

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

14 Cedar

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	212	COD	30.95
Total Sales Price	\$12,950,055	PRD	114.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$12,980,055	COV	53.54
Total Assessed Value	\$10,723,980	STD	50.44
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$61,227	Avg. Absolute Deviation	29.05
Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,585	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$49,072
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	83
Mean	94	Max	460
Min	3.13		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.12 to 94.92
95% Mean C.I	87.41 to 100.99
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.05 to 86.19

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	16.25
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.57
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.78

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	239	93	32.03	115.67
2007	256	93	31.84	113.13
2006	257	93	26.97	113.41
2005	250	95	20.39	108.56

2009 Commission Summary

14 Cedar

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	41	COD	23.05
Total Sales Price	\$1,593,732	PRD	110.61
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,593,732	COV	40.62
Total Assessed Value	\$1,377,290	STD	38.83
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$38,872	Avg. Absolute Deviation	22.11
Avg. Assessed Value	\$33,592	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,707
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	86
Mean	96	Max	280
Min	17		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I.	90.94 to 99.50
95% Mean C.I.	83.70 to 107.48
95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	78.26 to 94.57

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 3.76

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 6.47

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 3.76

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	51	96	42.99	121.01
2007	47	95	31.81	107.14
2006	42	108	44.26	142.8
2005	47	96	48.05	139.42

2009 Commission Summary

14 Cedar

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	63	COD	19.51
Total Sales Price	\$16,408,657	PRD	105.67
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$16,408,657	COV	26.84
Total Assessed Value	\$11,223,245	STD	19.40
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$260,455	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.89
Avg. Assessed Value	\$178,147	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$190,725
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	68
Mean	72	Max	151.03
Min	37.91		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	66.95 to 76.47
95% Mean C.I	67.48 to 77.06
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	64.68 to 72.11

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	79.99
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.54
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.29

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	95	70	17.49	104.57
2007	95	70	14.07	102.94
2006	86	79	16.47	102.62
2005	72	77	18.66	102.89

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Cedar 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 Cedar County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Cedar County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Cedar County is 96.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Cedar County is not 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 Cedar County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Cedar County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	220	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	60.86	95% Median C.I.:	84.43 to 93.41
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,133,373	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	58.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.78 to 85.30
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,163,373	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	33.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.03 to 104.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,733,745						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	59,833	COD:	37.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	486.15		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,789	PRD:	118.73	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:25

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	33	85.25	85.49	78.35	32.05	109.12	3.13	202.56	68.98 to 99.44		53,722	42,092
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	94.50	110.85	84.71	41.19	130.86	31.26	327.50	72.46 to 125.49		41,420	35,087
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	90.91	89.14	84.04	20.33	106.07	48.53	145.00	78.77 to 101.99		65,265	54,847
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	31	87.12	85.80	81.11	26.17	105.78	33.94	212.72	71.81 to 97.59		59,254	48,061
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	36	88.42	104.52	80.00	52.99	130.65	23.82	486.15	67.14 to 105.50		48,266	38,612
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	26	91.16	96.61	84.09	28.73	114.89	39.30	191.01	73.38 to 114.13		70,562	59,333
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	18	95.07	108.08	94.49	45.12	114.39	3.13	295.00	74.57 to 122.68		61,722	58,318
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	34	82.87	99.34	75.49	46.32	131.59	29.16	459.50	61.99 to 96.63		78,054	58,925
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	106	89.93	91.53	81.49	30.20	112.32	3.13	327.50	83.94 to 94.23		54,965	44,790
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	114	88.16	101.73	81.58	44.54	124.70	3.13	486.15	81.73 to 93.87		64,360	52,508
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	113	88.66	94.84	82.20	34.48	115.37	23.82	486.15	82.72 to 93.30		59,419	48,845
____ALL____												
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41		59,833	48,789

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	220	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	60.86	95% Median C.I.:	84.43 to 93.41
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,133,373	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	58.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.78 to 85.30
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,163,373	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	33.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.03 to 104.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,733,745						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	59,833	COD:	37.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	486.15		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,789	PRD:	118.73	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:26

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELDEN	6	80.50	82.29	75.05	32.95	109.64	48.31	136.05	48.31 to 136.05	40,733	30,571
BELDEN V	1	59.67	59.67	59.67			59.67	59.67	N/A	1,500	895
BOW VALLEY	3	107.06	90.26	83.29	17.43	108.37	53.87	109.86	N/A	105,666	88,015
CEDAR SHORES	1	58.00	58.00	58.00			58.00	58.00	N/A	35,000	20,300
COLERIDGE	23	99.83	139.65	91.41	64.70	152.77	31.26	459.50	77.00 to 174.71	30,899	28,246
COLERIDGE V	1	70.83	70.83	70.83			70.83	70.83	N/A	15,000	10,625
FORDYCE	4	76.97	74.69	63.91	16.03	116.86	56.57	88.24	N/A	45,000	28,760
FORDYCE V	3	39.30	119.37	43.18	230.01	276.44	23.82	295.00	N/A	3,666	1,583
HART BUD BECKER	2	83.38	83.38	83.27	5.52	100.13	78.77	87.98	N/A	114,650	95,465
HART BUD BECKER V	1	105.50	105.50	105.50			105.50	105.50	N/A	10,000	10,550
HARTINGTON	52	92.08	100.37	83.31	33.07	120.49	29.16	247.15	84.80 to 100.00	72,720	60,580
HARTINGTON V	4	45.86	45.48	45.79	9.26	99.33	38.32	51.88	N/A	23,000	10,531
LAUREL	41	94.45	93.10	87.37	24.59	106.55	38.57	247.50	76.42 to 101.99	61,916	54,096
LAUREL V	3	73.87	68.02	60.68	28.12	112.09	33.94	96.25	N/A	8,516	5,168
MAGNET	3	144.85	129.21	130.38	32.04	99.10	51.77	191.01	N/A	15,935	20,776
OBERT	1	55.21	55.21	55.21			55.21	55.21	N/A	28,000	15,460
RANDOLPH	23	94.23	97.41	80.76	31.97	120.61	34.24	208.25	79.11 to 111.32	46,313	37,403
REC BROOKY BOTTOM	3	85.25	88.38	89.15	7.78	99.14	80.00	99.89	N/A	44,333	39,523
REC BROOKY BOTTOM V	3	100.00	92.59	81.63	14.81	113.43	66.67	111.11	N/A	16,333	13,333
REC LEWON ACRES MH	2	44.48	44.48	44.74	9.93	99.42	40.06	48.89	N/A	42,500	19,012
REC NELSON BROS	1	95.68	95.68	95.68			95.68	95.68	N/A	130,000	124,380
RURAL	20	76.91	96.79	74.48	45.64	129.96	42.38	486.15	63.74 to 93.41	122,320	91,101
RURAL LEWIS/CLARK	2	92.65	92.65	92.52	0.70	100.14	92.00	93.30	N/A	159,750	147,795
RURAL NOHR SUB	1	90.14	90.14	90.14			90.14	90.14	N/A	90,000	81,130
RURAL V	2	68.57	68.57	67.40	5.01	101.73	65.13	72.00	N/A	11,350	7,650
ST HELENA	4	73.78	73.65	60.99	31.21	120.75	47.46	99.58	N/A	76,750	46,812
ST HELENA V	2	3.13	3.13	3.13	0.00	100.16	3.13	3.13	N/A	2,400	75
WYNOT	8	87.80	90.44	81.00	21.27	111.65	58.03	160.32	58.03 to 160.32	30,437	24,655
ALL	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

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	180	90.04	98.36	82.94	38.63	118.59	3.13	459.50	85.81 to 93.89	52,591	43,618
3	40	82.22	89.89	77.97	32.73	115.29	40.06	486.15	67.14 to 93.30	92,422	72,058
ALL	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

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:	220	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	60.86	95% Median C.I.:	84.43 to 93.41
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,133,373	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	58.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.78 to 85.30
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,163,373	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	33.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.03 to 104.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,733,745						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	59,833	COD:	37.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	486.15		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,789	PRD:	118.73	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:26

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	200	90.54	99.40	81.91	35.71	121.35	29.16	486.15	86.51 to 93.87	64,594	52,909
2	20	62.40	71.05	62.06	55.43	114.48	3.13	295.00	44.15 to 73.87	12,227	7,588
____ALL____											
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	211	89.57	97.68	81.77	37.88	119.45	3.13	486.15	84.80 to 93.53	60,954	49,842
06	9	80.00	76.65	71.82	25.37	106.73	40.06	111.11	48.89 to 100.00	33,555	24,099
07											
____ALL____											
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	293.73	293.73	176.50	65.51	166.42	101.30	486.15	N/A	43,500	76,777
14-0008	73	86.51	92.57	77.90	37.47	118.83	23.82	295.00	75.08 to 92.12	72,065	56,137
14-0045	34	94.02	92.68	80.24	30.00	115.49	34.24	208.25	67.19 to 102.55	43,914	35,239
14-0054	46	88.41	88.43	82.60	27.18	107.06	33.94	247.50	73.38 to 96.42	66,339	54,795
14-0101	26	85.85	79.47	80.43	28.16	98.81	3.13	160.32	59.15 to 99.58	44,338	35,661
14-0541	25	93.53	134.00	86.97	65.90	154.07	31.26	459.50	76.47 to 149.37	34,907	30,359
26-0024											
54-0096	10	91.07	83.94	84.05	12.79	99.86	60.98	100.59	63.74 to 96.37	110,360	92,763
54-0576	4	118.87	120.13	105.52	40.22	113.84	51.77	191.01	N/A	35,451	37,408
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School	2	293.73	293.73	176.50	65.51	166.42	101.30	486.15	N/A	43,500	76,777
____ALL____											
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	220	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	60.86	95% Median C.I.:	84.43 to 93.41
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,133,373	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	58.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.78 to 85.30
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,163,373	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	33.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.03 to 104.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,733,745						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	59,833	COD:	37.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	486.15		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,789	PRD:	118.73	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:26

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	32	69.48	89.63	74.95	64.64	119.59	3.13	459.50	51.88 to 95.68	28,274	21,191
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	64.07	118.00	59.25	111.29	199.16	32.40	253.25	32.40 to 253.25	50,700	30,040
1900 TO 1919	83	93.77	105.71	81.96	39.84	128.97	29.16	486.15	87.12 to 100.00	46,433	38,057
1920 TO 1939	13	98.60	107.89	84.30	40.66	127.99	31.26	327.50	53.32 to 130.55	39,784	33,538
1940 TO 1949	4	89.10	83.18	76.11	24.88	109.29	38.57	115.94	N/A	41,515	31,595
1950 TO 1959	11	82.72	83.34	79.52	18.31	104.80	39.50	109.10	61.31 to 108.14	73,018	58,064
1960 TO 1969	25	91.19	87.43	83.43	15.61	104.79	55.84	121.20	74.77 to 96.63	82,212	68,590
1970 TO 1979	24	85.63	88.83	80.70	28.84	110.07	40.06	199.19	65.16 to 93.89	83,533	67,413
1980 TO 1989	7	92.12	95.31	76.61	33.29	124.41	48.89	191.01	48.89 to 191.01	97,686	74,838
1990 TO 1994	5	81.47	76.64	79.21	9.86	96.76	53.78	86.51	N/A	119,400	94,573
1995 TO 1999	5	88.66	86.78	87.71	5.77	98.94	74.57	93.41	N/A	130,200	114,199
2000 TO Present	5	94.45	99.28	98.88	8.04	100.40	88.13	110.09	N/A	124,400	123,011
ALL	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

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	12	201.63	193.22	179.61	48.50	107.58	3.13	459.50	59.67 to 295.00	2,895	5,201
5000 TO 9999	17	106.57	119.40	123.16	42.84	96.95	23.82	247.50	73.87 to 185.59	7,264	8,947
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	29	114.13	149.95	135.55	69.41	110.62	3.13	459.50	93.53 to 202.56	5,456	7,397
10000 TO 29999	46	99.74	111.32	108.24	41.93	102.84	33.94	486.15	85.81 to 106.40	17,725	19,186
30000 TO 59999	51	87.12	89.74	89.29	24.08	100.50	31.26	168.99	82.14 to 96.58	44,211	39,477
60000 TO 99999	52	84.37	77.57	77.70	24.00	99.83	29.16	121.20	67.17 to 92.12	75,795	58,893
100000 TO 149999	28	73.72	75.89	75.13	19.53	101.01	47.46	109.86	63.28 to 87.98	126,896	95,336
150000 TO 249999	13	86.51	80.01	80.21	16.31	99.75	42.38	110.09	60.96 to 92.04	166,730	133,726
250000 TO 499999	1	56.02	56.02	56.02			56.02	56.02	N/A	273,000	152,930
ALL	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 6

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	220	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	60.86	95% Median C.I.:	84.43 to 93.41
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,133,373	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	58.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.78 to 85.30
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,163,373	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	33.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.03 to 104.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,733,745						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	59,833	COD:	37.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	486.15		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,789	PRD:	118.73	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:26

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	36.62	114.69	47.82	269.47	239.81	3.13	459.50	3.13 to 459.50	3,762	1,799
5000 TO 9999	24	89.67	110.33	78.96	53.53	139.73	34.24	327.50	72.00 to 131.28	9,818	7,753
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	32	76.09	111.42	75.44	84.99	147.70	3.13	459.50	58.03 to 114.13	8,304	6,264
10000 TO 29999	55	92.73	93.61	67.08	40.71	139.54	29.16	253.25	66.67 to 100.00	28,274	18,966
30000 TO 59999	58	88.94	99.35	86.62	32.54	114.71	46.72	247.15	83.59 to 99.89	49,875	43,199
60000 TO 99999	54	89.13	92.02	80.47	26.51	114.36	42.38	486.15	76.47 to 93.77	96,097	77,327
100000 TO 149999	15	92.04	88.28	86.70	11.04	101.83	60.96	109.86	80.00 to 95.68	140,633	121,928
150000 TO 249999	6	90.07	88.39	85.13	12.77	103.82	56.02	110.09	56.02 to 110.09	191,833	163,315
ALL											
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	31	70.83	90.85	75.40	64.58	120.49	3.13	459.50	58.00 to 95.68	28,622	21,582
10	1	111.19	111.19	111.19			111.19	111.19	N/A	27,250	30,300
15	7	94.76	95.45	80.21	42.67	119.01	35.37	212.72	35.37 to 212.72	30,057	24,107
20	59	93.53	104.52	76.08	42.09	137.38	29.16	327.50	85.25 to 102.24	34,934	26,579
25	49	82.72	95.40	77.94	38.52	122.40	32.40	253.25	73.38 to 94.23	61,591	48,005
30	49	92.35	95.78	83.01	27.82	115.38	40.06	486.15	86.56 to 93.88	87,791	72,878
35	23	92.00	90.66	89.60	12.44	101.18	61.99	115.18	88.18 to 97.59	109,673	98,268
40	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	135,000	113,975
ALL											
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	31	70.83	90.85	75.40	64.58	120.49	3.13	459.50	58.00 to 95.68	28,622	21,582
100	3	48.89	62.91	54.35	40.72	115.74	40.06	99.78	N/A	34,333	18,661
101	112	89.64	97.81	82.87	29.22	118.03	38.57	327.50	86.45 to 93.81	63,894	52,949
102	14	94.11	124.41	92.84	54.98	134.01	48.53	486.15	67.14 to 136.05	78,142	72,544
103	3	56.02	69.50	65.81	24.27	105.60	55.84	96.63	N/A	191,833	126,246
104	51	92.35	94.46	78.65	37.10	120.11	31.26	247.50	75.08 to 101.99	54,702	43,021
106	1	97.59	97.59	97.59			97.59	97.59	N/A	155,000	151,265
111	4	100.79	111.46	96.41	29.60	115.61	75.29	168.99	N/A	82,250	79,300
302	1	29.16	29.16	29.16			29.16	29.16	N/A	73,500	21,430
ALL											
	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

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:	220	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	60.86	95% Median C.I.:	84.43 to 93.41
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,133,373	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	58.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.78 to 85.30
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,163,373	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	33.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.03 to 104.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,733,745						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	59,833	COD:	37.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	486.15		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,789	PRD:	118.73	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:26

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	32	71.41	91.16	76.63	63.35	118.95	3.13	459.50	58.00 to 96.25	29,149	22,338
10	14	90.16	103.30	65.05	56.43	158.79	32.40	247.15	35.37 to 185.59	28,400	18,475
15	2	149.64	149.64	118.25	65.40	126.55	51.77	247.50	N/A	13,250	15,667
20	50	101.65	112.09	85.94	35.97	130.42	29.16	327.50	92.73 to 109.10	34,900	29,994
25	20	82.15	87.88	73.72	34.54	119.20	31.26	212.72	67.14 to 96.42	56,975	42,004
30	89	88.18	91.41	82.52	27.45	110.78	38.57	486.15	82.72 to 92.88	79,398	65,515
35	5	93.89	86.87	74.38	20.91	116.79	56.02	122.68	N/A	138,900	103,317
40	8	90.07	88.22	89.72	12.35	98.33	59.15	110.09	59.15 to 110.09	145,125	130,204
ALL	220	88.93	96.82	81.54	37.62	118.73	3.13	486.15	84.43 to 93.41	59,833	48,789

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

Residential

Adjustments made to our residential properties were as follows:

The town of Hartington: Single family ranch style houses located west of Highway 57 were all increased by 10%. Most of this area contains newer homes (less than 50 years old).

