22	53.77	57.40	N/A	412,000	230,815
2	54	74.55	82.65	74.48	30.71	110.97	27.41	158.33	68.31 to 85.53	277,889	206,969
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

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:	56	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 83.40	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	31.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.38 to 79.66	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.75	95% Mean C.I.:	73.51 to 89.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,638,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	30.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	207,821	PRD:	111.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:48

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018	2	75.93	75.93	75.60	4.42	100.43	72.57	79.28	N/A	410,350	310,230
06-0001	28	70.94	78.33	70.33	25.37	111.37	50.59	150.94	63.29 to 77.57	322,547	226,856
06-0006	19	85.63	89.32	82.91	33.66	107.73	27.41	158.33	62.38 to 114.17	182,256	151,114
06-0017	3	85.53	88.12	81.08	24.95	108.69	57.41	121.42	N/A	446,716	362,176
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013	4	57.82	66.91	60.24	25.68	111.06	50.35	101.65	N/A	293,750	176,962
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
10.01 TO 30.00	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
30.01 TO 50.00	2	69.24	69.24	69.29	5.20	99.93	65.64	72.84	N/A	66,240	45,895
50.01 TO 100.00	14	78.03	72.26	64.53	34.37	111.98	27.41	137.48	38.43 to 100.34	176,386	113,826
100.01 TO 180.00	33	74.46	81.26	74.00	24.63	109.81	53.77	155.47	63.29 to 83.40	319,667	236,546
180.01 TO 330.00	4	93.82	94.19	81.96	33.79	114.92	51.51	137.60	N/A	553,106	453,302
330.01 TO 650.00	1	67.63	67.63	67.63			67.63	67.63	N/A	446,400	301,900
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	6	70.83	68.82	66.56	16.01	103.39	50.35	85.55	50.35 to 85.55	251,418	167,345
DRY-N/A	8	73.74	83.47	81.49	27.64	102.43	51.51	137.60	51.51 to 137.60	209,813	170,982
GRASS	5	85.67	105.80	90.33	34.46	117.12	73.39	155.47	N/A	75,188	67,920
GRASS-N/A	11	67.63	75.56	71.48	42.94	105.71	27.41	150.94	27.41 to 114.17	170,740	122,039
IRRGTD	7	85.53	93.87	86.95	19.63	107.96	60.90	137.48	60.90 to 137.48	324,778	282,379
IRRGTD-N/A	19	72.57	77.71	69.09	27.35	112.47	50.59	158.33	57.40 to 86.62	427,130	295,125
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 83.40	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	31.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.38 to 79.66	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.75	95% Mean C.I.:	73.51 to 89.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,638,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	30.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	207,821	PRD:	111.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:48

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	72.84	74.10	72.93	20.36	101.60	50.35	137.60	51.51 to 85.55	245,910	179,353
DRY-N/A	3	101.53	88.52	82.79	12.89	106.92	62.38	101.65	N/A	160,666	133,016
GRASS	9	74.46	92.88	77.15	32.19	120.39	63.29	155.47	67.63 to 140.00	138,500	106,847
GRASS-N/A	7	65.49	74.88	71.50	59.38	104.74	27.41	150.94	27.41 to 150.94	143,940	102,915
IRRGTD	24	74.59	78.38	72.23	24.61	108.53	50.59	145.37	60.80 to 85.53	419,511	302,994
IRRGTD-N/A	2	126.16	126.16	97.35	25.50	129.58	93.98	158.33	N/A	160,325	156,082
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

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	14	73.10	77.19	74.42	22.58	103.72	50.35	137.60	53.77 to 101.53	227,644	169,423
GRASS	16	73.93	85.01	74.62	42.01	113.92	27.41	155.47	63.29 to 114.17	140,880	105,126
IRRGTD	25	75.70	79.01	72.86	24.24	108.43	50.59	145.37	60.90 to 85.53	414,885	302,297
IRRGTD-N/A	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

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	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
10000 TO 29999	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
60000 TO 99999	8	101.00	108.75	111.72	27.36	97.34	65.64	155.47	65.64 to 155.47	76,096	85,017
100000 TO 149999	7	74.46	78.50	77.86	11.56	100.83	65.49	107.46	65.49 to 107.46	122,874	95,663
150000 TO 249999	12	77.47	76.48	78.88	35.85	96.96	27.41	145.37	38.43 to 101.53	195,192	153,965
250000 TO 499999	20	74.13	75.87	75.19	22.67	100.90	50.35	137.60	60.80 to 85.53	377,176	283,598
500000 +	7	57.41	60.18	61.44	7.81	97.95	51.51	73.47	51.51 to 73.47	636,428	391,022
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

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:	56	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	67.63 to 83.40	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,830,034	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	31.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.38 to 79.66	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,830,034	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.75	95% Mean C.I.:	73.51 to 89.86	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,638,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,679	COD:	30.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	207,821	PRD:	111.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:10:48

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	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
10000 TO 29999	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
30000 TO 59999	5	65.64	55.79	45.59	31.59	122.39	27.41	85.67	N/A	99,496	45,358
60000 TO 99999	8	74.02	84.74	76.50	31.45	110.77	38.43	155.47	38.43 to 155.47	108,397	82,927
100000 TO 149999	8	80.01	91.49	79.77	36.08	114.69	50.35	150.94	50.35 to 150.94	158,463	126,404
150000 TO 249999	9	73.35	73.62	68.83	21.62	106.96	50.59	101.53	50.59 to 100.16	260,269	179,138
250000 TO 499999	23	75.70	80.48	74.82	25.60	107.57	51.51	145.37	60.90 to 85.63	426,301	318,959
500000 +	1	73.47	73.47	73.47			73.47	73.47	N/A	1,030,000	756,740
ALL	56	73.97	81.68	73.52	30.76	111.11	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 83.40	282,679	207,821

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:	64	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	38.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.29 to 81.58	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,203,014	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	30.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.57 to 76.38	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,203,014	MEAN:	79	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	71.56 to 86.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,629,460							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,047	COD:	30.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,960	PRD:	111.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:11:01

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	1	150.94	150.94	150.94			150.94	150.94	N/A	96,000	144,900	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	71.53	71.53	74.00	8.44	96.67	65.49	77.57	N/A	243,534	180,205	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	81.58	84.34	83.57	13.72	100.92	67.63	121.42	67.63 to 121.42	351,221	293,505	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	101.53	113.18	112.14	23.99	100.93	85.63	155.47	N/A	190,961	214,136	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	63.79	63.79	63.79	57.03	100.00	27.41	100.16	N/A	152,500	97,275	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	74.02	77.16	73.77	15.21	104.60	60.80	101.65	60.80 to 101.65	264,606	195,206	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	73.47	91.30	76.75	40.19	118.97	50.35	145.37	61.86 to 140.00	340,896	261,623	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	147.91	147.91	140.70	7.05	105.12	137.48	158.33	N/A	54,444	76,600	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	100.34	100.34	100.34			100.34	100.34	N/A	73,200	73,450	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	69.24	66.39	65.01	15.12	102.13	38.43	85.55	38.43 to 85.55	237,404	154,329	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	53.86	58.97	56.07	21.56	105.17	35.81	100.38	35.81 to 100.38	382,211	214,298	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	12	56.29	58.58	59.01	17.41	99.27	27.41	82.70	50.59 to 72.57	413,322	243,895	
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	85.63	96.68	90.84	24.44	106.43	65.49	155.47	77.57 to 121.42	266,428	242,035	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	74.64	88.69	76.16	36.76	116.45	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 107.46	266,609	203,048	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	59.14	62.40	59.69	21.46	104.54	27.41	100.38	53.86 to 72.57	343,135	204,818	
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	84.47	86.42	83.65	22.03	103.30	27.41	155.47	68.54 to 100.16	265,236	221,882	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	73.41	87.45	74.10	35.88	118.01	38.43	158.33	63.29 to 107.46	257,469	190,794	
____ALL____												
	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960	

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	64	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	38.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.29 to 81.58	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,203,014	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	30.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.57 to 76.38	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,203,014	MEAN:	79	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	71.56 to 86.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,629,460							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,047	COD:	30.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,960	PRD:	111.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:11:01

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1767	3	73.39	72.19	72.19	2.77	100.00	68.54	74.64	N/A	112,000	80,855
1769	4	70.10	69.76	70.14	4.56	99.46	65.49	73.35	N/A	313,900	220,158
1771	3	57.40	63.94	62.46	14.02	102.37	55.14	79.28	N/A	460,233	287,450
1843	6	57.34	63.34	58.07	19.99	109.08	50.35	101.65	50.35 to 101.65	377,166	219,013
1845	2	65.80	65.80	66.44	3.81	99.04	63.29	68.31	N/A	279,250	185,530
1847	1	65.64	65.64	65.64			65.64	65.64	N/A	65,481	42,985
1849	1	150.94	150.94	150.94			150.94	150.94	N/A	96,000	144,900
2051	1	62.38	62.38	62.38			62.38	62.38	N/A	231,000	144,100
2053	5	77.57	78.62	75.48	14.54	104.16	53.86	100.34	N/A	283,738	214,165
2055	3	93.98	79.08	85.93	25.41	92.04	35.81	107.46	N/A	166,972	143,471
2057	7	73.47	79.69	71.36	23.44	111.68	57.41	137.48	57.41 to 137.48	455,341	324,911
2127	1	60.87	60.87	60.87			60.87	60.87	N/A	806,500	490,900
2129	2	60.46	60.46	60.00	8.73	100.77	55.18	65.74	N/A	561,000	336,600
2131	7	60.80	91.75	76.34	62.14	120.19	50.59	145.37	50.59 to 145.37	329,789	251,757
2133	8	93.39	87.15	81.51	33.31	106.91	27.41	158.33	27.41 to 158.33	181,266	147,756
2335	3	101.53	114.22	110.33	22.92	103.52	85.67	155.47	N/A	94,666	104,450
2337	5	72.84	64.55	57.35	19.24	112.56	38.43	85.55	N/A	247,686	142,048
2341	2	103.48	103.48	102.71	17.34	100.75	85.53	121.42	N/A	350,075	359,560
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	45	72.84	79.87	70.16	33.68	113.83	27.41	158.33	61.86 to 85.55	275,690	193,435
2	4	70.97	70.52	70.18	4.93	100.48	65.49	74.64	N/A	120,000	84,217
3	15	73.47	78.92	72.63	28.25	108.66	35.81	137.48	60.87 to 93.98	421,130	305,867
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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	9	55.18	59.54	57.87	18.28	102.87	35.81	100.38	51.49 to 65.74	376,720	218,021
2	55	74.46	82.25	73.78	30.52	111.48	27.41	158.33	67.63 to 85.53	287,500	212,132
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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:	64	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	38.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.29 to 81.58	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,203,014	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	30.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.57 to 76.38	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,203,014	MEAN:	79	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	71.56 to 86.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,629,460							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,047	COD:	30.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,960	PRD:	111.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:11:01

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0018	2	75.93	75.93	75.60	4.42	100.43	72.57	79.28	N/A	410,350	310,230
06-0001	33	67.63	74.69	67.96	25.71	109.91	35.81	150.94	60.90 to 74.64	343,160	233,198
06-0006	21	85.63	88.05	78.17	33.17	112.64	27.41	158.33	62.38 to 101.53	206,803	161,651
06-0017	3	85.53	88.12	81.08	24.95	108.69	57.41	121.42	N/A	446,716	362,176
39-0010											
39-0055											
59-0013	5	61.86	65.97	60.53	19.31	108.99	50.35	101.65	N/A	275,000	166,450
59-0080											
63-0001											
NonValid School											
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
10.01 TO 30.00	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
30.01 TO 50.00	3	65.64	58.10	55.45	18.80	104.78	35.81	72.84	N/A	75,293	41,746
50.01 TO 100.00	15	73.35	71.59	64.36	35.13	111.24	27.41	137.48	50.35 to 100.16	177,960	114,531
100.01 TO 180.00	38	72.98	79.16	71.35	25.26	110.94	51.49	155.47	62.38 to 81.58	337,423	240,756
180.01 TO 330.00	5	73.47	87.52	76.32	37.94	114.68	51.51	137.60	N/A	603,785	460,822
330.01 TO 650.00	1	67.63	67.63	67.63			67.63	67.63	N/A	446,400	301,900
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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	70.83	68.82	66.56	16.01	103.39	50.35	85.55	50.35 to 85.55	251,418	167,345
DRY-N/A	10	73.74	83.04	80.93	27.29	102.60	51.51	137.60	62.20 to 101.65	202,250	163,681
GRASS	6	80.07	94.13	79.48	41.11	118.43	35.81	155.47	35.81 to 155.47	78,223	62,175
GRASS-N/A	12	66.56	73.75	69.25	41.72	106.49	27.41	150.94	38.43 to 107.46	179,102	124,035
IRRGTD	7	85.53	93.87	86.95	19.63	107.96	60.90	137.48	60.90 to 137.48	324,778	282,379
IRRGTD-N/A	23	62.28	74.34	66.33	28.63	112.07	50.59	158.33	57.40 to 77.57	468,694	310,888
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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:	64	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	38.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.29 to 81.58	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,203,014	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	30.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.57 to 76.38	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,203,014	MEAN:	79	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	71.56 to 86.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,629,460							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,047	COD:	30.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,960	PRD:	111.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:11:01

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	12	70.58	73.11	72.20	20.52	101.27	50.35	137.60	53.77 to 81.58	242,084	174,773
DRY-N/A	4	100.96	91.48	86.84	10.01	105.35	62.38	101.65	N/A	156,500	135,900
GRASS	10	73.93	87.17	74.26	34.41	117.38	35.81	155.47	63.29 to 140.00	133,990	99,507
GRASS-N/A	8	59.68	72.26	67.76	59.45	106.64	27.41	150.94	27.41 to 150.94	159,832	108,300
IRRGTD	27	72.57	76.06	69.80	24.89	108.97	50.59	145.37	57.41 to 83.40	441,714	308,297
IRRGTD-N/A	3	93.98	104.39	71.25	34.57	146.52	60.87	158.33	N/A	375,716	267,688
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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	73.10	77.71	74.79	23.02	103.90	50.35	137.60	62.20 to 100.38	220,688	165,055
GRASS	18	70.97	80.54	71.09	43.37	113.30	27.41	155.47	53.86 to 107.46	145,475	103,415
IRRGTD	29	72.57	76.15	69.81	24.74	109.09	50.59	145.37	60.80 to 83.40	449,538	313,810
IRRGTD-N/A	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
10000 TO 29999	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
60000 TO 99999	9	100.34	100.65	101.63	31.62	99.04	35.81	155.47	65.64 to 150.94	78,018	79,287
100000 TO 149999	8	74.55	81.24	81.09	14.45	100.19	65.49	107.46	65.49 to 107.46	125,514	101,774
150000 TO 249999	13	73.35	75.38	77.57	36.12	97.18	27.41	145.37	38.43 to 101.53	195,562	151,691
250000 TO 499999	21	72.57	74.82	74.45	23.28	100.50	50.35	137.60	55.14 to 85.53	372,124	277,046
500000 +	11	57.41	59.50	60.12	8.12	98.98	51.49	73.47	51.51 to 65.74	647,227	389,110
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

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:	64	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	38.74	95% Median C.I.:	63.29 to 81.58	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,203,014	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	30.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.57 to 76.38	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,203,014	MEAN:	79	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.34	95% Mean C.I.:	71.56 to 86.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,629,460							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,047	COD:	30.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.33			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,960	PRD:	111.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	27.41			

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:11:01

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	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	3,500	4,900
10000 TO 29999	1	158.33	158.33	158.33			158.33	158.33	N/A	16,800	26,600
30000 TO 59999	6	50.73	52.46	44.04	43.87	119.12	27.41	85.67	27.41 to 85.67	98,480	43,373
60000 TO 99999	8	74.02	84.74	76.50	31.45	110.77	38.43	155.47	38.43 to 155.47	108,397	82,927
100000 TO 149999	11	74.46	86.21	75.75	35.37	113.82	50.35	150.94	53.86 to 137.48	171,162	129,653
150000 TO 249999	9	73.35	73.62	68.83	21.62	106.96	50.59	101.53	50.59 to 100.16	260,269	179,138
250000 TO 499999	26	70.10	77.83	71.92	27.11	108.21	51.49	145.37	60.80 to 85.53	448,574	322,624
500000 +	2	67.17	67.17	67.94	9.38	98.87	60.87	73.47	N/A	918,250	623,820
ALL	64	73.10	79.06	70.98	30.56	111.39	27.41	158.33	63.29 to 81.58	300,047	212,960

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the agricultural land class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the agricultural land class indicates that the median ratio is 74% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 30.76 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 111.11 is not in the acceptable range.

Analysis of the statistics prepared for the agricultural land class presents few opportunities to do any subclass analysis or recommendations for adjustment to a relevant subclass. No matter how sales are grouped in the agricultural land class, there are problems identifying relevant subclasses. The only relevant stratification presented in the R&O is the Area (Market). It is assessor defined and usually has locational integrity, geographic similarity and organizational integrity. Typically the assessor or appraiser recognizes the individual economic conditions that exist among the various market areas that stratify the agricultural land class. The assessor is likely to review, appraise and adjust the properties as they are grouped under Area (Market). A second analysis process available in the R&O that relates indirectly to the assessor acknowledged use subclasses of; Irrigated Land, Dry Land & Grass Land, is the analysis of the three Majority Land Use stratifications. They are relevant to the appraisal of agricultural land, but cannot be used to predict the statistical results of any adjustments within the R&O. If the prediction of the statistical impact is important, these stratifications though interesting become useless. That said; there may be instances when a recommendation will be made to adjust by land value by use, based on the Majority Land Use tables.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Market Area; Area 3 is a barely relevant substratum with 10 sales and has a median ratio of 84.47% which is outside the acceptable range of 69 to 75%. In the companion analysis with 5% minimally improved sales, there are 15 sales with a median ratio of 73.47%. The additional sales make the 5% minimally improved analysis stronger.

Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and probably each relevant subclass. No recommendations are offered for adjustments to the agricultural land class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	130	56	43.08
2008	132	60	45.45
2007	132	64	48.48
2006	135	63	46.67
2005	133	70	52.63

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II is indicative that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone 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	59	29.95	77	74
2008	70.17	13.98	80	74.79
2007	71	5.25	75	72
2006	72	4.09	75	74
2005	71	9.52	78	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and assessed population in a similar manner. This table indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone 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)
30.43	2009	29.95
18.95	2008	13.98
4.86	2007	5.25
8.31	2006	4.09
5.82	2005	9.52

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is virtually identical. The reported assessment actions are also consistent with the change statistics. Historically, the county has had a consistent relationship between these statistics. This indicates that the statistical calculations from the sales file should be reliable as an accurate measure of the population.

2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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 Boone County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	74	74	82

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median ratio and weighted mean ratio are within the acceptable range. The mean is noticeably above the acceptable range. In this class, there are 56 unimproved sales that were spread across 3 years of study. The years included in this study reflect some of the most significant increases in value of agricultural land in recent memory. The aggregate increase to agricultural land reflected in Table IV was nearly 30% in 2009 following nearly 14% in 2008. Most of the high ratios occur among the older sales as they are updated with current values. The sale prices in the sales file are not adjusted for time. This practice artificially inflates the ratios of older sales particularly during rapid value increases. This is more noticeable in the mean ratio calculation as it reacts strongly to outlier ratios. In all, the relationship of these statistics is what should be expected for this property type in the current economic times.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	30.76	111.11
Difference	10.76	8.11

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone County**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The COD and PRD statistics are both outside of the range. Analyzing the statistics for this class suggests that the assessment has not been done uniformly and proportionately. In the current market cycle, the value of agricultural land has been increasing at unprecedented rates. Most of the higher ratios are among the older sales and the small dollar sales. Conversely many of the lower ratios occurred among the more recent sales. This is a recipe for a high COD and PRD. The rapid increase in selling price calculated against a fixed schedule of values creates a wide ratio spread and high average deviation from the median and ultimately a high COD. Additionally, there are a few outlying ratios in this analysis that have the tendency to drive the mean and consequently the PRD higher. In the case of the valuation of agricultural land, the system of market analysis and value application is done consistently within the agricultural classification structure. These statistics are more a function of the statistical methodology during a time of rapidly rising values than a good indication a lack of assessment uniformity or of assessment regressivity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Boone 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	56	56	0
Median	59	74	15
Wgt. Mean	56	74	18
Mean	61	82	21
COD	29.09	30.76	1.67
PRD	109.91	111.11	1.20
Minimum	16.77	27.41	10.64
Maximum	114.44	158.33	43.89

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the Preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. Since the county removed the substantially sales before the preliminary statistics were prepared, the same sales were used to measure the Preliminary and R&O Statistics, so there was no impact due to the removal of sales.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 5,573

Value : 863,924,590

Growth 5,397,793

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	185	837,425	31	79,955	36	98,470	252	1,015,850	
02. Res Improve Land	1,464	11,423,645	116	1,207,175	272	3,470,525	1,852	16,101,345	
03. Res Improvements	1,481	66,256,130	119	12,942,010	295	20,625,685	1,895	99,823,825	
04. Res Total	1,666	78,517,200	150	14,229,140	331	24,194,680	2,147	116,941,020	2,780,936
% of Res Total	77.60	67.14	6.99	12.17	15.42	20.69	38.53	13.54	51.52
05. Com UnImp Land	59	282,700	7	19,895	8	52,260	74	354,855	
06. Com Improve Land	303	2,204,430	19	458,505	11	136,435	333	2,799,370	
07. Com Improvements	310	15,918,670	20	6,850,595	16	1,582,015	346	24,351,280	
08. Com Total	369	18,405,800	27	7,328,995	24	1,770,710	420	27,505,505	1,016,539
% of Com Total	87.86	66.92	6.43	26.65	5.71	6.44	7.54	3.18	18.83
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	193,725	0	0	0	0	1	193,725	
11. Ind Improvements	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
12. Ind Total	1	193,725	0	0	0	0	1	193,725	0
% of Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	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	1,666	78,517,200	150	14,229,140	331	24,194,680	2,147	116,941,020	2,780,936
% of Res & Rec Total	77.60	67.14	6.99	12.17	15.42	20.69	38.53	13.54	51.52
Com & Ind Total	370	18,599,525	27	7,328,995	24	1,770,710	421	27,699,230	1,016,539
% of Com & Ind Total	87.89	67.15	6.41	26.46	5.70	6.39	7.55	3.21	18.83
17. Taxable Total	2,036	97,116,725	177	21,558,135	355	25,965,390	2,568	144,640,250	3,797,475
% of Taxable Total	79.28	67.14	6.89	14.90	13.82	17.95	46.08	16.74	70.35

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	1	193,725	47,944,665		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		1	193,725	47,944,665
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					1	193,725	47,944,665

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	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	158	16	79	253

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	11	25,725	1,786	346,955,460	1,797	346,981,185
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,106	293,252,055	1,106	293,252,055
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,208	79,051,100	1,208	79,051,100
30. Ag Total							3,005	719,284,340

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	3.00	0		0	3.43	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	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	703	703.48	4,924,360		703	703.48	4,924,360	
33. HomeSite Improvements	693	0.00	23,102,645		693	0.00	23,102,645	456,813
34. HomeSite Total					693	703.48	28,027,005	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,060	3,653.20	2,632,115		1,060	3,653.20	2,632,115	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,163	0.00	55,948,455		1,163	0.00	55,948,455	1,143,505
38. FarmSite Total					1,163	3,653.20	58,580,570	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,609.07	0		0	7,615.50	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI					1,856	11,972.18	86,607,575	1,600,318

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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

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	17,822.45	16.27%	46,311,655	20.09%	2,598.50
46. 1A	12,789.66	11.68%	31,703,725	13.75%	2,478.86
47. 2A1	7,480.05	6.83%	17,143,170	7.44%	2,291.85
48. 2A	2,073.50	1.89%	4,244,265	1.84%	2,046.91
49. 3A1	10,592.71	9.67%	20,984,990	9.10%	1,981.08
50. 3A	41,076.83	37.51%	80,090,385	34.74%	1,949.77
51. 4A1	8,119.57	7.41%	14,533,150	6.30%	1,789.89
52. 4A	9,566.16	8.73%	15,542,020	6.74%	1,624.69
53. Total	109,520.93	100.00%	230,553,360	100.00%	2,105.11
Dry					
54. 1D1	5,867.86	8.50%	11,723,420	11.60%	1,997.90
55. 1D	8,652.04	12.53%	16,871,485	16.69%	1,950.00
56. 2D1	5,380.15	7.79%	8,498,595	8.41%	1,579.62
57. 2D	1,496.25	2.17%	2,329,585	2.31%	1,556.95
58. 3D1	6,542.90	9.48%	9,086,620	8.99%	1,388.78
59. 3D	31,048.43	44.97%	41,898,815	41.46%	1,349.47
60. 4D1	6,179.86	8.95%	6,779,705	6.71%	1,097.06
61. 4D	3,876.97	5.62%	3,875,860	3.84%	999.71
62. Total	69,044.46	100.00%	101,064,085	100.00%	1,463.75
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,394.13	0.00%	1,304,865	2.70%	935.97
64. 1G	2,640.79	3.64%	2,495,295	5.17%	944.90
65. 2G1	2,430.78	3.35%	2,217,675	4.59%	912.33
66. 2G	2,107.14	2.90%	1,762,420	3.65%	836.40
67. 3G1	8,742.68	12.05%	6,063,260	12.56%	693.52
68. 3G	22,374.07	30.83%	15,376,315	31.85%	687.24
69. 4G1	5,242.34	7.22%	3,021,510	6.26%	576.37
70. 4G	27,631.20	38.08%	16,038,545	33.22%	580.45
71. Total	72,563.13	100.00%	48,279,885	100.00%	665.35
Irrigated Total	109,520.93	43.19%	230,553,360	60.61%	2,105.11
Dry Total	69,044.46	27.23%	101,064,085	26.57%	1,463.75
Grass Total	72,563.13	28.62%	48,279,885	12.69%	665.35
Waste	1,783.23	0.70%	338,810	0.09%	190.00
Other	664.33	0.26%	130,940	0.03%	197.10
Exempt	9.64	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	253,576.08	100.00%	380,367,080	100.00%	1,500.01

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	93.76	1.15%	118,605	1.43%	1,264.99
46. 1A	196.00	2.41%	225,400	2.71%	1,150.00
47. 2A1	796.69	9.78%	916,195	11.01%	1,150.00
48. 2A	960.55	11.79%	1,047,000	12.58%	1,090.00
49. 3A1	2,587.83	31.76%	2,820,740	33.89%	1,090.00
50. 3A	426.33	5.23%	464,700	5.58%	1,090.00
51. 4A1	1,066.67	13.09%	981,340	11.79%	920.00
52. 4A	2,020.85	24.80%	1,748,040	21.00%	865.00
53. Total	8,148.68	100.00%	8,322,020	100.00%	1,021.27
Dry					
54. 1D1	32.00	0.56%	37,760	0.97%	1,180.00
55. 1D	77.00	1.36%	83,930	2.15%	1,090.00
56. 2D1	758.81	13.40%	598,010	15.35%	788.09
57. 2D	948.69	16.75%	809,575	20.78%	853.36
58. 3D1	1,876.50	33.13%	1,209,180	31.04%	644.38
59. 3D	316.64	5.59%	241,865	6.21%	763.85
60. 4D1	270.25	4.77%	150,935	3.87%	558.50
61. 4D	1,384.51	24.44%	764,040	19.61%	551.85
62. Total	5,664.40	100.00%	3,895,295	100.00%	687.68
Grass					
63. 1G1	36.00	0.00%	20,055	0.14%	557.08
64. 1G	26.00	0.07%	14,895	0.10%	572.88
65. 2G1	336.00	0.87%	184,425	1.25%	548.88
66. 2G	1,385.03	3.58%	674,445	4.56%	486.95
67. 3G1	4,239.78	10.97%	2,105,445	14.22%	496.59
68. 3G	1,612.20	4.17%	638,520	4.31%	396.06
69. 4G1	6,910.66	17.88%	2,402,530	16.23%	347.66
70. 4G	24,103.95	62.37%	8,766,075	59.20%	363.68
71. Total	38,649.62	100.00%	14,806,390	100.00%	383.09
Irrigated Total	8,148.68	14.56%	8,322,020	30.76%	1,021.27
Dry Total	5,664.40	10.12%	3,895,295	14.40%	687.68
Grass Total	38,649.62	69.05%	14,806,390	54.73%	383.09
Waste	2,837.96	5.07%	15,035	0.06%	5.30
Other	676.37	1.21%	17,030	0.06%	25.18
Exempt	42.35	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	55,977.03	100.00%	27,055,770	100.00%	483.34

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	13,294.46	18.82%	35,895,040	20.88%	2,700.00
46. 1A	9,026.50	12.78%	24,371,555	14.17%	2,700.00
47. 2A1	4,276.43	6.06%	10,691,075	6.22%	2,500.00
48. 2A	1,600.67	2.27%	4,001,675	2.33%	2,500.00
49. 3A1	4,053.23	5.74%	9,727,755	5.66%	2,400.00
50. 3A	28,344.72	40.14%	68,027,345	39.56%	2,400.00
51. 4A1	7,290.98	10.32%	14,581,960	8.48%	2,000.00
52. 4A	2,735.53	3.87%	4,650,400	2.70%	1,700.00
53. Total	70,622.52	100.00%	171,946,805	100.00%	2,434.73
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,198.78	10.04%	4,287,680	11.35%	1,950.03
55. 1D	3,517.92	16.06%	6,859,965	18.16%	1,950.01
56. 2D1	1,329.18	6.07%	2,326,075	6.16%	1,750.01
57. 2D	162.95	0.74%	285,170	0.75%	1,750.05
58. 3D1	1,049.40	4.79%	1,783,975	4.72%	1,700.00
59. 3D	10,451.43	47.72%	17,767,430	47.03%	1,700.00
60. 4D1	2,500.15	11.41%	3,500,215	9.26%	1,400.00
61. 4D	692.53	3.16%	969,540	2.57%	1,400.00
62. Total	21,902.34	100.00%	37,780,050	100.00%	1,724.93
Grass					
63. 1G1	637.29	0.00%	561,850	3.67%	881.62
64. 1G	714.11	3.68%	695,920	4.55%	974.53
65. 2G1	1,096.46	5.65%	871,205	5.69%	794.56
66. 2G	693.29	3.57%	586,010	3.83%	845.26
67. 3G1	1,017.01	5.24%	854,330	5.58%	840.04
68. 3G	6,995.71	36.05%	5,813,940	38.00%	831.07
69. 4G1	3,454.79	17.80%	2,555,785	16.71%	739.78
70. 4G	4,797.82	24.72%	3,359,620	21.96%	700.24
71. Total	19,406.48	100.00%	15,298,660	100.00%	788.33
Irrigated Total	70,622.52	62.46%	171,946,805	76.33%	2,434.73
Dry Total	21,902.34	19.37%	37,780,050	16.77%	1,724.93
Grass Total	19,406.48	17.16%	15,298,660	6.79%	788.33
Waste	950.83	0.84%	189,990	0.08%	199.81
Other	192.07	0.17%	38,410	0.02%	199.98
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	113,074.24	100.00%	225,253,915	100.00%	1,992.09

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	188,292.13	410,822,185	188,292.13	410,822,185
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	96,611.20	142,739,430	96,611.20	142,739,430
78. Grass	0.00	0	31.78	25,725	130,587.45	78,359,210	130,619.23	78,384,935
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,572.02	543,835	5,572.02	543,835
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,532.77	186,380	1,532.77	186,380
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	51.99	0	51.99	0
82. Total	0.00	0	31.78	25,725	422,595.57	632,651,040	422,627.35	632,676,765

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	188,292.13	44.55%	410,822,185	64.93%	2,181.83
Dry Land	96,611.20	22.86%	142,739,430	22.56%	1,477.46
Grass	130,619.23	30.91%	78,384,935	12.39%	600.10
Waste	5,572.02	1.32%	543,835	0.09%	97.60
Other	1,532.77	0.36%	186,380	0.03%	121.60
Exempt	51.99	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	422,627.35	100.00%	632,676,765	100.00%	1,497.01

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

06 Boone

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	110,498,815	116,941,020	6,442,205	5.83%	2,780,936	3.31%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	28,040,570	28,027,005	-13,565	-0.05%	456,813	-1.68%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	138,539,385	144,968,025	6,428,640	4.64%	3,237,749	2.30%
05. Commercial	26,712,660	27,505,505	792,845	2.97%	1,016,539	-0.84%
06. Industrial	193,725	193,725	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	57,744,325	58,580,570	836,245	1.45%	1,143,505	-0.53%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	84,650,710	86,279,800	1,629,090	1.92%	2,160,044	-0.63%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	223,190,095	231,247,825	8,057,730	3.61%	5,397,793	1.19%
11. Irrigated	317,047,245	410,822,185	93,774,940	29.58%		
12. Dryland	108,118,265	142,739,430	34,621,165	32.02%		
13. Grassland	61,523,545	78,384,935	16,861,390	27.41%		
14. Wasteland	122,170	543,835	421,665	345.15%		
15. Other Agland	51,280	186,380	135,100	263.46%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	486,862,505	632,676,765	145,814,260	29.95%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	710,052,600	863,924,590	153,871,990	21.67%	5,397,793	20.91%

BOONE COUNTY PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

DUE OCTOBER 31, 2008

Residential

2009

Town & Impr. parcels
Albion # 697
Cedar Rapids #210
St Edward #336
Petersburg #178
Primrose #46
Acreages #382

Add pickup work from zoning and other information resources brought into the office
Revalue on Acreages were done 2008, & residential lots were also revalued.
Review farm houses and out buildings, putting in CAMA with 2005 Replacement
Costs & sketches. Review sales and ratios.

2010

Ag Impr #1103

Start reviewing the town, and getting new picture for each parcel.
Add new improvements from zoning permits and other references.
In the future make new Property Record cards
Review sales and ratios

2011

Continuing reviewing towns & taking pictures. Update improvements by permits and
other changes. Review sales and ratios

Commercial

2009

Town & Impr. Parcels
Albion #143
Cedar Rapids #38
St Edward #60
Petersburg #45
Primrose # 13
Rural #11

After towns are updated we will start with the Commercial, getting new pictures &
reviewing site. Do updates from zoning permits and other changes. New Property
Record cards were made in 2003. Review sales and ratios make proper adjustments
Commercial lots values were adjusted for 2008.

2010

Keep updating pictures and information. Add any new improvements by zoning
permits and other informational factors. Review sales and ratios for level of value
and determine what actions need to be taken.

2011

Do the annual pickup work from zoning permits and other information. Review sales
and ratios adjust accordingly

Agricultural

2009

Agricultural Parcels
Improved #1103
Total Ag #2994

The footwork and taking pictures are done for 2008, all the information and sketches are being entered into CAMA. Land has been updated by NRD acres and our annual land use update. Our office has purchased the Agri Data program to aid in the conversion of land classes and acre count. Review the sales and ratios per area and land use. Make new property record card.

2010

Update info on farm buildings implement reappraisal values. Adjust agland values by sales per area and use. Improvement updates and changes that were made. Work on making new property record cards.

2011

Annual pickup work by zoning permits and other informational references. Land use update. Review sales and ratios, adjust values of areas and classes per market sales. Possibly implementing GIS in the county.

Joyce Sock
Boone County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Boone County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$99,295 (General Funds)
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$1,500 from budget goes to data processing costs. MIPS is paid by County Board.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$99,295
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	N/A
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,500
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$57,253 Total appraisal budget includes \$27,750 for contract appraiser, including \$3,750 for pick-up work, and the balance for misc. The remaining (approx. \$20,000) is being set aside for the purchase of GIS in the future.

12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	N/A
13.	Total budget
	\$156,548
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Of the FY 2008 appraisal budget, \$33,701.25 was not used but has been rolled into the 2009 appraisal budget. Of the FY 2008 general fund budget, \$1,006.57 was not used and lost.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS County Solutions
2.	CAMA software
	CAMA 2000
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and Deputy
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes

2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Blaser Appraisal -for valuation projects William Scarlett -is a part time per parcel contract for pick-up work only
2.	Other services
	None

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 Boone County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts