

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

11 Burt

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	228	COD	21.48
Total Sales Price	\$17,278,947	PRD	110.52
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$17,347,947	COV	34.82
Total Assessed Value	\$15,599,735	STD	34.60
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$76,087	Avg. Absolute Deviation	20.45
Avg. Assessed Value	\$68,420	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$50,356
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	90
Mean	99	Max	325
Min	6.25		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.34 to 97.03
95% Mean C.I	94.89 to 103.87
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	86.95 to 92.90

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	19.53
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.05
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.58

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	245	96	22.04	112.21
2007	268	97	22.91	112.22
2006	242	96	22.35	106.34
2005	198	92	22.25	103.36

2009 Commission Summary

11 Burt

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	35	COD	21.28
Total Sales Price	\$2,018,066	PRD	100.98
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,942,066	COV	36.57
Total Assessed Value	\$1,970,590	STD	37.47
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$55,488	Avg. Absolute Deviation	20.91
Avg. Assessed Value	\$56,303	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$94,442
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	101
Mean	102	Max	233
Min	56		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.32 to 100.00
95% Mean C.I	90.04 to 114.87
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.53 to 108.40

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 5.23

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.58

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 4.52

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	36	98	25.27	111.61
2007	48	97	25.08	109.6
2006	49	97	29.25	117.72
2005	47	96	29.35	113.22

2009 Commission Summary

11 Burt

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	90	COD	23.20
Total Sales Price	\$28,773,248	PRD	108.88
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$28,765,748	COV	33.61
Total Assessed Value	\$19,164,840	STD	24.38
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$319,619	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.78
Avg. Assessed Value	\$212,943	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$201,273
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	67
Mean	73	Max	179.86
Min	4.98		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	65.81 to 75.99
95% Mean C.I	67.50 to 77.58
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	62.46 to 70.79

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	75.24
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.89
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.39

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	89	72	17.65	102.53
2007	101	71	18.53	104.81
2006	102	76	19.24	104.8
2005	86	75	17.71	102.17

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Burt 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 Burt County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Burt 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 Burt County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Burt 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 Burt County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Burt County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	224	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	39.39	95% Median C.I.:	88.56 to 95.88	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,408,994	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.37 to 89.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,477,994	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.03	95% Mean C.I.:	93.13 to 103.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,128,794							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,026	COD:	24.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,539	PRD:	113.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:21

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	34	97.02	100.31	94.15	20.87	106.54	40.24	158.64	85.87 to 104.55	61,325	57,738
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	25	94.64	98.08	90.10	18.53	108.87	44.08	174.17	87.67 to 100.00	72,314	65,151
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	22	92.91	90.99	87.41	13.93	104.09	59.67	123.45	82.64 to 96.05	84,031	73,455
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	26	91.96	100.47	82.91	30.75	121.17	49.78	324.81	77.59 to 102.18	74,266	61,577
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	22	91.62	84.34	82.41	18.19	102.34	6.25	113.68	77.56 to 99.09	97,363	80,235
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	94.51	91.58	84.04	15.21	108.97	62.56	139.83	81.25 to 100.80	91,047	76,520
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	27	96.01	122.39	92.06	41.68	132.95	63.80	308.00	85.57 to 123.58	62,371	57,416
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	44	83.89	94.57	83.49	31.50	113.27	18.26	233.67	75.37 to 98.72	86,233	71,998
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	107	94.11	97.91	88.74	21.46	110.33	40.24	324.81	89.43 to 97.43	71,706	63,634
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	117	91.57	98.45	84.85	27.94	116.03	6.25	308.00	84.73 to 96.62	83,807	71,109
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	94	92.91	92.21	84.11	19.88	109.62	6.25	324.81	86.45 to 96.00	86,242	72,539
<u>ALL</u>											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	224	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	39.39	95% Median C.I.:	88.56 to 95.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,408,994	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.37 to 89.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,477,994	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.03	95% Mean C.I.:	93.13 to 103.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,128,794							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,026	COD:	24.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,539	PRD:	113.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:21

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	6.25	6.25	6.25			6.25	6.25	N/A	20,000	1,250
1521	2	170.03	170.03	144.22	27.69	117.90	122.95	217.11	N/A	77,500	111,767
1531	3	107.32	97.24	98.73	16.09	98.49	66.29	118.10	N/A	69,216	68,336
1533	6	97.90	105.70	95.16	29.29	111.08	47.81	158.64	47.81 to 158.64	97,433	92,717
1535	3	77.56	75.02	72.30	6.12	103.75	66.63	80.86	N/A	166,316	120,253
1799	4	80.97	79.78	77.82	15.96	102.51	57.47	99.69	N/A	119,000	92,606
1801	2	92.87	92.87	81.43	24.14	114.04	70.45	115.28	N/A	122,500	99,750
1803	2	66.95	66.95	37.32	72.73	179.41	18.26	115.64	N/A	93,250	34,797
1813	4	100.19	97.79	95.25	7.52	102.68	84.71	106.10	N/A	107,750	102,628
1815	6	68.29	71.68	71.03	9.58	100.92	62.56	85.67	62.56 to 85.67	182,536	129,655
1817	9	85.77	88.42	88.61	14.24	99.78	66.44	113.55	74.76 to 109.34	125,655	111,348
1819	3	85.87	95.46	86.17	24.12	110.78	69.19	131.32	N/A	115,883	99,860
2083	3	89.81	81.31	74.54	10.77	109.08	62.54	91.57	N/A	106,966	79,735
2085	5	71.69	67.94	67.02	16.94	101.36	51.82	87.67	N/A	157,300	105,430
2087	1	68.44	68.44	68.44			68.44	68.44	N/A	124,000	84,870
CRAIG	6	91.07	87.49	81.13	19.94	107.85	40.24	117.88	40.24 to 117.88	40,333	32,720
CRAIG V	1	81.25	81.25	81.25			81.25	81.25	N/A	10,000	8,125
DECATUR	16	109.76	128.57	83.82	49.21	153.39	51.31	324.81	71.86 to 174.17	50,984	42,735
DECATUR V	3	96.62	104.10	98.72	8.17	105.45	96.00	119.67	N/A	10,666	10,530
HARBOR 671	3	142.93	126.13	115.78	13.88	108.94	87.97	147.50	N/A	32,333	37,435
LYONS	14	83.79	93.68	86.28	25.05	108.58	49.78	188.84	71.70 to 108.73	59,178	51,057
LYONS V	1	308.00	308.00	308.00			308.00	308.00	N/A	2,000	6,160
OAKLAND	52	97.31	102.86	90.74	22.24	113.36	44.86	222.92	91.57 to 101.81	65,575	59,501
OAKLAND V	2	69.84	69.84	49.71	36.03	140.50	44.68	95.00	N/A	6,000	2,982
TEKAMAH	71	94.61	95.58	91.39	14.50	104.59	44.08	233.67	89.43 to 96.98	76,147	69,590
TEKAMAH V	1	56.04	56.04	56.04			56.04	56.04	N/A	12,500	7,005
ALL	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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	167	94.64	101.35	89.95	23.67	112.68	40.24	324.81	92.27 to 96.98	64,497	58,016
2	7	85.67	79.14	78.32	11.63	101.05	65.75	97.04	65.75 to 97.04	147,857	115,803
3	50	85.80	90.32	81.62	29.02	110.66	6.25	217.11	76.23 to 95.88	113,437	92,589
ALL	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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:	224	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	39.39	95% Median C.I.:	88.56 to 95.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,408,994	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.37 to 89.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,477,994	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.03	95% Mean C.I.:	93.13 to 103.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,128,794							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,026	COD:	24.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,539	PRD:	113.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:21

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	216	93.28	98.06	86.63	23.74	113.18	18.26	324.81	89.06 to 95.88	80,347	69,607
2	8	91.49	101.97	76.00	51.30	134.17	6.25	308.00	6.25 to 308.00	15,375	11,685
____ALL____											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	219	93.13	97.64	86.87	23.71	112.39	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.84	78,858	68,505
06	2	82.88	82.88	36.72	77.97	225.71	18.26	147.50	N/A	87,500	32,130
07	3	123.58	149.18	187.66	44.12	79.50	80.20	243.76	N/A	10,998	20,640
____ALL____											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0001	99	90.04	91.92	85.28	18.19	107.78	18.26	233.67	85.75 to 94.98	90,618	77,280
11-0014	73	94.57	98.26	88.56	21.83	110.95	40.24	222.92	89.06 to 100.21	68,717	60,855
11-0020	48	96.65	112.68	88.80	41.80	126.90	6.25	324.81	82.64 to 118.10	63,842	56,690
20-0020	1	77.56	77.56	77.56			77.56	77.56	N/A	80,000	62,050
27-0594	3	82.68	78.93	72.97	11.70	108.17	62.54	91.57	N/A	115,300	84,130
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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:	224	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	39.39	95% Median C.I.:	88.56 to 95.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,408,994	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.37 to 89.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,477,994	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.03	95% Mean C.I.:	93.13 to 103.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,128,794							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,026	COD:	24.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,539	PRD:	113.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:21

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	16	95.50	96.68	79.34	32.76	121.85	6.25	308.00	66.63 to 101.56	35,678	28,308
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	3	102.00	112.40	112.43	11.36	99.97	100.21	134.98	N/A	24,833	27,920
1900 TO 1919	79	92.79	105.65	90.31	31.25	116.98	40.24	324.81	85.72 to 97.32	69,668	62,918
1920 TO 1939	31	100.80	103.98	92.84	21.06	112.00	44.86	222.92	89.81 to 106.10	60,167	55,858
1940 TO 1949	12	81.55	75.90	69.53	19.00	109.16	49.78	102.18	51.82 to 98.22	84,408	58,690
1950 TO 1959	18	89.24	86.54	81.89	16.97	105.67	55.11	122.83	73.75 to 100.65	90,751	74,316
1960 TO 1969	16	86.77	91.95	87.01	13.99	105.68	63.80	123.58	82.64 to 99.09	106,143	92,354
1970 TO 1979	21	93.42	95.31	86.89	19.38	109.68	18.26	147.50	82.62 to 107.32	80,246	69,727
1980 TO 1989	12	95.22	106.45	96.09	21.35	110.78	71.70	243.76	88.56 to 101.56	91,824	88,235
1990 TO 1994	4	82.19	83.05	78.44	14.11	105.88	71.22	96.61	N/A	125,475	98,420
1995 TO 1999	6	89.31	85.90	82.96	14.84	103.55	51.31	113.06	51.31 to 113.06	132,983	110,317
2000 TO Present	6	76.40	79.39	76.70	19.95	103.50	62.56	109.79	62.56 to 109.79	172,000	131,924
ALL	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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	98.65	138.92	132.50	47.44	104.84	80.20	308.00	80.20 to 308.00	2,638	3,495
5000 TO 9999	3	222.92	213.62	206.02	34.64	103.69	93.13	324.81	N/A	6,916	14,250
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	11	100.00	159.29	168.95	66.27	94.28	80.20	324.81	93.13 to 308.00	3,805	6,428
10000 TO 29999	36	121.95	123.97	122.42	29.96	101.27	6.25	243.76	100.21 to 142.53	18,849	23,075
30000 TO 59999	41	94.98	98.38	98.20	22.69	100.18	40.24	217.11	82.91 to 107.23	46,587	45,750
60000 TO 99999	72	93.88	92.69	92.03	11.72	100.73	55.11	145.73	90.04 to 97.17	78,960	72,663
100000 TO 149999	41	84.46	85.14	84.87	15.56	100.32	44.86	122.95	80.86 to 91.20	121,520	103,130
150000 TO 249999	21	71.22	69.22	69.82	16.24	99.14	18.26	86.22	62.54 to 82.62	173,739	121,311
250000 TO 499999	2	64.60	64.60	64.71	3.15	99.82	62.56	66.63	N/A	265,725	171,960
ALL	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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:	224	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	39.39	95% Median C.I.:	88.56 to 95.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,408,994	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.37 to 89.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,477,994	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.03	95% Mean C.I.:	93.13 to 103.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,128,794							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,026	COD:	24.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,539	PRD:	113.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:21

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	8	95.50	79.89	47.46	24.45	168.31	6.25	119.67	6.25 to 119.67	5,925	2,812
5000 TO 9999	5	93.13	150.72	97.49	82.88	154.61	56.04	308.00	N/A	7,000	6,824
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	13	95.00	107.13	68.71	46.53	155.92	6.25	308.00	56.04 to 119.67	6,338	4,355
10000 TO 29999	31	104.35	118.34	85.84	37.98	137.85	18.26	324.81	96.62 to 137.65	24,837	21,321
30000 TO 59999	51	91.57	101.47	89.88	27.58	112.90	44.86	243.76	82.64 to 100.80	49,690	44,662
60000 TO 99999	89	92.79	92.70	87.42	16.53	106.04	47.81	217.11	88.42 to 96.61	89,319	78,084
100000 TO 149999	35	85.77	90.00	87.57	15.06	102.77	62.54	145.73	81.46 to 94.86	141,400	123,818
150000 TO 249999	5	67.12	71.91	71.27	10.15	100.89	62.56	85.67	N/A	238,590	170,050
ALL											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	16	96.31	97.04	79.76	32.48	121.66	6.25	308.00	66.63 to 101.56	36,303	28,955
10	10	103.34	119.00	84.26	48.48	141.22	40.24	217.11	47.81 to 215.20	41,180	34,699
20	85	91.20	97.17	82.71	26.20	117.49	18.26	324.81	82.64 to 97.32	69,499	57,479
30	106	93.88	97.37	89.13	19.56	109.24	44.86	243.76	88.42 to 95.99	91,848	81,865
40	6	82.07	91.61	84.13	18.64	108.89	71.69	133.72	71.69 to 133.72	120,333	101,237
50	1	122.95	122.95	122.95			122.95	122.95	N/A	120,000	147,545
ALL											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	95.50	98.02	78.90	41.58	124.23	6.25	308.00	56.04 to 104.55	46,120	36,389
100	12	89.77	105.99	73.74	44.98	143.74	18.26	243.76	71.69 to 142.93	61,791	45,563
101	97	92.27	94.26	86.85	17.36	108.54	49.78	324.81	85.77 to 95.82	89,401	77,640
102	33	95.04	108.02	99.63	25.49	108.43	44.08	233.67	89.43 to 118.03	84,112	83,797
104	65	92.35	98.16	81.06	29.96	121.09	40.24	222.92	80.89 to 98.42	70,892	57,466
106	4	95.21	92.66	93.45	6.29	99.15	80.20	100.00	N/A	4,351	4,066
301	1	88.42	88.42	88.42			88.42	88.42	N/A	110,000	97,265
ALL											
	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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:	224	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	39.39	95% Median C.I.:	88.56 to 95.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,408,994	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.37 to 89.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,477,994	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.03	95% Mean C.I.:	93.13 to 103.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,128,794							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	78,026	COD:	24.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,539	PRD:	113.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:21

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	17	96.00	96.76	81.39	30.90	118.88	6.25	308.00	66.63 to 101.56	39,285	31,974
10	5	125.76	143.78	113.51	48.44	126.67	44.08	233.67	N/A	23,700	26,902
20	58	97.77	107.93	89.70	31.32	120.31	18.26	324.81	87.97 to 109.34	58,992	52,918
30	134	89.97	93.10	85.73	19.70	108.60	44.86	243.76	84.73 to 94.46	88,419	75,797
40	10	89.23	89.72	86.12	9.92	104.18	67.12	109.79	77.57 to 101.81	142,190	122,457
ALL	224	93.28	98.20	86.56	24.69	113.44	6.25	324.81	88.56 to 95.88	78,026	67,539

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

Residential:

Annually, the county conducts a review and 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.

Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick-up) is completed in a timely fashion.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. In 2009, an additional part of the rural residential and agricultural residential improvements as well as the town of Lyons were completed.

For 2009, the county has progressed in their inspection and review of all of the rural and agricultural residential parcels. This year, they completed Logan Township (Geocodes 1519 and 1533) and Summit Township (Geocodes 1815 and 2085) is under way for completion in 2010. During this inspection process, the records were reviewed for listing accuracy, property characteristics, and to note the current condition of the improvements. Listers are going on-site for a close up examination of the improvements, photos and if necessary a remeasurement of the improvements. Every effort is made to conduct interior inspection of the residences. When property owners are not home, the listers leave questionnaires and make 2 return trips to contact them, followed by phone appointments.

Also for 2009, the inspection and review of the town of Lyons will be completed. This project includes an off-site (drive-by) inspection, new photos, and if necessary an on-site inspection is done to verify the listing or correct any errors discovered.

2009 Assessment Survey for Burt County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor/Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor/Staff (the part time listers)
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2003
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2004: The county does class or subclass adjustments if they are needed based on annual analysis of the sales.
6.	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. Additionally the values are adjusted if the sales analysis indicates it is needed.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	7 -Assessor Locations: The 2009 Preliminary Statistics show 25 different Assessor Locations, even though the county generally uses 7 as appraisal subclasses.
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	There are 5 town names; Craig, Decatur, Lyons, Oakland and Tekamah, as well as Rural. There is also a rural subdivision named Harbor 671. It has also been the county's practice to separate the vacant land parcels from improved parcels using the town name plus "V", which can lead to many more entries in the Assessor Location section of the R&O. The county additionally reports the "Rural", non-urban, parcels by Geo Codes as separate Assessor Locations which can produce 15 or more additional sub groups in the R&O. This enables the county to adjust and demonstrate the adjustments made to the various locations in years they are not revalued. This practice will likely cease when the rural and agricultural residential and agricultural improvement inspection and revaluation process is completed.

9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Assessor Location is usable; with the exception of the rural location reported using multiple Geocodes. When the county considers making changes, they may consolidate the rural and the Geo Codes designations before deciding on an adjustment. Since the county is updating their rural parcels by groupings related to the Geo Codes, they have opted to display their assessor locations similarly.
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>)
	The location defined as suburban is not considered a useful identity for valuation purposes. In Burt County, parcels in the location defined as suburban are grouped with a rural residential assessor location, not with the adjacent town’s assessor location.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes; The assessor indicated that the costs and depreciation tables are being implemented as the inspection and review progresses, but that the other parts of the county are monitored, and displayed using the Geocodes. The ones that are in a different part of the process are adjusted if the market indicates the need to do so.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
69	N/A	5	74

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:	228	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.82	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 97.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,278,947	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.95 to 92.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,347,947	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.45	95% Mean C.I.:	94.89 to 103.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,599,735							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,087	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,419	PRD:	110.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:46

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	34	97.02	100.13	95.07	18.61	105.32	40.24	157.42	87.97 to 104.35	61,325	58,301
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	25	95.84	104.33	95.63	16.43	109.10	79.99	196.14	94.11 to 100.27	72,314	69,151
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	22	96.19	96.72	92.57	8.27	104.48	69.72	123.45	89.25 to 99.69	84,031	77,787
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	26	92.36	100.88	83.51	30.56	120.80	49.78	324.81	77.59 to 102.18	74,266	62,020
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	23	93.42	84.08	85.29	19.00	98.58	6.25	113.68	77.56 to 99.09	82,864	70,675
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	94.78	94.43	89.79	14.43	105.17	62.77	139.83	81.46 to 104.04	91,047	81,750
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	29	96.01	119.55	93.25	37.92	128.20	63.80	243.76	85.75 to 123.58	59,865	55,827
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	45	93.61	93.96	87.27	22.18	107.67	18.26	217.11	81.74 to 104.19	85,517	74,628
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	107	95.99	100.59	91.69	18.74	109.71	40.24	324.81	93.34 to 98.42	71,706	65,746
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	121	94.57	98.31	88.52	23.86	111.05	6.25	243.76	90.04 to 97.17	79,961	70,783
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	95	95.20	94.22	87.81	18.33	107.30	6.25	324.81	89.25 to 97.03	82,848	72,751
<u>ALL</u>											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	228	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.82	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 97.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,278,947	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.95 to 92.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,347,947	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.45	95% Mean C.I.:	94.89 to 103.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,599,735							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,087	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,419	PRD:	110.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:46

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1521	2	170.03	170.03	144.22	27.69	117.90	122.95	217.11	N/A	77,500	111,767
1529	2	100.44	100.44	110.90	93.78	90.56	6.25	194.62	N/A	22,500	24,952
1531	3	107.32	106.25	106.53	7.69	99.74	93.34	118.10	N/A	69,216	73,736
1533	7	96.43	91.04	89.11	21.90	102.18	39.75	139.27	39.75 to 139.27	91,228	81,290
1535	3	77.56	80.59	87.35	12.83	92.26	67.18	97.03	N/A	81,526	71,216
1799	4	85.24	81.91	79.60	18.22	102.90	57.47	99.69	N/A	119,000	94,725
1801	2	98.01	98.01	87.01	22.00	112.64	76.45	119.57	N/A	122,500	106,585
1803	2	58.34	58.34	33.95	68.70	171.86	18.26	98.42	N/A	93,250	31,655
1813	4	100.96	102.74	99.38	12.36	103.38	84.71	124.34	N/A	107,750	107,082
1815	6	78.01	75.04	78.98	14.33	95.01	43.46	99.90	43.46 to 99.90	118,174	93,337
1817	9	85.77	89.24	89.48	14.30	99.74	66.44	113.55	76.18 to 109.34	125,655	112,433
1819	3	86.04	95.81	86.53	24.00	110.73	69.72	131.67	N/A	115,883	100,268
2083	3	92.37	87.01	82.58	7.85	105.37	73.46	95.20	N/A	106,966	88,328
2085	5	79.99	80.86	80.88	23.95	99.97	57.13	112.81	N/A	157,300	127,226
2087	1	68.44	68.44	68.44			68.44	68.44	N/A	124,000	84,870
CRAIG	6	91.07	87.35	81.03	19.78	107.80	40.24	117.02	40.24 to 117.02	40,333	32,683
CRAIG V	1	83.30	83.30	83.30			83.30	83.30	N/A	10,000	8,330
DECATUR	16	97.84	127.08	83.38	53.68	152.41	51.31	324.81	71.86 to 174.17	50,984	42,511
DECATUR V	3	96.62	104.10	98.72	8.17	105.45	96.00	119.67	N/A	10,666	10,530
HARBOR 671	3	142.93	126.13	115.78	13.88	108.94	87.97	147.50	N/A	32,333	37,435
LYONS	14	96.78	94.15	90.52	13.80	104.01	49.78	111.91	82.89 to 109.96	59,178	53,567
LYONS V	1	177.00	177.00	177.00			177.00	177.00	N/A	2,000	3,540
NORTHBRIDGE	2	80.05	80.05	79.49	16.15	100.70	67.12	92.98	N/A	215,750	171,510
OAKLAND	52	99.69	104.85	93.93	19.00	111.63	44.86	222.92	92.49 to 104.38	65,575	61,593
OAKLAND V	2	69.84	69.84	49.71	36.03	140.50	44.68	95.00	N/A	6,000	2,982
TEKAMAH	71	95.99	98.02	93.21	12.89	105.16	63.80	196.14	91.06 to 97.97	76,147	70,974
TEKAMAH V	1	56.04	56.04	56.04			56.04	56.04	N/A	12,500	7,005
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

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	167	96.05	102.13	92.14	20.11	110.84	40.24	324.81	94.11 to 98.32	64,497	59,429
2	9	79.52	78.03	81.47	16.09	95.78	43.46	96.43	66.44 to 93.79	120,036	97,793
3	52	95.16	94.25	87.24	25.71	108.04	6.25	217.11	79.99 to 99.69	105,701	92,210
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	228	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.82	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 97.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,278,947	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.95 to 92.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,347,947	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.45	95% Mean C.I.:	94.89 to 103.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,599,735							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,087	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,419	PRD:	110.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:46

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	215	95.88	100.88	90.35	20.49	111.65	18.26	324.81	93.65 to 97.43	79,469	71,801
2	13	76.78	74.62	62.05	37.92	120.26	6.25	177.00	43.46 to 96.00	20,146	12,500
____ALL____											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	223	95.20	98.86	90.28	20.45	109.50	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 96.98	76,860	69,388
06	2	82.88	82.88	36.72	77.97	225.71	18.26	147.50	N/A	87,500	32,130
07	3	123.58	149.18	187.66	44.12	79.50	80.20	243.76	N/A	10,998	20,640
____ALL____											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0001	102	94.92	95.47	89.28	16.90	106.93	18.26	196.14	89.64 to 96.61	88,643	79,142
11-0014	73	95.12	99.82	90.90	19.85	109.81	40.24	222.92	91.57 to 100.95	68,717	62,466
11-0020	49	97.03	108.31	91.89	33.26	117.87	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 108.73	58,450	53,711
20-0020	1	77.56	77.56	77.56			77.56	77.56	N/A	80,000	62,050
27-0594	3	83.24	83.02	78.99	7.57	105.10	73.46	92.37	N/A	115,300	91,078
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	228	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.82	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 97.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,278,947	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.95 to 92.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,347,947	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.45	95% Mean C.I.:	94.89 to 103.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,599,735							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,087	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,419	PRD:	110.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:46

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	19	95.00	84.89	83.31	28.95	101.89	6.25	177.00	56.04 to 101.56	21,884	18,232
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	3	111.91	115.70	115.49	10.36	100.18	100.21	134.98	N/A	24,833	28,680
1900 TO 1919	79	95.88	107.55	93.26	26.55	115.33	40.24	324.81	92.49 to 100.46	69,668	64,970
1920 TO 1939	32	101.31	106.98	95.78	18.98	111.70	44.86	222.92	94.98 to 105.14	59,068	56,573
1940 TO 1949	12	85.82	82.00	76.80	17.49	106.77	49.78	102.18	57.13 to 98.42	84,408	64,828
1950 TO 1959	18	93.40	90.90	88.02	10.03	103.27	57.47	109.96	82.23 to 99.69	90,751	79,879
1960 TO 1969	16	92.65	95.23	91.43	14.45	104.16	63.80	123.58	84.40 to 110.19	106,143	97,049
1970 TO 1979	21	94.64	94.71	86.84	18.13	109.07	18.26	147.50	82.62 to 104.04	80,246	69,683
1980 TO 1989	12	96.51	107.40	97.44	20.78	110.22	72.57	243.76	88.56 to 101.56	91,824	89,472
1990 TO 1994	4	86.34	85.13	81.25	11.03	104.78	71.22	96.61	N/A	125,475	101,945
1995 TO 1999	6	89.31	85.90	82.96	14.84	103.55	51.31	113.06	51.31 to 113.06	132,983	110,317
2000 TO Present	6	83.83	83.47	82.27	16.42	101.47	62.77	110.32	62.77 to 110.32	172,000	141,497
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

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	98.65	122.55	120.09	30.84	102.04	80.20	215.20	80.20 to 215.20	2,638	3,168
5000 TO 9999	3	222.92	218.49	211.66	32.46	103.23	107.75	324.81	N/A	6,916	14,640
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	11	107.75	148.71	165.49	49.87	89.86	80.20	324.81	95.00 to 222.92	3,805	6,296
10000 TO 29999	39	111.91	118.89	117.93	30.65	100.81	6.25	243.76	99.00 to 142.53	19,125	22,554
30000 TO 59999	43	96.68	99.99	99.40	21.22	100.60	39.75	217.11	90.12 to 105.14	46,376	46,096
60000 TO 99999	72	95.83	95.02	94.38	9.15	100.68	66.44	127.93	92.69 to 97.97	78,960	74,520
100000 TO 149999	41	88.42	87.88	87.59	14.71	100.33	44.86	122.95	81.74 to 95.20	121,520	106,443
150000 TO 249999	21	76.45	74.41	75.12	16.19	99.05	18.26	112.81	67.12 to 84.71	173,739	130,520
250000 TO 499999	1	79.23	79.23	79.23			79.23	79.23	N/A	250,000	198,065
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	228	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.82	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 97.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,278,947	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.95 to 92.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,347,947	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.45	95% Mean C.I.:	94.89 to 103.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,599,735							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,087	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,419	PRD:	110.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:46

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	96.00	90.68	52.71	31.00	172.04	6.25	177.00	44.68 to 119.67	5,489	2,893
5000 TO 9999	4	95.53	115.57	88.89	48.05	130.01	56.04	215.20	N/A	8,250	7,333
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	13	96.00	98.34	67.20	36.17	146.34	6.25	215.20	56.04 to 119.67	6,338	4,259
10000 TO 29999	36	103.69	114.12	84.76	37.61	134.64	18.26	324.81	94.57 to 123.58	24,998	21,187
30000 TO 59999	44	97.50	105.22	96.29	20.84	109.28	44.86	243.76	92.37 to 106.04	46,673	44,939
60000 TO 99999	92	94.55	95.10	90.17	14.93	105.46	51.31	217.11	90.46 to 96.43	86,129	77,663
100000 TO 149999	37	86.04	91.08	89.26	13.91	102.03	69.72	124.34	82.62 to 96.98	138,649	123,764
150000 TO 249999	6	86.11	87.25	85.85	14.64	101.63	67.12	112.81	67.12 to 112.81	209,666	179,994
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	19	95.00	86.85	85.46	31.01	101.63	6.25	177.00	56.04 to 101.56	22,410	19,151
10	10	103.34	123.22	93.35	44.40	132.00	40.24	217.11	62.99 to 215.20	41,180	38,443
20	86	96.13	101.26	88.47	22.77	114.46	18.26	324.81	91.57 to 99.90	68,981	61,028
30	106	94.75	98.06	90.75	16.40	108.05	44.86	243.76	91.06 to 96.98	91,848	83,355
40	6	89.06	91.76	85.84	13.04	106.91	77.57	109.96	77.57 to 109.96	120,333	103,288
50	1	122.95	122.95	122.95			122.95	122.95	N/A	120,000	147,545
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	15	83.30	81.84	82.57	38.10	99.11	6.25	177.00	44.68 to 101.56	26,560	21,931
100	12	90.17	106.75	75.68	44.09	141.06	18.26	243.76	77.59 to 142.93	61,791	46,761
101	97	94.64	96.30	89.80	15.18	107.25	49.78	324.81	89.64 to 96.68	89,401	80,277
102	33	99.50	105.78	100.03	15.92	105.75	76.45	196.14	93.65 to 109.34	84,112	84,140
104	66	96.00	103.70	87.01	27.00	119.17	40.24	222.92	91.06 to 100.95	70,196	61,080
106	4	98.65	96.31	100.17	7.67	96.14	80.20	107.75	N/A	4,351	4,358
301	1	88.42	88.42	88.42			88.42	88.42	N/A	110,000	97,265
ALL											
	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

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:	228	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.82	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 97.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,278,947	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.95 to 92.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,347,947	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.45	95% Mean C.I.:	94.89 to 103.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,599,735							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,087	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	324.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,419	PRD:	110.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.25			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:46

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	20	89.15	86.63	84.95	32.10	101.98	6.25	177.00	67.18 to 100.00	25,640	21,780
10	5	154.75	153.35	139.73	27.23	109.75	100.21	215.20	N/A	23,700	33,117
20	59	99.50	109.71	93.18	27.11	117.74	18.26	324.81	96.01 to 109.34	58,416	54,431
30	134	93.63	95.38	89.02	16.49	107.15	44.86	243.76	90.12 to 95.88	88,419	78,706
40	10	91.51	90.51	87.23	9.57	103.75	67.12	110.32	77.57 to 101.81	142,190	124,034
ALL	228	95.22	99.38	89.92	21.48	110.52	6.25	324.81	93.34 to 97.03	76,087	68,419

2009 Correlation Section for Burt County

RESIDENTIAL:Collectively, 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 95% and most of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 21.48 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 110.52 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%. This stratification presently is difficult to utilize in the R&O since the county has separated all of the geo codes as subsets of the rural residential during the duration of their rural residential inspection and update process. They believe that they represent the way that the project has been organized, but stated that they would cease this practice when the project has been completed.

Under the stratification of Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL; the substratum #2, Unimproved, with 13 sales has a median ratio of 76.78% which is outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. No recommendation for adjustment has been made to the group because it is not 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 for the class and probably each relevant subclass.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	359	228	63.51
2008	364	245	67.31
2007	393	268	68.19
2006	369	242	65.58
2005	337	198	58.75

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 Burt 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 Burt 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	93	1.76	95	95
2008	95.57	3.01	98	96.13
2007	96	0.22	96	97
2006	94	3.20	97	96
2005	90	-0.81	90	92

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 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 Burt 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 Burt 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)
4.71	2009	1.76
3.41	2008	3.01
1.83	2007	0.22
6.33	2006	3.20
4.72	2005	-0.81

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is somewhat dissimilar. This indicates that the statistical calculations from the sales file should be used cautiously as a reliable measure of the population. In this case, there were 4 sales added to the final year of sales between the preliminary and final statistics. The targeted assessment actions toward Lyons and selected townships of the rural residential probably favored the increase in the sales file since both subclasses were carrying older values than other parts of the assessed base. The trended statistics should also be considered and the results correlated and based on the assessment practices in the county, to estimate the level of value and quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 Burt County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	95	90	99

RESIDENTIAL: The median and mean are within the acceptable range, while the weighted mean is below the range. The low weighted mean is indicative of mild regressivity in the assessment. The under valuation of high dollar sales is responsible for the low weighted mean. The relative high mean is usually strongly influenced by the overvaluation among low dollar sales. This appears to be the case in this county. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by these outliers, and in this subclass, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	21.48	110.52
Difference	6.48	7.52

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 COD's and PRD's that this 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. A review of the assessment actions reveals an ongoing assessment process for 2009. The county is still working on the project to review and revalue the rural and agricultural houses and improvements. This project has taken several years and may lead to some valuation inconsistency as indicated by the quality statistics. Even though the quality of the residential valuation may be considered less than acceptable, the assessment practices are consistent. The long duration of the update of the residential class may be reflected in the COD and PRD.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	224	228	4
Median	93	95	2
Wgt. Mean	87	90	3
Mean	98	99	1
COD	24.69	21.48	-3.21
PRD	113.44	110.52	-2.92
Minimum	6.25	6.25	0.00
Maximum	324.81	324.81	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. In this case, the county has been in a process of updating the class over a period of years. The quality statistics are likely to improve when this process is complete. There were 4 sales that were qualified and included in the final sales file that were not in the preliminary sales file. The changes shown between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were generally considered to be favorable ones even though the statistics are not ideal.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	228	211	17
Median	95	88	7
Wgt. Mean	90	85	5
Mean	99	100	-1
COD	21.48	36.80	-15.32
PRD	110.52	117.94	-7.42
Minimum	6.25	4.94	1.31
Maximum	324.81	637.15	-312.34

There are relatively few small dollar sales in this sample (just over 5% below \$10,000). The side-by-side comparison to the R&O Stats demonstrates that the methodology tends to produce a wider range of outlier ratios and inferior quality statistics (COD & PRD). The data gathering is done in such a way that some sales that might be substantially changed but wrongly be included and others that should be included are not discovered. With that in mind, it is not surprising that the quality stats are inferior to the R&O Stats. Otherwise in Burt County; the median and weighted mean are well below the acceptable range and the mean is in the range at 100%. This table lends mild support for the R&O Stats, in that they tend to parallel each other. On their own, the trended statistics suggest that perhaps the level of value is somewhat lower than the R&O Stats report. The quality of assessment may also not be represented by either of the two sets of statistics, rather 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

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	38.31	95% Median C.I.:	88.90 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	38.49	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.49 to 108.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.52	95% Mean C.I.:	87.74 to 113.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,932,915						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	229.38		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,226	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:30

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	3	97.75	88.65	95.27	14.24	93.06	63.22	104.99	N/A	35,333	33,661
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	103.50	103.50	103.50			103.50	103.50	N/A	27,000	27,945
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	97.30	97.30	97.21	1.64	100.09	95.70	98.89	N/A	9,500	9,235
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	105.23	105.87	108.29	11.11	97.77	84.29	131.03	N/A	200,050	216,625
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	102.05	102.05	102.05			102.05	102.05	N/A	65,000	66,330
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	96.25	96.25	96.25			96.25	96.25	N/A	2,000	1,925
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	90.68	90.68	90.68			90.68	90.68	N/A	11,000	9,975
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	143.21	143.21	105.53	30.35	135.70	99.74	186.67	N/A	11,250	11,872
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	85.03	102.58	75.67	47.92	135.56	55.55	207.42	N/A	17,841	13,500
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	99.28	115.91	93.61	34.60	123.82	48.50	229.38	48.50 to 229.38	59,203	55,421
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	74.73	78.20	84.73	8.00	92.29	70.97	88.90	N/A	31,330	26,546
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	80.56	81.12	80.02	15.77	101.37	59.84	97.85	N/A	30,180	24,149
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	11	98.89	99.40	106.79	10.62	93.08	63.22	131.03	84.29 to 110.24	104,750	111,865
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	99.74	115.08	101.47	20.41	113.41	90.68	186.67	N/A	20,100	20,395
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	88.90	97.29	87.10	32.82	111.70	48.50	229.38	70.90 to 100.00	36,279	31,600
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	98.89	102.47	107.70	8.29	95.15	84.29	131.03	95.70 to 110.24	120,694	129,983
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	99.15	113.24	90.76	37.50	124.78	48.50	229.38	56.52 to 186.67	34,137	30,982
____ALL____											
	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1519	1	84.29	84.29	84.29			84.29	84.29	N/A	50,000	42,145
1813	3	97.85	101.51	109.04	4.70	93.09	96.43	110.24	N/A	196,966	214,766
1819	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	270,000	266,085
CRAIG	1	63.22	63.22	63.22			63.22	63.22	N/A	16,000	10,115
DECATUR	1	74.73	74.73	74.73			74.73	74.73	N/A	15,000	11,210
DECATUR V	1	55.55	55.55	55.55			55.55	55.55	N/A	10,000	5,555
LYONS	8	98.26	113.51	110.79	22.08	102.45	85.03	207.42	85.03 to 207.42	36,775	40,745
LYONS V	2	141.46	141.46	135.00	31.96	104.79	96.25	186.67	N/A	1,750	2,362
OAKLAND	9	97.75	102.70	87.91	28.24	116.83	56.52	229.38	70.90 to 108.37	19,434	17,084
TEKAMAH	8	100.30	90.14	90.63	18.22	99.46	48.50	121.38	48.50 to 121.38	64,693	58,631
____ALL____											
	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	38.31	95% Median C.I.:	88.90 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	38.49	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.49 to 108.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.52	95% Mean C.I.:	87.74 to 113.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,932,915						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	229.38		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,226	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:31

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	32	97.69	100.76	95.20	24.36	105.84	48.50	229.38	85.03 to 102.05	33,970	32,340
2	2	104.40	104.40	106.32	5.60	98.19	98.55	110.24	N/A	402,500	427,942
3	1	84.29	84.29	84.29			84.29	84.29	N/A	50,000	42,145
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

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	31	97.85	99.82	100.10	21.16	99.72	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 102.05	60,598	60,660
2	4	90.27	105.69	82.56	39.63	128.02	55.55	186.67	N/A	15,875	13,106
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0001	11	98.55	93.24	100.44	14.82	92.83	48.50	121.38	59.84 to 110.24	100,768	101,214
11-0014	11	97.75	98.73	93.29	26.39	105.84	56.52	229.38	63.22 to 108.37	41,900	39,087
11-0020	13	96.25	108.12	104.53	27.25	103.43	55.55	207.42	84.29 to 131.03	28,669	29,969
20-0020											
27-0594											
NonValid School											
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

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)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	38.31	95% Median C.I.:	88.90 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	38.49	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.49 to 108.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.52	95% Mean C.I.:	87.74 to 113.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,932,915						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	229.38		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,226	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:31

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	5	84.29	94.25	63.57	42.44	148.26	48.50	186.67	N/A	28,700	18,245
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	8	99.87	95.78	92.72	8.08	103.30	56.52	108.37	56.52 to 108.37	26,740	24,793
1920 TO 1939	7	96.43	110.69	94.69	27.63	116.90	74.73	229.38	74.73 to 229.38	20,878	19,770
1940 TO 1949	1	207.42	207.42	207.42			207.42	207.42	N/A	3,206	6,650
1950 TO 1959	3	97.75	99.63	99.10	2.00	100.53	97.63	103.50	N/A	37,333	36,996
1960 TO 1969	5	85.03	82.87	92.94	10.72	89.16	70.90	98.55	N/A	51,158	47,547
1970 TO 1979	3	110.24	97.15	108.09	18.61	89.89	59.84	121.38	N/A	218,833	236,528
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	131.03	131.03	131.03			131.03	131.03	N/A	125,000	163,785
1995 TO 1999	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	270,000	266,085
2000 TO Present	1	63.22	63.22	63.22			63.22	63.22	N/A	16,000	10,115
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

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	4	197.05	179.93	191.95	19.52	93.74	96.25	229.38	N/A	2,676	5,137
5000 TO 9999	3	98.89	89.95	89.25	9.79	100.79	70.97	100.00	N/A	9,303	8,303
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	100.00	141.37	117.72	51.05	120.09	70.97	229.38	70.97 to 229.38	5,516	6,494
10000 TO 29999	12	93.19	87.42	90.19	15.10	96.93	55.55	108.37	70.90 to 103.50	15,437	13,922
30000 TO 59999	8	90.96	84.93	84.40	16.08	100.63	56.52	104.99	56.52 to 104.99	43,362	36,596
60000 TO 99999	4	95.47	90.21	89.27	22.53	101.05	48.50	121.38	N/A	72,625	64,831
100000 TO 149999	1	131.03	131.03	131.03			131.03	131.03	N/A	125,000	163,785
150000 TO 249999	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	150,800	148,610
250000 TO 499999	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	270,000	266,085
500000 +	1	110.24	110.24	110.24			110.24	110.24	N/A	535,000	589,800
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	38.31	95% Median C.I.:	88.90 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	38.49	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.49 to 108.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.52	95% Mean C.I.:	87.74 to 113.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,932,915						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	229.38		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,226	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:31

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	141.46	141.46	135.00	31.96	104.79	96.25	186.67	N/A	1,750	2,362
5000 TO 9999	9	95.70	113.28	95.81	40.36	118.23	55.55	229.38	70.90 to 207.42	8,457	8,102
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	11	96.25	118.40	97.53	41.42	121.40	55.55	229.38	70.90 to 207.42	7,237	7,059
10000 TO 29999	10	90.73	85.26	79.94	19.17	106.66	56.52	108.37	59.84 to 105.23	23,425	18,725
30000 TO 59999	7	97.63	87.37	82.88	12.77	105.42	48.50	104.99	48.50 to 104.99	48,128	39,887
60000 TO 99999	3	102.05	104.11	104.76	10.61	99.38	88.90	121.38	N/A	70,166	73,508
100000 TO 149999	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	150,800	148,610
150000 TO 249999	1	131.03	131.03	131.03			131.03	131.03	N/A	125,000	163,785
250000 TO 499999	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	270,000	266,085
500000 +	1	110.24	110.24	110.24			110.24	110.24	N/A	535,000	589,800
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	84.29	94.25	63.57	42.44	148.26	48.50	186.67	N/A	28,700	18,245
10	3	100.00	138.14	109.61	48.12	126.02	85.03	229.38	N/A	9,640	10,566
20	27	97.85	97.47	102.28	16.89	95.29	56.52	207.42	88.90 to 103.50	65,542	67,036
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	38.31	95% Median C.I.:	88.90 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	38.49	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.49 to 108.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.52	95% Mean C.I.:	87.74 to 113.25
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,932,915						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	229.38		
AVG. Assessed Value:	55,226	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:31

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	77.63	90.37	64.05	41.26	141.09	48.50	186.67	48.50 to 186.67	25,581	16,385
276	1	59.84	59.84	59.84			59.84	59.84	N/A	45,000	26,930
306	1	104.99	104.99	104.99			104.99	104.99	N/A	40,000	41,995
326	2	103.64	103.64	102.80	1.53	100.81	102.05	105.23	N/A	42,625	43,820
334	1	131.03	131.03	131.03			131.03	131.03	N/A	125,000	163,785
344	4	103.11	133.01	106.72	34.79	124.64	96.43	229.38	N/A	18,725	19,982
350	4	98.75	101.94	103.47	8.73	98.52	88.90	121.38	N/A	54,125	56,003
352	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	150,800	148,610
353	3	95.70	93.25	90.57	7.99	102.96	80.56	103.50	N/A	25,666	23,246
406	7	98.89	112.84	108.72	20.85	103.79	85.03	207.42	85.03 to 207.42	88,303	96,002
419	1	98.55	98.55	98.55			98.55	98.55	N/A	270,000	266,085
442	2	65.63	65.63	61.08	13.87	107.45	56.52	74.73	N/A	30,000	18,322
471	1	63.22	63.22	63.22			63.22	63.22	N/A	16,000	10,115
5	1	70.90	70.90	70.90			70.90	70.90	N/A	10,000	7,090
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

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	34	97.69	99.60	97.36	22.73	102.29	48.50	229.38	85.03 to 100.00	53,443	52,033
04	1	131.03	131.03	131.03			131.03	131.03	N/A	125,000	163,785
ALL	35	97.75	100.49	99.53	23.04	100.97	48.50	229.38	88.90 to 100.00	55,487	55,226

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

Commercial:

Annually, all subclasses are monitored for problem areas that are revealed by analysis of the sales activity. There was a 3 year total of 35 sales, and nothing in the preliminary statistics indicated a need to adjust or revalue the commercial property for 2009.

Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick-up) is completed in a timely fashion.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. Since the commercial inspection is relatively current, there was no inspection done during 2008 and efforts were focused on the rural and agricultural residences, the agricultural improvements and the residential parcels in Lyons.

In 2008, the county reported updating some of the commercial costs, but adapting the depreciation in a way that the values would not change noticeably. They also reviewed the application of land values throughout the commercial parcels. Apparently the last land update had some inconsistencies that the county sought to fix. The assessment actions for 2009 were characterized as housekeeping rather than update or revaluation.

2009 Assessment Survey for Burt County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor/Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor/Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2003
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2005
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?
	1999: In 1999, the county hired Stanard Appraisal to do a commercial income approach. The county has considered updating the approach but has not retained Stanard to update it, so it is presently out dated. The county has indicated that their market is much more of an owner operator structure than a landlord tenant arrangement. Because of this, the rent and expense data needed for the income approach is scarce and the commercial rental market for most of the common types of commercial uses are not well organized and inconsistent. All things considered, the county, to date, has decided that updating this approach would not be a good expenditure of resources.
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. Annually, the county analyzes the available sales and if needed, adjusts the values or recalibrates the depreciation. A sales comparison approach has not been used in Burt County.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	*10 -Assessor Locations: The Preliminary Statistics show 10 Assessor Locations. 5 are town names, 2 are vacant lots associated with the towns, and 3 are Geocode subdivisions of the Rural. *The county generally uses 6 as appraisal subclasses.

9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	There are 5 town names; Craig, Decatur, Lyons, Oakland and Tekamah, as well as Rural. The Rural; (non-urban parcels), are subdivided by Geocodes as separate Assessor Locations. When the county considers changes, they may consolidate the rural and the Geocodes designations before deciding on an adjustment. Since the county typically updates their rural parcels by groupings related to the Geocodes, they have opted to display their assessor locations similarly. It has also been the county's practice to separate the vacant land parcels from improved parcels using the town name plus "V", which can lead to additional entries in the Assessor Location section of the R&O.
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 during the Statewide Equalization process. The sales file does not contain sufficient detail to make any other adjustments. Any other strata would not 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?
	No, the occupancy codes by themselves as displayed in the R&O would not be certain to have common value characteristics. While they may depict common construction characteristics, location and condition are property characteristics that are much better correlated to 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 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. Parcels associated with this stratum have no consistent relationship with either the rural parcels or the urban parcels and often have characteristics of both. This stratum merely collects the parcels that are located in the land areas that immediately surround the various urban areas throughout the county. While there may be some relationship among the parcels in the proximity of an individual town, it is illogical to suggest any relationship exists among the parcels from all of the suburban areas of the county.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
9	N/A	0	9

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)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	36.57	95% Median C.I.:	92.32 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	37.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 108.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.91	95% Mean C.I.:	90.04 to 114.87
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,970,590						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	21.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	56,302	PRD:	100.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	55.70		

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:56

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	98.96	91.28	96.94	12.11	94.16	69.47	105.41	N/A	35,333	34,253
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	104.19	104.19	104.19			104.19	104.19	N/A	27,000	28,130
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	97.07	97.07	96.97	1.87	100.10	95.25	98.89	N/A	9,500	9,212
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	106.05	105.11	107.73	10.14	97.57	84.29	126.41	N/A	200,050	215,512
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	102.07	102.07	102.07			102.07	102.07	N/A	65,000	66,345
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	96.25	96.25	96.25			96.25	96.25	N/A	2,000	1,925
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	92.32	92.32	92.32			92.32	92.32	N/A	11,000	10,155
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	143.54	143.54	105.58	30.51	135.95	99.74	187.33	N/A	11,250	11,877
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	85.19	103.27	76.31	48.36	135.34	55.70	207.89	N/A	17,841	13,614
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	99.39	124.61	104.59	27.10	119.14	96.63	233.25	96.63 to 233.25	59,203	61,923
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	74.70	78.79	85.01	7.33	92.68	72.62	89.04	N/A	31,330	26,633
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	81.23	82.04	80.86	15.16	101.46	61.16	98.28	N/A	30,180	24,405
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	11	98.96	99.79	106.48	9.72	93.72	69.47	126.41	84.29 to 110.24	104,750	111,534
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	99.74	115.54	101.67	20.22	113.64	92.32	187.33	N/A	20,100	20,436
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	96.63	100.56	93.07	28.10	108.05	55.70	233.25	72.62 to 100.00	36,279	33,765
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	98.89	102.00	107.18	7.91	95.17	84.29	126.41	95.25 to 110.24	120,694	129,361
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	99.26	117.39	99.08	34.34	118.48	55.70	233.25	85.19 to 187.33	34,137	33,822
<u>ALL</u>											
	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1519	1	84.29	84.29	84.29			84.29	84.29	N/A	50,000	42,145
1813	3	98.28	101.84	109.08	4.49	93.36	97.00	110.24	N/A	196,966	214,853
1819	1	98.57	98.57	98.57			98.57	98.57	N/A	270,000	266,130
CRAIG	1	69.47	69.47	69.47			69.47	69.47	N/A	16,000	11,115
DECATUR	1	74.70	74.70	74.70			74.70	74.70	N/A	15,000	11,205
DECATUR V	1	55.70	55.70	55.70			55.70	55.70	N/A	10,000	5,570
LYONS	8	98.26	113.06	108.93	21.66	103.80	85.19	207.89	85.19 to 207.89	36,775	40,058
LYONS V	2	141.79	141.79	135.29	32.12	104.81	96.25	187.33	N/A	1,750	2,367
OAKLAND	9	98.96	104.11	88.93	27.99	117.08	56.89	233.25	72.55 to 110.70	19,434	17,282
TEKAMAH	8	100.43	96.59	98.37	12.09	98.19	61.16	121.39	61.16 to 121.39	64,693	63,639
<u>ALL</u>											
	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	36.57	95% Median C.I.:	92.32 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	37.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 108.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.91	95% Mean C.I.:	90.04 to 114.87
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,970,590						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	21.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	56,302	PRD:	100.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	55.70		

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:56

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	32	97.96	102.91	98.66	22.51	104.30	55.70	233.25	89.04 to 102.07	33,970	33,516
2	2	104.41	104.41	106.33	5.59	98.19	98.57	110.24	N/A	402,500	427,965
3	1	84.29	84.29	84.29			84.29	84.29	N/A	50,000	42,145
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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	31	98.57	102.02	102.11	19.11	99.91	56.89	233.25	92.32 to 102.07	60,598	61,875
2	4	90.27	105.89	82.60	39.77	128.20	55.70	187.33	N/A	15,875	13,112
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0001	11	98.78	98.02	104.08	10.20	94.18	61.16	121.39	81.23 to 110.24	100,768	104,879
11-0014	11	98.57	100.46	93.90	25.71	106.99	56.89	233.25	69.47 to 110.70	41,900	39,344
11-0020	13	96.25	107.90	103.06	27.03	104.70	55.70	207.89	84.29 to 126.41	28,669	29,548
20-0020											
27-0594											
NonValid School											
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	36.57	95% Median C.I.:	92.32 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	37.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 108.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.91	95% Mean C.I.:	90.04 to 114.87
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,970,590						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	21.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	56,302	PRD:	100.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	55.70		

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:56

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	5	96.25	104.04	90.42	29.92	115.06	55.70	187.33	N/A	28,700	25,951
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	8	99.87	96.12	93.03	8.44	103.32	56.89	110.70	56.89 to 110.70	26,740	24,875
1920 TO 1939	7	97.00	111.83	95.39	27.88	117.24	74.70	233.25	74.70 to 233.25	20,878	19,916
1940 TO 1949	1	207.89	207.89	207.89			207.89	207.89	N/A	3,206	6,665
1950 TO 1959	3	98.96	100.26	99.80	2.21	100.46	97.63	104.19	N/A	37,333	37,260
1960 TO 1969	5	85.19	83.64	93.25	10.01	89.69	72.55	98.78	N/A	51,158	47,707
1970 TO 1979	3	110.24	97.60	108.18	18.21	90.22	61.16	121.39	N/A	218,833	236,726
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	126.41	126.41	126.41			126.41	126.41	N/A	125,000	158,010
1995 TO 1999	1	98.57	98.57	98.57			98.57	98.57	N/A	270,000	266,130
2000 TO Present	1	69.47	69.47	69.47			69.47	69.47	N/A	16,000	11,115
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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	4	197.61	181.18	193.63	19.93	93.57	96.25	233.25	N/A	2,676	5,182
5000 TO 9999	3	98.89	90.50	89.84	9.23	100.74	72.62	100.00	N/A	9,303	8,358
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	100.00	142.32	118.62	51.53	119.98	72.62	233.25	72.62 to 233.25	5,516	6,543
10000 TO 29999	12	93.79	88.57	91.33	14.48	96.98	55.70	110.70	72.55 to 104.19	15,437	14,099
30000 TO 59999	8	90.96	85.48	84.97	16.04	100.61	56.89	105.41	56.89 to 105.41	43,362	36,843
60000 TO 99999	4	99.35	102.28	102.56	9.51	99.73	89.04	121.39	N/A	72,625	74,487
100000 TO 149999	1	126.41	126.41	126.41			126.41	126.41	N/A	125,000	158,010
150000 TO 249999	1	98.78	98.78	98.78			98.78	98.78	N/A	150,800	148,955
250000 TO 499999	1	98.57	98.57	98.57			98.57	98.57	N/A	270,000	266,130
500000 +	1	110.24	110.24	110.24			110.24	110.24	N/A	535,000	589,800
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	36.57	95% Median C.I.:	92.32 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	37.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 108.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.91	95% Mean C.I.:	90.04 to 114.87
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,970,590						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	21.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	56,302	PRD:	100.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	55.70		

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:56

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	141.79	141.79	135.29	32.12	104.81	96.25	187.33	N/A	1,750	2,367
5000 TO 9999	8	97.07	117.02	97.40	44.29	120.15	55.70	233.25	55.70 to 233.25	8,139	7,927
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	97.57	121.97	99.33	44.58	122.80	55.70	233.25	72.55 to 207.89	6,861	6,815
10000 TO 29999	11	92.32	87.04	81.53	16.77	106.75	56.89	110.70	61.16 to 106.05	22,295	18,178
30000 TO 59999	6	97.96	94.30	94.06	6.72	100.26	81.23	105.41	81.23 to 105.41	42,816	40,271
60000 TO 99999	4	99.35	102.28	102.56	9.51	99.73	89.04	121.39	N/A	72,625	74,487
100000 TO 149999	1	98.78	98.78	98.78			98.78	98.78	N/A	150,800	148,955
150000 TO 249999	1	126.41	126.41	126.41			126.41	126.41	N/A	125,000	158,010
250000 TO 499999	1	98.57	98.57	98.57			98.57	98.57	N/A	270,000	266,130
500000 +	1	110.24	110.24	110.24			110.24	110.24	N/A	535,000	589,800
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	96.25	104.04	90.42	29.92	115.06	55.70	187.33	N/A	28,700	25,951
10	3	100.00	139.48	110.24	49.35	126.53	85.19	233.25	N/A	9,640	10,626
20	27	98.57	98.05	102.22	16.25	95.92	56.89	207.89	89.04 to 104.19	65,542	66,998
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	35	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	36.57	95% Median C.I.:	92.32 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,018,066	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	37.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 108.40
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,942,066	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.91	95% Mean C.I.:	90.04 to 114.87
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,970,590						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,487	COD:	21.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	56,302	PRD:	100.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	55.70		

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:36:56

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.27	98.80	89.26	30.94	110.69	55.70	187.33	55.70 to 187.33	25,581	22,835
276	1	61.16	61.16	61.16			61.16	61.16	N/A	45,000	27,520
306	1	105.41	105.41	105.41			105.41	105.41	N/A	40,000	42,165
326	2	104.06	104.06	103.01	1.91	101.01	102.07	106.05	N/A	42,625	43,910
334	1	126.41	126.41	126.41			126.41	126.41	N/A	125,000	158,010
344	4	104.49	134.81	107.74	35.57	125.13	97.00	233.25	N/A	18,725	20,173
350	4	99.35	102.28	103.80	8.34	98.54	89.04	121.39	N/A	54,125	56,181
352	1	98.78	98.78	98.78			98.78	98.78	N/A	150,800	148,955
353	3	95.25	93.56	91.10	8.03	102.70	81.23	104.19	N/A	25,666	23,381
406	7	98.89	113.17	108.75	20.66	104.06	85.19	207.89	85.19 to 207.89	88,303	96,034
419	1	98.57	98.57	98.57			98.57	98.57	N/A	270,000	266,130
442	2	65.80	65.80	61.34	13.53	107.26	56.89	74.70	N/A	30,000	18,402
471	1	69.47	69.47	69.47			69.47	69.47	N/A	16,000	11,115
5	1	72.55	72.55	72.55			72.55	72.55	N/A	10,000	7,255
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

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	34	97.96	101.75	99.75	21.13	102.01	55.70	233.25	89.04 to 100.00	53,443	53,311
04	1	126.41	126.41	126.41			126.41	126.41	N/A	125,000	158,010
ALL	35	98.28	102.46	101.47	21.28	100.98	55.70	233.25	92.32 to 100.00	55,487	56,302

2009 Correlation Section
for Burt County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Collectively, 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 98% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 21.28 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 100.98 is 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. There are no recommendations for an adjustment.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	63	35	55.56
2008	69	36	52.17
2007	79	48	60.76
2006	79	49	62.03
2005	75	47	62.67

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 Burt 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 Burt 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	98	2.95	101	98
2008	98.15	1.97	100	98.15
2007	98	0.79	99	97
2006	97	-0.15	96	97
2005	96	6.83	103	96

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 population in a similar manner. 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. The history of this statistic has shown fairly consistent change in both files. In 2009, the assessed base moved more than the sales file. The assessment actions describe no real update of commercial property. However the assessor did say that they had updated the commercial costing throughout the county. The market among commercial property has been relatively flat for several years, so the county was not attempting to redo the depreciation or revalue the class. They were attempting to prepare depreciation to leave values the same, but in most circumstances, there were a few dollars change throughout the county. This accounts for small changes in nearly every sale throughout the sales file between the preliminary and final statistics. Another situation involved switching a previously residential parcel to commercial classification, causing the change in value excluding growth statistic to increase. Finally, the assessor indicated that they had perhaps improperly allocated value changes between the recosting process and new improvements that were done for Central Valley Ag, a large agri-based business in Burt County. The combination of these actions is a reasonable explanation for the migration of the assessed value growth when no actual revaluation projects were done. In this case, the relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio may not be a useful statistic.

2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 Burt 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)
6.9	2009	2.95
0.00	2008	1.97
-10.91	2007	0.79
0.00	2006	-0.15
-1.87	2005	6.83

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is somewhat dissimilar. This tends to indicate that the statistical calculations from the sales file should be used cautiously as a reliable and accurate measure of the population. In this case, there are not many parcels in the sale file or the assessed base so statistics tend to be vulnerable to the methodology calculating the change to the sales base. There was 1 sale that should have been removed as substantially changed that had improvements made increasing the value by about \$45,000 between the preliminary and final sales files. It was a sale that occurred in the final year of the sales file and changed the final weighted mean, which is a key data element for calculating the change to the sales file. In this county, there were only minor assessment changes to the property in this property class, so the change statistic is deceptive. In this situation, this table really gives no information that relates to the level of or quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 Burt County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	101	102

COMMERCIAL: The median is in the acceptable range, while the mean and weighted mean are 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 35 sales in this class sold for less than \$10,000, and about 54% 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 subclass, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	21.28	100.98
Difference	1.28	0.00

2009 Correlation Section
for Burt County

COMMERCIAL: The PRD is well within the range and the COD is fractionally out of the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. That said, commercial quality statistics (good or bad), in low population counties may be 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 35 commercial sales, there were 13 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. 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, even though they are good in this case.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	35	35	0
Median	98	98	0
Wgt. Mean	100	101	1
Mean	100	102	2
COD	23.04	21.28	-1.76
PRD	100.97	100.98	0.01
Minimum	48.50	55.70	7.20
Maximum	229.38	233.25	3.87

COMMERCIAL: 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 no substantially changed sales after the preliminary statistics were prepared, the same sales were used to measure the Preliminary and R&O Statistics. The assessment action in this class was described as a housekeeping action rather than an update or systematic revaluation. It resulted in some changes that seemed to be consistent with the described action.

**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:	94	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	28.70	95% Median C.I.:	55.26 to 66.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,980,501	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.49 to 62.89	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,973,001	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	59.39 to 66.70	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,148,445							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,223	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,430	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:55

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												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	72.71	77.96	74.29	10.80	104.95	68.14	101.24	N/A		175,246	130,191
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	16	72.79	75.09	74.12	11.36	101.30	49.52	92.24	69.12 to 86.84		253,337	187,785
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	79.55	79.59	77.80	17.55	102.30	52.16	125.39	61.68 to 92.67		276,686	215,253
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	65.59	70.94	70.56	19.41	100.53	54.52	92.71	N/A		111,693	78,815
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	64.07	63.76	64.56	11.18	98.76	55.26	71.63	N/A		352,940	227,841
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	66.82	71.38	64.62	27.69	110.46	46.39	129.21	47.27 to 91.30		310,832	200,867
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	9	48.70	47.51	50.84	16.21	93.46	16.41	62.75	44.78 to 60.21		277,142	140,897
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	8	62.21	61.80	62.35	12.55	99.12	40.63	77.18	40.63 to 77.18		209,654	130,721
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	52.47	55.38	55.52	8.86	99.74	48.80	64.75	48.80 to 64.75		184,489	102,427
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	51.35	49.91	48.05	12.76	103.87	30.50	66.94	45.26 to 55.45		552,662	265,570
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	9	47.21	49.40	48.25	13.54	102.38	33.83	63.63	42.04 to 61.42		402,683	194,307
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	30	73.05	76.92	75.38	13.87	102.04	49.52	125.39	70.58 to 79.98		247,327	186,426
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	25	57.92	61.52	60.01	25.41	102.51	16.41	129.21	48.70 to 66.82		281,544	168,947
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	39	52.17	53.36	50.51	14.52	105.62	30.50	77.18	48.83 to 56.85		372,168	187,998
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	32	71.39	74.55	73.45	15.00	101.49	49.52	125.39	69.12 to 79.98		259,075	190,301
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	34	57.45	59.04	58.51	20.90	100.91	16.41	129.21	49.21 to 64.32		248,380	145,325
____ALL____	_____											
	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82		308,223	182,430

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:	94	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	28.70	95% Median C.I.:	55.26 to 66.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,980,501	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.49 to 62.89	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,973,001	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	59.39 to 66.70	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,148,445							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,223	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,430	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:55

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1519	1	51.67	51.67	51.67			51.67	51.67	N/A	307,878	159,070
1521	2	70.70	70.70	67.08	13.13	105.39	61.42	79.98	N/A	170,191	114,170
1529	5	49.52	49.54	48.13	21.45	102.93	30.50	66.82	N/A	637,444	306,792
1531	8	64.81	64.46	54.22	20.46	118.89	36.21	88.93	36.21 to 88.93	358,725	194,485
1533	9	56.85	62.97	59.54	28.00	105.76	33.83	129.21	46.96 to 72.71	247,408	147,315
1535	6	55.91	57.96	56.94	14.40	101.80	46.39	76.94	46.39 to 76.94	325,641	185,406
1797	6	60.73	57.41	64.82	30.28	88.55	16.41	89.87	16.41 to 89.87	293,894	190,515
1799	10	54.71	59.84	57.50	23.35	104.08	45.26	92.67	45.96 to 73.39	263,583	151,557
1801	4	74.17	75.95	73.65	12.13	103.12	62.75	92.71	N/A	155,780	114,726
1803	2	72.10	72.10	65.74	27.94	109.67	51.95	92.24	N/A	277,500	182,425
1811	2	45.79	45.79	45.81	2.21	99.97	44.78	46.80	N/A	137,111	62,805
1813	5	59.69	60.95	60.52	4.39	100.70	57.92	64.75	N/A	251,311	152,095
1815	6	75.69	79.93	85.80	24.96	93.16	40.63	125.39	40.63 to 125.39	224,259	192,405
1817	13	67.17	61.41	57.46	14.97	106.88	47.11	83.27	50.29 to 70.22	366,647	210,677
1819	8	61.63	65.56	60.14	19.84	109.01	52.16	83.36	52.16 to 83.36	429,398	258,261
2083	2	88.34	88.34	81.21	14.60	108.78	75.44	101.24	N/A	136,576	110,917
2085	4	57.15	58.44	60.06	18.29	97.30	47.27	72.18	N/A	223,692	134,340
2087	1	55.26	55.26	55.26			55.26	55.26	N/A	264,000	145,880
ALL	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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	58.82	61.57	56.07	21.15	109.79	30.50	129.21	55.26 to 64.32	307,971	172,694
2	49	66.94	64.40	62.04	21.36	103.80	16.41	125.39	52.98 to 70.58	308,454	191,371
ALL	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430
ALL	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	28.70	95% Median C.I.:	55.26 to 66.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,980,501	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.49 to 62.89	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,973,001	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	59.39 to 66.70	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,148,445							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,223	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,430	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:55

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	69.22	69.22	69.22			69.22	69.22	N/A	165,000	114,220
11-0001	29	64.32	64.98	61.21	21.97	106.16	30.50	125.39	55.26 to 71.63	287,962	176,253
11-0014	31	55.12	61.67	59.34	21.06	103.92	45.26	92.67	50.52 to 70.21	370,220	219,688
11-0020	29	56.37	59.45	55.59	23.97	106.93	16.41	129.21	49.52 to 64.72	292,466	162,593
20-0020	1	76.94	76.94	76.94			76.94	76.94	N/A	195,450	150,380
27-0594	3	83.27	86.65	81.42	10.33	106.43	75.44	101.24	N/A	101,086	82,301
NonValid School	1	69.22	69.22	69.22			69.22	69.22	N/A	165,000	114,220
ALL											
	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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	3	56.37	55.95	52.87	17.86	105.82	40.63	70.84	N/A	24,134	12,760
10.01 TO 30.00	6	49.01	49.52	42.07	33.68	117.69	16.41	83.27	16.41 to 83.27	56,586	23,808
30.01 TO 50.00	9	50.50	61.62	56.91	28.88	108.27	44.78	101.24	46.12 to 92.67	115,011	65,456
50.01 TO 100.00	30	64.54	66.77	63.01	19.70	105.97	45.26	129.21	55.32 to 71.15	204,395	128,787
100.01 TO 180.00	34	65.83	64.99	63.29	15.55	102.68	45.96	91.30	58.82 to 70.58	353,334	223,637
180.01 TO 330.00	12	52.49	57.83	52.35	28.07	110.46	30.50	125.39	42.04 to 66.82	781,729	409,240
ALL											
	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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	55	64.32	63.68	59.45	17.18	107.11	36.21	129.21	56.37 to 69.12	322,593	191,793
DRY-N/A	23	52.98	64.81	63.50	33.95	102.06	33.83	125.39	48.80 to 79.76	245,569	155,943
GRASS	1	47.27	47.27	47.27			47.27	47.27	N/A	307,759	145,475
GRASS-N/A	4	66.95	57.57	59.76	26.87	96.34	16.41	79.98	N/A	141,393	84,497
IRRGTD	5	57.92	62.75	60.59	15.98	103.57	49.52	92.24	N/A	282,544	171,189
IRRGTD-N/A	6	59.49	56.97	50.78	25.89	112.20	30.50	83.36	30.50 to 83.36	549,366	278,948
ALL											
	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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:	94	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	28.70	95% Median C.I.:	55.26 to 66.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,980,501	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.49 to 62.89	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,973,001	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	59.39 to 66.70	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,148,445							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,223	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,430	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:55

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	71	64.32	64.71	60.25	19.32	107.41	36.21	129.21	56.37 to 69.12	314,879	189,712
DRY-N/A	7	50.29	56.91	64.36	31.14	88.42	33.83	125.39	33.83 to 125.39	147,757	95,103
GRASS	3	62.75	60.39	57.20	12.69	105.58	47.27	71.15	N/A	224,003	128,131
GRASS-N/A	2	48.20	48.20	49.21	65.95	97.94	16.41	79.98	N/A	100,661	49,535
IRRGTD	7	57.92	58.74	51.23	20.40	114.67	30.50	92.24	30.50 to 92.24	375,740	192,475
IRRGTD-N/A	4	59.49	61.10	56.88	23.52	107.42	42.04	83.36	N/A	519,684	295,577
ALL	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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	78	62.34	64.01	60.43	21.64	105.93	33.83	129.21	55.12 to 67.27	299,881	181,222
GRASS	4	55.01	49.40	52.04	31.91	94.93	16.41	71.15	N/A	192,362	100,096
GRASS-N/A	1	79.98	79.98	79.98		79.98	79.98	79.98	N/A	103,882	83,080
IRRGTD	11	57.92	59.60	53.72	21.77	110.94	30.50	92.24	42.04 to 83.36	428,083	229,966
ALL	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	63.61	63.61	61.58	11.37	103.29	56.37	70.84	N/A	21,151	13,025
30000 TO 59999	5	49.21	54.51	51.91	30.24	105.01	33.83	83.27	N/A	40,379	20,959
60000 TO 99999	5	70.79	65.98	63.21	36.36	104.39	16.41	101.24	N/A	82,020	51,844
100000 TO 149999	12	64.60	69.91	69.00	30.35	101.32	44.78	129.21	48.70 to 86.84	120,637	83,237
150000 TO 249999	22	65.37	70.63	70.92	18.55	99.59	46.12	125.39	61.42 to 76.94	196,212	139,155
250000 TO 499999	35	60.21	61.16	61.43	16.32	99.55	45.26	89.87	52.13 to 67.27	348,514	214,107
500000 +	13	50.52	51.02	50.25	16.97	101.53	30.50	79.76	42.04 to 55.45	796,644	400,333
ALL	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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:	94	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	28.70	95% Median C.I.:	55.26 to 66.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,980,501	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.49 to 62.89	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,973,001	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	59.39 to 66.70	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,148,445							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,223	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,430	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:22:55

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
Total \$ _____											
10000 TO 29999	8	52.79	52.02	42.98	32.20	121.03	16.41	83.27	16.41 to 83.27	42,705	18,354
30000 TO 59999	2	50.89	50.89	51.27	4.11	99.27	48.80	52.98	N/A	85,890	44,032
60000 TO 99999	14	64.42	66.38	63.01	25.54	105.35	44.78	101.24	46.80 to 86.84	120,784	76,104
100000 TO 149999	19	61.68	65.00	61.01	19.56	106.55	46.39	129.21	52.16 to 68.14	206,782	126,156
150000 TO 249999	30	65.20	65.16	63.02	16.87	103.40	45.26	92.24	57.92 to 71.63	308,058	194,132
250000 TO 499999	19	55.45	61.59	55.63	28.14	110.71	30.50	125.39	47.11 to 70.58	610,597	339,662
500000 +	2	59.50	59.50	58.78	12.31	101.22	52.17	66.82	N/A	998,308	586,760
ALL _____											
	94	61.55	63.04	59.19	22.28	106.52	16.41	129.21	55.26 to 66.82	308,223	182,430

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:	116	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	28.11	95% Median C.I.:	55.25 to 64.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,402,747	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.63 to 61.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,395,247	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.22	95% Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 65.17	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,691,335							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	382,717	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	221,477	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:23:07

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	85.55	85.55	85.94			85.55	85.55	N/A		597,250	513,285
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	72.71	76.29	74.18	10.71	102.85	64.47	101.24	64.47 to 101.24		231,139	171,450
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	73.39	75.34	74.46	11.08	101.18	49.52	92.24	69.12 to 86.84		250,144	186,268
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	75.35	77.46	76.09	19.49	101.80	52.16	125.39	58.36 to 92.67		276,416	210,338
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	65.59	70.94	70.56	19.41	100.53	54.52	92.71	N/A		111,693	78,815
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	64.07	63.76	64.56	11.18	98.76	55.26	71.63	N/A		352,940	227,841
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	67.04	70.37	65.41	22.84	107.58	46.39	129.21	47.89 to 83.27		322,230	210,775
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	12	51.01	49.55	55.31	14.85	89.60	16.41	62.75	45.96 to 56.59		628,533	347,622
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	9	60.29	61.63	61.88	11.51	99.61	40.63	77.18	56.85 to 70.84		244,623	151,363
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	51.81	53.44	47.64	9.59	112.18	42.45	64.75	48.80 to 64.32		474,371	225,982
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	19	50.52	49.60	48.32	13.04	102.65	30.50	66.94	45.26 to 55.32		548,148	264,853
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	12	48.75	48.18	47.45	13.47	101.54	32.52	63.63	42.04 to 52.13		387,271	183,755
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	35	73.39	76.43	75.64	13.72	101.04	49.52	125.39	70.58 to 79.76		263,767	199,525
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	31	57.92	61.51	59.66	22.44	103.11	16.41	129.21	52.81 to 66.82		424,387	253,180
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	50	51.81	52.19	49.34	14.44	105.77	30.50	77.18	48.83 to 55.32		440,147	217,187
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	34	71.39	74.21	73.23	14.98	101.34	49.52	125.39	69.12 to 79.76		257,749	188,757
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	43	56.85	58.79	56.24	19.18	104.54	16.41	129.21	51.67 to 62.75		426,848	240,066
____ALL____												
	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72		382,717	221,477

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:	116	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	28.11	95% Median C.I.:	55.25 to 64.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,402,747	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.63 to 61.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,395,247	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.22	95% Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 65.17	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,691,335							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	382,717	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	221,477	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:23:07

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1519	2	51.05	51.05	51.35	1.22	99.41	50.42	51.67	N/A	323,064	165,880
1521	3	61.42	67.45	64.08	10.33	105.26	60.95	79.98	N/A	239,347	153,371
1529	5	49.52	49.54	48.13	21.45	102.93	30.50	66.82	N/A	637,444	306,792
1531	9	64.47	64.46	55.29	18.28	116.58	36.21	88.93	52.13 to 86.84	354,127	195,797
1533	9	56.85	62.97	59.54	28.00	105.76	33.83	129.21	46.96 to 72.71	247,408	147,315
1535	6	55.91	57.96	56.94	14.40	101.80	46.39	76.94	46.39 to 76.94	325,641	185,406
1797	7	56.59	57.29	63.14	27.86	90.73	16.41	89.87	16.41 to 89.87	319,802	201,922
1799	11	50.60	59.00	56.82	22.95	103.85	45.26	92.67	45.96 to 73.39	267,749	152,130
1801	5	77.18	77.87	79.66	11.50	97.75	62.75	92.71	N/A	244,074	194,438
1803	4	47.20	56.20	45.94	33.69	122.33	38.14	92.24	N/A	962,358	442,078
1811	3	46.80	48.94	57.17	7.46	85.60	44.78	55.25	N/A	1,345,295	769,158
1813	6	58.87	59.98	58.60	4.99	102.37	55.18	64.75	55.18 to 64.75	344,626	201,938
1815	9	79.41	74.58	76.14	22.46	97.95	32.52	125.39	40.63 to 91.30	260,495	198,342
1817	17	60.29	60.15	56.52	17.31	106.42	45.04	83.27	48.83 to 70.22	405,282	229,049
1819	9	55.12	64.09	59.00	20.29	108.62	52.16	83.36	52.17 to 80.12	448,026	264,346
2083	3	75.44	82.69	77.14	13.18	107.20	71.40	101.24	N/A	197,672	152,480
2085	5	48.96	56.54	57.08	17.08	99.05	47.27	72.18	N/A	261,343	149,182
2087	2	57.10	57.10	57.62	3.22	99.09	55.26	58.94	N/A	339,325	195,527
2089	1	58.36	58.36	60.62			58.36	58.36	N/A	273,983	166,100
ALL											
	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

AREA (MARKET)

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	55	58.36	60.73	55.49	20.16	109.44	30.50	129.21	55.25 to 63.00	437,184	242,601
2	61	65.59	63.14	60.68	21.83	104.05	16.41	125.39	52.32 to 70.22	333,608	202,430
ALL											
	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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	18	55.22	56.92	54.87	20.49	103.73	32.52	85.55	47.14 to 64.47	749,490	411,237
2	98	60.86	62.93	59.18	22.04	106.34	16.41	129.21	55.32 to 65.98	315,351	186,623
ALL											
	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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

NUMBER of Sales:	116	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	28.11	95% Median C.I.:	55.25 to 64.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,402,747	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.63 to 61.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,395,247	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.22	95% Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 65.17	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,691,335							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	382,717	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	221,477	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:23:07

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	69.22	69.22	69.22			69.22	69.22	N/A	165,000	114,220
11-0001	43	59.69	62.92	57.96	23.35	108.55	30.50	125.39	55.25 to 70.84	461,897	267,706
11-0014	35	54.52	60.47	57.98	20.19	104.29	45.04	92.67	50.52 to 67.27	396,071	229,648
11-0020	32	56.48	59.12	55.72	22.28	106.10	16.41	129.21	50.42 to 63.63	302,271	168,439
20-0020	1	76.94	76.94	76.94			76.94	76.94	N/A	195,450	150,380
27-0594	4	79.35	82.90	76.43	11.79	108.46	71.64	101.24	N/A	159,502	121,906
NonValid School	1	69.22	69.22	69.22			69.22	69.22	N/A	165,000	114,220
ALL	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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	3	56.37	55.95	52.87	17.86	105.82	40.63	70.84	N/A	24,134	12,760
10.01 TO 30.00	6	49.01	49.52	42.07	33.68	117.69	16.41	83.27	16.41 to 83.27	56,586	23,808
30.01 TO 50.00	9	50.50	61.62	56.91	28.88	108.27	44.78	101.24	46.12 to 92.67	115,011	65,456
50.01 TO 100.00	33	64.32	65.79	61.52	20.56	106.94	38.14	129.21	55.26 to 71.15	214,512	131,972
100.01 TO 180.00	47	61.42	62.48	60.90	16.59	102.60	32.52	91.30	58.36 to 67.27	371,088	225,979
180.01 TO 330.00	15	52.81	58.74	53.67	26.08	109.45	30.50	125.39	47.11 to 66.82	747,559	401,198
330.01 TO 650.00	1	85.55	85.55	85.94			85.55	85.55	N/A	597,250	513,285
650.01 +	2	48.85	48.85	51.59	13.10	94.70	42.45	55.25	N/A	3,308,756	1,706,860
ALL	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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	63	63.63	63.56	59.73	16.93	106.41	36.21	129.21	56.85 to 68.14	334,811	199,994
DRY-N/A	33	52.32	62.40	60.96	30.79	102.36	32.52	125.39	48.83 to 67.17	310,580	189,336
GRASS	1	47.27	47.27	47.27			47.27	47.27	N/A	307,759	145,475
GRASS-N/A	4	66.95	57.57	59.76	26.87	96.34	16.41	79.98	N/A	141,393	84,497
IRRGTD	6	58.37	62.12	60.26	13.51	103.09	49.52	92.24	49.52 to 92.24	304,562	183,520
IRRGTD-N/A	9	52.16	53.07	50.80	25.40	104.47	30.50	83.36	38.14 to 66.94	1,150,254	584,335
ALL	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	116	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	28.11	95% Median C.I.:	55.25 to 64.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,402,747	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.63 to 61.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,395,247	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.22	95% Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 65.17	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,691,335							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	382,717	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	221,477	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:23:07

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	85	61.68	63.73	59.59	19.32	106.94	36.21	129.21	56.37 to 67.17	336,148	200,322
DRY-N/A	11	50.42	58.78	65.73	34.63	89.44	32.52	125.39	33.83 to 85.55	251,785	165,486
GRASS	3	62.75	60.39	57.20	12.69	105.58	47.27	71.15	N/A	224,003	128,131
GRASS-N/A	2	48.20	48.20	49.21	65.95	97.94	16.41	79.98	N/A	100,661	49,535
IRRGTD	9	57.92	56.48	50.64	19.86	111.52	30.50	92.24	38.14 to 66.94	387,046	196,012
IRRGTD-N/A	6	53.71	57.01	52.85	21.35	107.88	42.04	83.36	42.04 to 83.36	1,449,374	766,005
ALL	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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	95	60.95	63.49	60.46	21.17	105.01	33.83	129.21	55.32 to 65.68	325,966	197,073
DRY-N/A	1	32.52	32.52	33.49			32.52	32.52	N/A	375,450	125,750
GRASS	4	55.01	49.40	52.04	31.91	94.93	16.41	71.15	N/A	192,362	100,096
GRASS-N/A	1	79.98	79.98	79.98			79.98	79.98	N/A	103,882	83,080
IRRGTD	15	55.26	56.69	52.22	21.11	108.56	30.50	92.24	42.45 to 66.82	811,977	424,009
ALL	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	63.61	63.61	61.58	11.37	103.29	56.37	70.84	N/A	21,151	13,025
30000 TO 59999	5	49.21	54.51	51.91	30.24	105.01	33.83	83.27	N/A	40,379	20,959
60000 TO 99999	5	70.79	65.98	63.21	36.36	104.39	16.41	101.24	N/A	82,020	51,844
100000 TO 149999	12	64.60	69.91	69.00	30.35	101.32	44.78	129.21	48.70 to 86.84	120,637	83,237
150000 TO 249999	23	65.98	71.01	71.38	18.47	99.48	46.12	125.39	61.68 to 76.94	196,336	140,148
250000 TO 499999	48	59.32	60.07	60.37	16.76	99.49	32.52	89.87	52.13 to 66.94	354,365	213,941
500000 +	21	52.17	52.69	52.05	16.68	101.23	30.50	85.55	45.96 to 55.25	988,953	514,753
ALL	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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:	116	MEDIAN:	59	COV:	28.11	95% Median C.I.:	55.25 to 64.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,402,747	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.63 to 61.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,395,247	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.22	95% Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 65.17	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,691,335							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	382,717	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.21			
AVG. Assessed Value:	221,477	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.41			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:23:08

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	_____										
____Total \$____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	8	52.79	52.02	42.98	32.20	121.03	16.41	83.27	16.41 to 83.27	42,705	18,354
30000 TO 59999	2	50.89	50.89	51.27	4.11	99.27	48.80	52.98	N/A	85,890	44,032
60000 TO 99999	14	64.42	66.38	63.01	25.54	105.35	44.78	101.24	46.80 to 86.84	120,784	76,104
100000 TO 149999	20	61.55	63.38	58.61	20.99	108.14	32.52	129.21	52.16 to 65.98	215,216	126,136
150000 TO 249999	41	63.00	63.61	61.82	17.15	102.90	38.14	92.24	57.92 to 71.14	316,518	195,667
250000 TO 499999	26	55.32	60.25	55.71	24.26	108.14	30.50	125.39	48.83 to 70.21	603,764	336,360
500000 +	5	55.25	60.45	55.37	20.90	109.17	42.45	85.55	N/A	1,842,276	1,020,105
____ALL____	_____										
	116	59.32	62.00	57.87	22.28	107.13	16.41	129.21	55.25 to 64.72	382,717	221,477

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

Agricultural:

Annually, the county conducts a review and market analysis that included the qualified agricultural sales that occurred from 1 July 2005 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 agricultural land.

Annually, all appraisal maintenance (pick-up) is completed in a timely fashion.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. In 2009, an additional part of the agricultural improvements were completed.

For 2009, the county has progressed in their inspection and review of all of the agricultural improvements. This year, they completed Logan Township (Geocodes 1519 and 1533) and are under way in Summit Township (Geocodes 1815 and 2085) with completion expected in 2010. During this inspection process, the records were reviewed for listing accuracy, property characteristics, and to note the current condition of the improvements. Listers are going on-site for a close up examination of the improvements, photos and if necessary a remeasurement of the improvements. When property owners are not home, the listers leave questionnaires and make 2 return trips to contact them, followed by phone appointments.

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. The assessor estimated that Market Area 1 would increase about 19% and Market Area 2 would increase about 12%. These changes would not be applied as a direct class adjustment, but to the LCG sub-strata as needed, based on the market analysis.

2009 Assessment Survey for Burt County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor/Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor/Staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Not currently
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By statute and regulation
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?
	Burt County has not implemented an income approach for agricultural land.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1980: The conversion is from 1995
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2004 – 2006: The last process was from 2004 to 2006, and is being updated in 2007 and 2008. Letters were mailed to all taxpayers participating in the wetland reserve program requesting the current status of all of the land enrolled. The county requires certification from the Farm Service Agency that the land is no longer farmed before they convert assessments to the wetland classification. In 2010, the county plans to implement a GIS system as a tool for implementing the new soil survey and to manage the land use updates.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	The county has sent letters to the taxpayers requesting current land use from the FSA. The majority of the taxpayers have responded to the letters and land use has been updated accordingly

b.	By whom?
	Staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%: The county will begin again in 2010
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	2 Market Areas; This is the same number as last year, and the same configuration as last year.
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	The market areas are determined through market analysis and delineated by both topography and market activity. The boundaries follow township lines. Generally speaking, market area 1 is made up of the northern and eastern Geocodes and market area 2 is made up of the southwestern Geocodes.
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?
	Burt County has only one application for special valuation, so technically, the process is in place. To date, the market analysis that the county does annually has never indicated that there were any non-agricultural forces in the market.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
53	N/A	3	56

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:	90	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.61	95% Median C.I.:	65.81 to 75.99	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,773,248	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	24.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.46 to 70.79	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,765,748	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.78	95% Mean C.I.:	67.50 to 77.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,164,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	319,619	COD:	23.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.86			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,942	PRD:	108.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:19

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	86.48	87.68	85.00	11.78	103.15	73.78	109.81	N/A	175,246	148,954	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	16	81.72	85.04	82.80	12.32	102.71	59.00	108.58	75.99 to 96.40	253,337	209,763	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	85.23	86.40	84.15	16.70	102.68	55.95	135.05	73.39 to 100.11	276,686	232,818	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	71.36	80.14	80.14	24.09	99.99	58.74	110.31	N/A	111,693	89,513	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	72.04	71.75	72.30	6.70	99.24	65.81	77.11	N/A	352,940	255,176	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	74.85	81.46	74.59	27.73	109.20	50.56	154.23	55.37 to 98.27	310,832	231,855	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	9	53.69	53.51	57.36	17.51	93.29	17.55	72.75	49.62 to 64.83	277,142	158,968	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	69.65	74.10	72.56	8.29	102.13	67.61	92.03	67.61 to 92.03	271,984	197,347	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	60.70	77.54	67.40	34.78	115.04	53.18	179.86	53.18 to 179.86	174,382	117,530	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	54.40	51.29	52.40	20.10	97.88	4.98	72.01	43.09 to 65.88	593,091	310,794	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	8	56.17	59.77	55.94	12.41	106.85	50.17	75.68	50.17 to 75.68	446,269	249,646	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	30	83.01	85.89	83.51	13.95	102.85	55.95	135.05	76.70 to 89.62	247,327	206,545	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	25	65.81	69.68	68.29	25.22	102.04	17.55	154.23	55.83 to 74.85	281,544	192,266	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	35	59.42	63.14	57.05	23.01	110.68	4.98	179.86	54.65 to 67.61	408,780	233,195	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	32	78.87	83.30	81.31	15.39	102.45	55.95	135.05	75.99 to 85.85	259,075	210,650	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	32	66.22	71.24	67.82	26.56	105.04	17.55	179.86	55.83 to 74.85	259,960	176,304	
____ALL____	_____											
	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942	

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:	90	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.61	95% Median C.I.:	65.81 to 75.99	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,773,248	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	24.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.46 to 70.79	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,765,748	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.78	95% Mean C.I.:	67.50 to 77.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,164,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	319,619	COD:	23.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.86			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,942	PRD:	108.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:19

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1519	1	60.80	60.80	60.80			60.80	60.80	N/A	307,878	187,205
1521	2	84.10	84.10	79.80	13.14	105.40	73.05	95.16	N/A	170,191	135,805
1529	5	59.00	58.57	56.97	21.15	102.81	35.57	79.51	N/A	637,444	363,179
1531	8	77.14	76.66	64.48	20.44	118.89	43.09	105.50	43.09 to 105.50	358,725	231,305
1533	8	70.50	79.35	71.67	25.38	110.72	56.04	154.23	56.04 to 154.23	271,585	194,633
1535	5	66.08	69.45	67.86	16.99	102.34	55.37	91.61	N/A	385,354	261,514
1797	6	65.38	61.84	69.86	30.19	88.52	17.55	96.40	17.55 to 96.40	293,894	205,311
1799	10	59.26	60.13	59.04	30.53	101.85	4.98	100.11	48.70 to 79.14	263,583	155,613
1801	4	87.91	89.72	86.76	13.03	103.41	72.75	110.31	N/A	155,780	135,148
1803	2	84.59	84.59	77.03	28.36	109.82	60.60	108.58	N/A	277,500	213,750
1811	2	54.13	54.13	54.15	3.14	99.95	52.43	55.83	N/A	137,111	74,252
1813	5	76.65	94.12	74.90	31.41	125.66	68.04	179.86	N/A	235,141	176,115
1815	4	91.88	98.98	93.52	19.25	105.84	77.11	135.05	N/A	325,057	303,993
1817	13	72.65	66.45	62.10	15.14	106.99	50.99	90.53	54.02 to 76.04	366,647	227,698
1819	8	66.60	70.47	64.68	19.75	108.94	55.95	89.62	55.95 to 89.62	429,398	277,743
2083	2	95.51	95.51	87.61	14.98	109.02	81.20	109.81	N/A	136,576	119,650
2085	4	61.70	63.01	64.69	18.97	97.40	50.56	78.07	N/A	223,692	144,707
2087	1	65.81	65.81	65.81			65.81	65.81	N/A	264,000	173,750
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	43	72.75	76.51	66.88	23.70	114.39	35.57	179.86	65.81 to 77.29	318,529	213,039
2	47	72.01	68.91	66.39	22.71	103.80	4.98	135.05	57.26 to 76.33	320,616	212,853
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

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:	90	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.61	95% Median C.I.:	65.81 to 75.99	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,773,248	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	24.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.46 to 70.79	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,765,748	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.78	95% Mean C.I.:	67.50 to 77.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,164,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	319,619	COD:	23.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.86			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,942	PRD:	108.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:19

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	75.10	75.10	75.10			75.10	75.10	N/A	165,000	123,910
11-0001	27	76.65	79.02	70.50	24.74	112.09	35.57	179.86	65.81 to 83.78	304,620	214,752
11-0014	31	59.42	65.06	63.30	23.44	102.79	4.98	100.11	54.65 to 75.99	370,220	234,341
11-0020	27	67.61	71.47	65.86	24.00	108.53	17.55	154.23	59.00 to 77.06	311,128	204,904
20-0020	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	195,450	179,045
27-0594	3	90.53	93.85	87.90	10.53	106.77	81.20	109.81	N/A	101,086	88,851
NonValid School	1	75.10	75.10	75.10			75.10	75.10	N/A	165,000	123,910
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	5	53.69	57.26	47.41	33.96	120.78	17.55	90.53	N/A	57,103	27,073
30.01 TO 50.00	9	55.83	62.65	55.26	35.78	113.36	4.98	109.81	52.04 to 100.11	115,011	63,556
50.01 TO 100.00	30	75.39	80.56	72.82	24.19	110.63	48.70	179.86	65.88 to 81.20	201,700	146,869
100.01 TO 180.00	34	72.90	73.03	70.77	14.41	103.20	49.62	105.50	68.04 to 77.06	353,334	250,041
180.01 TO 330.00	12	57.79	64.90	59.16	28.56	109.69	35.57	135.05	50.17 to 79.51	781,729	462,497
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

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	53	73.39	73.17	66.64	20.18	109.80	4.98	179.86	65.88 to 76.65	332,443	221,530
DRY-N/A	21	60.80	75.16	70.66	34.12	106.37	50.99	135.05	54.02 to 98.27	264,952	187,209
GRASS	1	50.56	50.56	50.56			50.56	50.56	N/A	307,759	155,590
GRASS-N/A	4	78.27	67.31	69.76	28.31	96.49	17.55	95.16	N/A	141,393	98,636
IRRGTD	5	68.04	74.01	71.43	15.40	103.61	59.00	108.58	N/A	282,544	201,821
IRRGTD-N/A	6	63.98	63.81	58.65	25.91	108.80	35.57	89.62	35.57 to 89.62	549,366	322,179
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

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:	90	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.61	95% Median C.I.:	65.81 to 75.99	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,773,248	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	24.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.46 to 70.79	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,765,748	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.78	95% Mean C.I.:	67.50 to 77.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,164,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	319,619	COD:	23.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.86			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,942	PRD:	108.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:19

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	69	73.39	73.95	67.39	21.67	109.74	4.98	179.86	65.88 to 76.65	322,221	217,140
DRY-N/A	5	54.65	70.68	72.60	31.42	97.36	52.43	135.05	N/A	190,040	137,962
GRASS	3	72.75	69.03	64.61	15.22	106.84	50.56	83.78	N/A	224,003	144,726
GRASS-N/A	2	56.36	56.36	57.60	68.86	97.84	17.55	95.16	N/A	100,661	57,977
IRRGTD	7	68.04	68.23	59.39	18.65	114.88	35.57	108.58	35.57 to 108.58	375,740	223,167
IRRGTD-N/A	4	67.73	68.81	66.39	23.26	103.65	50.17	89.62	N/A	519,684	345,001
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

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	74	72.87	73.73	67.60	22.88	109.06	4.98	179.86	64.83 to 76.33	313,290	211,790
GRASS	4	61.66	56.16	58.65	35.85	95.75	17.55	83.78	N/A	192,362	112,821
GRASS-N/A	1	95.16	95.16	95.16			95.16	95.16	N/A	103,882	98,850
IRRGTD	11	68.04	68.44	62.48	20.29	109.54	35.57	108.58	50.17 to 89.62	428,083	267,470
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	4	80.94	98.86	96.07	44.89	102.90	53.69	179.86	N/A	39,081	37,546
60000 TO 99999	5	76.70	71.47	68.44	36.29	104.43	17.55	109.81	N/A	82,020	56,133
100000 TO 149999	11	83.78	82.83	81.69	30.70	101.39	52.04	154.23	52.43 to 110.31	120,751	98,644
150000 TO 249999	22	76.17	78.11	78.67	19.37	99.29	4.98	135.05	72.75 to 89.62	196,212	154,355
250000 TO 499999	35	68.75	68.58	68.74	14.15	99.76	48.70	96.40	60.80 to 75.99	348,514	239,578
500000 +	13	54.40	57.39	56.66	17.99	101.29	35.57	85.48	49.62 to 66.08	796,644	451,370
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

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:	90	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.61	95% Median C.I.:	65.81 to 75.99	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,773,248	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	24.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.46 to 70.79	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,765,748	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.78	95% Mean C.I.:	67.50 to 77.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,164,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	319,619	COD:	23.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.86			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,942	PRD:	108.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:19

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	4.98	4.98	4.98			4.98	4.98	N/A	172,000	8,560
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	4.98	4.98	4.98			4.98	4.98	N/A	172,000	8,560
10000 TO 29999	4	62.53	58.28	45.53	36.25	128.02	17.55	90.53	N/A	53,809	24,497
30000 TO 59999	2	55.22	55.22	55.59	3.69	99.34	53.18	57.26	N/A	85,890	47,745
60000 TO 99999	10	67.72	83.53	72.03	42.52	115.97	52.04	179.86	52.43 to 109.81	107,201	77,215
100000 TO 149999	13	77.29	80.66	78.18	14.34	103.18	55.95	110.31	67.61 to 92.03	161,720	126,426
150000 TO 249999	33	70.55	73.15	69.20	20.70	105.71	48.70	154.23	60.60 to 76.65	283,500	196,189
250000 TO 499999	23	74.85	70.48	64.07	19.44	110.00	35.57	135.05	54.40 to 77.06	521,759	334,315
500000 +	4	62.75	65.29	64.84	11.96	100.70	56.15	79.51	N/A	919,090	595,897
ALL	90	72.33	72.54	66.62	23.20	108.88	4.98	179.86	65.81 to 75.99	319,619	212,942

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:	111	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	29.49	95% Median C.I.:	64.83 to 73.78	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,519,504	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	20.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.44 to 68.46	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,512,004	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.24	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 73.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,911,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	401,009	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	154.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	260,467	PRD:	107.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:30

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	99.74	99.74	99.74			99.74	99.74	N/A		600,000	598,465
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	85.27	85.70	83.35	10.25	102.82	73.78	109.81	73.78 to 109.81		232,342	193,648
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	82.23	85.09	82.95	11.78	102.58	59.00	108.58	75.99 to 96.40		250,435	207,727
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	80.85	84.74	82.67	17.76	102.50	55.95	135.05	69.73 to 100.11		277,477	229,381
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	71.36	80.14	80.14	24.09	99.99	58.74	110.31	N/A		111,693	89,513
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	72.04	71.75	72.30	6.70	99.24	65.81	77.11	N/A		352,940	255,176
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	75.98	79.79	74.55	21.57	107.04	50.56	154.23	57.15 to 90.53		323,291	240,999
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	12	58.37	56.15	62.68	15.92	89.58	17.55	72.75	52.04 to 65.64		644,920	404,262
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	7	68.75	72.80	70.71	7.99	102.96	64.95	92.03	64.95 to 92.03		308,129	217,867
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	57.26	60.43	54.76	12.44	110.34	50.64	77.29	52.77 to 76.65		520,475	285,030
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	18	53.59	52.26	52.74	18.69	99.08	4.98	72.29	48.70 to 59.42		579,750	305,750
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	11	56.04	57.01	54.35	13.08	104.89	35.61	75.68	50.17 to 73.05		419,213	227,856
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	35	83.78	85.53	84.02	13.25	101.79	55.95	135.05	76.70 to 86.48		264,530	222,262
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	31	65.81	69.64	67.58	21.92	103.04	17.55	154.23	58.74 to 74.85		431,141	291,367
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	45	56.47	58.25	55.28	17.54	105.36	4.98	92.03	54.02 to 61.94		486,401	268,894
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	34	78.87	82.98	81.04	15.08	102.39	55.95	135.05	75.99 to 85.85		258,206	209,247
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	40	65.30	67.12	64.10	19.50	104.70	17.55	154.23	57.26 to 70.55		461,493	295,837
<u>ALL</u>												
	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78		401,009	260,467

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:	111	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	29.49	95% Median C.I.:	64.83 to 73.78	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,519,504	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	20.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.44 to 68.46	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,512,004	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.24	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 73.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,911,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	401,009	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	154.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	260,467	PRD:	107.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:30

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1519	2	59.84	59.84	59.79	1.60	100.08	58.88	60.80	N/A		325,189	194,442
1521	3	73.05	80.17	75.83	10.44	105.71	72.29	95.16	N/A		240,213	182,165
1529	5	59.00	58.57	56.97	21.15	102.81	35.57	79.51	N/A		637,444	363,179
1531	9	76.24	76.61	65.66	18.39	116.68	43.09	105.50	61.94 to 103.39		354,422	232,710
1533	8	70.50	79.35	71.67	25.38	110.72	56.04	154.23	56.04 to 154.23		271,585	194,633
1535	5	66.08	69.45	67.86	16.99	102.34	55.37	91.61	N/A		385,354	261,514
1797	7	60.91	61.71	67.95	27.78	90.81	17.55	96.40	17.55 to 96.40		320,159	217,551
1799	11	54.45	59.61	58.55	30.21	101.81	4.98	100.11	48.70 to 79.14		267,985	156,910
1801	5	92.03	91.72	93.13	11.63	98.49	72.75	110.31	N/A		244,624	227,812
1803	4	55.62	66.30	53.79	32.87	123.27	45.40	108.58	N/A		976,687	525,327
1811	3	55.83	57.97	64.89	7.89	89.33	52.43	65.64	N/A		1,407,878	913,586
1813	5	68.75	71.29	68.98	5.88	103.34	65.70	77.29	N/A		390,955	269,693
1815	7	85.48	86.09	81.67	20.25	105.42	35.61	135.05	35.61 to 135.05		331,584	270,804
1817	17	64.95	65.05	60.76	17.52	107.05	48.70	90.53	52.78 to 76.04		407,304	247,491
1819	9	59.42	68.91	63.46	20.23	108.58	55.95	89.62	56.15 to 85.85		448,165	284,425
2083	3	81.20	89.37	81.87	13.42	109.17	77.11	109.81	N/A		201,051	164,591
2085	5	52.77	60.96	60.85	17.75	100.19	50.56	78.07	N/A		264,153	160,727
2087	2	67.84	67.84	68.29	2.99	99.33	65.81	69.87	N/A		340,000	232,202
2089	1	69.73	69.73	69.73			69.73	69.73	N/A		284,593	198,450
ALL												
	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78		401,009	260,467

AREA (MARKET)

											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1	52	69.24	72.77	65.10	20.44	111.78	35.57	154.23	65.70 to 75.68		463,853	301,976
2	59	70.55	67.61	64.78	22.93	104.38	4.98	135.05	56.47 to 76.04		345,620	223,882
ALL												
	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78		401,009	260,467

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	17	65.70	66.42	62.76	18.69	105.83	45.40	99.74	50.92 to 77.11		791,825	496,975
2	94	70.96	70.68	65.90	22.14	107.25	4.98	154.23	62.84 to 75.68		330,329	217,694
ALL												
	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78		401,009	260,467

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	111	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	29.49	95% Median C.I.:	64.83 to 73.78	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,519,504	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	20.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.44 to 68.46	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,512,004	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.24	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 73.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,911,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	401,009	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	154.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	260,467	PRD:	107.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:30

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	75.10	75.10	75.10			75.10	75.10	N/A	165,000	123,910
11-0001	40	70.62	72.20	65.92	21.64	109.53	35.57	135.05	65.70 to 77.29	500,360	329,815
11-0014	35	58.74	63.94	61.81	22.32	103.45	4.98	100.11	54.65 to 72.69	397,054	245,416
11-0020	30	66.85	70.73	65.62	22.85	107.79	17.55	154.23	60.80 to 74.85	320,032	209,999
20-0020	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	195,450	179,045
27-0594	4	85.87	89.74	82.40	12.14	108.92	77.43	109.81	N/A	159,815	131,680
NonValid School	1	75.10	75.10	75.10			75.10	75.10	N/A	165,000	123,910
ALL	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	5	53.69	57.26	47.41	33.96	120.78	17.55	90.53	N/A	57,103	27,073
30.01 TO 50.00	9	55.83	62.65	55.26	35.78	113.36	4.98	109.81	52.04 to 100.11	115,011	63,556
50.01 TO 100.00	32	74.44	75.71	70.02	21.14	108.13	45.40	154.23	59.00 to 81.20	218,077	152,690
100.01 TO 180.00	47	72.29	70.18	67.67	15.06	103.71	35.61	105.50	64.95 to 76.04	373,083	252,473
180.01 TO 330.00	15	59.42	65.75	60.50	26.15	108.68	35.57	135.05	50.99 to 79.51	748,454	452,790
330.01 TO 650.00	1	99.74	99.74	99.74			99.74	99.74	N/A	600,000	598,465
650.01 +	2	58.14	58.14	59.29	12.90	98.07	50.64	65.64	N/A	3,425,581	2,030,887
ALL	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

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	60	72.85	70.87	66.51	17.18	106.57	4.98	154.23	65.70 to 76.47	349,698	232,567
DRY-N/A	31	58.88	71.51	67.53	31.99	105.89	35.61	135.05	54.45 to 81.20	330,021	222,863
GRASS	1	50.56	50.56	50.56			50.56	50.56	N/A	307,759	155,590
GRASS-N/A	4	78.27	67.31	69.76	28.31	96.49	17.55	95.16	N/A	141,393	98,636
IRRGTD	6	68.33	73.32	71.07	13.23	103.16	59.00	108.58	59.00 to 108.58	304,787	216,626
IRRGTD-N/A	9	55.95	60.50	58.50	24.82	103.43	35.57	89.62	45.40 to 79.51	1,177,484	688,793
ALL	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

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:	111	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	29.49	95% Median C.I.:	64.83 to 73.78	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,519,504	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	20.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.44 to 68.46	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,512,004	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.24	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 73.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,911,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	401,009	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	154.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	260,467	PRD:	107.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:30

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	82	72.47	71.17	66.20	19.31	107.52	4.98	154.23	64.95 to 76.04	347,597	230,101
DRY-N/A	9	57.26	70.32	73.61	35.36	95.54	35.61	135.05	52.43 to 99.74	301,062	221,607
GRASS	3	72.75	69.03	64.61	15.22	106.84	50.56	83.78	N/A	224,003	144,726
GRASS-N/A	2	56.36	56.36	57.60	68.86	97.84	17.55	95.16	N/A	100,661	57,977
IRRGTD	9	68.04	65.88	58.84	18.50	111.96	35.57	108.58	45.40 to 72.01	388,464	228,568
IRRGTD-N/A	6	60.80	65.26	60.94	21.39	107.08	50.17	89.62	50.17 to 89.62	1,488,316	906,963
ALL	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

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	90	71.83	71.48	67.23	20.65	106.32	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 75.99	342,509	230,279
DRY-N/A	1	35.61	35.61	35.61			35.61	35.61	N/A	386,700	137,695
GRASS	4	61.66	56.16	58.65	35.85	95.75	17.55	83.78	N/A	192,362	112,821
GRASS-N/A	1	95.16	95.16	95.16			95.16	95.16	N/A	103,882	98,850
IRRGTD	15	65.81	65.63	60.35	19.64	108.75	35.57	108.58	50.64 to 72.01	828,405	499,926
ALL	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	3	71.36	71.86	68.66	17.21	104.65	53.69	90.53	N/A	39,265	26,961
60000 TO 99999	5	76.70	71.47	68.44	36.29	104.43	17.55	109.81	N/A	82,020	56,133
100000 TO 149999	11	83.78	82.83	81.69	30.70	101.39	52.04	154.23	52.43 to 110.31	120,751	98,644
150000 TO 249999	23	76.65	78.45	78.99	18.93	99.31	4.98	135.05	73.05 to 85.86	196,550	155,259
250000 TO 499999	48	69.24	67.42	67.31	14.79	100.16	35.61	96.40	60.80 to 74.85	356,040	239,666
500000 +	21	56.15	59.47	58.87	18.57	101.01	35.57	99.74	50.64 to 65.64	1,002,152	590,011
ALL	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

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:	111	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	29.49	95% Median C.I.:	64.83 to 73.78	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	44,519,504	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	20.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.44 to 68.46	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	44,512,004	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.24	95% Mean C.I.:	66.19 to 73.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,911,840							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	401,009	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	154.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	260,467	PRD:	107.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	4.98			

Printed: 03/25/2009 16:37:31

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	_____										
____Total \$____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	4	62.53	58.28	45.53	36.25	128.02	17.55	90.53	N/A	53,809	24,497
30000 TO 59999	2	55.22	55.22	55.59	3.69	99.34	53.18	57.26	N/A	85,890	47,745
60000 TO 99999	10	57.29	66.05	59.01	38.51	111.91	4.98	109.81	52.04 to 100.11	120,548	71,141
100000 TO 149999	14	76.49	77.45	71.56	17.35	108.22	35.61	110.31	65.88 to 92.03	177,790	127,231
150000 TO 249999	40	69.18	71.43	67.49	20.71	105.84	45.40	154.23	59.00 to 73.78	292,364	197,311
250000 TO 499999	33	72.29	69.24	64.04	18.57	108.13	35.57	135.05	60.91 to 76.47	508,809	325,825
500000 +	8	65.67	67.86	63.47	15.07	106.92	50.64	99.74	50.64 to 99.74	1,493,140	947,627
____ALL____	_____										
	111	69.73	70.03	64.95	21.85	107.82	4.98	154.23	64.83 to 73.78	401,009	260,467

Burt County Assessor's Office

111 N 13th Street, Ste: 10

Tekamah, NE 68061

Phone - 402.374.2926 * Fax - 402.374.2956

Joni L. Renshaw
County Assessor

Joan K. Zessin
Deputy Assessor

Dan Magill
Sales /Review

Jeanice Bowers
Office Clerk

Jay Johnson
Reviewer

February 23, 2009

Dear Ms. Sorensen:

Concerning Burt County being a county needing special valuation procedures. Please see below for our current methodology concerning the one parcel where application has been made for special value.

Burt County Special Valuation Methodology:

- *Due to the application by one taxpayer, Burt County has implemented a special valuation process.*
- *This is reported on line 43 of Form 45 of the 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property.*
- *The market analysis that has been performed over the past years has not demonstrated that there are consistently measureable non-agricultural influences in the Burt County market.*
- *In my opinion, the valuations that have been prepared for the agricultural land in Burt County do not reflect any non-agricultural influence. As a result, the special valuation process that is in place in Burt County has identical values for special value and recapture value.*
- *This is demonstrated in the county's Abstract on line 43 of Form 45.*

I hope this explanation of the situation in Burt County and our methodology will suffice. If you need anything further, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Joni L. Renshaw
Burt County Assessor

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section for Burt County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Collectively, 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 72% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 23.20 is not in the acceptable range and the PRD at 108.88 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; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 69 to 75%. This suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and each relevant subclass and no adjustments are recommended.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	184	90	48.91
2008	162	89	54.94
2007	158	101	63.92
2006	151	102	67.55
2005	151	86	56.95

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. The percentage used has ranged from 49 to 68% over the history of this statistic. In 2009, 49% is at the low end of the utilization percentage. The actual number of qualified sales has ranged from 76 to 102, and 90 qualified sales are well within the range. In the end, nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 Burt 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	62	13.11	70	72
2008	65.83	15.01	76	71.86
2007	69	2.10	70	71
2006	68	9.54	74	76
2005	71	4.42	75	75

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. 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 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 Burt 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 Burt 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)
11.76	2009	13.11
14.05	2008	15.01
3.74	2007	2.10
10.93	2006	9.54
4.16	2005	4.42

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is very similar. Historically, the county has had a consistent relationship between these statistics. This indicates that the statistical calculations from either set of statistics are equally reliable as an accurate measure of the population.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 Burt County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	72	67	73

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The median ratio and mean ratio are near the top of the range and the weighted mean is just below the bottom of the range. This is not an unusual relationship among the three statistics since even a modest undervaluation of higher priced property can reduce the average assessed value and result in a lower weighted mean. Conversely, a modest over assessment of lower value property can produce very high ratios which strongly influence the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by outliers, and in this subclass, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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	23.20	108.88
Difference	3.20	5.88

2009 Correlation Section
for Burt 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 Burt County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	94	90	-4
Median	62	72	10
Wgt. Mean	59	67	8
Mean	63	73	10
COD	22.28	23.20	0.92
PRD	106.52	108.88	2.36
Minimum	16.41	4.98	-11.43
Maximum	129.21	179.86	50.65

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. The county removed four substantially changed sales between the preliminary statistics and the final statistics. There is one ratio of 4.98% with a selling price of \$172,000 and an assessed value of \$8,560. In hindsight, it is likely that parcel is misclassified or used for something other than agricultural purposes. Otherwise, there are no other unusual or abnormal statistics.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 6,812

Value : 833,802,642

Growth 1,861,037

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	315	1,246,755	74	771,470	16	145,075	405	2,163,300	
02. Res Improve Land	2,052	9,755,945	89	1,426,490	375	8,207,135	2,516	19,389,570	
03. Res Improvements	2,068	100,002,365	89	9,418,315	375	26,783,303	2,532	136,203,983	
04. Res Total	2,383	111,005,065	163	11,616,275	391	35,135,513	2,937	157,756,853	993,347
% of Res Total	81.14	70.36	5.55	7.36	13.31	22.27	43.12	18.92	53.38
05. Com UnImp Land	54	232,715	12	59,705	5	209,660	71	502,080	
06. Com Improve Land	346	2,117,125	18	547,475	21	157,510	385	2,822,110	
07. Com Improvements	346	18,494,660	18	2,104,470	21	4,324,990	385	24,924,120	
08. Com Total	400	20,844,500	30	2,711,650	26	4,692,160	456	28,248,310	59,110
% of Com Total	87.72	73.79	6.58	9.60	5.70	16.61	6.69	3.39	3.18
09. Ind UnImp Land									
10. Ind Improve Land	4	52,765	0	0	2	497,505	6	550,270	
11. Ind Improvements	4	877,295	0	0	2	13,956,200	6	14,833,495	
12. Ind Total							6	15,383,765	108,000
% of Ind Total							0.09	1.85	5.80
13. Rec UnImp Land	2	0	1	9,500	17	80,645	20	90,145	
14. Rec Improve Land	50	0	10	0	204	992,730	264	992,730	
15. Rec Improvements	51	346,470	10	62,335	215	3,552,853	276	3,961,658	
16. Rec Total	53	346,470	11	71,835	232	4,626,228	296	5,044,533	0
% of Rec Total	17.91	6.87	3.72	1.42	78.38	91.71	4.35	0.61	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,436	111,351,535	174	11,688,110	623	39,761,741	3,233	162,801,386	993,347
% of Res & Rec Total	75.35	68.40	5.38	7.18	19.27	24.42	47.46	19.53	53.38
Com & Ind Total							462	43,632,075	167,110
% of Com & Ind Total							6.78	5.23	8.98
17. Taxable Total							3,695	206,433,461	1,160,457
% of Taxable Total							54.24	24.76	62.36

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing									
24. Non-Producing									
25. Total									

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	212	24	95	331

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	5	273,020	142	18,062,835	1,888	315,054,500	2,035	333,390,355
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	0	64	12,277,775	1,017	219,282,255	1,082	231,560,030
29. Ag Improvements	1	5,140	64	4,857,855	1,017	57,555,801	1,082	62,418,796
30. Ag Total							3,117	627,369,181

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI							

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks						
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks						

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value						
44. Recapture Value N/A						
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value						
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	10,060.65	22.14%	25,755,270	27.57%	2,560.00
46. 1A	829.15	1.82%	2,048,000	2.19%	2,470.00
47. 2A1	6,729.58	14.81%	15,612,610	16.72%	2,320.00
48. 2A	5,209.50	11.46%	11,356,710	12.16%	2,180.00
49. 3A1	21,168.48	46.58%	36,644,810	39.23%	1,731.10
50. 3A	280.22	0.62%	517,030	0.55%	1,845.09
51. 4A1	149.65	0.33%	222,245	0.24%	1,485.10
52. 4A	1,021.96	2.25%	1,246,785	1.33%	1,219.99
53. Total	45,449.19	100.00%	93,403,460	100.00%	2,055.12
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,121.37	12.29%	27,803,435	15.91%	2,500.00
55. 1D	14,096.09	15.57%	33,548,700	19.19%	2,380.00
56. 2D1	6,285.76	6.94%	14,205,810	8.13%	2,260.00
57. 2D	8,004.73	8.84%	17,170,680	9.82%	2,145.07
58. 3D1	22,391.68	24.74%	39,526,325	22.61%	1,765.22
59. 3D	6,786.65	7.50%	12,215,965	6.99%	1,800.00
60. 4D1	18,708.36	20.67%	26,661,215	15.25%	1,425.10
61. 4D	3,126.89	3.45%	3,674,480	2.10%	1,175.12
62. Total	90,521.53	100.00%	174,806,610	100.00%	1,931.11
Grass					
63. 1G1	275.13	0.00%	290,015	1.52%	1,054.10
64. 1G	2,469.64	12.52%	2,884,330	15.15%	1,167.92
65. 2G1	749.18	3.80%	807,605	4.24%	1,077.99
66. 2G	1,189.76	6.03%	1,073,300	5.64%	902.11
67. 3G1	1,566.76	7.94%	1,554,915	8.17%	992.44
68. 3G	1,127.33	5.71%	1,164,235	6.12%	1,032.74
69. 4G1	8,200.40	41.56%	8,021,505	42.14%	978.18
70. 4G	4,153.45	21.05%	3,237,285	17.01%	779.42
71. Total	19,731.65	100.00%	19,033,190	100.00%	964.60
Irrigated Total	45,449.19	27.01%	93,403,460	31.70%	2,055.12
Dry Total	90,521.53	53.79%	174,806,610	59.33%	1,931.11
Grass Total	19,731.65	11.73%	19,033,190	6.46%	964.60
Waste	2,089.19	1.24%	156,915	0.05%	75.11
Other	10,481.07	6.23%	7,252,460	2.46%	691.96
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	168,272.63	100.00%	294,652,635	100.00%	1,751.04

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	3,239.86	29.33%	8,407,500	32.43%	2,595.02
46. 1A	2,218.40	20.08%	5,601,610	21.61%	2,525.07
47. 2A1	119.32	1.08%	274,435	1.06%	2,299.99
48. 2A	2,750.13	24.90%	6,050,290	23.34%	2,200.00
49. 3A1	1,063.10	9.62%	2,182,695	8.42%	2,053.14
50. 3A	1,517.48	13.74%	3,186,710	12.29%	2,100.00
51. 4A1	118.46	1.07%	193,090	0.74%	1,630.00
52. 4A	20.00	0.18%	25,200	0.10%	1,260.00
53. Total	11,046.75	100.00%	25,921,530	100.00%	2,346.53
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,297.62	11.91%	28,752,985	13.75%	2,545.05
55. 1D	28,746.63	30.30%	70,000,975	33.48%	2,435.10
56. 2D1	758.80	0.80%	1,726,355	0.83%	2,275.11
57. 2D	12,264.60	12.93%	26,614,160	12.73%	2,170.00
58. 3D1	10,836.60	11.42%	22,515,305	10.77%	2,077.71
59. 3D	21,869.25	23.05%	45,380,625	21.71%	2,075.09
60. 4D1	8,404.67	8.86%	13,238,155	6.33%	1,575.10
61. 4D	705.64	0.74%	850,380	0.41%	1,205.12
62. Total	94,883.81	100.00%	209,078,940	100.00%	2,203.53
Grass					
63. 1G1	226.11	0.00%	246,220	1.79%	1,088.94
64. 1G	2,911.07	19.26%	3,166,390	22.97%	1,087.71
65. 2G1	236.72	1.57%	250,425	1.82%	1,057.90
66. 2G	1,924.42	12.73%	1,511,165	10.96%	785.26
67. 3G1	1,125.17	7.44%	1,121,360	8.13%	996.61
68. 3G	1,285.47	8.50%	1,153,060	8.36%	896.99
69. 4G1	5,668.05	37.50%	5,035,315	36.53%	888.37
70. 4G	1,737.94	11.50%	1,301,350	9.44%	748.79
71. Total	15,114.95	100.00%	13,785,285	100.00%	912.03
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	11,046.75	8.88%	25,921,530	10.34%	2,346.53
Dry Total					
Dry Total	94,883.81	76.24%	209,078,940	83.43%	2,203.53
Grass Total					
Grass Total	15,114.95	12.15%	13,785,285	5.50%	912.03
Waste					
Waste	1,080.62	0.87%	81,135	0.03%	75.08
Other					
Other	2,323.05	1.87%	1,742,350	0.70%	750.03
Exempt					
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total					
Market Area Total	124,449.18	100.00%	250,609,240	100.00%	2,013.75

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	2,260.26	4,888,540	54,235.68	114,436,450	56,495.94	119,324,990
77. Dry Land	116.00	273,020	10,091.01	21,527,755	175,198.33	362,084,775	185,405.34	383,885,550
78. Grass	0.00	0	2,215.05	2,216,240	32,631.55	30,602,235	34,846.60	32,818,475
79. Waste	0.00	0	330.74	24,830	2,839.07	213,220	3,169.81	238,050
80. Other	0.00	0	593.69	405,120	12,210.43	8,589,690	12,804.12	8,994,810
81. Exempt								
82. Total	116.00	273,020	15,490.75	29,062,485	277,115.06	515,926,370	292,721.81	545,261,875

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	56,495.94	19.30%	119,324,990	21.88%	2,112.10
Dry Land	185,405.34	63.34%	383,885,550	70.40%	2,070.52
Grass	34,846.60	11.90%	32,818,475	6.02%	941.80
Waste	3,169.81	1.08%	238,050	0.04%	75.10
Other	12,804.12	4.37%	8,994,810	1.65%	702.49
Exempt					
Total	292,721.81	100.00%	545,261,875	100.00%	1,862.73

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

11 Burt

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	153,941,598	157,756,853	3,815,255	2.48%	993,347	1.83%
02. Recreational	5,071,013	5,044,533	-26,480	-0.52%	0	-0.52%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	53,474,665	52,799,450	-675,215	-1.26%	297,320	-1.82%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	212,487,276	215,600,836	3,113,560	1.47%	1,290,667	0.86%
05. Commercial	27,091,640	28,248,310	1,156,670	4.27%	59,110	4.05%
06. Industrial	15,129,280	15,383,765	254,485	1.68%	108,000	0.97%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	29,448,340	29,307,856	-140,484	-0.48%	403,260	-1.85%
08. Minerals	0					
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	71,669,260					
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	284,156,536					
11. Irrigated	102,848,905	119,324,990	16,476,085	16.02%		
12. Dryland	340,975,475	383,885,550	42,910,075	12.58%		
13. Grassland	29,605,200	32,818,475	3,213,275	10.85%		
14. Wasteland	238,050	238,050	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	8,415,470	8,994,810	579,340	6.88%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	482,083,100	545,261,875	63,178,775	13.11%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	766,239,636	833,802,642	67,563,006	8.82%		

Burt County's 3 Year Plan of Assessment June 15, 2008

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

This plan of assessment is required by law, as amended by Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. The former provisions relating to the assessors's 5-year plan of assessment in Neb. Rev. Stat 77-1311(8) were repealed. On or before June 15th each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and present it to the county board of equalization on or before July 31st. The county assessor may amend the plan of assessment, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. The plan shall be updated annually before its adoption. The updates shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the County and shall describe the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete these actions. A copy of the plan and any amendments shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, on or before October 31st each year.

REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

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

GENERAL COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Burt County has a total count of 6,802 parcels as reported on the 2008 County Abstract. Per the 2008 County Abstract, Burt County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	2,910	42.78%	19.84%
Commercial	460	6.76%	3.54%
Industrial	6	.09%	1.97%
Recreational	299	4.40%	.67%
Agricultural	3,127	45.97%	73.98%

Agricultural land – 292,605.923 taxable acres

New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 105 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions to the county.

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

The county handled 859 personal property schedules for 2008. The office also processed 417 homestead applications. Approximately 56 permissive exemptions are applied for each year through the County Assessor's Office.

The Burt County Assessor has the required assessor certification, several IAAO educational course certifications and numerous assessor workshops of assessment education. She has a continuing education requirement pursuant to Section 77-414 of 40 hours prior to December 31, 2002 and thereafter, 60 hours of continued education will be required within the following 4-year period.

The County Assessor's Office has a deputy and one full-time clerk to carry out the responsibilities and duties of the office with the assessor. The deputy has the necessary certification to hold the position and will fulfill the continuing education requirement of 60 hours required within the next 4-year period. The county does not have a full-time appraiser but has two part-time lister/reviewers for "pickup work" and other needed valuation projects being completed to keep Burt County in line with uniform and proportionate valuations. An independent appraisal company was contracted with to complete the reappraisal of commercial properties in the county.

The current 2008-2009 budget for the office is being reviewed by the County Board. The general fund request is \$83,668.86 which includes the Assessor and Deputy salaries. The appraisal budget request is \$94,397.68 which includes the payroll for the regular clerk and two part-time employees. This also funds all cadastral map work, appraisal schooling, and data service contracts and fees. The funding for aerial photos had been removed in 2006 from the appraisal budget, at the county board's request. Partial funding for the photos is being added to the budget as the county is in need of updates. It may have to be funded over two year's time. The aerial photos were last flown in 2002 and really need to be done about every 4-5 years to keep up with the property changes that occur in the county.

PROCEDURES

A procedures manual is in place with continual updating that describes the procedures and operations of the office. The manual adheres to the statutes, regulations and directives that apply to the Assessor's Office. A copy of this is entered into the record at the County Board of Equalization meetings each year as part of the process of hearing protests.

CADASTRAL MAPS

The cadastral maps are updated on a daily basis as sales and other changes arise. The maps are currently in the process of being redrawn and updated by the County Surveyor over a 3-4 year plan. The city maps are completed with all information having been proofed by the Assessor's Office staff. We hope to have the Surveyor continue on with the rural maps if we are allowed to budget for them.

PROPERTY RECORD CARDS

Regulation 10-004 requires the assessor to prepare and maintain a property record file for each parcel of real property including improvements on leased land in the county. New property record cards have been made for all residential, commercial, agricultural, exempt, and leased improvements. The new cards will contain all the required information including ownership, legal description, classification codes, and tax districts.

REPORT GENERATION

The County Assessor has basic duties and requirements in filing administrative reports with the Property Tax Administrator that may be different than those specified in statute to ensure proper administration of the law. They include the County Real Estate Abstract due March 19th, the Personal Property Abstract due June 15th, 3 Year Plan of Assessment to be presented to the county board of equalization by July 31st, and due with the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, by October 31st, Certification of Values to School Districts and Political Subdivisions due August 20th, School District Taxable Value Report due August 25th, generate Tax Roll to be given to the County Treasurer by November 22nd, and Certificate of Taxes Levied Report due December 1st. Taxpayer appeals must be handled during the months of June and July. Regulation 10-002.09 requires tax list corrections created because of undervalued or overvalued real property and omitted real property must be reported to the County Board of Equalization by July 25th. Clerical error may be corrected as needed.

The assessor must do an annual review of all government owned property and if not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, and place on the tax roll. All centrally assessed property valuations must be reviewed after being certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities along with establishing assessment records and tax billing for the tax list. The assessor also manages school district and other entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information. This process includes the input and review of all tax rates for the billing process. We prepare and certify the tax lists/books to the county treasurer for real, personal property, and centrally assessed. The assessor prepares all tax list correction documents for county board approval. The assessor must attend all County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests where information is assembled and provided. The assessor must prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC where we also defend the valuation. During TERC Statewide Equalization, we attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

There are many numerous other deadlines that the assessor must meet throughout the year. All administrative reports are prepared by the County Assessor by their due dates and will continue to be done in a timely fashion as part of Burt County's assessment plan.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS

Statutes 77-3510 through 77-3528 require the County Assessor to furnish forms for persons desiring to make application for Homestead Exemption. Applications are furnished and accepted along with an income statement between the dates of February 1st and June 30th of each year. The County Assessor must approve or disapprove the applications based on conformity to law. Notices shall be sent to rejected applicants by July 31st of each year except in the case of change of ownership or occupancy from January 1st through August 15th. Notice will be sent within a reasonable time. Approved applications will be sent to the Tax Commissioner on or before August 1st of each year. The County Assessor and clerical staff will process the applications and place them on the tax roll after their approval by the State based on income.

Per section 77-3506.02, the county assessor is required to certify to the Department of Revenue the average assessed value of single-family residential property in the county and to report the computed exempt amounts pursuant to section 77-3501.01 on or before September 1st each year.

PERSONAL PROPERTY

The Burt County Assessor's office will require that all taxable personal property be lawfully assessed throughout the county according to the requirements of the statutes and regulations. All schedules are to be filed by May 1st to be considered timely. From May 1 to July 31, all schedules received by the office have a 10% penalty applied. After July 31, a 25% penalty is assessed. Postcards are mailed around February 1 to remind taxpayers that it is the beginning of personal property season. Advertisements are placed in the three county newspapers to remind taxpayers of the deadlines and to alert new personal property owners of the requirements for filing a timely schedule with the appropriate information. The taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule is used as a basis for the personal property schedule. Local accountants are provided with their clients' forms when requested, which they compute and return to our office. Legislation has eliminated the 13AG's and the taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule will be our only source of information in the future. We have been requiring them and have close to 95% compliance. The assessor and staff process Personal Property schedules. The Personal Property Abstract is due June 15th with the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division.

REAL PROPERTY

All real property is assessed each year as of January 1, 12:01 a.m. following the statutes. The assessment level of residential and commercial property will be set between 92-100% of actual market value. The agricultural land will be assessed at 69-75% of actual market value. Valuation notices will be sent out on or before June 1st of each year to every owner of record in which the assessed valuation changed from the previous year.

Real property is updated annually through maintenance and "pickup work". We plan to finish by the end of February, to allow time for data entry and completion of value generation. We do sales analysis with assistance of our liaison to determine what assessment actions need to be implemented. This is an ongoing study with all data available on spreadsheets in our computers. Information is updated and areas for adjustment are determined along with the information provided from the current rosters.

The mass appraisal process for valuing properties in the county mainly is performed with the cost approach and market approach. We use the Marshall & Swift costing data supplied through MIPS/County Solutions. We do a depreciation study on an annual basis to determine any actions that may need to be taken. The income approach was applied on the contracted commercial reappraisal.

Burt County has changed from Northeast Data to MIPS/County Solutions for real estate pricing programs. They will also do our administrative and report programs. This conversion process has been very time consuming but is pretty well completed and reviewed for correctness.

Countywide zoning was adopted by the Burt County Board effective February 4, 2000. The Assessor's Office works with the zoning administrator in locating new improvements.

The review process in place in Burt County consists of a physical inspection of all properties that are being revalued. If there was any question as to the accuracy of the data, the property was remeasured, confirmed, and/or corrected. Additional information was collected that is necessary for the new CAMA software. The quality and condition of the property

are noted as well as any other outstanding facts. A new digital photo was taken of each parcel. With the owner's permission and accompaniment, an interior inspection was performed. If permission was denied or there was no response to our door hanger and follow-up calls, we assumed that the interior condition of the property was the same as the exterior, unless there was evidence otherwise.

LEVEL OF VALUE, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2008

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	96.00	22.04	112.21
Commercial	98.00	25.27	111.61
Agricultural Land	72.00	17.65	102.53

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see the 2008 Reports & Opinions.

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED

RESIDENTIAL

2009 – Finish the review of the rural residential and improved parcels in Logan and Silver Creek Townships. We will review Lyons City for updating of both homes and lot prices. We will implement the newer pricing on the city residential now that we have finished reviewing all five towns. Continue working on depreciation analysis and effective age study. The COD and PRD will be examined on an annual basis to see if the quality of assessment is appropriate, and what might be done to improve these numbers. Continue to analyze for uniformity and that levels are within the acceptable ranges.

2010 – Revalue rural residential and outbuildings in Summit and Decatur Townships. Continue to monitor the other rural areas, making sure the levels are within acceptable ranges. We will review Craig Village, and possibly Oakland City, continuing on with the review and depreciation analysis.

2011 – Continue on with our rural revalue, starting over with the townships of Arizona and Riverside. Start on the review of Tekamah City with completion in 2012.

COMMERCIAL

The commercial class of property had a complete reappraisal done in 2000 by Great Plains Appraisal Company. The pricing program that was applied was 1999 and all data was entered in the new CAMA 2000 system. Market, income, and cost approach were all applied in valuing the commercial class.

2009 – All commercial data has been moved to the windows version of CAMA 2000 along with the implementation of newer pricing. Bill Kaiser and Jeff Quist will be assisting the office with an updated sales analysis and depreciation study. They will be assisting with the review of commercial properties in Lyons as well. The COD and PRD will be examined to address the quality of the assessments and their uniformity. The office staff will be entering and reviewing all data in the commercial program. We will also start the review of all commercial properties in Oakland along with the updated pricing.

2010 – The review of the commercial properties will continue with Tekamah and Craig Village. We will continue to monitor the COD and PRD to see if we are improving our quality of assessments. Our smaller communities have such a wide variance in commercial sales; we may never be able to achieve really tight numbers.

2011 - The commercial properties in rural areas and Decatur Village will be reviewed and another study conducted on vacant lots if any sales are available.

AGRICULTURAL

2009 – Continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute. The new level has been implemented as changed by the Legislature in 2006. Burt County currently has implemented two market areas and will continue to monitor the market activity to be assured that the market areas are needed. Market areas

were adjusted in 2006 with Logan and Everett Townships being moved from Area 2 to Area 1 as their sales showed it was needed. We will continue to review and locate sales of Solomon and Luton soils in Map Area 2 as it is becoming a problem on the west side of the county as well as on the east. We have adjusted both dry and irrigated acres within these soil types. It is classified as 3A1 and 3D1 which falls in with some of the Monona and Moody that are bringing higher prices on the market. We have separated our Solomon and Luton and call them "gumbo" in our current computer pricing program. The problem is in finding enough sales to verify value as it is not very desirable and there are not a lot of sales. We will also be looking at Forney and Albaton as they are a type of "gumbo" as well although not as heavy. The value on these soils is no longer comparable with the Monona and Moody when it comes to sales.

We are implementing wetland reserve pricing on the acres that have been converted and verified as such with the Farm Service Agency. This land is actually no longer considered agland once it is implemented and goes on at 100% of market as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

We will implement the new numeric identifiers from the Natural Resource Conservation Service on our soil surveys. The new numeric system will combine several mapping symbols for similar soils, reducing the total number of soils and creating more uniformity across the state. We will be reviewing all of our soil maps for any changes, especially along the county's boundaries where changes were made to blend soil types. The Natural Conservation Service will not be publishing a book this time. We purchased a computer program from Agridata, Inc. to obtain the new 2008 soil maps and to assist in determining acres of each soil type on individual parcels. All changes must be completed for the 2009 tax year.

2010 – Review our files to see whose farm summary we have yet to be provided from the Farm Service Agency. All those individuals will be contacted about providing us with that information. Some individuals will need to provide us with a new version of their farm summary. We will continue to monitor sales in the northwest corner of the county to see if an additional market area needs to be implemented. We will be collecting and studying all sales data we can find on wetland reserve acres to establish its current value. Burt County could have more than 3,000 acres of farm ground put into this program through easement sales to the federal government. We will continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute.

2011 – Review all information that we have been able to obtain on land in the CRP program. Implement a study on the available sales data to determine how CRP land compares to both dryland and grassland sales. We hope to be able to access the Farm Service Agency's current maps via the internet so we can begin another update on current land use. Continue to study the market of the agricultural class on the required 3-year sale period each year. Based on that study, values are set for land valuation groups to keep the level of assessment at an acceptable level by statute.

All school land was valued according to soil and use for 2008. Current soil survey is dated 1980 and we are using the 8/95 conversion as currently required by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. All school land will be updated for 2009 with the new soil survey and numeric designations.

New aerial photos will be taken of the rural properties for 2009. We will be using the photos to assist in the review of the rural properties as well as a physical inspection of the parcel. Plans are nearly completed to review two to three townships a year for the next six years. All outbuildings are being measured again, and their condition verified. Each home is being physically inspected or a detailed questionnaire is left for completion. We have implemented the 2000 CAMA software during the review and are monitoring the market activity to ensure that the quality and level of assessment are uniform.

Small tracts continue to be a concern in our sales study. Buyers purchase as much as 20-40 acres to build a home in the country. A home may be located on 1-2 acres but the remainder acres are used as farmland. Some are grazing cattle or allowing the nearest neighbor to farm along with his operation. New legislative statute LB 777 clarified the definition of agricultural and horticultural land versus land associated with a building or enclosed structure. This legislation was needed to support our procedure for valuing these properties. We did raise our homesite value to 14,000 and our building site value to 2,500 for 2008. We will continue to monitor this as sales occur.

SALES REVIEW

Regulation 12-003 requires the assessor to forward a copy of all real estate transfer statements and the required supplemental data to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before the 15th of the second month following the month the deed was recorded. The office tries to file them as timely as possible. Two full-time clerks help with the completion of the 521's and filling out of the supplemental sheets after the review of all transfer statements by the assessor. Verification of all sales is done primarily with a questionnaire that is mailed first to the seller. If additional information is needed, we may call whoever might be able to provide that information. All sales are reviewed with the property card out in the field to see if any major improvements or changes have occurred. A new photo is taken at that time. The office maintains sales books for residential, commercial, small tracts, and farms. All agricultural sales are maintained on a spreadsheet to allow for setting value according to market. The sales review process will continue to be a part of the assessment plan with sales being disallowed as non-qualified based on statutes.

CONCLUSION

The office will continue to do studies annually to determine if values are within range and determine what type of revaluations are needed. We hope to be able to complete the above-mentioned projects for better assessment and data control in the office. The end result should create better efficiency and improved assessment and appraisal practices. It is important that we follow these requirements set forth by law and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, to prove to the State and our taxpayers that the assessment in our county is being done well.

This process will be accomplished with the current requests of \$83,668.86 for our general budget and \$94,397.68 for the appraisal budget in 2008-2009.

I attest this to be true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Joni L. Renshaw
Burt County Assessor

6/15/08

2009 Assessment Survey for Burt 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
	2 (field listers)
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$83,668.86
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$9,000 (includes supplies and vendor contracts)
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$83,668.86
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	None: (there is a separate appraisal budget in the general fund, not the assessor's budget)
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,000.00
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$94,397.68 This is used for the costs of 2 part time employees (listers), supplies and mileage needed for field work and any contracted appraisal services as needed.

12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$178,066.54 Total of general and reappraisal budgets.
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes: (approximately \$5,000 to 6,000 –for 2009, any left over budget will be diverted into a fund to purchase a GIS system)

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS/County Solutions
2.	CAMA software
	MIPS/County Solutions
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor/Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Not yet: The county is beginning a 3 year project in 2009 to implement a GIS system. The first phase is to capture the soils and be able to implement a new soil survey in 2010.
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	The system will be maintained by the assessor and staff when it becomes operational.
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?
	Decatur, Lyons, Oakland and Tekamah (only Craig does not have municipal zoning)
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Nothing is contracted currently. Burt County uses an outside appraisal company for commercial appraisal work. At times Jeff Quist is hired to do some of the pick-up work or for an occasional project.
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 Burt 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