Rural residential: Increases of 21 to 25% was made to homes with assessed values of \$50,000 to \$95,000. This group of homes represents over 50% of the rural residential sales file, and nearly 38% of all of the county's rural residential properties.

Rural home sites were all increased by 4%.

These adjustments brought our level of value within the acceptable range.

2009 Assessment Survey for Cedar County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor/Part Time Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor/Part Time 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?
	2007
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Sales comparison and Cost
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	7
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Small towns as one, large towns individually, rural residential and rural recreational
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	No
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
75			75

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:	212	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	53.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.12 to 94.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,950,055	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	50.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.05 to 86.19
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,980,055	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.05	95% Mean C.I.:	87.41 to 100.99
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,980						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,226	COD:	30.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	459.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,584	PRD:	114.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:20:58

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	33	92.97	86.43	80.44	29.67	107.45	3.13	202.56	68.98 to 99.83		53,965	43,408
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	95.61	112.75	87.25	42.00	129.22	31.26	327.50	80.37 to 125.49		42,940	37,464
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	94.31	90.42	86.31	18.66	104.76	48.53	145.00	78.77 to 101.99		65,265	56,330
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	32	86.82	82.18	79.45	21.16	103.44	33.94	151.17	72.50 to 94.65		57,090	45,357
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	34	91.22	93.98	80.36	37.65	116.95	23.82	262.25	68.13 to 102.48		50,458	40,550
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	95.33	97.72	87.65	22.62	111.48	39.30	191.01	83.18 to 114.13		76,665	67,200
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	17	96.39	107.81	96.58	35.17	111.62	3.13	295.00	82.54 to 122.68		64,058	61,870
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	32	82.87	94.91	75.10	42.43	126.39	29.16	459.50	61.32 to 96.63		81,167	60,954
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	106	93.80	91.11	82.50	27.53	110.44	3.13	327.50	85.25 to 94.94		54,856	45,257
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	106	93.88	97.29	82.71	34.40	117.62	3.13	459.50	83.59 to 95.44		67,596	55,912
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	109	93.33	90.65	83.23	25.98	108.92	23.82	262.25	84.08 to 94.94		60,652	50,480
<u>ALL</u>												
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92		61,226	50,584

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	212	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	53.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.12 to 94.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,950,055	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	50.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.05 to 86.19
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,980,055	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.05	95% Mean C.I.:	87.41 to 100.99
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,980						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,226	COD:	30.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	459.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,584	PRD:	114.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:20:58

ASSESSOR LOCATION

											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
BELDEN	6	80.50	82.29	75.05	32.95	109.64	48.31	136.05	48.31 to 136.05		40,733	30,571
BELDEN V	1	59.67	59.67	59.67			59.67	59.67	N/A		1,500	895
BOW VALLEY	3	107.30	90.49	83.55	17.26	108.30	54.31	109.86	N/A		105,666	88,286
CEDAR SHORES	1	58.00	58.00	58.00			58.00	58.00	N/A		35,000	20,300
COLERIDGE	20	97.28	131.74	87.40	60.81	150.73	31.26	459.50	76.47 to 118.70		34,209	29,900
COLERIDGE V	1	70.83	70.83	70.83			70.83	70.83	N/A		15,000	10,625
FORDYCE	4	76.97	74.69	63.91	16.03	116.86	56.57	88.24	N/A		45,000	28,760
FORDYCE V	3	39.30	119.37	43.18	230.01	276.44	23.82	295.00	N/A		3,666	1,583
HART BUD BECKER	2	83.38	83.38	83.27	5.52	100.13	78.77	87.98	N/A		114,650	95,465
HART BUD BECKER V	1	105.50	105.50	105.50			105.50	105.50	N/A		10,000	10,550
HARTINGTON	48	94.66	98.53	82.39	30.58	119.60	29.16	255.12	84.08 to 99.69		72,513	59,741
HARTINGTON V	3	47.58	47.87	48.14	5.42	99.45	44.15	51.88	N/A		23,333	11,231
LAUREL	42	95.56	95.85	89.83	20.76	106.70	38.57	247.50	93.33 to 101.16		61,632	55,365
LAUREL V	3	73.87	68.02	60.68	28.12	112.09	33.94	96.25	N/A		8,516	5,168
MAGNET	3	144.85	129.21	130.38	32.04	99.10	51.77	191.01	N/A		15,935	20,776
OBERT	1	55.21	55.21	55.21			55.21	55.21	N/A		28,000	15,460
RANDOLPH	22	94.50	93.25	80.95	27.84	115.19	34.24	208.25	63.28 to 114.13		48,190	39,011
REC BROOKY BOTTOM	2	92.57	92.57	92.42	7.91	100.16	85.25	99.89	N/A		49,000	45,285
REC BROOKY BOTTOM V	3	100.00	92.59	81.63	14.81	113.43	66.67	111.11	N/A		16,333	13,333
REC LEWON ACRES MH	2	44.48	44.48	44.74	9.93	99.42	40.06	48.89	N/A		42,500	19,012
RURAL	22	93.44	83.96	79.96	14.51	105.00	49.54	104.60	76.88 to 96.39		124,200	99,308
RURAL LEWIS/CLARK	2	94.35	94.35	94.57	1.11	99.77	93.30	95.40	N/A		159,750	151,072
RURAL NOHR SUB	1	94.16	94.16	94.16			94.16	94.16	N/A		90,000	84,740
RURAL V	2	70.19	70.19	68.57	6.85	102.37	65.39	75.00	N/A		11,350	7,782
ST HELENA	4	76.68	75.33	62.53	32.22	120.47	47.46	100.50	N/A		76,750	47,990
ST HELENA V	2	3.13	3.13	3.13	0.00	100.16	3.13	3.13	N/A		2,400	75
WYNOT	8	87.80	90.77	81.51	21.65	111.37	58.03	160.32	58.03 to 160.32		30,437	24,808
ALL												
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92		61,226	50,584

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	171	93.89	96.77	83.20	34.32	116.30	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 95.28		52,585	43,751
3	41	92.97	83.51	81.31	16.99	102.71	40.06	111.11	76.97 to 95.40		97,265	79,084
ALL												
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92		61,226	50,584

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	212	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	53.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.12 to 94.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,950,055	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	50.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.05 to 86.19
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,980,055	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.05	95% Mean C.I.:	87.41 to 100.99
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,980						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,226	COD:	30.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	459.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,584	PRD:	114.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:20:58

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	192	94.19	96.60	83.01	28.91	116.37	29.16	459.50	88.70 to 95.28	66,330	55,062
2	20	62.53	71.21	62.17	55.57	114.54	3.13	295.00	44.15 to 75.00	12,227	7,601
____ALL____											
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	204	93.88	94.91	82.87	31.12	114.53	3.13	459.50	87.24 to 94.94	62,318	51,642
06	8	75.96	76.23	70.75	30.05	107.76	40.06	111.11	40.06 to 111.11	33,375	23,611
07											
____ALL____											
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

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	102.29	102.29	102.29			102.29	102.29	N/A	70,000	71,605
14-0008	68	87.25	91.99	77.75	36.20	118.32	23.82	295.00	75.08 to 94.94	72,616	56,456
14-0045	33	94.23	89.76	80.38	27.17	111.67	34.24	208.25	67.19 to 102.48	45,093	36,245
14-0054	48	94.22	91.62	86.17	21.82	106.33	33.94	247.50	80.37 to 96.42	66,596	57,384
14-0101	25	89.15	80.46	83.10	28.23	96.82	3.13	160.32	59.15 to 99.89	44,712	37,157
14-0541	23	94.37	125.24	86.62	56.27	144.59	31.26	459.50	76.47 to 110.64	40,182	34,804
26-0024											
54-0096	10	94.78	87.90	88.96	10.23	98.82	61.24	102.16	65.39 to 97.44	110,360	98,171
54-0576	4	119.94	120.66	106.94	39.41	112.83	51.77	191.01	N/A	35,451	37,911
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School	1	102.29	102.29	102.29			102.29	102.29	N/A	70,000	71,605
____ALL____											
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	212	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	53.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.12 to 94.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,950,055	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	50.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.05 to 86.19
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,980,055	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.05	95% Mean C.I.:	87.41 to 100.99
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,980						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,226	COD:	30.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	459.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,584	PRD:	114.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:20:58

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	26	68.75	89.80	78.73	69.25	114.05	3.13	459.50	51.77 to 96.25	19,803	15,591
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	64.07	119.50	59.37	113.63	201.29	32.40	262.25	32.40 to 262.25	50,700	30,100
1900 TO 1919	80	95.01	98.41	81.43	30.71	120.85	29.16	255.12	85.81 to 100.00	47,481	38,664
1920 TO 1939	13	95.50	110.34	90.25	35.32	122.26	31.26	327.50	82.14 to 115.53	42,092	37,989
1940 TO 1949	4	89.10	83.18	76.11	24.88	109.29	38.57	115.94	N/A	41,515	31,595
1950 TO 1959	12	89.30	86.43	83.18	18.08	103.91	39.50	118.70	76.42 to 102.55	71,100	59,138
1960 TO 1969	25	94.58	87.49	83.00	15.18	105.41	55.84	121.20	74.77 to 96.59	87,096	72,289
1970 TO 1979	23	84.80	83.67	78.84	23.69	106.13	40.06	168.99	65.16 to 93.89	84,121	66,321
1980 TO 1989	7	94.73	95.91	77.08	32.61	124.42	48.89	191.01	48.89 to 191.01	97,686	75,299
1990 TO 1994	5	86.51	82.13	86.35	14.47	95.11	53.78	97.44	N/A	119,400	103,101
1995 TO 1999	6	94.36	93.28	94.31	2.36	98.91	85.25	96.39	85.25 to 96.39	130,166	122,758
2000 TO Present	5	94.45	97.75	96.98	6.42	100.80	88.13	109.86	N/A	124,400	120,638
ALL	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

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	12	201.63	193.97	180.65	48.87	107.38	3.13	459.50	59.67 to 295.00	2,895	5,231
5000 TO 9999	13	99.58	102.07	107.21	35.57	95.21	23.82	247.50	73.87 to 115.53	7,076	7,586
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	25	114.13	146.18	127.34	70.06	114.80	3.13	459.50	75.17 to 200.70	5,070	6,456
10000 TO 29999	43	99.69	100.01	97.06	30.07	103.03	33.94	255.12	85.81 to 104.19	17,408	16,897
30000 TO 59999	50	94.02	90.79	90.26	21.13	100.58	31.26	168.99	85.25 to 98.35	44,436	40,106
60000 TO 99999	53	84.80	79.32	79.48	23.39	99.79	29.16	121.20	72.50 to 94.92	76,308	60,652
100000 TO 149999	28	80.41	79.69	78.94	18.59	100.95	47.46	109.86	63.28 to 94.00	126,896	100,173
150000 TO 249999	12	90.55	82.12	82.40	15.61	99.66	49.54	102.44	61.32 to 95.40	167,708	138,188
250000 TO 499999	1	56.02	56.02	56.02			56.02	56.02	N/A	273,000	152,930
ALL	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales: 212 **MEDIAN: 94** COV: 53.54 95% Median C.I.: 87.12 to 94.92
 TOTAL Sales Price: 12,950,055 WGT. MEAN: 83 STD: 50.44 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 79.05 to 86.19
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 12,980,055 MEAN: 94 AVG.ABS.DEV: 29.05 95% Mean C.I.: 87.41 to 100.99
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 10,723,980
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 61,226 COD: 30.95 MAX Sales Ratio: 459.50
 AVG. Assessed Value: 50,584 PRD: 114.02 MIN Sales Ratio: 3.13

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:20:58

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	8	36.62	114.69	47.82	269.47	239.81	3.13	459.50	3.13 to 459.50	3,762	1,799
5000 TO 9999	22	91.03	114.70	82.94	54.81	138.30	34.24	327.50	72.46 to 145.00	9,279	7,696
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	30	76.09	114.70	78.42	88.27	146.25	3.13	459.50	59.67 to 114.13	7,808	6,123
10000 TO 29999	50	94.19	89.18	66.25	35.49	134.61	29.16	262.25	63.88 to 100.00	27,915	18,493
30000 TO 59999	57	93.81	96.75	86.29	27.05	112.13	46.72	255.12	83.59 to 98.35	50,478	43,558
60000 TO 99999	52	93.88	86.16	81.29	16.03	105.99	47.46	121.20	82.74 to 95.02	95,620	77,734
100000 TO 149999	15	94.45	90.78	89.42	9.00	101.52	61.32	109.86	80.45 to 96.39	134,133	119,948
150000 TO 249999	8	93.78	89.19	86.76	8.83	102.80	56.02	102.44	56.02 to 102.44	186,062	161,419
ALL											
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	25	70.83	91.32	79.68	68.83	114.60	3.13	459.50	51.88 to 96.25	19,895	15,853
10	1	113.85	113.85	113.85			113.85	113.85	N/A	27,250	31,025
15	7	93.72	78.45	70.03	25.17	112.03	35.37	115.94	35.37 to 115.94	30,057	21,047
20	58	93.99	104.96	76.23	42.88	137.69	29.16	327.50	83.44 to 102.48	36,531	27,847
25	49	84.08	92.57	81.68	29.37	113.33	32.40	262.25	76.97 to 95.61	63,245	51,660
30	49	93.88	87.38	82.25	17.59	106.23	40.06	146.58	87.24 to 95.00	92,340	75,949
35	22	94.94	92.00	90.89	10.60	101.23	61.99	115.18	88.70 to 98.68	107,613	97,808
40	1	95.91	95.91	95.91			95.91	95.91	N/A	135,000	129,480
ALL											
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	23	66.67	90.28	79.34	74.99	113.80	3.13	459.50	47.58 to 96.25	21,140	16,772
100	3	48.89	62.91	54.35	40.72	115.74	40.06	99.78	N/A	34,333	18,661
101	113	94.16	98.43	84.74	25.97	116.16	38.57	327.50	88.24 to 95.37	65,724	55,693
102	13	100.50	100.08	90.91	25.20	110.08	48.53	190.22	67.17 to 115.94	82,846	75,318
103	3	56.02	69.50	65.81	24.27	105.60	55.84	96.63	N/A	191,833	126,246
104	50	93.53	87.84	78.74	28.42	111.56	31.26	247.50	76.97 to 98.68	57,957	45,637
106	2	103.23	103.23	94.80	27.18	108.89	75.17	131.28	N/A	5,575	5,285
111	4	100.79	111.46	96.41	29.60	115.61	75.29	168.99	N/A	82,250	79,300
302	1	29.16	29.16	29.16			29.16	29.16	N/A	73,500	21,430
ALL											
	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92	61,226	50,584

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:	212	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	53.54	95% Median C.I.:	87.12 to 94.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,950,055	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	50.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.05 to 86.19
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,980,055	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.05	95% Mean C.I.:	87.41 to 100.99
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,980						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,226	COD:	30.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	459.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,584	PRD:	114.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	3.13		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:20:58

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	26	72.35	91.74	81.57	66.46	112.47	3.13	459.50	51.88 to 99.83		20,880	17,031
10	12	79.77	87.47	59.30	50.07	147.52	32.40	255.12	35.37 to 110.64		31,716	18,807
15	2	149.64	149.64	118.25	65.40	126.55	51.77	247.50	N/A		13,250	15,667
20	50	101.00	114.78	91.22	34.61	125.82	29.16	327.50	94.76 to 111.40		37,054	33,802
25	21	80.70	83.65	76.12	27.74	109.90	31.26	151.17	67.19 to 96.42		56,547	43,042
30	88	89.43	86.16	81.96	20.53	105.13	38.57	191.01	83.94 to 94.65		81,072	66,444
35	5	93.89	87.15	74.69	20.61	116.68	56.02	122.68	N/A		138,900	103,750
40	8	94.29	90.43	91.67	9.00	98.65	59.15	103.24	59.15 to 103.24		145,125	133,035
ALL	212	93.88	94.20	82.62	30.95	114.02	3.13	459.50	87.12 to 94.92		61,226	50,584

2009 Correlation Section for Cedar County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The county reported in the assessment actions portion of the survey that single family ranch style houses located west of Highway 57 in Hartington was increased 10%. That particular area of Hartington is where the homes are less than 50 years old and warranted increasing. They also reported that the rural residential properties received percentage increases based on the assessed value range of the homes. Rural home sites were increased as well.

The county reacted to the preliminary statistics in the determination of the changes applied to the 2009 assessment. The previous history of the county indicates that all residential improvements have been completed with a 2003 costing. Since 2005 properties have been percentage increased or decreased to achieve a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential have been steadily distorted by these percentage changes.

The analysis of the current statistical profile indicates a median level of value and a mean level are within the acceptable range. The weighted mean, coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are all outside the acceptable range. The analysis of the statistics reveals that the properties selling under \$10,000 and over \$100,000 have a strong impact on the quality of assessment in the county.

It is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the median level of value is an acceptable level of value for the 2009 assessment year supported with the trended preliminary statistical calculation. However, there is concern with the assessment practices employed by Cedar County i.e. percentage adjustments to subclasses, do not address the inequities demonstrated by the disparity of the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential which will need to be addressed by the county.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	308	212	68.83
2008	351	239	68.09
2007	393	256	65.14
2006	412	257	62.38
2005	369	250	67.75

RESIDENTIAL: Review of the non qualified sales verified that the majority of the reasoning for a transaction being non arm's length included parcels that were substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures. The personal knowledge of the assessor and staff as well as communication with local realtors aids in the determination of the sale being non arm's length. There is no reason to believe that the county has unreasonably trimmed the residential sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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	89	2.87	92	94
2008	91	1.24	92	92.83
2007	89	5.97	95	93
2006	91	0.67	92	93
2005	94	1.06	95	95

RESIDENTIAL: The trended preliminary ratio and R&O median are two percentage points apart. The numbers are relatively close and supportive of each other. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value for the residential class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
1.22	2009	2.87
0.73	2008	1.24
6.71	2007	5.97
1.24	2006	0.67
2.14	2005	1.06

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value Change shows a reasonable difference between the two. The percentages also represent that the action reported by the assessor were completed for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	83	94

RESIDENTIAL:When reviewing the three measures of central tendency the median and mean are within the acceptable parameter. The median ratio is statistically supported by the trended preliminary ratio. However, the weighted mean is 11 points lower than the median and mean, indicating that the properties with a higher sale price are under assessed. Review of the properties that have sold over \$100,000 which represents approximately 19% of the sales file supports the idea that those properties are under assessed. Consideration for parcels selling less than \$10,000 and analysis without those sales still supports that the weighted mean is low and supports the under assessment of the high end sale price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	30.95	114.02
Difference	15.95	11.02

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of the quality of assessment, the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential, are well outside the acceptable levels for the residential class of property. Analysis of the statistical profile reveals that the parcels that sell for less than \$10,000 have a strong impact on the measures. There are 25 sales included in the sales file; analysis without those sales indicated a COD of 23.24 and a PRD of 106.18.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	220	212	-8
Median	89	94	5
Wgt. Mean	82	83	1
Mean	97	94	-3
COD	37.62	30.95	-6.67
PRD	118.73	114.02	-4.71
Minimum	3.13	3.13	0.00
Maximum	486.15	459.50	-26.65

RESIDENTIAL: The difference in the number of preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics was decreased by eight sales. The reason for the decline in sales was that the county found parcels that had been substantially changed after the sale. The R&O Statistics is a final result of the assessment actions for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	212	202	10
Median	94	90	4
Wgt. Mean	83	85	-2
Mean	94	101	-7
COD	30.95	40.90	-9.95
PRD	114.02	118.48	-4.46
Minimum	3.13	3.45	-0.32
Maximum	459.50	507.10	-47.60

The three measures of central tendency, the median, mean and weighted mean are all reasonably close in comparison between the R&O statistics and the trended ratio statistics. Based on the knowledge of the assessment practices in Cedar County my opinion of the level of value would be consistent with the statistics generated from the assessed value update.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	MEDIAN:	80	COV:	122.60	95% Median C.I.:	65.00 to 109.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,700,628	WGT. MEAN:	79	STD:	145.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.74 to 89.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,700,628	MEAN:	119	AVG.ABS.DEV:	63.38	95% Mean C.I.:	77.60 to 160.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,350,940						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,429	COD:	78.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	1015.41		
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,144	PRD:	149.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:36

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	6	66.07	75.31	62.41	56.05	120.67	17.40	153.20	17.40 to 153.20		26,641	16,626
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	71.60	76.91	71.83	18.56	107.06	56.78	107.65	N/A		55,750	40,047
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	125.73	128.35	113.10	32.66	113.48	60.61	230.10	N/A		21,000	23,752
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	60.39	70.94	87.42	33.37	81.14	47.00	116.35	47.00 to 116.35		40,666	35,551
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	150.55	143.56	122.36	38.14	117.33	53.00	280.00	53.00 to 280.00		5,091	6,230
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	145.76	132.31	121.72	12.62	108.70	97.98	153.18	N/A		19,000	23,126
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	106.60	106.60	52.14	65.67	204.42	36.59	176.60	N/A		22,500	11,732
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	109.00	158.46	68.94	73.03	229.85	63.79	302.60	N/A		40,110	27,653
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	78.28	65.77	78.18	16.13	84.13	40.57	78.46	N/A		97,348	76,108
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	35.54	259.28	50.79	634.67	510.50	31.24	1015.41	N/A		25,740	13,073
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	75.57	83.00	76.00	15.08	109.21	69.62	103.81	N/A		56,750	43,128
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	93.26	93.26	98.21	12.02	94.96	82.05	104.47	N/A		62,450	61,330
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	72.74	86.99	80.89	46.78	107.54	17.40	230.10	56.78 to 109.00		34,850	28,191
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	143.08	139.06	84.30	40.70	164.96	36.59	302.60	63.79 to 176.60		18,063	15,227
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	78.28	148.40	76.23	125.32	194.67	31.24	1015.41	35.54 to 104.47		55,068	41,979
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	107.17	116.28	100.52	45.00	115.68	47.00	280.00	64.74 to 145.76		21,827	21,941
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	78.28	167.87	68.27	158.99	245.89	31.24	1015.41	35.54 to 178.92		45,082	30,778
<u>ALL</u>												
	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00		35,429	28,144

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	MEDIAN:	80	COV:	122.60	95% Median C.I.:	65.00 to 109.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,700,628	WGT. MEAN:	79	STD:	145.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.74 to 89.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,700,628	MEAN:	119	AVG.ABS.DEV:	63.38	95% Mean C.I.:	77.60 to 160.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,350,940						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,429	COD:	78.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	1015.41		
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,144	PRD:	149.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:37

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELDEN	4	132.26	149.38	112.23	53.66	133.10	53.00	280.00	N/A	11,562	12,976
BELDEN V	1	109.00	109.00	109.00			109.00	109.00	N/A	500	545
COLERIDGE	6	146.79	260.60	60.24	128.47	432.58	35.54	1015.41	35.54 to 1015.41	24,450	14,729
COLERIDGE V	1	17.40	17.40	17.40			17.40	17.40	N/A	5,000	870
FORDYCE	3	75.57	125.10	77.21	70.79	162.03	69.62	230.10	N/A	51,416	39,696
HARTINGTON	7	82.05	91.34	81.16	28.05	112.54	56.04	145.76	56.04 to 145.76	50,104	40,665
HARTINGTON V	1	47.00	47.00	47.00			47.00	47.00	N/A	3,000	1,410
LAUREL	10	66.68	88.87	67.98	69.39	130.72	31.24	302.60	35.28 to 107.65	26,450	17,982
MAGNET	1	162.25	162.25	162.25			162.25	162.25	N/A	2,000	3,245
OBERT	1	65.00	65.00	65.00			65.00	65.00	N/A	800	520
RANDOLPH	5	125.73	113.01	97.01	27.84	116.49	57.31	176.60	N/A	27,170	26,358
RANDOLPH V	1	40.57	40.57	40.57			40.57	40.57	N/A	2,046	830
RURAL	5	70.46	77.36	82.04	20.80	94.29	56.78	116.35	N/A	114,600	94,017
WYNOT	2	122.69	122.69	111.25	24.87	110.28	92.18	153.20	N/A	8,000	8,900
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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	43	92.18	123.63	78.12	74.18	158.27	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	26,223	20,485
3	5	70.46	77.36	82.04	20.80	94.29	56.78	116.35	N/A	114,600	94,017
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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	44	87.12	124.19	79.68	75.62	155.87	31.24	1015.41	69.62 to 116.35	38,439	30,627
2	4	56.00	59.60	35.97	48.93	165.70	17.40	109.00	N/A	2,325	836
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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:	48	MEDIAN:	80	COV:	122.60	95% Median C.I.:	65.00 to 109.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,700,628	WGT. MEAN:	79	STD:	145.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.74 to 89.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,700,628	MEAN:	119	AVG.ABS.DEV:	63.38	95% Mean C.I.:	77.60 to 160.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,350,940						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,429	COD:	78.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	1015.41		
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,144	PRD:	149.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:37

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0008	12	76.93	93.89	79.73	40.37	117.75	47.00	230.10	63.79 to 109.00	42,398	33,806
14-0045	12	106.41	117.51	99.92	43.47	117.61	40.57	280.00	57.31 to 160.70	17,887	17,872
14-0054	9	60.61	87.86	64.15	77.97	136.97	31.24	302.60	35.28 to 107.65	26,055	16,713
14-0101	4	85.32	95.16	75.94	32.27	125.30	56.78	153.20	N/A	87,750	66,636
14-0541	7	140.40	225.85	58.83	127.64	383.91	17.40	1015.41	17.40 to 1015.41	21,671	12,749
26-0024											
54-0096	2	67.60	67.60	69.25	4.23	97.62	64.74	70.46	N/A	59,000	40,857
54-0576	2	139.30	139.30	117.11	16.48	118.95	116.35	162.25	N/A	61,000	71,435
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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	8	62.81	80.09	94.00	61.60	85.20	17.40	160.70	17.40 to 160.70	5,355	5,034
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	70.46	70.46	70.46			70.46	70.46	N/A	93,000	65,530
1900 TO 1919	26	98.00	146.99	77.94	86.98	188.60	31.24	1015.41	63.79 to 153.18	24,443	19,050
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	3	104.47	88.93	92.52	28.44	96.12	36.59	125.73	N/A	55,000	50,888
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	4	72.60	76.98	74.99	13.50	102.65	64.74	97.98	N/A	51,062	38,291
1980 TO 1989	4	105.55	129.91	92.11	41.04	141.04	78.46	230.10	N/A	107,000	98,558
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	37.83	37.83	37.69	6.05	100.37	35.54	40.12	N/A	66,000	24,875
2000 TO Present											
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	MEDIAN:	80	COV:	122.60	95% Median C.I.:	65.00 to 109.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,700,628	WGT. MEAN:	79	STD:	145.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.74 to 89.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,700,628	MEAN:	119	AVG.ABS.DEV:	63.38	95% Mean C.I.:	77.60 to 160.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,350,940						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,429	COD:	78.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	1015.41		
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,144	PRD:	149.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:37

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____												
1 TO	4999	10	151.33	234.12	233.70	101.58	100.18	40.57	1015.41	47.00 to 302.60	1,729	4,042
5000 TO	9999	5	153.20	146.10	146.96	30.83	99.41	17.40	230.10	N/A	5,700	8,377
Total \$ _____												
1 TO	9999	15	153.20	204.78	179.72	77.17	113.94	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 230.10	3,053	5,487
10000 TO	29999	13	78.28	87.42	84.18	41.84	103.86	31.24	160.70	53.00 to 130.56	17,576	14,795
30000 TO	59999	8	88.40	81.60	80.73	28.20	101.07	35.28	125.73	35.28 to 125.73	33,487	27,034
60000 TO	99999	9	69.62	64.83	66.61	21.84	97.32	35.54	104.47	40.12 to 75.57	72,344	48,189
100000 TO	149999	2	90.07	90.07	90.37	29.18	99.67	63.79	116.35	N/A	118,666	107,237
250000 TO	499999	1	78.46	78.46	78.46			78.46	78.46	N/A	270,000	211,840
ALL _____												
		48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____												
1 TO	4999	9	109.00	115.62	83.25	60.31	138.88	17.40	280.00	40.57 to 178.92	1,994	1,660
5000 TO	9999	7	60.61	119.22	70.74	115.69	168.55	31.24	302.60	31.24 to 302.60	11,071	7,831
Total \$ _____												
1 TO	9999	16	87.00	117.19	73.09	81.24	160.35	17.40	302.60	47.00 to 176.60	5,965	4,360
10000 TO	29999	19	92.18	143.86	75.58	94.32	190.34	35.28	1015.41	49.30 to 145.76	25,302	19,123
30000 TO	59999	7	75.57	84.48	78.20	26.55	108.03	56.04	125.73	56.04 to 125.73	49,514	38,720
60000 TO	99999	4	70.04	77.09	76.15	14.82	101.23	63.79	104.47	N/A	96,958	73,831
100000 TO	149999	1	116.35	116.35	116.35			116.35	116.35	N/A	120,000	139,625
150000 TO	249999	1	78.46	78.46	78.46			78.46	78.46	N/A	270,000	211,840
ALL _____												
		48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		28	73.95	120.69	75.33	96.08	160.22	17.40	1015.41	56.78 to 104.47	38,747	29,189
10		10	138.16	128.25	84.66	40.37	151.48	31.24	280.00	53.00 to 178.92	17,745	15,023
15		3	94.74	113.37	103.67	21.46	109.36	92.18	153.18	N/A	17,500	18,141
20		7	75.57	100.12	85.28	53.48	117.40	40.12	230.10	40.12 to 230.10	55,107	46,997
ALL _____												
		48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	MEDIAN:	80	COV:	122.60	95% Median C.I.:	65.00 to 109.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,700,628	WGT. MEAN:	79	STD:	145.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.74 to 89.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,700,628	MEAN:	119	AVG.ABS.DEV:	63.38	95% Mean C.I.:	77.60 to 160.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,350,940						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,429	COD:	78.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	1015.41		
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,144	PRD:	149.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:25:37

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	47.00	55.79	36.80	49.37	151.63	17.40	109.00	N/A	2,269	835
300	2	240.76	240.76	250.00	25.69	96.30	178.92	302.60	N/A	2,175	5,437
318	1	82.05	82.05	82.05			82.05	82.05	N/A	34,900	28,635
321	1	104.47	104.47	104.47			104.47	104.47	N/A	90,000	94,025
336	1	63.79	63.79	63.79			63.79	63.79	N/A	117,332	74,850
344	5	75.57	107.10	81.35	56.82	131.65	53.00	176.60	N/A	35,850	29,164
350	3	78.46	74.23	76.11	30.19	97.54	36.59	107.65	N/A	113,333	86,256
353	11	78.28	94.20	82.36	45.73	114.38	31.24	153.20	56.04 to 153.18	25,272	20,813
381	1	1015.41	1015.41	1015.41			1015.41	1015.41	N/A	1,850	18,785
384	2	72.14	72.14	53.71	51.10	134.31	35.28	109.00	N/A	20,000	10,742
386	1	94.74	94.74	94.74			94.74	94.74	N/A	33,000	31,265
389	1	35.54	35.54	35.54			35.54	35.54	N/A	70,000	24,875
406	2	173.23	173.23	120.90	32.83	143.27	116.35	230.10	N/A	62,500	75,565
408	2	82.21	82.21	86.53	26.27	95.01	60.61	103.81	N/A	17,500	15,142
419	1	70.46	70.46	70.46			70.46	70.46	N/A	93,000	65,530
420	1	140.40	140.40	140.40			140.40	140.40	N/A	2,500	3,510
442	6	111.37	132.77	76.39	52.23	173.80	56.78	280.00	56.78 to 280.00	26,350	20,129
444	1	49.30	49.30	49.30			49.30	49.30	N/A	25,000	12,325
841	1	40.12	40.12	40.12			40.12	40.12	N/A	62,000	24,875
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144
04											
ALL	48	80.26	118.81	79.44	78.98	149.56	17.40	1015.41	65.00 to 109.00	35,429	28,144

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

Commercial

Adjustments to our commercial properties were as follows:

Laurel had some properties that had use changes, or renovations, those properties were changed to bring them up to date. Retail and office properties were increased by 25% in the towns of Hartington, and Laurel. The other assessor locations were either within the acceptable range or did not have enough of these types of properties sell to warrant a change. These 2 types of properties represent about 37% of all the sales within our commercial file. Properties of this type that were vacant were not changed because there are some of those that have been for sale for some time and have not even received an offer on them. The changes that we have made raised our level of value within the acceptable range, and also did improve the quality of our assessment.

2009 Assessment Survey for Cedar County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor/Part Time Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor/Part Time Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	1989
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006 and 2007
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?
	NA
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Sales Approach and Cost
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	7
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Small towns as one, larger towns individually, rural residential and rural recreational
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
15			15

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	40.62	95% Median C.I.:	90.94 to 99.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,593,732	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	38.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.26 to 94.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,593,732	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.11	95% Mean C.I.:	83.70 to 107.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,377,290						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,871	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,592	PRD:	110.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:11

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	6	73.23	79.98	69.15	44.20	115.66	17.40	153.20	17.40 to 153.20		26,641	18,421
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	90.94	90.43	85.68	12.81	105.55	72.70	107.65	N/A		43,333	37,126
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	122.20	113.83	112.68	10.74	101.03	94.74	130.56	N/A		21,000	23,662
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	92.18	87.36	96.00	16.29	91.01	64.74	116.35	N/A		48,200	46,270
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	82.68	127.59	87.18	74.95	146.35	65.00	280.00	N/A		6,512	5,677
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	97.22	97.22	97.65	0.78	99.57	96.47	97.98	N/A		19,250	18,797
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	70.52	70.52	47.97	41.10	147.01	41.53	99.50	N/A		22,500	10,792
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	94.66	94.66	80.43	15.16	117.69	80.31	109.00	N/A		58,916	47,385
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	88.15	88.15	79.79	10.99	110.46	78.46	97.83	N/A		145,000	115,702
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	97.70	91.95	74.22	14.82	123.88	47.65	115.68	N/A		29,070	21,577
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	94.86	97.81	95.93	3.18	101.96	94.76	103.81	N/A		56,750	54,438
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	98.69	98.69	101.24	5.85	97.48	92.92	104.47	N/A		62,450	63,227
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	93.52	92.48	89.89	25.16	102.88	17.40	153.20	71.63 to 116.35		33,465	30,082
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	97.22	103.51	77.69	34.56	133.23	41.53	280.00	65.00 to 109.00		22,738	17,666
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	97.44	93.91	86.11	9.85	109.05	47.65	115.68	92.92 to 103.81		60,875	52,421
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	96.20	106.92	99.86	27.68	107.08	64.74	280.00	70.03 to 122.20		25,659	25,622
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	97.70	87.85	76.17	16.60	115.34	41.53	115.68	47.65 to 109.00		54,380	41,422
_____ALL_____												
	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50		38,871	33,592

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELDEN	4	101.46	137.29	95.11	53.83	144.34	66.25	280.00	N/A		11,562	10,997
BELDEN V	1	109.00	109.00	109.00			109.00	109.00	N/A		500	545
COLERIDGE	5	96.47	83.03	59.58	24.00	139.35	47.65	115.68	N/A		32,170	19,167
COLERIDGE V	1	17.40	17.40	17.40			17.40	17.40	N/A		5,000	870
FORDYCE	3	94.86	103.94	95.71	9.64	108.60	94.76	122.20	N/A		51,416	49,208
HARTINGTON	6	95.38	92.43	88.24	11.89	104.74	70.03	109.00	70.03 to 109.00		55,372	48,860
LAUREL	9	95.93	90.80	88.48	9.24	102.62	41.53	107.65	90.94 to 97.98		29,111	25,756
OBERT	1	65.00	65.00	65.00			65.00	65.00	N/A		800	520
RANDOLPH	5	99.50	100.45	95.86	22.08	104.79	71.63	130.56	N/A		27,170	26,045
RURAL	4	75.58	83.06	86.44	18.98	96.09	64.74	116.35	N/A		120,000	103,726
WYNOT	2	122.69	122.69	111.25	24.87	110.28	92.18	153.20	N/A		8,000	8,900
_____ALL_____												
	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50		38,871	33,592

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	40.62	95% Median C.I.:	90.94 to 99.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,593,732	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	38.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.26 to 94.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,593,732	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.11	95% Mean C.I.:	83.70 to 107.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,377,290						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,871	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,592	PRD:	110.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:11

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	37	96.47	96.94	86.41	22.80	112.19	17.40	280.00	92.92 to 99.50	30,100	26,010
3	4	75.58	83.06	86.44	18.98	96.09	64.74	116.35	N/A	120,000	103,726
____ALL____	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

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	38	96.20	98.10	86.64	21.45	113.22	41.53	280.00	92.18 to 99.50	41,774	36,193
2	3	65.00	63.80	30.71	46.97	207.72	17.40	109.00	N/A	2,100	645
____ALL____	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0008	10	94.81	93.14	90.57	13.22	102.84	65.00	122.20	70.03 to 109.00	48,728	44,131
14-0045	11	99.50	114.40	96.03	31.00	119.13	66.25	280.00	71.63 to 130.56	19,327	18,559
14-0054	8	95.34	89.90	87.25	10.19	103.04	41.53	107.65	41.53 to 107.65	29,000	25,301
14-0101	4	85.32	99.13	78.89	27.61	125.67	72.70	153.20	N/A	87,750	69,223
14-0541	6	75.13	72.09	58.31	43.22	123.64	17.40	115.68	17.40 to 115.68	27,641	16,117
26-0024											
54-0096	1	64.74	64.74	64.74			64.74	64.74	N/A	25,000	16,185
54-0576	1	116.35	116.35	116.35			116.35	116.35	N/A	120,000	139,625
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 41 **MEDIAN: 96** COV: 40.62 95% Median C.I.: 90.94 to 99.50
 TOTAL Sales Price: 1,593,732 WGT. MEAN: 86 STD: 38.83 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 78.26 to 94.57
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 1,593,732 MEAN: 96 AVG.ABS.DEV: 22.11 95% Mean C.I.: 83.70 to 107.48
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 1,377,290
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 38,871 COD: 23.05 MAX Sales Ratio: 280.00
 AVG. Assessed Value: 33,592 PRD: 110.61 MIN Sales Ratio: 17.40

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:11

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	4	80.47	71.83	75.69	38.07	94.90	17.40	109.00	N/A	5,075	3,841
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	23	97.18	104.15	87.38	22.13	119.19	66.25	280.00	90.94 to 103.81	27,355	23,903
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	3	104.47	90.58	93.72	26.87	96.64	41.53	125.73	N/A	55,000	51,546
1960 TO 1969	1	99.10	99.10	99.10			99.10	99.10	N/A	15,000	14,865
1970 TO 1979	4	94.81	88.09	91.60	8.79	96.16	64.74	97.98	N/A	51,062	46,773
1980 TO 1989	4	105.55	102.94	90.85	15.48	113.30	78.46	122.20	N/A	107,000	97,210
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	50.72	50.72	50.54	6.06	100.37	47.65	53.80	N/A	66,000	33,355
2000 TO Present											
ALL	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

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	112.34	142.42	114.85	49.33	124.00	65.00	280.00	N/A	850	976
5000 TO 9999	5	99.50	97.75	97.60	32.47	100.16	17.40	153.20	N/A	5,700	5,563
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	109.00	117.61	99.44	40.03	118.27	17.40	280.00	65.00 to 153.20	3,544	3,524
10000 TO 29999	13	97.18	94.10	94.06	12.47	100.04	64.74	130.56	71.63 to 103.81	17,576	16,533
30000 TO 59999	8	96.22	93.65	92.25	14.15	101.52	41.53	125.73	41.53 to 125.73	33,487	30,892
60000 TO 99999	8	73.77	76.64	78.45	21.14	97.69	47.65	104.47	47.65 to 104.47	69,762	54,726
100000 TO 149999	2	98.33	98.33	98.53	18.33	99.79	80.31	116.35	N/A	118,666	116,925
250000 TO 499999	1	78.46	78.46	78.46			78.46	78.46	N/A	270,000	211,840
ALL	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	40.62	95% Median C.I.:	90.94 to 99.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,593,732	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	38.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.26 to 94.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,593,732	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.11	95% Mean C.I.:	83.70 to 107.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,377,290						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,871	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,592	PRD:	110.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:11

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	104.25	114.43	72.76	51.60	157.27	17.40	280.00	17.40 to 280.00	2,233	1,625
5000 TO 9999	4	109.34	109.53	100.33	25.76	109.17	66.25	153.20	N/A	7,125	7,148
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	104.25	112.47	91.52	41.77	122.90	17.40	280.00	65.00 to 153.20	4,190	3,834
10000 TO 29999	15	97.70	92.95	89.05	12.49	104.38	41.53	130.56	92.18 to 101.54	21,233	18,908
30000 TO 59999	11	90.94	84.16	78.87	19.67	106.70	47.65	125.73	53.80 to 107.65	49,863	39,328
60000 TO 99999	3	94.86	93.21	92.00	8.49	101.32	80.31	104.47	N/A	98,277	90,416
100000 TO 149999	1	116.35	116.35	116.35			116.35	116.35	N/A	120,000	139,625
150000 TO 249999	1	78.46	78.46	78.46			78.46	78.46	N/A	270,000	211,840
ALL											
	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	23	93.52	84.23	82.34	20.41	102.29	17.40	125.73	71.63 to 99.50	46,805	38,541
10	8	106.43	126.08	91.13	41.14	138.35	66.25	280.00	66.25 to 280.00	19,618	17,879
15	3	94.74	94.46	94.49	1.51	99.98	92.18	96.47	N/A	17,500	16,535
20	7	99.10	98.54	96.90	14.66	101.70	53.80	122.20	53.80 to 122.20	43,964	42,599
ALL											
	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	40.62	95% Median C.I.:	90.94 to 99.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,593,732	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	38.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.26 to 94.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,593,732	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.11	95% Mean C.I.:	83.70 to 107.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,377,290						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,871	COD:	23.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,592	PRD:	110.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.40		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:11

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	65.00	63.80	30.71	46.97	207.72	17.40	109.00	N/A	2,100	645
300	1	115.68	115.68	115.68			115.68	115.68	N/A	1,850	2,140
318	1	92.92	92.92	92.92			92.92	92.92	N/A	34,900	32,430
321	1	104.47	104.47	104.47			104.47	104.47	N/A	90,000	94,025
336	1	80.31	80.31	80.31			80.31	80.31	N/A	117,332	94,225
344	5	94.86	90.89	93.71	7.93	96.99	66.25	99.50	N/A	35,850	33,596
350	3	78.46	75.88	76.69	28.09	98.94	41.53	107.65	N/A	113,333	86,915
353	10	96.83	96.57	90.41	18.40	106.82	64.74	153.20	70.03 to 125.73	25,950	23,461
381	1	101.54	101.54	101.54			101.54	101.54	N/A	18,500	18,785
384	2	103.35	103.35	100.53	5.47	102.81	97.70	109.00	N/A	20,000	20,105
386	1	94.74	94.74	94.74			94.74	94.74	N/A	33,000	31,265
389	1	47.65	47.65	47.65			47.65	47.65	N/A	70,000	33,355
406	2	119.28	119.28	116.59	2.45	102.30	116.35	122.20	N/A	62,500	72,867
408	2	99.87	99.87	100.66	3.95	99.22	95.93	103.81	N/A	17,500	17,615
442	5	92.18	130.05	81.92	57.07	158.75	72.70	280.00	N/A	31,220	25,576
444	1	93.52	93.52	93.52			93.52	93.52	N/A	25,000	23,380
841	1	53.80	53.80	53.80			53.80	53.80	N/A	62,000	33,355
ALL	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

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	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592
04											
ALL	41	95.93	95.59	86.42	23.05	110.61	17.40	280.00	90.94 to 99.50	38,871	33,592

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The county reported that through the statistical analysis the commercial properties described as retail and office occupancy were increased 25% in the towns of Laurel and Hartington. The other assessor locations did not have that type of property sell. If the properties were vacant, the county did not increase the value.

Review of the history in the commercial class for Cedar County reveals that the county uses a 1989 costing as reported in the Assessment Survey. Reaction to the preliminary statistical profile by percentage increases based on occupancy codes has been a practice in the county since at least 2001. The disparity in the percentage change to the sales file and the assessed value may be a strong indication that the county is in need of a reappraisal of the commercial class of property.

The Property Tax Administrator is relying on the median and mean calculation to determine the level of value in the county. The disparity of the weighted mean, coefficient of dispersion and price related differential causes concern about the uniformity and quality of assessment in the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	93	41	44.09
2008	95	51	53.68
2007	89	47	52.81
2006	76	42	55.26
2005	79	47	59.49

COMMERCIAL:Review of the non qualified sales, the typical reasons for the transaction not being an arm's length sale included parcels that were substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures. There is no reason to believe that the county has unreasonably trimmed the residential sales. The personal knowledge of the assessor, staff and communication with the local realtor's assists the county in the determination of the qualification of the sale transaction.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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	80	0.72	81	96
2008	96.44	0.39	97	96.44
2007	86	8.51	93	95
2006	80	9.13	87	108
2005	96	-0.43	96	96

COMMERCIAL: The trended preliminary ratio is and the R&O ratio are 15 percentage points apart. The trended ratio does not support the R&O median.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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)
13.16	2009	0.72
0.20	2008	0.39
9.52	2007	8.51
36.43	2006	9.13
0.00	2005	-0.43

COMMERCIAL: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is less 12.44 percentage points and lends one to believe that the sales file has been increased. A loss of one sale and the fact that five of the sales with the assessor location of Hartington and Laurel contribute to the sales file percent change increase.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	96	86	96

COMMERCIAL:When reviewing the three measures of central tendency the median and mean are within the acceptable parameter. The weighted mean is not within the acceptable level. The median ratio is not statistically supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	23.05	110.61
Difference	3.05	7.61

COMMERCIAL: The measures of the quality of assessment, the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential, are outside the acceptable levels for the commercial class of property. Review of the statistical information does not provide information that the reason for this is confined to one specific area but rather to the county as a whole.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	48	41	-7
Median	80	96	16
Wgt. Mean	79	86	7
Mean	119	96	-23
COD	78.98	23.05	-55.93
PRD	149.56	110.61	-38.95
Minimum	17.40	17.40	0.00
Maximum	1,015.41	280.00	-735.41

COMMERCIAL:Table VII supports the fact that seven sales were removed since the preliminary statistics due to substantial changes to the properties since the sale. The remainder of the table is a reflection of the changes to the commercial class of property for the 2009 assessment year.

**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:	63	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	27.23	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.88	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	17.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.75 to 65.64	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.04	95% Mean C.I.:	61.55 to 70.42	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,205,040							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,984	PRD:	106.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:03

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	73.57	75.07	74.96	11.93	100.15	57.60	98.72	57.60 to 98.72	155,160	116,305
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	16	71.18	74.50	71.84	10.59	103.70	63.53	109.17	66.49 to 75.33	281,022	201,880
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	71.86	72.21	68.02	15.98	106.15	55.15	89.61	N/A	283,564	192,885
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	81.71	82.11	79.76	8.08	102.95	72.41	92.22	N/A	212,263	169,308
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	57.78	67.95	56.11	32.98	121.09	40.74	137.32	40.74 to 137.32	273,295	153,350
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	60.56	60.33	56.52	18.83	106.75	43.20	88.38	43.20 to 88.38	221,525	125,198
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	54.29	52.11	52.84	10.40	98.61	38.22	62.81	N/A	310,053	163,840
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	55.50	58.74	56.00	14.10	104.89	50.64	73.34	N/A	320,053	179,240
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	54.51	52.23	53.47	16.88	97.68	37.28	64.89	N/A	236,326	126,358
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	52.85	56.54	52.69	9.25	107.30	50.56	69.88	N/A	402,673	212,156
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	40.68	44.29	43.83	19.18	101.04	34.39	57.80	N/A	207,130	90,791
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	71.52	74.41	71.93	11.68	103.45	55.15	109.17	67.87 to 76.50	244,012	175,525
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	58.72	63.51	58.02	24.54	109.45	38.22	137.32	49.53 to 72.41	254,501	147,673
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	52.85	53.62	52.52	15.64	102.09	34.39	73.34	40.68 to 64.89	301,519	158,359
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	71.18	73.67	68.69	17.07	107.24	40.74	137.32	65.86 to 75.15	272,272	187,027
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	54.47	56.74	54.91	17.10	103.33	37.28	88.38	50.64 to 62.83	265,583	145,841
____ALL____	_____										
	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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:	63	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	27.23	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.88	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	17.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.75 to 65.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.04	95% Mean C.I.:	61.55 to 70.42	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,205,040							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,984	PRD:	106.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:03

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
203	3	40.68	43.12	39.14	16.31	110.17	34.39	54.29	N/A	160,891	62,973
205	2	50.75	50.75	50.06	14.87	101.37	43.20	58.29	N/A	132,000	66,080
429	4	91.26	96.18	75.96	29.66	126.62	64.89	137.32	N/A	130,625	99,223
431	4	65.70	65.37	66.57	5.64	98.20	59.79	70.28	N/A	178,118	118,570
451	6	71.15	70.96	72.08	15.68	98.45	46.44	92.22	46.44 to 92.22	169,982	122,519
455	3	59.16	62.12	59.49	6.54	104.43	57.80	69.41	N/A	199,245	118,528
457	3	71.86	67.17	65.57	9.57	102.44	54.51	75.15	N/A	268,724	176,213
685	3	55.15	53.11	51.44	5.22	103.24	47.77	56.40	N/A	329,466	169,481
687	3	65.86	63.05	58.18	11.13	108.37	50.64	72.64	N/A	210,666	122,556
689	3	71.52	68.15	68.30	8.26	99.78	57.60	75.33	N/A	182,333	124,536
715	7	52.97	55.31	54.84	15.01	100.85	37.28	76.50	37.28 to 76.50	435,533	238,852
717	7	69.40	78.28	73.65	16.71	106.29	64.54	100.78	64.54 to 100.78	310,586	228,743
719	2	44.39	44.39	46.60	13.90	95.26	38.22	50.56	N/A	212,000	98,790
721	2	72.23	72.23	72.09	1.92	100.19	70.84	73.62	N/A	279,750	201,680
951	3	67.92	73.04	66.85	12.55	109.26	62.81	88.38	N/A	273,333	182,713
953	2	68.52	68.52	67.94	8.30	100.85	62.83	74.21	N/A	461,345	313,435
955	6	64.80	64.82	58.01	26.47	111.73	40.74	89.61	40.74 to 89.61	314,462	182,432
ALL											
	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	36	65.38	66.33	62.60	19.24	105.97	34.39	137.32	57.80 to 71.52	198,120	124,018
2	27	64.54	65.52	61.88	21.13	105.87	37.28	100.78	52.73 to 76.50	343,567	212,605
ALL											
	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984
ALL											
	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	63	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	27.23	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.88	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	17.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.75 to 65.64	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.04	95% Mean C.I.:	61.55 to 70.42	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,205,040							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,984	PRD:	106.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:03

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0008	17	59.79	65.90	59.15	19.95	111.41	46.44	137.32	54.29 to 69.88	198,543	117,435
14-0045	6	66.23	66.01	65.84	16.34	100.27	38.22	88.38	38.22 to 88.38	297,698	195,996
14-0054	18	63.42	64.79	60.46	23.00	107.17	37.28	100.78	50.79 to 76.86	332,044	200,753
14-0101	1	67.87	67.87	67.87			67.87	67.87	N/A	88,000	59,725
14-0541	7	67.66	68.93	64.85	14.08	106.29	51.20	98.72	51.20 to 98.72	302,631	196,265
26-0024	2	77.06	77.06	78.01	6.03	98.78	72.41	81.71	N/A	279,145	217,767
54-0096	10	61.59	62.55	58.92	26.52	106.17	34.39	109.17	40.68 to 75.15	194,622	114,662
54-0576	2	72.23	72.23	72.09	1.92	100.19	70.84	73.62	N/A	279,750	201,680
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	88.38	88.38	88.38			88.38	88.38	N/A	12,000	10,605
10.01 TO 30.00	2	55.28	55.28	47.83	26.41	115.58	40.68	69.88	N/A	46,347	22,167
30.01 TO 50.00	7	58.29	74.07	60.71	37.35	122.01	43.20	137.32	43.20 to 137.32	87,317	53,006
50.01 TO 100.00	22	66.87	64.89	61.55	21.49	105.43	34.39	98.72	50.56 to 76.86	168,191	103,522
100.01 TO 180.00	26	64.04	64.33	61.91	14.53	103.91	47.77	100.78	54.51 to 71.52	379,277	234,814
180.01 TO 330.00	4	66.41	64.41	62.48	8.25	103.08	52.97	71.86	N/A	448,798	280,430
330.01 TO 650.00	1	81.71	81.71	81.71			81.71	81.71	N/A	336,131	274,660
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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	21	65.86	69.35	62.87	20.49	110.31	40.74	137.32	55.15 to 76.50	266,247	167,387
DRY-N/A	21	64.54	64.18	61.16	21.96	104.95	34.39	100.78	52.97 to 73.34	215,914	132,046
GRASS	6	66.38	66.00	58.54	24.33	112.74	38.22	109.17	38.22 to 109.17	101,151	59,213
GRASS-N/A	1	81.71	81.71	81.71			81.71	81.71	N/A	336,131	274,660
IRRGTD	1	89.61	89.61	89.61			89.61	89.61	N/A	170,000	152,345
IRRGTD-N/A	13	59.16	60.42	60.63	11.80	99.66	47.77	74.21	50.64 to 67.92	397,709	241,126
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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:	63	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	27.23	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.88	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	17.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.75 to 65.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.04	95% Mean C.I.:	61.55 to 70.42	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,205,040							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,984	PRD:	106.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:03

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	30	63.31	65.12	60.81	20.16	107.08	34.39	137.32	55.15 to 70.84	258,694	157,322
DRY-N/A	12	72.53	70.88	66.33	17.85	106.86	37.28	100.78	52.97 to 88.38	197,045	130,703
GRASS	6	66.38	66.00	58.54	24.33	112.74	38.22	109.17	38.22 to 109.17	101,151	59,213
GRASS-N/A	1	81.71	81.71	81.71			81.71	81.71	N/A	336,131	274,660
IRRGTD	8	65.25	66.12	64.22	13.95	102.96	47.77	89.61	47.77 to 89.61	348,923	224,063
IRRGTD-N/A	6	55.27	57.69	58.63	11.54	98.39	50.56	67.92	50.56 to 67.92	424,806	249,080
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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	41	65.86	67.10	62.77	21.09	106.90	34.39	137.32	57.60 to 72.64	230,131	144,453
DRY-N/A	1	52.97	52.97	52.97			52.97	52.97	N/A	690,000	365,525
GRASS	7	67.87	68.24	66.80	23.31	102.16	38.22	109.17	38.22 to 109.17	134,719	89,991
IRRGTD	14	61.00	62.51	61.55	14.19	101.55	47.77	89.61	50.64 to 69.40	381,444	234,785
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	88.38	89.14	89.73	14.82	99.35	69.88	109.17	N/A	19,565	17,555
30000 TO 59999	2	103.37	103.37	97.84	32.85	105.65	69.41	137.32	N/A	43,000	42,070
60000 TO 99999	7	56.40	59.67	59.44	19.88	100.38	40.68	92.22	40.68 to 92.22	88,590	52,659
100000 TO 149999	7	65.86	64.61	63.72	23.21	101.39	38.22	98.72	38.22 to 98.72	127,944	81,530
150000 TO 249999	14	67.15	67.94	67.63	14.40	100.46	37.28	89.61	57.80 to 79.43	193,271	130,700
250000 TO 499999	20	68.38	65.20	64.87	16.48	100.50	34.39	100.78	55.15 to 73.34	322,489	209,208
500000 +	10	52.85	55.78	55.70	10.18	100.15	47.77	67.92	49.53 to 67.66	559,263	311,494
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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:	63	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	27.23	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.88	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	17.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.75 to 65.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.04	95% Mean C.I.:	61.55 to 70.42	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,205,040							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,984	PRD:	106.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:03

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	79.13	77.03	63.05	27.48	122.17	40.68	109.17	N/A	32,173	20,285
30000 TO 59999	8	58.10	66.22	58.22	29.92	113.73	38.22	137.32	38.22 to 137.32	86,704	50,483
60000 TO 99999	8	62.08	62.80	59.57	22.09	105.43	37.28	92.22	37.28 to 92.22	129,312	77,026
100000 TO 149999	13	64.00	65.33	61.39	19.90	106.41	34.39	98.72	50.56 to 79.43	211,584	129,901
150000 TO 249999	15	70.28	66.21	63.88	11.71	103.65	47.77	89.61	55.15 to 72.41	301,046	192,318
250000 TO 499999	15	64.54	64.95	62.18	16.61	104.45	49.53	100.78	52.73 to 74.21	485,702	302,022
ALL	63	64.89	65.98	62.19	20.09	106.10	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.88	260,454	161,984

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:	80	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	26.01	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.40	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,585,838	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	16.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 64.74	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,585,838	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.42	95% Mean C.I.:	61.54 to 68.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,906,380							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,322	COD:	19.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	173,829	PRD:	105.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:15

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>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	69.85	71.88	67.72	13.26	106.14	57.37	98.72	57.60 to 80.38	232,867	157,698	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	71.52	74.63	72.29	10.34	103.23	63.53	109.17	66.49 to 76.50	287,792	208,055	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	71.07	69.48	67.92	13.40	102.29	54.43	89.61	54.43 to 89.61	285,373	193,835	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	77.06	77.76	74.32	11.95	104.62	64.69	92.22	N/A	254,410	189,086	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	59.16	68.31	59.00	27.69	115.78	40.74	137.32	49.53 to 89.04	300,830	177,479	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	60.56	60.33	56.52	18.83	106.75	43.20	88.38	43.20 to 88.38	221,525	125,198	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	52.54	51.84	52.78	10.15	98.21	38.22	62.81	38.22 to 62.81	273,811	144,530	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	55.50	58.74	56.00	14.10	104.89	50.64	73.34	N/A	320,053	179,240	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	54.51	50.02	45.34	17.34	110.32	36.89	64.89	N/A	304,582	138,106	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	52.85	56.13	53.52	9.24	104.89	50.46	69.88	50.46 to 69.88	434,970	232,780	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	57.80	55.04	54.84	23.28	100.37	34.39	80.74	N/A	219,863	120,567	
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	33	70.84	72.86	70.26	11.86	103.69	54.43	109.17	67.87 to 75.33	270,708	190,210	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	27	59.16	63.68	59.14	22.81	107.69	38.22	137.32	50.79 to 64.69	264,451	156,386	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	20	53.74	54.85	52.32	16.88	104.85	34.39	80.74	50.56 to 60.19	325,613	170,350	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	36	70.56	72.54	68.28	16.37	106.23	40.74	137.32	64.69 to 75.15	286,939	195,933	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	54.42	55.60	52.69	16.77	105.52	36.89	88.38	50.51 to 62.81	270,356	142,446	
<u>ALL</u>												
	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829	

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:	80	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	26.01	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.40	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,585,838	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	16.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 64.74	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,585,838	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.42	95% Mean C.I.:	61.54 to 68.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,906,380							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,322	COD:	19.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	173,829	PRD:	105.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:15

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
203	3	40.68	43.12	39.14	16.31	110.17	34.39	54.29	N/A	160,891	62,973
205	2	50.75	50.75	50.06	14.87	101.37	43.20	58.29	N/A	132,000	66,080
429	4	91.26	96.18	75.96	29.66	126.62	64.89	137.32	N/A	130,625	99,223
431	4	65.70	65.37	66.57	5.64	98.20	59.79	70.28	N/A	178,118	118,570
435	1	57.37	57.37	57.50			57.37	57.37	N/A	574,353	330,235
451	6	71.15	70.96	72.08	15.68	98.45	46.44	92.22	46.44 to 92.22	169,982	122,519
453	1	56.53	56.53	59.40			56.53	56.53	N/A	47,359	28,130
455	3	59.16	62.12	59.49	6.54	104.43	57.80	69.41	N/A	199,245	118,528
457	4	73.51	70.57	68.32	10.04	103.28	54.51	80.74	N/A	242,225	165,492
683	1	57.43	57.43	57.87			57.43	57.43	N/A	823,665	476,655
685	5	55.15	54.87	52.58	5.37	104.37	47.77	60.62	N/A	257,997	135,651
687	5	64.69	60.87	60.07	11.55	101.32	50.51	72.64	N/A	221,090	132,815
689	3	71.52	68.15	68.30	8.26	99.78	57.60	75.33	N/A	182,333	124,536
715	7	52.97	55.31	54.84	15.01	100.85	37.28	76.50	37.28 to 76.50	435,533	238,852
717	8	68.53	76.02	71.42	16.49	106.44	60.19	100.78	60.19 to 100.78	326,457	233,162
719	4	60.42	58.94	64.45	24.09	91.46	38.22	76.71	N/A	304,725	196,383
721	4	72.23	70.40	70.31	5.78	100.12	61.60	75.53	N/A	275,275	193,552
951	3	67.92	73.04	66.85	12.55	109.26	62.81	88.38	N/A	273,333	182,713
953	3	62.83	62.50	61.37	12.60	101.85	50.46	74.21	N/A	494,755	303,611
955	9	60.83	63.96	55.44	28.32	115.38	36.89	89.61	40.74 to 89.04	371,687	206,056
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	46	63.31	65.38	62.35	18.27	104.87	34.39	137.32	57.60 to 70.28	218,632	136,306
2	34	64.27	65.10	60.95	21.07	106.81	36.89	100.78	52.97 to 74.21	368,492	224,596
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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	6	59.10	58.49	56.31	15.10	103.86	36.89	76.71	36.89 to 76.71	477,877	269,111
2	74	64.27	65.81	62.34	19.63	105.57	34.39	137.32	59.79 to 69.41	266,467	166,104
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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:	80	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	26.01	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.40	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,585,838	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	16.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 64.74	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,585,838	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.42	95% Mean C.I.:	61.54 to 68.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,906,380							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,322	COD:	19.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	173,829	PRD:	105.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:15

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0008	20	59.47	65.75	59.75	19.28	110.03	46.44	137.32	56.53 to 69.41	220,449	131,725
14-0045	8	66.23	64.60	63.39	16.00	101.91	38.22	88.38	38.22 to 88.38	343,320	217,631
14-0054	21	62.83	64.43	58.82	24.00	109.53	36.89	100.78	50.79 to 76.86	354,057	208,260
14-0101	2	62.62	62.62	58.87	8.38	106.36	57.37	67.87	N/A	331,176	194,980
14-0541	13	64.69	65.36	64.69	14.06	101.04	50.51	98.72	54.43 to 72.64	286,701	185,463
26-0024	2	77.06	77.06	78.01	6.03	98.78	72.41	81.71	N/A	279,145	217,767
54-0096	10	61.59	62.55	58.92	26.52	106.17	34.39	109.17	40.68 to 75.15	194,622	114,662
54-0576	4	72.23	70.40	70.31	5.78	100.12	61.60	75.53	N/A	275,275	193,552
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	88.38	88.38	88.38			88.38	88.38	N/A	12,000	10,605
10.01 TO 30.00	3	56.53	55.70	51.74	17.22	107.65	40.68	69.88	N/A	46,684	24,155
30.01 TO 50.00	9	58.29	69.95	59.72	30.98	117.13	43.20	137.32	50.51 to 109.17	85,451	51,033
50.01 TO 100.00	23	67.87	65.94	62.85	21.61	104.92	34.39	98.72	57.60 to 76.86	168,652	105,990
100.01 TO 180.00	36	63.31	63.45	60.95	14.56	104.11	36.89	100.78	55.15 to 70.28	391,490	238,600
180.01 TO 330.00	6	66.41	65.97	62.26	11.35	105.96	52.97	80.74	52.97 to 80.74	463,597	288,617
330.01 TO 650.00	1	81.71	81.71	81.71			81.71	81.71	N/A	336,131	274,660
650.01 +	1	57.37	57.37	57.50			57.37	57.37	N/A	574,353	330,235
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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	25	65.86	69.06	63.72	20.17	108.38	40.74	137.32	56.40 to 75.15	267,957	170,743
DRY-N/A	28	61.11	63.01	60.30	20.23	104.50	34.39	100.78	54.43 to 72.41	234,309	141,284
GRASS	7	67.87	68.11	63.49	23.11	107.28	38.22	109.17	38.22 to 109.17	109,947	69,801
GRASS-N/A	1	81.71	81.71	81.71			81.71	81.71	N/A	336,131	274,660
IRRGTD	1	89.61	89.61	89.61			89.61	89.61	N/A	170,000	152,345
IRRGTD-N/A	18	60.00	60.11	59.20	12.91	101.53	36.89	76.71	52.73 to 67.66	447,247	264,789
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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:	80	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	26.01	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.40	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,585,838	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	16.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 64.74	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,585,838	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.42	95% Mean C.I.:	61.54 to 68.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,906,380							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,322	COD:	19.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	173,829	PRD:	105.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:15

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	36	62.95	64.88	61.10	19.66	106.19	34.39	137.32	55.15 to 70.28	270,704	165,395
DRY-N/A	17	71.86	67.94	64.60	17.90	105.17	37.28	100.78	54.43 to 75.53	206,720	133,549
GRASS	7	67.87	68.11	63.49	23.11	107.28	38.22	109.17	38.22 to 109.17	109,947	69,801
GRASS-N/A	1	81.71	81.71	81.71			81.71	81.71	N/A	336,131	274,660
IRRGTD	12	63.76	64.00	60.80	15.23	105.28	36.89	89.61	58.29 to 74.21	403,995	245,617
IRRGTD-N/A	7	57.43	57.65	58.45	9.52	98.64	50.56	67.92	50.56 to 67.92	481,786	281,591
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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	50	64.27	66.52	62.92	20.52	105.71	34.39	137.32	59.79 to 71.86	235,178	147,985
DRY-N/A	3	54.43	54.92	54.99	2.69	99.87	52.97	57.37	N/A	500,234	275,098
GRASS	8	68.64	69.81	69.03	22.51	101.13	38.22	109.17	38.22 to 109.17	138,220	95,408
IRRGTD	19	60.83	61.66	59.83	14.56	103.06	36.89	89.61	52.73 to 67.92	432,655	258,871
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	88.38	89.14	89.73	14.82	99.35	69.88	109.17	N/A	19,565	17,555
30000 TO 59999	3	69.41	87.75	84.19	38.80	104.24	56.53	137.32	N/A	44,453	37,423
60000 TO 99999	9	56.40	58.76	58.73	17.45	100.05	40.68	92.22	46.44 to 67.87	86,441	50,763
100000 TO 149999	7	65.86	64.61	63.72	23.21	101.39	38.22	98.72	38.22 to 98.72	127,944	81,530
150000 TO 249999	18	70.91	69.49	69.13	14.68	100.52	37.28	89.61	62.81 to 79.43	195,004	134,814
250000 TO 499999	25	66.49	65.50	65.43	15.18	100.10	34.39	100.78	60.19 to 71.86	335,131	219,270
500000 +	15	52.97	54.72	54.41	11.21	100.57	36.89	67.92	50.46 to 60.83	588,789	320,361
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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:	80	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	26.01	95% Median C.I.:	59.16 to 69.40	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,585,838	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	16.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.40 to 64.74	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,585,838	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.42	95% Mean C.I.:	61.54 to 68.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,906,380							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	282,322	COD:	19.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.32			
AVG. Assessed Value:	173,829	PRD:	105.99	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:26:16

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	79.13	77.03	63.05	27.48	122.17	40.68	109.17	N/A	32,173	20,285
30000 TO 59999	11	56.53	63.40	57.88	23.99	109.53	38.22	137.32	46.44 to 69.41	81,711	47,295
60000 TO 99999	8	62.08	62.80	59.57	22.09	105.43	37.28	92.22	37.28 to 92.22	129,312	77,026
100000 TO 149999	15	64.00	65.63	61.96	19.99	105.92	34.39	98.72	54.43 to 79.43	209,978	130,105
150000 TO 249999	18	70.56	67.74	65.24	12.30	103.84	47.77	89.61	59.16 to 73.34	290,894	189,772
250000 TO 499999	24	61.83	62.88	60.32	16.14	104.25	36.89	100.78	52.97 to 67.92	505,751	305,053
ALL	80	63.77	65.26	61.57	19.48	105.99	34.39	137.32	59.16 to 69.40	282,322	173,829

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

Agricultural

Adjustments made to our ag-land for 2009 were as follows:

Market Area 1: Irrigated land was increased by 15%

Dry land was increased by 10%

Grass land was increased by 5%

Market Area 2: Irrigated land was increased by 10%

Dry land was increased by 10%

Grass land was increased by 5%

These adjustments brought our level of value within the acceptable range. The new values that were set also show that our county is fairly comparable with our adjoining counties.

2009 Assessment Survey for Cedar County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor/Part Time Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor/Part Time Staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By Statutes, Regulations and soil capability and market
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?
	NA
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	NA
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	8/95, Converted the new soil numbers but haven't counted the acres
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	1998
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection and FSA
b.	By whom?
	Staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	All
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	2
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Market area and soil types
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.

12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	NA
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
85			85

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:	63	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.84	95% Median C.I.:	66.95 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	19.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 72.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.89	95% Mean C.I.:	67.48 to 77.06	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,223,245							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	178,146	PRD:	105.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:48

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	8	80.91	81.68	82.06	13.04	99.54	63.33	108.57	63.33 to 108.57	155,160	127,325	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	16	78.35	81.46	78.92	9.91	103.23	69.94	114.33	73.11 to 82.74	281,022	221,779	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	77.93	79.12	74.48	16.25	106.24	60.72	98.71	N/A	283,564	211,186	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	87.70	89.09	86.22	8.30	103.33	78.86	100.71	N/A	212,263	183,018	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	65.01	75.27	62.34	32.99	120.73	44.80	151.03	44.80 to 151.03	273,295	170,384	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	68.07	66.38	62.86	17.13	105.59	48.36	94.92	48.36 to 94.92	221,525	139,260	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	59.55	56.89	57.94	11.09	98.20	40.09	69.13	N/A	310,053	179,640	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	61.37	64.84	61.92	13.22	104.71	56.31	80.30	N/A	320,053	198,188	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	60.02	56.24	57.76	15.23	97.37	40.64	68.06	N/A	236,326	136,493	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	58.00	62.06	57.86	8.94	107.26	55.78	76.47	N/A	402,673	232,980	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	44.64	49.43	49.05	20.79	100.77	37.91	65.75	N/A	207,130	101,605	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	77.94	81.27	78.94	11.72	102.95	60.72	114.33	73.11 to 84.12	244,012	192,616	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	67.44	69.74	64.00	23.12	108.97	40.09	151.03	54.78 to 78.77	254,501	162,892	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	58.00	58.90	57.78	15.25	101.94	37.91	80.30	44.64 to 68.06	301,519	174,212	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	77.94	80.70	75.47	16.40	106.94	44.80	151.03	72.50 to 81.74	272,272	205,478	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	59.93	62.18	60.52	16.76	102.74	40.09	94.92	55.86 to 69.13	265,583	160,725	
____ALL____	_____											
	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146	

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:	63	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.84	95% Median C.I.:	66.95 to 76.47	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	19.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 72.11	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.89	95% Mean C.I.:	67.48 to 77.06	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,223,245							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	178,146	PRD:	105.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:48

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
203	3	44.64	47.37	43.06	16.16	110.00	37.91	59.55	N/A		160,891	69,280
205	2	57.66	57.66	56.81	16.12	101.48	48.36	66.95	N/A		132,000	74,992
429	4	97.32	103.43	81.76	30.06	126.51	68.06	151.03	N/A		130,625	106,795
431	4	70.58	71.02	72.79	4.60	97.56	65.60	77.30	N/A		178,118	129,653
451	6	77.66	76.97	78.08	15.61	98.57	48.79	100.71	48.79 to 100.71		169,982	132,730
455	3	67.92	68.77	67.47	3.39	101.93	65.75	72.65	N/A		199,245	134,438
457	3	77.93	73.56	71.75	9.72	102.53	60.02	82.74	N/A		268,724	192,808
685	3	60.72	59.20	57.77	4.02	102.47	54.78	62.10	N/A		329,466	190,343
687	3	72.50	69.47	64.64	9.94	107.47	57.14	78.77	N/A		210,666	136,173
689	3	78.75	74.61	74.95	7.79	99.54	63.33	81.74	N/A		182,333	136,658
715	7	57.97	60.75	60.23	15.20	100.86	40.64	84.12	40.64 to 84.12		435,533	262,330
717	7	76.39	86.04	80.97	16.53	106.26	71.20	110.10	71.20 to 110.10		310,586	251,478
719	2	47.94	47.94	50.75	16.37	94.46	40.09	55.78	N/A		212,000	107,585
721	2	79.13	79.13	79.01	1.50	100.16	77.94	80.32	N/A		279,750	221,022
951	3	74.80	79.62	73.57	11.49	108.22	69.13	94.92	N/A		273,333	201,098
953	2	75.44	75.44	74.80	8.30	100.86	69.18	81.70	N/A		461,345	345,072
955	6	71.28	71.33	63.85	26.48	111.72	44.80	98.71	44.80 to 98.71		314,462	200,777
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47		260,454	178,146

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	36	70.58	72.56	68.89	18.51	105.33	37.91	151.03	65.60 to 77.94		198,120	136,480
2	27	71.20	71.89	68.02	21.04	105.69	40.09	110.10	57.97 to 84.12		343,567	233,701
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47		260,454	178,146

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47		260,454	178,146
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47		260,454	178,146

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:	63	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.84	95% Median C.I.:	66.95 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	19.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 72.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.89	95% Mean C.I.:	67.48 to 77.06	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,223,245							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	178,146	PRD:	105.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:48

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0008	17	67.92	72.56	65.83	18.55	110.22	48.79	151.03	59.55 to 76.47	198,543	130,697
14-0045	6	73.00	71.97	72.35	16.21	99.47	40.09	94.92	40.09 to 94.92	297,698	215,398
14-0054	18	69.85	71.16	66.44	22.88	107.12	40.64	110.10	55.86 to 84.53	332,044	220,599
14-0101	1	71.22	71.22	71.22			71.22	71.22	N/A	88,000	62,670
14-0541	7	74.43	75.67	71.27	13.86	106.16	56.31	108.57	56.31 to 108.57	302,631	215,700
26-0024	2	83.28	83.28	84.19	5.31	98.92	78.86	87.70	N/A	279,145	235,000
54-0096	10	67.51	68.12	64.41	24.51	105.76	37.91	114.33	44.64 to 82.74	194,622	125,360
54-0576	2	79.13	79.13	79.01	1.50	100.16	77.94	80.32	N/A	279,750	221,022
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	94.92	94.92	94.92			94.92	94.92	N/A	12,000	11,390
10.01 TO 30.00	2	60.56	60.56	52.43	26.28	115.50	44.64	76.47	N/A	46,347	24,300
30.01 TO 50.00	7	65.60	81.13	67.26	35.34	120.62	48.36	151.03	48.36 to 151.03	87,317	58,730
50.01 TO 100.00	22	71.86	70.84	67.52	21.66	104.91	37.91	108.57	55.78 to 84.53	168,191	113,557
100.01 TO 180.00	26	70.57	70.94	68.32	14.02	103.84	54.55	110.10	60.02 to 78.75	379,277	259,121
180.01 TO 330.00	4	71.43	69.69	68.07	9.34	102.39	57.97	77.93	N/A	448,798	305,476
330.01 TO 650.00	1	87.70	87.70	87.70			87.70	87.70	N/A	336,131	294,800
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

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	21	72.50	76.31	69.17	20.47	110.32	44.80	151.03	60.72 to 84.12	266,247	184,171
DRY-N/A	21	71.20	70.15	66.97	21.29	104.76	37.91	110.10	57.97 to 80.30	215,914	144,589
GRASS	6	69.64	69.19	61.40	24.23	112.69	40.09	114.33	40.09 to 114.33	101,151	62,104
GRASS-N/A	1	87.70	87.70	87.70			87.70	87.70	N/A	336,131	294,800
IRRGTD	1	98.71	98.71	98.71			98.71	98.71	N/A	170,000	167,805
IRRGTD-N/A	13	67.92	67.38	67.39	10.33	99.99	54.78	81.70	57.14 to 74.80	397,709	268,003
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

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:	63	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.84	95% Median C.I.:	66.95 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	19.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 72.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.89	95% Mean C.I.:	67.48 to 77.06	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,223,245							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	178,146	PRD:	105.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:48

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	30	69.62	71.63	66.90	20.19	107.06	37.91	151.03	60.72 to 77.94	258,694	173,078
DRY-N/A	12	78.82	77.23	72.39	17.61	106.69	40.64	110.10	57.97 to 94.92	197,045	142,635
GRASS	6	69.64	69.19	61.40	24.23	112.69	40.09	114.33	40.09 to 114.33	101,151	62,104
GRASS-N/A	1	87.70	87.70	87.70			87.70	87.70	N/A	336,131	294,800
IRRGTD	8	71.81	73.76	71.53	12.60	103.12	54.78	98.71	54.78 to 98.71	348,923	249,573
IRRGTD-N/A	6	61.89	64.10	64.94	11.51	98.70	55.78	74.80	55.78 to 74.80	424,806	275,875
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

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	41	72.50	73.60	68.93	20.74	106.78	37.91	151.03	63.33 to 78.86	230,131	158,633
DRY-N/A	1	57.97	57.97	57.97			57.97	57.97	N/A	690,000	400,015
GRASS	7	71.22	71.83	70.77	23.62	101.50	40.09	114.33	40.09 to 114.33	134,719	95,346
IRRGTD	14	68.55	69.62	68.38	12.71	101.81	54.78	98.71	57.14 to 76.39	381,444	260,846
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	94.92	95.24	95.72	13.30	99.49	76.47	114.33	N/A	19,565	18,728
30000 TO 59999	2	111.84	111.84	105.46	35.04	106.05	72.65	151.03	N/A	43,000	45,347
60000 TO 99999	7	62.10	64.66	64.39	19.45	100.41	44.64	100.71	44.64 to 100.71	88,590	57,047
100000 TO 149999	7	72.50	71.00	70.04	22.40	101.36	40.09	108.57	40.09 to 108.57	127,944	89,617
150000 TO 249999	14	73.46	74.60	74.26	14.56	100.46	40.64	98.71	65.75 to 87.39	193,271	143,518
250000 TO 499999	20	75.21	71.70	71.38	15.84	100.46	37.91	110.10	60.72 to 80.30	322,489	230,178
500000 +	10	58.00	61.57	61.45	9.79	100.20	54.55	74.80	54.78 to 74.43	559,263	343,688
ALL	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

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:	63	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	26.84	95% Median C.I.:	66.95 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,408,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	19.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 72.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,408,657	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.89	95% Mean C.I.:	67.48 to 77.06	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,223,245							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	260,454	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	178,146	PRD:	105.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:21:48

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
Total \$ _____											
10000 TO 29999	3	94.92	95.24	95.72	13.30	99.49	76.47	114.33	N/A	19,565	18,728
30000 TO 59999	6	54.17	69.46	57.93	46.06	119.90	40.09	151.03	40.09 to 151.03	80,255	46,493
60000 TO 99999	10	66.28	67.94	64.87	18.01	104.74	40.64	100.71	48.36 to 81.74	116,860	75,802
100000 TO 149999	10	71.51	72.80	67.86	20.36	107.28	37.91	108.57	44.80 to 88.45	198,435	134,657
150000 TO 249999	18	76.85	73.31	71.76	11.23	102.16	55.78	98.71	65.75 to 78.86	273,146	196,018
250000 TO 499999	16	70.19	70.23	67.38	16.98	104.22	54.55	110.10	56.31 to 81.70	487,426	328,447
ALL _____											
	63	71.20	72.27	68.40	19.51	105.67	37.91	151.03	66.95 to 76.47	260,454	178,146

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:	79	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	25.67	95% Median C.I.:	66.45 to 74.80	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,582,414	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	18.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.54 to 71.24	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,582,414	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	67.77 to 75.90	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,331,075							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	285,853	COD:	19.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,064	PRD:	105.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:22:04

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											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	74.97	78.14	73.51	14.82	106.30	61.00	108.57	63.33 to 88.45	233,694	171,788
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	78.75	81.64	79.37	9.70	102.86	69.94	114.33	73.11 to 84.12	288,021	228,604
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	77.62	78.30	75.90	15.58	103.17	60.60	98.71	60.60 to 98.71	286,448	217,416
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	83.28	85.32	81.62	10.67	104.52	73.99	100.71	N/A	255,197	208,297
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	66.45	75.71	65.74	26.96	115.17	44.80	151.03	54.55 to 97.95	301,801	198,402
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	68.07	66.38	62.86	17.13	105.59	48.36	94.92	48.36 to 94.92	221,525	139,260
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	57.71	56.67	57.80	10.69	98.05	40.09	69.13	40.09 to 69.13	274,211	158,499
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	61.37	64.84	61.92	13.22	104.71	56.31	80.30	N/A	320,053	198,188
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	52.28	53.32	50.88	20.51	104.78	40.64	68.06	N/A	369,244	187,890
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	58.00	61.69	58.79	9.01	104.93	55.64	76.47	55.64 to 76.47	435,370	255,949
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	65.75	59.82	59.51	20.76	100.51	37.91	83.19	N/A	221,303	131,706
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	33	77.93	79.97	77.17	12.27	103.63	60.60	114.33	73.11 to 82.74	271,272	209,353
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	27	66.95	70.14	65.47	21.82	107.13	40.09	151.03	55.86 to 73.99	264,980	173,477
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	58.02	60.10	57.73	16.57	104.10	37.91	83.19	55.64 to 67.61	340,838	196,765
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	36	77.62	80.01	75.44	15.99	106.06	44.80	151.03	72.50 to 81.74	287,557	216,932
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	59.70	61.08	58.45	16.78	104.49	40.09	94.92	54.78 to 69.13	280,666	164,063
<u>ALL</u>											
	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

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:	79	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	25.67	95% Median C.I.:	66.45 to 74.80	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,582,414	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	18.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.54 to 71.24	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,582,414	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	67.77 to 75.90	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,331,075							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	285,853	COD:	19.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,064	PRD:	105.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:22:04

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
203	3	44.64	47.37	43.06	16.16	110.00	37.91	59.55	N/A	160,891	69,280
205	2	57.66	57.66	56.81	16.12	101.48	48.36	66.95	N/A	132,000	74,992
429	4	97.32	103.43	81.76	30.06	126.51	68.06	151.03	N/A	130,625	106,795
431	4	70.58	71.02	72.79	4.60	97.56	65.60	77.30	N/A	178,118	129,653
435	1	61.00	61.00	61.00			61.00	61.00	N/A	575,663	351,175
451	6	77.66	76.97	78.08	15.61	98.57	48.79	100.71	48.79 to 100.71	169,982	132,730
455	3	67.92	68.77	67.47	3.39	101.93	65.75	72.65	N/A	199,245	134,438
457	4	80.34	75.97	73.69	8.71	103.09	60.02	83.19	N/A	242,825	178,948
683	1	65.40	65.40	65.40			65.40	65.40	N/A	830,000	542,850
685	5	60.72	60.93	58.74	4.34	103.73	54.78	66.45	N/A	258,567	151,883
687	5	72.50	67.59	67.10	11.05	100.74	55.57	78.77	N/A	222,200	149,090
689	3	78.75	74.61	74.95	7.79	99.54	63.33	81.74	N/A	182,333	136,658
715	7	57.97	60.75	60.23	15.20	100.86	40.64	84.12	40.64 to 84.12	435,533	262,330
717	8	75.41	83.56	78.50	16.33	106.45	66.25	110.10	66.25 to 110.10	326,607	256,375
719	4	66.55	64.41	70.44	24.75	91.44	40.09	84.45	N/A	306,000	215,547
721	4	79.13	80.11	78.94	9.27	101.48	67.61	94.56	N/A	277,375	218,967
951	3	74.80	79.62	73.57	11.49	108.22	69.13	94.92	N/A	273,333	201,098
953	3	69.18	68.84	67.54	12.56	101.93	55.64	81.70	N/A	495,155	334,423
955	9	66.94	70.83	61.74	27.66	114.72	44.54	98.71	44.80 to 97.95	372,753	230,129
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	45	69.29	72.01	68.79	17.79	104.69	37.91	151.03	65.60 to 77.30	223,035	153,418
2	34	70.86	71.59	67.17	20.84	106.58	40.09	110.10	58.02 to 81.70	368,995	247,859
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	6	63.97	65.25	62.64	15.43	104.18	44.54	84.45	44.54 to 84.45	480,943	301,254
2	73	70.52	72.37	68.66	19.28	105.41	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 76.47	269,818	185,254
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	79	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	25.67	95% Median C.I.:	66.45 to 74.80	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,582,414	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	18.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.54 to 71.24	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,582,414	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	67.77 to 75.90	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,331,075							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	285,853	COD:	19.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,064	PRD:	105.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:22:04

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0008	19	67.92	72.74	66.40	17.98	109.54	48.79	151.03	60.72 to 76.47	230,019	152,740
14-0045	8	73.00	70.60	69.65	15.87	101.36	40.09	94.92	40.09 to 94.92	343,620	239,342
14-0054	21	69.18	70.97	64.98	23.63	109.23	40.64	110.10	55.86 to 84.53	354,514	230,346
14-0101	2	66.11	66.11	62.36	7.73	106.02	61.00	71.22	N/A	331,831	206,922
14-0541	13	73.11	72.08	71.21	13.61	101.22	55.57	108.57	60.60 to 78.77	287,739	204,897
26-0024	2	83.28	83.28	84.19	5.31	98.92	78.86	87.70	N/A	279,145	235,000
54-0096	10	67.51	68.12	64.41	24.51	105.76	37.91	114.33	44.64 to 82.74	194,622	125,360
54-0576	4	79.13	80.11	78.94	9.27	101.48	67.61	94.56	N/A	277,375	218,967
54-0586											
90-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	94.92	94.92	94.92			94.92	94.92	N/A	12,000	11,390
10.01 TO 30.00	2	60.56	60.56	52.43	26.28	115.50	44.64	76.47	N/A	46,347	24,300
30.01 TO 50.00	9	65.60	76.66	65.75	29.33	116.59	48.36	151.03	55.57 to 114.33	85,851	56,451
50.01 TO 100.00	23	72.50	72.01	68.93	22.06	104.48	37.91	108.57	63.33 to 84.53	168,704	116,286
100.01 TO 180.00	36	69.62	70.45	67.55	14.60	104.29	44.54	110.10	60.72 to 77.31	392,298	265,009
180.01 TO 330.00	6	71.43	71.23	68.17	10.38	104.48	57.97	83.19	57.97 to 83.19	465,053	317,020
330.01 TO 650.00	1	87.70	87.70	87.70			87.70	87.70	N/A	336,131	294,800
650.01 +	1	61.00	61.00	61.00			61.00	61.00	N/A	575,663	351,175
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

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	25	72.50	75.99	70.05	20.14	108.48	44.80	151.03	62.10 to 82.74	268,197	187,863
DRY-N/A	27	67.61	69.59	66.23	20.76	105.08	37.91	110.10	59.55 to 78.86	241,743	160,106
GRASS	7	71.22	71.19	66.06	22.71	107.77	40.09	114.33	40.09 to 114.33	110,290	72,856
GRASS-N/A	1	87.70	87.70	87.70			87.70	87.70	N/A	336,131	294,800
IRRGTD	1	98.71	98.71	98.71			98.71	98.71	N/A	170,000	167,805
IRRGTD-N/A	18	67.44	67.29	66.14	11.59	101.74	44.54	84.45	58.02 to 74.43	448,456	296,611
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	79	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	25.67	95% Median C.I.:	66.45 to 74.80	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,582,414	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	18.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.54 to 71.24	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,582,414	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	67.77 to 75.90	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,331,075							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	285,853	COD:	19.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,064	PRD:	105.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:22:04

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	36	69.21	71.37	67.14	19.68	106.30	37.91	151.03	60.72 to 77.31	271,038	181,966
DRY-N/A	16	78.35	75.59	71.05	18.39	106.39	40.64	110.10	60.60 to 94.56	217,165	154,291
GRASS	7	71.22	71.19	66.06	22.71	107.77	40.09	114.33	40.09 to 114.33	110,290	72,856
GRASS-N/A	1	87.70	87.70	87.70			87.70	87.70	N/A	336,131	294,800
IRRGTD	12	71.59	71.67	68.03	13.89	105.34	44.54	98.71	66.94 to 81.70	405,282	275,725
IRRGTD-N/A	7	65.40	64.29	65.06	9.33	98.82	55.78	74.80	55.78 to 74.80	482,691	314,015
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

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	49	71.20	73.45	69.27	20.60	106.04	37.91	151.03	66.25 to 78.75	239,354	165,796
DRY-N/A	3	60.60	59.86	59.55	1.67	100.52	57.97	61.00	N/A	501,221	298,475
GRASS	8	71.94	73.25	72.62	22.54	100.87	40.09	114.33	40.09 to 114.33	138,520	100,599
IRRGTD	19	67.92	68.95	66.81	13.29	103.19	44.54	98.71	58.02 to 74.80	433,801	289,832
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	94.92	95.24	95.72	13.30	99.49	76.47	114.33	N/A	19,565	18,728
30000 TO 59999	2	111.84	111.84	105.46	35.04	106.05	72.65	151.03	N/A	43,000	45,347
60000 TO 99999	9	62.10	63.85	63.50	17.07	100.55	44.64	100.71	48.79 to 71.22	86,841	55,141
100000 TO 149999	7	72.50	71.00	70.04	22.40	101.36	40.09	108.57	40.09 to 108.57	127,944	89,617
150000 TO 249999	18	77.63	76.71	76.29	15.17	100.54	40.64	98.71	68.06 to 87.39	195,496	149,148
250000 TO 499999	25	73.99	72.15	71.99	14.39	100.22	37.91	110.10	67.61 to 78.75	335,701	241,668
500000 +	15	58.02	60.62	60.28	10.56	100.56	44.54	74.80	55.64 to 66.94	589,938	355,614
ALL	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

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:	79	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	25.67	95% Median C.I.:	66.45 to 74.80	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,582,414	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	18.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.54 to 71.24	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,582,414	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	67.77 to 75.90	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,331,075							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	285,853	COD:	19.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	151.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,064	PRD:	105.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:22:04

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	3	94.92	95.24	95.72	13.30	99.49	76.47	114.33	N/A	19,565	18,728
30000 TO 59999	9	59.55	67.15	59.38	31.09	113.08	40.09	151.03	44.64 to 72.65	81,996	48,691
60000 TO 99999	9	66.95	68.20	64.80	19.59	105.25	40.64	100.71	48.36 to 81.74	119,288	77,300
100000 TO 149999	12	71.51	72.65	68.20	19.60	106.53	37.91	108.57	60.60 to 84.53	198,957	135,681
150000 TO 249999	21	77.30	75.23	73.29	12.50	102.64	55.78	98.71	67.61 to 80.30	268,887	197,070
250000 TO 499999	24	68.06	68.91	66.10	16.55	104.25	44.54	110.10	57.97 to 74.80	493,667	326,310
500000 +	1	65.40	65.40	65.40			65.40	65.40	N/A	830,000	542,850
_____ALL_____	_____										
	79	69.94	71.83	67.89	19.16	105.81	37.91	151.03	66.45 to 74.80	285,853	194,064

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:

The county reported that after an analysis of the agricultural sales file the county increased land values in both market areas for the 2009 assessment year. In market area 1, irrigation was increased 15%, dry land increase 10% and grass land increased 5%. In market area 2, irrigation was not increased, dry land was increased 10% and grass land was increased 5%. The adjustments achieved the level of value. The county also feels that the land valuations are comparable to the surrounding counties.

It is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the median level of value, as supported with the trended preliminary statistics, the quality of assessment is all within the acceptable level for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	163	63	38.65
2008	178	95	53.37
2007	183	95	51.91
2006	191	86	45.03
2005	163	72	44.17

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Review of the non qualified sales, the typical reasons for the transaction not being an arm's length sale included parcels that were substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures. There is no reason to believe that the county has unreasonably trimmed the residential sales. The personal knowledge of the assessor, staff and communication with the local realtor's assists the county in the determination of the qualification of the sale transaction.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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	65	10.52	72	71
2008	65.04	8.96	71	70.28
2007	70	0.12	70	70
2006	71	10.01	78	79
2005	66	14.91	75	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary ratio is relatively close to the R & O median ratio. There is no information available to suggest that the median is not the best representation of the level of value for the agricultural class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
9.43	2009	10.52
9.99	2008	8.96
0.00	2007	0.12
10.06	2006	10.01
14.21	2005	14.91

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is less than one percentage point and supports the assessment practices of the unsold and sold properties.

2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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 Cedar County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71	68	72

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The measures of central tendency are all within the acceptable range with the exception of the weighted mean. The median is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	19.51	105.67
Difference	0.00	2.67

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range and the price related differential is slightly outside of the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Cedar 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	63	63	0
Median	65	71	6
Wgt. Mean	62	68	6
Mean	66	72	6
COD	20.09	19.51	-0.58
PRD	106.10	105.67	-0.43
Minimum	34.39	37.91	3.52
Maximum	137.32	151.03	13.71

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is a reflection of the assessment actions implemented for the 2009 assessment year. The county had increased values based on land use to achieve the acceptable level.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 7,944

Value : 973,955,628

Growth 7,660,072

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	284	1,049,605	0	0	68	371,335	352	1,420,940	
02. Res Improve Land	2,069	9,774,209	0	0	496	7,019,790	2,565	16,793,999	
03. Res Improvements	2,083	97,947,455	0	0	555	38,225,410	2,638	136,172,865	
04. Res Total	2,367	108,771,269	0	0	623	45,616,535	2,990	154,387,804	2,660,572
% of Res Total	79.16	70.45	0.00	0.00	20.84	29.55	37.64	15.85	34.73
05. Com UnImp Land	61	272,455	0	0	20	144,155	81	416,610	
06. Com Improve Land	444	1,675,465	0	0	83	1,455,085	527	3,130,550	
07. Com Improvements	456	22,234,845	0	0	92	8,784,330	548	31,019,175	
08. Com Total	517	24,182,765	0	0	112	10,383,570	629	34,566,335	1,468,360
% of Com Total	82.19	69.96	0.00	0.00	17.81	30.04	7.92	3.55	19.17
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	2	7,200	2	7,200	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	3	57,755	3	57,755	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	3	1,955,180	3	1,955,180	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	5	2,020,135	5	2,020,135	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.06	0.21	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	31	452,820	31	452,820	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	87	1,233,910	87	1,233,910	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	204	2,182,725	204	2,182,725	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	235	3,869,455	235	3,869,455	69,100
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	2.96	0.40	0.90
Res & Rec Total	2,367	108,771,269	0	0	858	49,485,990	3,225	158,257,259	2,729,672
% of Res & Rec Total	73.40	68.73	0.00	0.00	26.60	31.27	40.60	16.25	35.64
Com & Ind Total	517	24,182,765	0	0	117	12,403,705	634	36,586,470	1,468,360
% of Com & Ind Total	81.55	66.10	0.00	0.00	18.45	33.90	7.98	3.76	19.17
17. Taxable Total	2,884	132,954,034	0	0	975	61,889,695	3,859	194,843,729	4,198,032
% of Taxable Total	74.73	68.24	0.00	0.00	25.27	31.76	48.58	20.01	54.80

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	4	60,580	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		4	60,580	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					4	60,580	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	241	0	96	337

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	2,405	344,065,420	2,405	344,065,420
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,969	336,899,635	1,969	336,899,635
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,680	98,146,844	1,680	98,146,844
30. Ag Total							4,085	779,111,899

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban				SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total								
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total								
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
	Rural				Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,094	1,111.87	13,892,375		1,094	1,111.87	13,892,375	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,082	0.00	67,125,420		1,082	0.00	67,125,420	1,841,375
34. HomeSite Total					1,082	1,111.87	81,017,795	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	84	222.07	277,605		84	222.07	277,605	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,741	9,053.94	11,336,410		1,741	9,053.94	11,336,410	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,582	0.00	31,021,424		1,582	0.00	31,021,424	1,620,665
38. FarmSite Total					1,666	9,276.01	42,635,439	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,973.68	0		0	8,973.68	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI					2,748	19,361.56	123,653,234	3,462,040

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	4	379.60	91,430	4	379.60	91,430

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	5,030.78	9.76%	11,466,820	11.24%	2,279.33
46. 1A	6,265.30	12.15%	14,052,050	13.78%	2,242.84
47. 2A1	6,067.03	11.77%	13,192,450	12.93%	2,174.45
48. 2A	4,656.91	9.03%	9,899,485	9.71%	2,125.76
49. 3A1	7,697.36	14.93%	15,243,445	14.95%	1,980.35
50. 3A	6,274.13	12.17%	11,762,490	11.53%	1,874.76
51. 4A1	13,796.16	26.76%	23,628,265	23.17%	1,712.67
52. 4A	1,767.81	3.43%	2,748,955	2.70%	1,555.01
53. Total	51,555.48	100.00%	101,993,960	100.00%	1,978.33
Dry					
54. 1D1	10,560.79	6.41%	17,571,300	7.46%	1,663.82
55. 1D	23,628.94	14.34%	38,477,720	16.34%	1,628.41
56. 2D1	10,694.98	6.49%	17,159,910	7.29%	1,604.48
57. 2D	15,592.80	9.46%	24,486,575	10.40%	1,570.38
58. 3D1	23,395.48	14.20%	35,900,120	15.25%	1,534.49
59. 3D	20,483.10	12.43%	29,959,065	12.72%	1,462.62
60. 4D1	50,008.27	30.35%	61,617,565	26.17%	1,232.15
61. 4D	10,404.00	6.31%	10,298,060	4.37%	989.82
62. Total	164,768.36	100.00%	235,470,315	100.00%	1,429.10
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,348.64	0.00%	1,145,580	1.95%	849.43
64. 1G	7,046.25	7.54%	6,011,405	10.25%	853.14
65. 2G1	2,882.92	3.08%	2,113,840	3.60%	733.23
66. 2G	6,268.26	6.70%	4,866,950	8.30%	776.44
67. 3G1	6,554.70	7.01%	4,769,060	8.13%	727.58
68. 3G	6,862.44	7.34%	5,048,955	8.61%	735.74
69. 4G1	28,634.32	30.63%	18,551,750	31.62%	647.89
70. 4G	33,894.68	36.25%	16,157,980	27.54%	476.71
71. Total	93,492.21	100.00%	58,665,520	100.00%	627.49
Irrigated Total	51,555.48	16.42%	101,993,960	25.69%	1,978.33
Dry Total	164,768.36	52.48%	235,470,315	59.30%	1,429.10
Grass Total	93,492.21	29.78%	58,665,520	14.77%	627.49
Waste	4,139.91	1.32%	954,220	0.24%	230.49
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	8.01	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	313,955.96	100.00%	397,084,015	100.00%	1,264.78

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,483.69	3.16%	3,767,495	3.55%	2,539.27
46. 1A	5,861.70	12.50%	14,445,865	13.62%	2,464.45
47. 2A1	4,420.49	9.43%	10,696,915	10.09%	2,419.85
48. 2A	968.27	2.07%	2,322,405	2.19%	2,398.51
49. 3A1	7,820.00	16.68%	18,311,775	17.26%	2,341.66
50. 3A	13,654.25	29.12%	30,443,100	28.70%	2,229.57
51. 4A1	12,462.78	26.58%	25,721,940	24.25%	2,063.90
52. 4A	217.40	0.46%	355,455	0.34%	1,635.03
53. Total	46,888.58	100.00%	106,064,950	100.00%	2,262.06
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,778.86	2.40%	3,982,835	2.70%	2,238.98
55. 1D	9,648.67	13.00%	21,307,970	14.45%	2,208.38
56. 2D1	8,151.78	10.98%	17,484,345	11.86%	2,144.85
57. 2D	2,804.25	3.78%	5,874,260	3.98%	2,094.77
58. 3D1	14,030.91	18.90%	28,713,850	19.48%	2,046.47
59. 3D	20,472.49	27.58%	40,295,025	27.33%	1,968.25
60. 4D1	17,064.21	22.99%	29,411,725	19.95%	1,723.59
61. 4D	269.76	0.36%	353,390	0.24%	1,310.02
62. Total	74,220.93	100.00%	147,423,400	100.00%	1,986.28
Grass					
63. 1G1	72.37	0.00%	63,795	1.37%	881.51
64. 1G	646.46	10.31%	566,695	12.13%	876.61
65. 2G1	984.24	15.70%	786,990	16.84%	799.59
66. 2G	591.65	9.44%	470,365	10.07%	795.01
67. 3G1	711.80	11.35%	535,320	11.46%	752.07
68. 3G	1,277.15	20.37%	934,170	19.99%	731.45
69. 4G1	1,623.19	25.89%	1,098,315	23.51%	676.64
70. 4G	363.08	5.79%	216,370	4.63%	595.93
71. Total	6,269.94	100.00%	4,672,020	100.00%	745.15
Irrigated Total	46,888.58	36.53%	106,064,950	41.05%	2,262.06
Dry Total	74,220.93	57.83%	147,423,400	57.06%	1,986.28
Grass Total	6,269.94	4.89%	4,672,020	1.81%	745.15
Waste	961.57	0.75%	218,030	0.08%	226.74
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	128,341.02	100.00%	258,378,400	100.00%	2,013.22

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	98,444.06	208,058,910	98,444.06	208,058,910
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	238,989.29	382,893,715	238,989.29	382,893,715
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	99,762.15	63,337,540	99,762.15	63,337,540
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,101.48	1,172,250	5,101.48	1,172,250
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	8.01	0	8.01	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	442,296.98	655,462,415	442,296.98	655,462,415

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	98,444.06	22.26%	208,058,910	31.74%	2,113.47
Dry Land	238,989.29	54.03%	382,893,715	58.42%	1,602.14
Grass	99,762.15	22.56%	63,337,540	9.66%	634.89
Waste	5,101.48	1.15%	1,172,250	0.18%	229.79
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	8.01	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	442,296.98	100.00%	655,462,415	100.00%	1,481.95

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

14 Cedar

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	147,390,159	154,387,804	6,997,645	4.75%	2,660,572	2.94%
02. Recreational	3,799,225	3,869,455	70,230	1.85%	69,100	0.03%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	73,773,855	81,017,795	7,243,940	9.82%	1,841,375	7.32%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	224,963,239	239,275,054	14,311,815	6.36%	4,571,047	4.33%
05. Commercial	32,845,505	34,566,335	1,720,830	5.24%	1,468,360	0.77%
06. Industrial	2,020,135	2,020,135	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	40,664,034	42,635,439	1,971,405	4.85%	1,620,665	0.86%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	75,529,674	79,221,909	3,692,235	4.89%	3,089,025	0.80%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	300,492,913	318,496,963	18,004,050	5.99%	7,660,072	3.44%
11. Irrigated	180,452,250	208,058,910	27,606,660	15.30%		
12. Dryland	351,141,530	382,893,715	31,752,185	9.04%		
13. Grassland	60,670,905	63,337,540	2,666,635	4.40%		
14. Wasteland	821,875	1,172,250	350,375	42.63%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	593,086,560	655,462,415	62,375,855	10.52%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	893,579,473	973,955,628	80,376,155	8.99%	7,660,072	8.14%

**Cedar County's
3 Year Plan of Assessment
September 1st, 2008(update)**

Introduction

This plan of assessment is required by law, pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 170, Section 5. It is submitted to the Cedar County Board of Equalization and the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before September 1, 2001 and every year thereafter. The assessor shall update the plan annually. The plan and any update shall examine the level, quality, & uniformity of assessment in the county and may be derived from the Progress Report developed by the Department and presented to the assessor on or before July 31.

General Description of Cedar County

Cedar County has a total parcel count of about 8,147 parcels. The residential parcel count is 39% of the total, the commercial/industrial is 7% of the total base and the agricultural is 50%. Exempt property accounts for 4% of the county total. Cedar County has a total valuation of \$891,193,671(from the 2008 abstract). The county has about 1705 personal property schedules to process, and about 480 Homestead Exemptions to file for the 2008 year.

Office Staff

The office staff of the Cedar County Assessor consists of the Assessor, the Deputy, 3 full time clerks, and one part time person to do the measuring and listing of the “pickup work” for the year.

Budget

The total budget for the operation of the office is \$179,680. This amount does not include any funds for appraisal. This amount reflects only the necessary amount to run the office.

Responsibilities

The various responsibilities include, taking care of the counter traffic, answering phone calls, keeping our record cards current and up to date, maintaining the county's cadastral maps, processing 521 real estate transfers, filling out and processing all reports due to the state, political subdivisions, and TERC, personal property filings and homestead applications, plus many more day to day jobs too numerous to mention.

Computers

The office is furnished with 5 computers, training has been for the most part self taught with staff going to short 2 or 4 hour classes offered through the extension office. We are contracted with Mips/County Solutions for the assessment software, real estate and personal property. We have been on Mips/County Solutions cama software system for 6 years so we did drop our license with Marshall & Swift and will do our residential and rural improvement pricing through them. We are in the process of printing new house sheets on all our residential records. We have all the rural parcels completed and are done with the town records. The process of converting from our Marshall & Swift reports to the new Cama program did take a good deal of time as we also had to check and make sure all the components have transferred completely. We also have to calculate the correct value for the house. Completion of this process was accomplished last year.

Current and near Future Plan

The office has completed a residential update and review. This included all of our residential properties, rural as well as the towns. In the rural review we are also looking at the ag-outbuildings, we will use our new aerial photos to help us with this. This past year we worked on reviewing and updating most of our lot values and did reprice a number of them, especially the recreational ones. We did work on our commercial properties, with a driveby inspection and cost update, and new appreciation applied. The review was mainly in the towns of Hartington, and Laurel. The completion of this project will most likely take us into the second year. The completion of lots and commercial will bring us full circle and it will be time to start over on the Ag and residential again, taking us well beyond the next 3 years. We will be working on improving our commercial properties and possibly get started on a new update and review of our residential properties. Our focus on the upcoming work will not only be on our level of value, but quality as well. It will be our goal to get both the level of value and quality of assessment in the acceptable range.

FREE HOLDING PETITIONS

This process has caused our staff to spend a great deal of time going through the legal's of the petitions, mapping them and checking which school system they are located in and providing the data that is part of each petition filed on behalf of the petitioners. I am not

going to try to list all the time that has gone into this process, or the amount of time that will be required to meet the demands for the petitions that will still be filed during the rest of this calendar year. It appears we are done with the Freeholding issue, at least for now, the case is in the Supreme Court. We have made the changes the district court ordered us, now we wait to see if this will stand or be over turned. This case is scheduled to be heard by the NE Supreme Court in September of 2008.

Sales Review Process

The review of sales is done annually. We continue to make adjustments to ag-land annually, including implementing the use of “market areas”. We have 2 different market areas since the 2005 year. We spent a great deal of time deciding where and how to draw the lines that map out the 2 different areas. (2008) we are still using the 2 market area concept, but will have to see what happens at TERC on cases appealing this whole concept. The TERC has upheld our market areas and this case has been heard at the NE Appellate Court and has been affirmed as well. I am in the process of developing a sales survey to be sent to the buyers and sellers on Ag and commercial properties to help inform me on whether or not the sales are deemed “arms length”, and will be used or not used in the sales file. This information is readily available when these sales go through realtors, in those cases I can get the information I need from them. The review of commercial property will follow the completion of all residential property, targeting the year of 2009 for that completion.

Submitted

This document is being submitted to the Cedar County Board of Equalization and the office of the Property Assessment and Taxation on this day, August 6, 2008.

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

Don J. Hoelsing
Cedar County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Cedar County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	Assessor
3.	Other full-time employees
	3
4.	Other part-time employees
	1
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$163,305
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$4,000
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$163,305
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$0
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$0
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$0
13.	Total budget
	\$163,305
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$1,055

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software
	County Solutions

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

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All, Belden, Bow Valley, Coleridge, Fordyce, Hartington, Laurel, Magnet, Obert, Randolph, St. Helena and Wynot
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	In House
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 Cedar County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts