

# **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

### 18 Clay

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	152	COD	19.23
Total Sales Price	\$8,413,771	PRD	109.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,417,771	COV	37.32
Total Assessed Value	\$8,301,765	STD	40.22
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$55,380	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.80
Avg. Assessed Value	\$54,617	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$46,603
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	99
Mean	108	Max	440
Min	15.46		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.37 to 99.17
95% Mean C.I	101.37 to 114.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.47 to 101.77

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	20.47
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.41
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.17

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	194	97	18.45	108.87
2007	195	96	25.26	111.87
2006	155	97	16.1	105.08
2005	170	98	16.87	104.96

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 18 Clay

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	27	COD	11.96
Total Sales Price	\$1,117,147	PRD	102.01
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,142,424	COV	23.58
Total Assessed Value	\$1,138,495	STD	23.97
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,312	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.55
Avg. Assessed Value	\$42,166	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$85,495
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	100
Mean	102	Max	196
Min	71		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.34 to 99.72
95% Mean C.I	92.18 to 111.15
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.48 to 107.83

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 7.67

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 3.84

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.89

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	28	94	14.7	105.19
2007	43	99	27.85	137.89
2006	45	98	23.24	139.65
2005	45	98	19.21	133.52

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 18 Clay

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	45	COD	19.62
Total Sales Price	\$15,183,246	PRD	106.20
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$15,621,246	COV	24.60
Total Assessed Value	\$10,532,990	STD	17.62
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$347,139	Avg. Absolute Deviation	14.10
Avg. Assessed Value	\$234,066	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$177,742
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	67
Mean	72	Max	113.25
Min	42.83		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	64.72 to 78.49
95% Mean C.I	66.46 to 76.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	61.36 to 73.49

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	71.85
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.42
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.15

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	51	73	16.12	100.94
2007	82	75	14.87	103.47
2006	55	79	11.98	101.46
2005	70	78	11.92	101.46



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

### **Commercial Real Property**

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

### **Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Clay County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Clay County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.78	95% Median C.I.:	96.72 to 99.55
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	40.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.44 to 101.67
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.67	95% Mean C.I.:	101.21 to 114.14
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,253,985						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,302	PRD:	109.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.41		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:32

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____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	95.65	100.19	90.53	10.57	110.67	72.33	174.44	94.65 to 99.55	76,400	69,165
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	99.85	99.37	100.66	14.16	98.72	36.50	135.99	91.97 to 106.22	63,916	64,336
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	18	99.57	107.71	101.39	12.49	106.23	89.96	194.67	95.96 to 106.01	43,512	44,116
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	27	97.82	101.72	97.98	11.91	103.82	70.60	164.33	93.60 to 100.91	51,066	50,034
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	21	100.27	125.73	103.22	42.29	121.80	33.18	440.09	86.49 to 128.16	41,664	43,007
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	124.44	126.64	102.80	33.31	123.19	14.41	198.00	91.18 to 197.94	46,018	47,307
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	98.18	115.00	102.15	26.35	112.58	81.70	216.57	84.88 to 144.10	62,748	64,099
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	19	96.84	97.11	95.85	9.56	101.32	69.31	146.21	93.31 to 100.56	53,263	51,051
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	87	97.70	102.05	96.44	12.34	105.81	36.50	194.67	95.96 to 99.55	59,150	57,046
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	65	98.42	115.21	100.59	30.31	114.53	14.41	440.09	96.08 to 102.34	50,332	50,629
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	77	99.17	113.23	100.72	25.31	112.42	14.41	440.09	96.84 to 102.32	46,015	46,345
____ALL____											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302
<b>ASSESSOR LOCATION</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
CLAY CENTER	14	97.65	107.17	99.33	14.91	107.89	84.88	198.00	91.39 to 112.04	68,132	67,678
DEWEESE	1	36.50	36.50	36.50			36.50	36.50	N/A	1,000	365
EDGAR	19	97.69	109.06	104.34	15.60	104.53	84.57	197.94	95.02 to 107.08	25,826	26,946
FAIRFIELD	14	101.37	121.14	111.09	23.86	109.05	91.18	216.57	97.70 to 144.10	48,948	54,377
GLENVIL	8	98.65	117.30	108.70	22.12	107.91	93.00	213.32	93.00 to 213.32	32,750	35,600
HARVARD	24	97.30	103.17	96.44	12.60	106.97	69.31	164.33	95.15 to 108.38	48,671	46,940
HARVARD COURTS	2	88.37	88.37	87.94	8.22	100.49	81.11	95.63	N/A	4,250	3,737
ONG	1	81.70	81.70	81.70			81.70	81.70	N/A	22,000	17,975
RURAL RES	17	89.67	95.52	90.34	16.60	105.73	72.33	126.69	74.41 to 118.08	122,350	110,526
SARONVILLE	1	93.14	93.14	93.14			93.14	93.14	N/A	40,500	37,720
SUTTON	46	98.77	112.51	98.98	28.27	113.67	14.41	440.09	95.96 to 103.00	52,432	51,897
TRUMBULL	5	99.14	99.26	99.35	2.95	99.91	92.83	103.05	N/A	58,800	58,415
____ALL____											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.78	95% Median C.I.:	96.72 to 99.55
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	40.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.44 to 101.67
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.67	95% Mean C.I.:	101.21 to 114.14
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,253,985						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,302	PRD:	109.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.41		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:32

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	135	98.29	109.21	100.59	20.47	108.57	14.41	440.09	96.84 to 100.00	46,946	47,222
3	17	89.67	95.52	90.34	16.60	105.73	72.33	126.69	74.41 to 118.08	122,350	110,526
____ALL____											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	141	98.13	108.62	98.23	18.78	110.58	14.41	440.09	96.84 to 100.00	58,367	57,334
2	9	73.90	95.43	78.01	53.53	122.33	33.18	194.67	36.50 to 164.33	5,444	4,247
3	2	95.96	95.96	94.63	6.25	101.41	89.96	101.96	N/A	69,500	65,765
____ALL____											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	146	97.88	106.94	98.00	19.75	109.13	14.41	440.09	96.27 to 99.43	57,063	55,921
06											
07	6	99.97	125.56	103.47	27.52	121.34	96.84	214.60	96.84 to 214.60	14,416	14,917
____ALL____											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	1	72.33	72.33	72.33			72.33	72.33	N/A	135,000	97,650
18-0002	53	98.60	111.23	99.04	26.28	112.31	14.41	440.09	95.71 to 103.00	59,444	58,871
18-0011	31	96.72	101.41	93.54	13.41	108.41	69.31	164.33	93.96 to 101.96	57,935	54,193
18-0070	16	97.08	104.48	96.47	14.60	108.30	74.16	198.00	91.39 to 106.22	76,734	74,025
18-0501	44	98.55	111.36	103.74	21.06	107.35	36.50	216.57	96.08 to 100.40	38,465	39,902
30-0054	1	81.70	81.70	81.70			81.70	81.70	N/A	22,000	17,975
40-0126	6	100.99	100.38	101.04	3.55	99.35	92.83	106.01	92.83 to 106.01	65,658	66,339
65-0005											
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.78	95% Median C.I.:	96.72 to 99.55
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	40.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.44 to 101.67
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.67	95% Mean C.I.:	101.21 to 114.14
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,253,985						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,302	PRD:	109.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.41		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:32

## 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	13	73.90	91.93	48.66	54.37	188.93	14.41	194.67	36.50 to 144.21	9,361	4,555
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	15	111.79	116.87	108.55	16.84	107.67	74.41	197.94	99.14 to 128.16	41,692	45,257
1900 TO 1919	50	96.55	110.31	97.92	19.99	112.66	69.31	440.09	95.15 to 100.00	48,871	47,852
1920 TO 1939	23	98.43	111.27	100.87	18.63	110.32	74.16	213.32	94.90 to 106.71	45,986	46,385
1940 TO 1949	4	90.26	90.26	87.71	8.05	102.92	81.11	99.43	N/A	26,150	22,935
1950 TO 1959	1	101.00	101.00	101.00			101.00	101.00	N/A	68,000	68,680
1960 TO 1969	9	109.15	112.24	111.22	15.14	100.92	89.03	146.21	95.02 to 135.99	61,222	68,091
1970 TO 1979	21	97.75	111.53	100.33	19.03	111.16	82.39	214.60	95.30 to 117.80	77,426	77,681
1980 TO 1989	6	98.28	93.48	84.36	6.36	110.81	73.97	100.40	73.97 to 100.40	107,833	90,973
1990 TO 1994	3	101.96	105.86	102.74	10.87	103.04	91.18	124.44	N/A	88,633	91,061
1995 TO 1999	6	96.03	93.00	91.47	7.99	101.67	72.33	106.01	72.33 to 106.01	116,991	107,015
2000 TO Present	1	93.04	93.04	93.04			93.04	93.04	N/A	205,000	190,725
ALL	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	10	125.65	131.17	131.66	37.63	99.63	36.50	214.60	81.11 to 194.67	2,770	3,647
5000 TO 9999	12	96.17	124.68	114.52	53.72	108.88	33.18	440.09	72.93 to 112.33	7,158	8,197
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	22	98.56	127.63	118.70	51.37	107.53	33.18	440.09	81.11 to 164.33	5,163	6,129
10000 TO 29999	32	100.20	118.02	120.31	23.75	98.10	71.83	216.57	96.36 to 122.26	18,542	22,308
30000 TO 59999	37	100.19	105.78	104.44	11.52	101.29	83.77	180.42	96.84 to 102.84	43,771	45,713
60000 TO 99999	42	98.06	99.72	99.59	11.79	100.13	14.41	146.21	95.15 to 101.00	76,893	76,574
100000 TO 149999	15	91.18	89.38	89.28	7.79	100.11	72.33	99.19	82.39 to 97.75	129,850	115,932
150000 TO 249999	3	88.43	88.43	88.63	3.48	99.77	83.81	93.04	N/A	188,000	166,623
250000 TO 499999	1	73.97	73.97	73.97			73.97	73.97	N/A	350,000	258,910
ALL	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.78	95% Median C.I.:	96.72 to 99.55
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	40.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.44 to 101.67
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.67	95% Mean C.I.:	101.21 to 114.14
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,253,985						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,302	PRD:	109.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.41		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:32

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	95.63	98.40	79.47	39.57	123.82	33.18	194.67	36.50 to 164.33	3,355	2,666
5000 TO 9999	16	97.85	111.69	74.04	33.16	150.85	14.41	214.60	92.88 to 144.21	10,493	7,769
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	25	97.75	106.90	74.87	35.27	142.79	14.41	214.60	92.88 to 112.00	7,924	5,932
10000 TO 29999	23	98.13	119.38	108.66	27.38	109.87	71.83	440.09	95.71 to 103.00	17,934	19,487
30000 TO 59999	47	100.91	113.82	107.27	19.83	106.10	69.31	216.57	97.67 to 114.61	42,046	45,105
60000 TO 99999	40	98.06	101.05	99.24	10.70	101.82	72.33	146.21	95.15 to 101.00	80,991	80,373
100000 TO 149999	13	95.22	93.68	93.23	5.80	100.48	74.41	106.01	89.62 to 98.80	129,023	120,291
150000 TO 249999	3	88.43	88.43	88.63	3.48	99.77	83.81	93.04	N/A	188,000	166,623
250000 TO 499999	1	73.97	73.97	73.97			73.97	73.97	N/A	350,000	258,910
ALL											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	73.90	91.93	48.66	54.37	188.93	14.41	194.67	36.50 to 144.21	9,361	4,555
10	4	98.02	104.31	123.71	16.26	84.32	81.11	140.09	N/A	15,850	19,607
20	32	97.68	108.32	103.13	15.91	105.04	81.70	198.00	95.26 to 102.84	26,479	27,308
30	99	98.43	109.24	98.76	17.73	110.61	69.31	440.09	96.84 to 100.27	71,301	70,418
40	4	93.09	118.28	83.02	40.71	142.46	72.33	214.60	N/A	81,625	67,768
ALL											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	17	92.83	93.63	79.17	35.96	118.27	14.41	194.67	70.60 to 116.25	19,011	15,051
100	5	97.75	121.28	100.96	24.48	120.13	96.84	214.60	N/A	16,700	16,860
101	77	97.15	103.73	97.99	12.23	105.85	73.97	198.00	95.96 to 99.19	58,225	57,054
102	11	100.56	118.19	99.69	26.19	118.55	74.16	197.94	88.89 to 195.43	58,198	58,020
103	1	109.15	109.15	109.15			109.15	109.15	N/A	80,000	87,320
104	38	99.56	118.18	100.36	27.49	117.76	69.31	440.09	97.67 to 108.38	66,660	66,898
106	1	89.62	89.62	89.62			89.62	89.62	N/A	135,453	121,390
301	1	89.96	89.96	89.96			89.96	89.96	N/A	85,000	76,470
304	1	101.96	101.96	101.96			101.96	101.96	N/A	54,000	55,060
ALL											
	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55	55,380	54,302

# 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:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.78	95% Median C.I.:	96.72 to 99.55
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	40.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.44 to 101.67
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.67	95% Mean C.I.:	101.21 to 114.14
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,253,985						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,302	PRD:	109.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.41		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:32

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	13	73.90	91.93	48.66	54.37	188.93	14.41	194.67	36.50 to 144.21		9,361	4,555
15	2	153.80	153.80	117.32	39.53	131.09	93.00	214.60	N/A		6,250	7,332
20	16	96.87	108.70	102.90	17.64	105.64	81.11	198.00	94.13 to 112.00		12,243	12,598
25	17	102.32	128.47	112.97	30.30	113.72	86.49	440.09	98.13 to 126.69		32,512	36,728
30	63	98.42	108.08	101.65	15.14	106.32	72.33	216.57	96.27 to 102.34		57,415	58,365
35	28	96.55	102.12	95.19	15.95	107.29	69.31	197.94	89.96 to 100.00		79,439	75,614
40	12	97.38	98.12	91.89	10.09	106.78	73.97	146.21	89.62 to 101.32		131,871	121,181
50	1	95.22	95.22	95.22			95.22	95.22	N/A		111,000	105,690
ALL	152	98.04	107.68	98.05	20.07	109.81	14.41	440.09	96.72 to 99.55		55,380	54,302

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

### **Residential**

The Clay County staff physically reviewed the towns of Harvard, Ong and Verona Village. The residential areas of Inland, Lynn, Lewis and Sutton townships were also physically reviewed. All "No Trespassing" signs were honored. The staff's physical review consisted of visiting each property with a copy of the record card, physically inspecting all property from the outside and taking pictures of each improvement. Updates of the condition were made to improvements, measurements of additions were made and deletions noted according to the on-site review. Owners were interviewed at the time of the review if possible. If the owner was not available, the Clay County staff left a questionnaire with the changes to the property assessment and noted if additional information was needed from the owner. The number of urban properties reviewed was 613.

As each township and town was reviewed new property cards were made for each parcel. All information pertinent to the property was updated. A sketch of the house was put in the parcel folder along with a photo page if the property consisted of the house with outbuildings. The picture of the house was printed on the parcel card. Lots in the towns of Harvard, Ong and Verona were valued by square foot vs. front foot. All lots being farmed were valued by current use and updated per acre value.

The Clay County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the buyer and seller. If there was no response, a follow-up call was made to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A spreadsheet analysis of all sales within the study period was completed by location. As a result the economic was removed from all house/garage in the rural areas. Building sites were increased to \$2000 per acre. Harvard Courts remaining residences were compared by condition and depreciation.

The Clay County Assessor and Deputy did all permit and pickup work. All was completed in a timely manner.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Clay County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	ASSESSOR/STAFF
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	ASSESSOR/STAFF WITH ASSESSOR RESPONSIBLE FOR FINAL VALUE
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	ASSESSOR & DEPUTY
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	6-2000
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2000
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	MARKET OR SALES COMPARISON APPROACH
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	3
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	LOCATION
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	YES
10.	<b>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.)</b>
	NO SUBURBAN
11.	<b>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?</b>
	YES, THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE SHOWN IN MARKET BETWEEN THE TWO. IF SO AN ECONOMIC FACTOR WOULD BE USED.

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
105	58	171	334



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.32	95% Median C.I.:	96.37 to 99.17
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	40.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.47 to 101.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.80	95% Mean C.I.:	101.37 to 114.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,301,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	19.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,616	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.46		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:01

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	95.65	100.29	91.47	10.15	109.64	77.06	174.44	93.97 to 98.93	76,400	69,880
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	99.85	99.77	101.67	13.45	98.13	36.50	135.99	95.02 to 106.22	63,916	64,983
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	18	100.11	108.62	101.73	13.08	106.78	89.96	194.67	95.96 to 114.09	43,512	44,263
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	27	97.37	102.11	99.09	11.67	103.05	70.67	164.33	94.00 to 100.91	51,066	50,602
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	21	100.27	125.45	102.47	41.50	122.43	33.18	440.09	89.62 to 128.16	41,664	42,692
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	114.38	124.70	99.91	35.18	124.81	15.46	198.00	91.18 to 197.94	46,018	45,977
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	98.18	115.82	103.91	25.52	111.46	81.70	216.57	88.26 to 144.08	62,748	65,203
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	19	96.83	96.75	96.52	5.63	100.24	73.90	112.02	93.32 to 99.19	53,263	51,409
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	87	97.67	102.47	97.35	12.21	105.26	36.50	194.67	95.96 to 99.14	59,150	57,584
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	65	98.29	114.86	100.62	28.46	114.15	15.46	440.09	96.22 to 101.33	50,332	50,645
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	77	99.14	113.23	100.62	24.95	112.52	15.46	440.09	96.73 to 102.84	46,015	46,302
____ALL____											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
CLAY CENTER	14	97.65	107.28	99.36	14.80	107.97	84.88	198.00	91.39 to 112.04	68,132	67,694
DEWEESE	1	36.50	36.50	36.50			36.50	36.50	N/A	1,000	365
EDGAR	19	97.69	109.67	104.75	16.50	104.70	84.57	197.94	95.00 to 111.79	25,826	27,052
FAIRFIELD	14	98.55	120.30	110.56	24.88	108.81	91.18	216.57	96.14 to 144.08	48,948	54,117
GLENVIL	8	98.65	117.31	108.71	22.13	107.91	93.00	213.32	93.00 to 213.32	32,750	35,601
HARVARD	24	97.30	103.89	97.83	11.81	106.20	73.90	164.33	95.61 to 108.38	48,671	47,612
HARVARD COURTS	2	88.37	88.37	87.94	8.22	100.49	81.11	95.63	N/A	4,250	3,737
ONG	1	81.70	81.70	81.70			81.70	81.70	N/A	22,000	17,975
RURAL RES	17	96.22	96.77	92.84	10.42	104.22	77.06	119.85	88.75 to 106.89	122,350	113,594
SARONVILLE	1	93.14	93.14	93.14			93.14	93.14	N/A	40,500	37,720
SUTTON	46	98.77	111.95	98.19	27.66	114.02	15.46	440.09	95.96 to 103.00	52,432	51,482
TRUMBULL	5	99.14	99.25	99.34	2.96	99.91	92.83	103.05	N/A	58,800	58,413
____ALL____											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.32	95% Median C.I.:	96.37 to 99.17
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	40.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.47 to 101.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.80	95% Mean C.I.:	101.37 to 114.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,301,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	19.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,616	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.46		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:01

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	135	97.94	109.15	100.52	20.28	108.59	15.46	440.09	96.73 to 99.55	46,946	47,190
3	17	96.22	96.77	92.84	10.42	104.22	77.06	119.85	88.75 to 106.89	122,350	113,594
____ALL____											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	141	97.75	108.72	98.81	17.89	110.03	15.46	440.09	96.38 to 99.19	58,367	57,673
2	9	73.90	95.43	78.01	53.53	122.33	33.18	194.67	36.50 to 164.33	5,444	4,247
3	2	95.96	95.96	94.63	6.25	101.41	89.96	101.96	N/A	69,500	65,765
____ALL____											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	146	97.72	107.06	98.58	18.86	108.60	15.46	440.09	96.27 to 99.17	57,063	56,251
06											
07	6	98.65	125.03	102.94	28.09	121.46	96.84	214.60	96.84 to 214.60	14,416	14,840
____ALL____											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	1	79.41	79.41	79.41			79.41	79.41	N/A	135,000	107,210
18-0002	53	98.60	110.69	98.72	25.18	112.13	15.46	440.09	96.22 to 103.00	59,444	58,681
18-0011	31	96.73	101.59	94.29	11.77	107.74	73.90	164.33	93.97 to 101.96	57,935	54,629
18-0070	16	97.08	105.49	98.00	13.57	107.64	84.88	198.00	91.39 to 106.22	76,734	75,197
18-0501	44	97.82	111.68	104.68	21.18	106.68	36.50	216.57	95.96 to 100.21	38,465	40,266
30-0054	1	81.70	81.70	81.70			81.70	81.70	N/A	22,000	17,975
40-0126	6	100.99	100.38	101.03	3.55	99.35	92.83	106.01	92.83 to 106.01	65,658	66,337
65-0005											
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.32	95% Median C.I.:	96.37 to 99.17
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	40.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.47 to 101.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.80	95% Mean C.I.:	101.37 to 114.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,301,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	19.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,616	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.46		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:01

## 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	13	73.90	92.01	49.18	54.24	187.10	15.46	194.67	36.50 to 144.09	9,361	4,603
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	15	111.79	117.02	109.46	16.26	106.91	80.42	197.94	99.14 to 128.16	41,692	45,636
1900 TO 1919	50	96.38	110.81	98.65	19.35	112.32	81.70	440.09	95.00 to 98.41	48,871	48,212
1920 TO 1939	23	98.43	111.95	102.63	17.90	109.09	84.57	213.32	95.96 to 106.70	45,986	47,194
1940 TO 1949	4	90.26	89.44	87.12	7.14	102.66	81.11	96.14	N/A	26,150	22,782
1950 TO 1959	1	101.00	101.00	101.00			101.00	101.00	N/A	68,000	68,680
1960 TO 1969	9	110.19	108.55	107.18	11.55	101.28	89.03	135.99	95.02 to 130.63	61,222	65,619
1970 TO 1979	21	97.75	111.82	100.87	18.15	110.86	83.81	214.60	95.61 to 114.38	77,426	78,098
1980 TO 1989	6	97.56	93.49	85.96	5.50	108.76	77.06	100.01	77.06 to 100.01	107,833	92,695
1990 TO 1994	3	101.96	102.54	99.94	7.62	102.61	91.18	114.49	N/A	88,633	88,576
1995 TO 1999	6	96.03	94.18	92.83	6.77	101.45	79.41	106.01	79.41 to 106.01	116,991	108,609
2000 TO Present	1	96.22	96.22	96.22			96.22	96.22	N/A	205,000	197,250
ALL	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## 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	10	125.59	131.16	131.64	37.64	99.64	36.50	214.60	81.11 to 194.67	2,770	3,646
5000 TO 9999	12	96.17	124.69	114.52	53.71	108.88	33.18	440.09	72.93 to 112.33	7,158	8,197
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	22	98.56	127.63	118.70	51.37	107.53	33.18	440.09	81.11 to 164.33	5,163	6,129
10000 TO 29999	32	100.92	118.23	120.51	24.22	98.11	71.83	216.57	96.14 to 122.26	18,542	22,344
30000 TO 59999	37	98.93	105.95	104.55	11.67	101.33	83.77	180.42	96.83 to 102.84	43,771	45,763
60000 TO 99999	42	98.06	98.42	98.45	9.69	99.97	15.46	133.18	94.82 to 101.00	76,893	75,699
100000 TO 149999	15	95.22	92.71	92.58	4.96	100.14	79.41	99.19	89.62 to 97.75	129,850	120,210
150000 TO 249999	3	88.43	89.49	89.79	4.68	99.67	83.81	96.22	N/A	188,000	168,798
250000 TO 499999	1	77.06	77.06	77.06			77.06	77.06	N/A	350,000	269,700
ALL	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.32	95% Median C.I.:	96.37 to 99.17
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	40.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.47 to 101.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.80	95% Mean C.I.:	101.37 to 114.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,301,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	19.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,616	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.46		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:01

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	95.63	98.40	79.47	39.57	123.82	33.18	194.67	36.50 to 164.33	3,355	2,666
5000 TO 9999	16	97.85	111.75	74.41	33.08	150.17	15.46	214.60	92.88 to 144.09	10,493	7,808
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	25	97.75	106.94	75.18	35.22	142.24	15.46	214.60	92.88 to 112.00	7,924	5,957
10000 TO 29999	23	96.38	119.67	108.94	28.38	109.85	71.83	440.09	95.71 to 108.38	17,934	19,537
30000 TO 59999	47	100.56	114.40	108.30	19.50	105.63	83.77	216.57	96.93 to 114.23	41,802	45,273
60000 TO 99999	38	98.35	100.70	99.98	7.97	100.71	84.88	133.18	95.66 to 101.26	78,664	78,650
100000 TO 149999	15	95.61	93.73	93.38	5.35	100.38	79.41	106.01	89.62 to 98.29	129,280	120,719
150000 TO 249999	3	88.43	89.49	89.79	4.68	99.67	83.81	96.22	N/A	188,000	168,798
250000 TO 499999	1	77.06	77.06	77.06			77.06	77.06	N/A	350,000	269,700
ALL											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	73.90	92.01	49.18	54.24	187.10	15.46	194.67	36.50 to 144.09	9,361	4,603
10	4	96.50	105.12	126.94	17.36	82.81	81.11	146.37	N/A	15,850	20,120
20	32	97.26	108.98	104.44	16.20	104.35	81.70	198.00	95.26 to 103.00	26,479	27,656
30	99	98.29	109.06	99.11	16.38	110.04	77.06	440.09	96.73 to 100.21	71,301	70,664
40	4	93.09	120.05	85.95	38.81	139.67	79.41	214.60	N/A	81,625	70,158
ALL											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	17	92.83	93.69	79.36	35.88	118.05	15.46	194.67	70.67 to 116.25	19,011	15,088
100	5	99.55	124.57	104.11	26.94	119.65	96.84	214.60	N/A	16,700	17,386
101	77	96.83	103.21	97.75	11.22	105.58	77.06	198.00	95.96 to 98.29	58,225	56,917
102	11	100.56	119.43	102.83	24.95	116.14	88.75	197.94	90.85 to 195.43	58,198	59,845
103	1	110.19	110.19	110.19			110.19	110.19	N/A	80,000	88,150
104	38	98.87	118.75	101.70	26.13	116.76	79.41	440.09	96.93 to 106.89	66,660	67,796
106	1	89.62	89.62	89.62			89.62	89.62	N/A	135,453	121,390
301	1	89.96	89.96	89.96			89.96	89.96	N/A	85,000	76,470
304	1	101.96	101.96	101.96			101.96	101.96	N/A	54,000	55,060
ALL											
	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17	55,380	54,616

**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:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	37.32	95% Median C.I.:	96.37 to 99.17
TOTAL Sales Price:	8,413,771	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	40.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.47 to 101.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,417,771	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.80	95% Mean C.I.:	101.37 to 114.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,301,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,380	COD:	19.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	440.09		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,616	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.46		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:01

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	13	73.90	92.01	49.18	54.24	187.10	15.46	194.67	36.50 to 144.09		9,361	4,603
15	2	153.80	153.80	117.32	39.53	131.09	93.00	214.60	N/A		6,250	7,332
20	16	96.72	109.54	104.01	18.53	105.31	81.11	198.00	94.13 to 114.09		12,243	12,734
25	17	102.29	127.21	110.25	28.83	115.38	91.92	440.09	96.38 to 121.81		32,512	35,845
30	63	97.83	107.85	101.65	14.85	106.10	79.41	216.57	96.27 to 100.21		57,415	58,362
35	28	96.55	104.39	98.15	14.07	106.35	80.42	197.94	92.24 to 100.00		79,439	77,970
40	12	97.38	95.80	91.53	6.63	104.66	77.06	112.02	89.62 to 101.33		131,871	120,702
50	1	95.22	95.22	95.22			95.22	95.22	N/A		111,000	105,690
ALL	152	97.75	107.77	98.62	19.23	109.27	15.46	440.09	96.37 to 99.17		55,380	54,616



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The calculated median indicates that the level of value for residential real property in Clay County is 98%. This is supported by the trended preliminary ratio as well as the detailed assessment actions. This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county.

Clay County has long had excellent cyclical physical inspection. They are diligent in annually physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. The Assessor has done an excellent job in cross training her staff to be able to handle all facets of the job.

Clay County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have begun the process of implementing a GIS program and offered the personal property schedules online this year.

Clay County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values. They should be commended for their diligence, willingness to move forward technologically, and solid assessment practices.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>46.63</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>53.15</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>55.71</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>50.82</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>59.65</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The number of qualified residential sales in Clay County has declined the past two years. As well, over the course of the two study years, the most recent year has 45 fewer total sales than the first year reflecting a decline in the residential market activity. Of these total sales, 24 of them were removed for having been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining disqualified sales are a mixture of family sales, foreclosure and other legal actions, estate planning and estate settlements. Clay County is diligent in their sales review. Questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and the seller, if the questionnaire is not returned, follow up phone calls are made to both parties. The Assessor also physically inspected each sale.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>97.22</b>	<b>-2.01</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97.07</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>13.22</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>11.23</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>10.01</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>98</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 3 illustrates that the residential values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio very similar to the R & O Ratio. The conclusion may be drawn that the residential population and the residential sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers strong support for the calculated level of value at 98% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for residential property in Clay County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	1.91
2.20	2008	-2.01
3.17	2007	7.47
4.86	2006	11.23
6.96	2005	10.01

RESIDENTIAL: Table 4 shows no percentage change in the sales file while there was a slight increase in the residential base for Clay County. This increase may be attributed to the diligent physical cyclical inspection that has been in place for many years in Clay County. According to the residential assessment actions the towns of Harvard, Ong and Verona were inspected. Property conditions were updated, building sites were increased and lots in town were valued by square foot. These towns only accounted for 27 of the 152 qualified residential sales.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>108</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates the median calculating to 98% and the weighted mean very close at 99%. The mean, being more susceptible to outliers, is higher at 108%. A review of the statistical page shows these outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 15.46% and the maximum sales ratio at 440.09%. It is the policy of the Clay County Assessor to use every possible sale and she is diligent in her sales verification. The median and weighted mean, being within 1% of each other, give credibility to the calculated statistical level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>19.23</b>	<b>109.27</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>6.27</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 6 accurately reflects that the COD and PRD are both above the acceptable range for qualitative measures, but not excessively. This is reflective of the diligent cyclical physical inspection in Clay County. A review of the qualified residential statistics and the residential assessment actions show the towns most recently inspected have qualitative measures within or close to within the acceptable range as would be expected with recent physical inspection. A further review of the residential statistics shows the qualitative measures being negatively affected by low dollar sales with 22 sales having a sale price of under \$10,000. Although the measures are above the required standards, the assessment practices in Clay County give confidence to the fact that the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>20.07</b>	<b>19.23</b>	<b>-0.84</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>109.81</b>	<b>109.27</b>	<b>-0.54</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>14.41</b>	<b>15.46</b>	<b>1.05</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>440.09</b>	<b>440.09</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: There were no changes in the number of sales between the preliminary statistics and the R & O Statistics. The statistics accurately reflect the residential assessment actions taken in Clay County. Minimal changes occurred due to the routine cyclical physical inspection and sales verification.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Trended Ratio</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>-7</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>19.23</b>	<b>35.08</b>	<b>-15.85</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>109.27</b>	<b>114.37</b>	<b>-5.10</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>15.46</b>	<b>35.61</b>	<b>-20.15</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>440.09</b>	<b>563.53</b>	<b>-123.44</b>

In January of 2009, the Field Liaison went to Clay County. Historical values were not available online or in the computer system. Certified tax rolls were obtained from the Clay County Treasurer. The Field Liaison went through each qualified residential sale and obtained the certified assessed valuation for the year preceding the sale. For example, for a sale that occurred in the calendar year 2006 the 2005 certified assessed valuation was recorded. Sales that were substantially changed, as documented by the assessor, and sales where there was no preceding year's valuation, land that had been split away from a different parcel, and valuations that were adjusted by the County Board of Equalization were discarded for this Trending analysis. Values were entered into a spreadsheet. These values were then trended by the percentage of movement in the base (abstract) as documented in the R & O for each subsequent year including 2009. Ratios were run using the trended assessed values and the adjusted sale prices. A Median was run from these ratios and the results are documented in the adjoining table. This trended median for qualified residential is 3.57% different than the calculated R & O median and just slightly higher than the acceptable range. There is nothing to suggest that the sales file is not representative of the population in Clay County.



## 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:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	166.53	95% Median C.I.:	88.89 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,419,497	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	223.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.01 to 110.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,425,039	MEAN:	134	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.36	95% Mean C.I.:	62.19 to 206.20
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,401,445						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,514	COD:	60.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	1430.77		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,876	PRD:	136.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.70		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:41

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	2	96.38	96.38	97.97	3.06	98.38	93.44	99.33	N/A		19,500	19,105
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	108.33	128.76	123.58	28.09	104.19	93.34	184.62	N/A		14,466	17,878
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	75.78	73.97	75.84	18.92	97.52	46.70	97.61	N/A		40,500	30,716
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	95.75	95.57	100.51	8.35	95.08	74.17	114.40	74.17 to 114.40		37,276	37,466
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	109.17	109.17	109.17			109.17	109.17	N/A		12,000	13,100
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	81.58	81.58	78.31	14.19	104.17	70.00	93.16	N/A		27,295	21,375
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	70.45	70.45	70.45			70.45	70.45	N/A		120,000	84,540
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	108.60	108.60	108.60			108.60	108.60	N/A		20,000	21,720
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	66.00	78.49	80.67	28.56	97.30	56.46	113.00	N/A		50,000	40,333
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	98.81	97.60	104.35	23.33	93.53	51.60	141.18	N/A		18,812	19,630
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	213.29	213.29	138.82	45.33	153.64	116.61	309.96	N/A		93,211	129,400
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	84.78	303.65	100.91	282.41	300.90	53.33	1430.77	53.33 to 1430.77		44,027	44,429
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	17	94.00	96.44	94.81	16.45	101.72	46.70	184.62	79.00 to 103.37		31,918	30,261
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	93.16	90.28	78.47	16.60	115.05	70.00	109.17	N/A		41,318	32,422
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	98.45	191.62	107.26	125.10	178.65	51.60	1430.77	66.00 to 116.61		45,055	48,326
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	15	93.23	88.85	90.82	13.63	97.83	46.70	114.40	74.17 to 98.97		35,120	31,896
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	97.50	89.43	83.72	24.89	106.83	51.60	141.18	56.46 to 113.00		40,583	33,975
____ALL____												
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00		38,514	37,876

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLAY CENTER	3	97.50	82.52	73.08	19.37	112.92	46.70	103.37	N/A		25,333	18,513
DEWEESE	1	53.33	53.33	53.33			53.33	53.33	N/A		1,500	800
EDGAR	2	201.65	201.65	200.21	53.71	100.72	93.34	309.96	N/A		21,711	43,467
GLENVIL	4	98.75	98.68	100.12	5.55	98.56	88.89	108.33	N/A		21,225	21,250
HARVARD	3	74.17	73.07	74.36	18.80	98.27	51.60	93.44	N/A		7,500	5,576
INLAND	2	104.64	104.64	102.03	4.33	102.56	100.11	109.17	N/A		28,375	28,950
NAD B-1	3	94.00	87.82	86.12	20.05	101.97	56.46	113.00	N/A		55,000	47,366
NAD B-2	3	93.23	87.80	88.42	8.96	99.29	72.55	97.61	N/A		60,333	53,348
NAD GLENVIL	2	100.88	100.88	100.96	7.65	99.92	93.16	108.60	N/A		19,795	19,985
NAD INLAND	1	1430.77	1430.77	1430.77			1430.77	1430.77	N/A		2,600	37,200
SUTTON	13	98.45	98.33	95.67	25.81	102.78	66.00	184.62	70.00 to 116.61		57,829	55,325
____ALL____												
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00		38,514	37,876

## 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:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	166.53	95% Median C.I.:	88.89 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,419,497	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	223.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.01 to 110.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,425,039	MEAN:	134	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.36	95% Mean C.I.:	62.19 to 206.20
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,401,445						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,514	COD:	60.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	1430.77		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,876	PRD:	136.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.70		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:41

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	26	95.47	99.86	98.38	29.97	101.51	46.70	309.96	71.11 to 100.00	37,696	37,085
3	11	97.61	215.33	98.26	135.26	219.14	56.46	1430.77	72.55 to 113.00	40,449	39,746
____ALL____											
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	35	97.50	138.13	98.67	62.47	139.98	46.70	1430.77	93.16 to 100.11	40,329	39,795
2	2	65.30	65.30	63.78	20.98	102.39	51.60	79.00	N/A	6,750	4,305
____ALL____											
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	9	97.61	240.77	98.00	163.55	245.68	56.46	1430.77	72.55 to 113.00	45,038	44,138
18-0002	13	98.45	98.33	95.67	25.81	102.78	66.00	184.62	70.00 to 116.61	57,829	55,325
18-0011	3	74.17	73.07	74.36	18.80	98.27	51.60	93.44	N/A	7,500	5,576
18-0070	3	97.50	82.52	73.08	19.37	112.92	46.70	103.37	N/A	25,333	18,513
18-0501	9	97.50	117.01	125.55	33.98	93.20	53.33	309.96	88.89 to 108.60	18,823	23,633
30-0054											
40-0126											
65-0005											
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## 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:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	166.53	95% Median C.I.:	88.89 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,419,497	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	223.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.01 to 110.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,425,039	MEAN:	134	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.36	95% Mean C.I.:	62.19 to 206.20
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,401,445						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,514	COD:	60.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	1430.77		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,876	PRD:	136.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.70		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:41

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	5	71.11	77.31	84.15	20.07	91.87	51.60	114.40	N/A	44,542	37,484
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	35,000	24,500
1900 TO 1919	10	91.12	95.99	83.12	29.85	115.49	46.70	184.62	66.00 to 141.18	23,950	19,906
1920 TO 1939	3	97.50	86.39	99.06	18.80	87.21	53.33	108.33	N/A	5,300	5,250
1940 TO 1949	9	97.61	240.70	98.80	163.50	243.63	56.46	1430.77	72.55 to 113.00	40,882	40,390
1950 TO 1959	2	101.20	101.20	95.71	7.88	105.73	93.23	109.17	N/A	38,500	36,850
1960 TO 1969	1	309.96	309.96	309.96			309.96	309.96	N/A	21,422	66,400
1970 TO 1979	2	108.31	108.31	111.76	7.67	96.91	100.00	116.61	N/A	116,500	130,200
1980 TO 1989	2	95.94	95.94	98.02	2.61	97.88	93.44	98.45	N/A	52,532	51,492
1990 TO 1994	1	103.37	103.37	103.37			103.37	103.37	N/A	30,000	31,010
1995 TO 1999	1	98.97	98.97	98.97			98.97	98.97	N/A	77,500	76,700
2000 TO Present											
ALL	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## 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	93.19	417.62	364.29	371.81	114.64	53.33	1430.77	N/A	3,150	11,475
5000 TO 9999	6	86.22	84.01	84.90	18.27	98.95	51.60	108.33	51.60 to 108.33	7,150	6,070
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	91.16	217.45	148.32	162.40	146.61	51.60	1430.77	53.33 to 108.33	5,550	8,232
10000 TO 29999	9	108.60	130.79	129.34	43.11	101.12	66.00	309.96	71.11 to 184.62	18,668	24,145
30000 TO 59999	7	94.00	83.72	82.36	17.26	101.65	46.70	103.37	46.70 to 103.37	39,250	32,327
60000 TO 99999	9	98.45	93.37	93.27	12.51	100.11	56.46	114.40	68.21 to 113.00	71,308	66,510
100000 TO 149999	1	70.45	70.45	70.45			70.45	70.45	N/A	120,000	84,540
150000 TO 249999	1	116.61	116.61	116.61			116.61	116.61	N/A	165,000	192,400
ALL	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## 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:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	166.53	95% Median C.I.:	88.89 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,419,497	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	223.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.01 to 110.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,425,039	MEAN:	134	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.36	95% Mean C.I.:	62.19 to 206.20
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,401,445						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,514	COD:	60.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	1430.77		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,876	PRD:	136.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.70		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:41

## 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	76.59	74.08	73.76	18.78	100.43	51.60	97.50	51.60 to 97.50	4,916	3,626
5000 TO 9999	3	97.50	99.76	99.83	5.09	99.93	93.44	108.33	N/A	7,800	7,786
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	88.89	82.64	85.29	17.33	96.89	51.60	108.33	53.33 to 97.50	5,877	5,013
10000 TO 29999	11	93.34	98.47	88.99	28.82	110.66	46.70	184.62	66.00 to 141.18	22,871	20,353
30000 TO 59999	8	95.81	252.89	90.33	187.97	279.96	56.46	1430.77	56.46 to 1430.77	47,043	42,494
60000 TO 99999	8	99.49	124.81	103.61	34.71	120.46	70.45	309.96	70.45 to 309.96	72,399	75,010
150000 TO 249999	1	116.61	116.61	116.61			116.61	116.61	N/A	165,000	192,400
ALL											
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	79.00	76.03	71.49	19.37	106.36	51.60	97.50	N/A	5,833	4,170
10	5	99.33	87.55	89.19	17.45	98.16	53.33	109.17	N/A	25,700	22,922
20	29	97.50	148.25	99.63	72.27	148.80	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 108.33	44,104	43,942
ALL											
	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	166.53	95% Median C.I.:	88.89 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,419,497	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	223.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.01 to 110.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,425,039	MEAN:	134	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.36	95% Mean C.I.:	62.19 to 206.20
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,401,445						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,514	COD:	60.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	1430.77		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,876	PRD:	136.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.70		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:29:41

## 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	71.11	67.24	67.97	12.84	98.92	51.60	79.00	N/A	10,500	7,136
306	1	114.40	114.40	114.40			114.40	114.40	N/A	71,212	81,470
334	1	97.61	97.61	97.61			97.61	97.61	N/A	61,000	59,545
344	2	101.35	101.35	101.35	1.99	100.00	99.33	103.37	N/A	30,000	30,405
349	1	184.62	184.62	184.62			184.62	184.62	N/A	13,000	24,000
350	1	93.34	93.34	93.34			93.34	93.34	N/A	22,000	20,535
353	1	98.97	98.97	98.97			98.97	98.97	N/A	77,500	76,700
40	2	107.53	107.53	109.92	8.44	97.82	98.45	116.61	N/A	130,532	143,487
406	9	93.44	91.07	87.83	8.14	103.69	72.55	108.33	74.17 to 97.50	21,988	19,312
408	1	109.17	109.17	109.17			109.17	109.17	N/A	12,000	13,100
44	1	70.45	70.45	70.45			70.45	70.45	N/A	120,000	84,540
442	1	46.70	46.70	46.70			46.70	46.70	N/A	40,000	18,680
48	1	141.18	141.18	141.18			141.18	141.18	N/A	17,000	24,000
49	2	106.50	106.50	106.09	6.10	100.38	100.00	113.00	N/A	64,000	67,900
50	3	68.21	68.07	68.26	1.95	99.72	66.00	70.00	N/A	46,000	31,400
7	1	309.96	309.96	309.96			309.96	309.96	N/A	21,422	66,400
98	6	96.63	307.07	103.93	247.76	295.46	53.33	1430.77	53.33 to 1430.77	25,573	26,578
ALL	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

## 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	29	97.50	100.25	98.61	27.27	101.67	46.70	309.96	74.17 to 103.37	35,575	35,079
04	8	95.81	257.22	97.66	185.96	263.38	56.46	1430.77	56.46 to 1430.77	49,168	48,018
ALL	37	97.50	134.19	98.34	60.88	136.45	46.70	1430.77	88.89 to 100.00	38,514	37,876

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

### **Commercial**

The Clay County staff physically reviewed a total of 118 commercial parcels in the townships of Inland, Lynn, Lewis and Sutton and also the towns of Harvard and Ong. The staff's physical review consisted of visiting each property with a copy of the record card, physically inspecting all property from the outside, and taking pictures of all improvements. Improvements no longer physically there were deleted from the record card. New additions were referred to the contract appraiser if needed. Owners were interviewed at the time of the inspection, if possible. If the owner was not available, a follow up phone call or letter was sent to gather the needed information. New property cards with the current pictures and information were made and put in folders along with new assessment sheets. An audit of the past appraisal commercial cards was completed to ensure accuracy and uniformity of current records. This will be ongoing until the review cycle has been completed. Any discrepancies were referred to the contract appraiser for review.

The Clay County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the grantor and grantee. If there was no response, a follow-up phone call was made to gather as much information about the sale as possible. This information was shared with the contract appraiser. If needed, a physical review was made to further process the sale information. An analysis of sales and market areas was done. Potential areas to review further were recommended and discussed with the contract appraiser. Maintenance work was done by the contract appraiser consisting of reviewing sales and neighborhoods as well as spreadsheet analysis and adjustments to valuation according to the market.

Assessment of all new commercial construction and most pickup work was made by the contract appraiser. Some pickup work was done by the assessor and deputy. All statutory duties were completed in a timely manner.



## 2009 Assessment Survey for Clay County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	ASSESSOR/STAFF NEW CONSTRUCTION/MAINTENANCE-APPRAISER
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	ASSESSOR/APPRAISER WITH ASSESSOR RESPONSIBLE FOR FINAL VALUE
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	ASSESSOR/DEPUTY/APPRAISER
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2005
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2004 FOR 2005
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	2004 FOR 2005
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	MARKET/SALES COMPARISON WITH SOME INCOME APPROACH
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	3
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	LOCATION
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	YES
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	YES
12.	<b>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>)</b>
	NO SUBURBAN

#### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
14	12	43	69

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.58	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 99.72
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,117,147	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	23.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.48 to 107.83
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,142,424	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.55	95% Mean C.I.:	92.18 to 111.15
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,138,495						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,312	COD:	11.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	196.05		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,166	PRD:	102.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.11		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:10

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	98.13	98.13	97.28	1.62	100.88	96.55	99.72	N/A		19,500	18,970
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	95.93	95.93	94.77	2.69	101.22	93.34	98.51	N/A		15,200	14,405
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	97.61	116.39	98.76	22.00	117.85	93.57	158.00	N/A		40,666	40,163
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	93.83	97.05	99.23	4.75	97.81	90.89	114.40	90.89 to 114.40		43,702	43,363
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	93.16	93.16	93.16			93.16	93.16	N/A		19,590	18,250
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	83.17	83.17	83.17			83.17	83.17	N/A		120,000	99,800
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	108.60	108.60	108.60			108.60	108.60	N/A		20,000	21,720
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	105.36	105.36	105.06	7.25	100.29	97.72	113.00	N/A		62,500	65,660
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	92.44	92.04	91.74	7.59	100.33	83.17	100.11	N/A		30,875	28,323
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	196.05	196.05	196.05			196.05	196.05	N/A		36,657	71,865
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	97.21	91.36	96.21	8.05	94.96	71.11	99.93	N/A		61,016	58,706
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	13	96.13	101.51	98.63	8.49	102.91	90.89	158.00	93.34 to 99.72		34,893	34,416
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	93.16	94.98	87.58	9.10	108.44	83.17	108.60	N/A		53,196	46,590
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	11	98.00	103.67	104.17	16.02	99.52	71.11	196.05	83.17 to 113.00		48,111	50,118
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	93.83	102.46	98.79	10.19	103.72	90.89	158.00	93.16 to 114.40		40,380	39,892
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	97.86	96.33	94.24	8.79	102.21	83.17	113.00	83.17 to 113.00		48,562	45,766
____ALL____												
	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72		42,312	42,166

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
CLAY CENTER	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A		6,000	5,880
EDGAR	2	144.70	144.70	157.53	35.49	91.85	93.34	196.05	N/A		29,328	46,200
GLENVIL	4	97.32	96.36	99.13	2.93	97.21	90.89	99.93	N/A		21,225	21,041
HARVARD	2	91.44	91.44	89.19	9.05	102.53	83.17	99.72	N/A		12,375	11,037
NAD B-1	4	95.86	97.90	98.39	7.78	99.50	86.87	113.00	N/A		55,500	54,608
NAD B-2	4	95.59	96.13	95.86	2.86	100.28	93.23	100.11	N/A		56,437	54,102
NAD GLENVIL	2	100.88	100.88	100.96	7.65	99.92	93.16	108.60	N/A		19,795	19,985
SUTTON	8	96.26	101.41	95.50	16.04	106.19	71.11	158.00	71.11 to 158.00		60,097	57,395
____ALL____												
	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72		42,312	42,166

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.58	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 99.72
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,117,147	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	23.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.48 to 107.83
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,142,424	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.55	95% Mean C.I.:	92.18 to 111.15
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,138,495						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,312	COD:	11.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	196.05		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,166	PRD:	102.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.11		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:10

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	96.55	103.94	101.31	15.57	102.60	71.11	196.05	90.89 to 99.93	38,534	39,040
3	10	95.81	97.79	97.43	5.87	100.37	86.87	113.00	93.16 to 108.60	48,734	47,481
____ALL____											
	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	26	96.34	99.50	99.35	10.00	100.15	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 98.51	43,708	43,423
2	1	158.00	158.00	158.00			158.00	158.00	N/A	6,000	9,480
____ALL____											
	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	8	95.81	97.01	97.12	5.32	99.89	86.87	113.00	86.87 to 113.00	55,968	54,355
18-0002	8	96.26	101.41	95.50	16.04	106.19	71.11	158.00	71.11 to 158.00	60,097	57,395
18-0011	2	91.44	91.44	89.19	9.05	102.53	83.17	99.72	N/A	12,375	11,037
18-0070	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	6,000	5,880
18-0501	8	97.32	109.58	118.23	16.64	92.68	90.89	196.05	90.89 to 196.05	22,893	27,066
30-0054											
40-0126											
65-0005											
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.58	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 99.72
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,117,147	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	23.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.48 to 107.83
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,142,424	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.55	95% Mean C.I.:	92.18 to 111.15
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,138,495						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,312	COD:	11.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	196.05		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,166	PRD:	102.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.11		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:10

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	4	98.79	106.67	94.58	29.89	112.78	71.11	158.00	N/A	53,803	50,887
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	95.96	94.57	95.45	1.76	99.08	90.89	96.55	N/A	24,500	23,386
1920 TO 1939	2	98.26	98.26	98.30	0.26	99.96	98.00	98.51	N/A	7,200	7,077
1940 TO 1949	9	97.61	98.29	98.08	5.90	100.22	86.87	113.00	93.16 to 108.60	46,926	46,023
1950 TO 1959	2	88.20	88.20	91.27	5.70	96.64	83.17	93.23	N/A	40,375	36,850
1960 TO 1969	1	196.05	196.05	196.05			196.05	196.05	N/A	36,657	71,865
1970 TO 1979	1	99.93	99.93	99.93			99.93	99.93	N/A	68,000	67,955
1980 TO 1989	2	99.09	99.09	98.56	0.64	100.53	98.45	99.72	N/A	52,532	51,775
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	93.65	93.65	93.65			93.65	93.65	N/A	77,500	72,575
2000 TO Present											
ALL	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	93.51	93.51	93.35	2.80	100.17	90.89	96.13	N/A	4,250	3,967
5000 TO 9999	4	99.12	113.56	110.92	15.44	102.38	98.00	158.00	N/A	7,350	8,152
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	98.26	106.88	106.98	12.08	99.90	90.89	158.00	90.89 to 158.00	6,316	6,757
10000 TO 29999	5	93.16	89.88	90.63	10.23	99.17	71.11	108.60	N/A	19,068	17,281
30000 TO 59999	6	95.28	111.19	107.90	20.69	103.05	86.87	196.05	86.87 to 196.05	43,901	47,368
60000 TO 99999	9	97.72	100.44	100.28	5.15	100.16	93.23	114.40	93.65 to 113.00	69,530	69,726
100000 TO 149999	1	83.17	83.17	83.17			83.17	83.17	N/A	120,000	99,800
ALL	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.58	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 99.72
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,117,147	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	23.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.48 to 107.83
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,142,424	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.55	95% Mean C.I.:	92.18 to 111.15
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,138,495						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,312	COD:	11.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	196.05		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,166	PRD:	102.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.11		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:10

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	93.51	93.51	93.35	2.80	100.17	90.89	96.13	N/A	4,250	3,967
5000 TO 9999	4	99.12	113.56	110.92	15.44	102.38	98.00	158.00	N/A	7,350	8,152
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	98.26	106.88	106.98	12.08	99.90	90.89	158.00	90.89 to 158.00	6,316	6,757
10000 TO 29999	6	93.25	90.99	92.05	9.12	98.85	71.11	108.60	71.11 to 108.60	20,890	19,228
30000 TO 59999	6	94.98	94.69	94.58	3.38	100.11	86.87	100.11	86.87 to 100.11	53,291	50,403
60000 TO 99999	9	98.45	109.96	103.14	17.56	106.60	83.17	196.05	93.23 to 114.40	73,270	75,573
ALL	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	127.07	127.07	133.25	24.35	95.36	96.13	158.00	N/A	5,000	6,662
10	3	93.57	91.10	92.83	4.77	98.13	83.17	96.55	N/A	33,583	31,176
20	22	97.66	100.79	100.00	10.77	100.80	71.11	196.05	93.23 to 99.93	46,894	46,892
ALL	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	114.56	114.56	92.83	37.93	123.40	71.11	158.00	N/A	12,000	11,140
306	1	114.40	114.40	114.40			114.40	114.40	N/A	71,212	81,470
334	1	97.61	97.61	97.61			97.61	97.61	N/A	61,000	59,545
344	1	96.55	96.55	96.55			96.55	96.55	N/A	30,000	28,965
350	1	93.34	93.34	93.34			93.34	93.34	N/A	22,000	20,535
353	1	93.65	93.65	93.65			93.65	93.65	N/A	77,500	72,575
40	1	98.45	98.45	98.45			98.45	98.45	N/A	96,065	94,575
406	8	95.07	95.51	94.18	2.72	101.41	90.89	99.72	90.89 to 99.72	23,987	22,591
42	1	83.17	83.17	83.17			83.17	83.17	N/A	15,750	13,100
44	1	83.17	83.17	83.17			83.17	83.17	N/A	120,000	99,800
49	2	106.47	106.47	106.06	6.14	100.38	99.93	113.00	N/A	64,000	67,877
50	1	95.96	95.96	95.96			95.96	95.96	N/A	62,000	59,495
7	1	196.05	196.05	196.05			196.05	196.05	N/A	36,657	71,865
98	5	97.72	97.29	95.86	5.87	101.49	86.87	108.60	N/A	41,268	39,561
ALL	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166

# 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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.58	95% Median C.I.:	93.34 to 99.72
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,117,147	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	23.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.48 to 107.83
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,142,424	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.55	95% Mean C.I.:	92.18 to 111.15
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,138,495						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,312	COD:	11.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	196.05		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,166	PRD:	102.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.11		

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

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:10

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	19	96.55	103.62	101.29	14.78	102.30	71.11	196.05	93.16 to 99.93	36,561	37,034
04	8	95.81	97.01	97.12	5.32	99.89	86.87	113.00	86.87 to 113.00	55,968	54,355
ALL	27	96.55	101.66	99.66	11.96	102.01	71.11	196.05	93.34 to 99.72	42,312	42,166



## **2009 Correlation Section for Clay County**

---

### **Commerical Real Property**

#### **I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The calculated median indicates that the level of value for commercial real property in Clay County is 97%. This is supported by the trended preliminary ratio as well as the detailed assessment actions. This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county.

Clay County has long had excellent cyclical physical inspection. They are diligent in annually physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. The Assessor has done an excellent job in cross training her staff to be able to handle all facets of the job.

Clay County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have begun the process of implementing a GIS program and offered the personal property schedules online this year. Clay County employs a contract appraiser who helps with the commercial property maintenance valuation.

Clay County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values. They should be commended for their diligence, willingness to move forward technologically, and solid assessment practices.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>39.71</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>44.44</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>59.72</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>60.00</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>60.81</b>

COMMERCIAL: After a decrease in the total number of sales from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, the total number of commercial sales has risen to be more comparable to previous years. Of these total sales, 21 of them were removed for having been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining disqualified sales are a mixture of partial interest sales to partners, sales to exempt entities, family sales and legal action. Clay County is diligent in their sales review. Questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and the seller, if the questionnaire is not returned, follow up phone calls are made to both parties. The Assessor also physically inspects each sale.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>94.94</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93.72</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>8.42</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>23.67</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>98</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table 3 illustrates that the commercial values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio similar to the R & O Ratio. The slight disproportionate movement may be attributed to the commercial maintenance work being done in the county by the contract appraiser. There were only 27 commercial sales in the county but the contract appraiser does borrow sales from surrounding counties to ensure commercial valuations are at an acceptable level of value even though there may be no sales to represent the type of commercial property in the Clay County sales file. The conclusion may be drawn that the commercial population and the commercial sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers support for the calculated level of value at 97% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for commercial property in Clay County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay 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)
-2.8	2009	1.48
11.99	2008	0.26
0.25	2007	0.75
1.90	2006	8.42
13.16	2005	23.67

COMMERCIAL: Table 4 reveals some disproportionate movement between the sales file and the commercial base of property. According to the commercial assessment actions the towns of Harvard and Ong were physically inspected and the contract appraiser did the commercial maintenance work. This maintenance consisted of reviewing sales and neighborhoods as well as spreadsheet analysis and adjustments to valuation according to the market. Ten sales were removed from the sales file after the review with the majority removed due to being substantially changed since the date of the sale. The adjustments to the sales file were slight but with only 27 qualified sales the movement in the sales file when compared to the commercial base of property appears slightly skewed.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>102</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates all three measures of central tendency to be close. The median calculates to 97%, the weighted mean close at 100% and the mean, being more susceptible to outliers, just slightly high at 102%. A review of the statistical page shows these outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 71.11% and the maximum sales ratio at 196.05%. It is the policy of the Clay County Assessor to use every possible sale and she is diligent in her sales verification. The three measures being close to each other give credibility to the calculated statistical level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>11.96</b>	<b>102.01</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL:Both qualitative measures reflect good assessment uniformity and they meet performance standards as outlined in the IAAO standards. The COD and PRD are within the prescribed parameters for the 2009 assessment year and reflect the assessment actions taken by the Clay County Assessor and contract appraiser to equalize the commercial property within the county.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>-10</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>-32</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>60.88</b>	<b>11.96</b>	<b>-48.92</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>136.45</b>	<b>102.01</b>	<b>-34.44</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>46.70</b>	<b>71.11</b>	<b>24.41</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>1,430.77</b>	<b>196.05</b>	<b>-1,234.72</b>

COMMERCIAL: The above table reflects that ten sales were removed from the preliminary sales database. These sales included a partial interest sale and parcels that had substantially changed since the date of the sale. The R & O statistics accurately reflect the assessment actions taken for the commercial class of property in Clay County, including the first year of maintenance work by the contract appraiser.

**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:	59	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.20	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 65.21	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,208,109	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.93 to 64.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,646,109	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.04	95% Mean C.I.:	55.01 to 65.19	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,035	COD:	27.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,752	PRD:	104.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:05

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	76.83	76.88	76.77	6.59	100.14	65.21	89.93	65.21 to 89.93	297,312	228,250
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	64.75	73.22	70.79	17.94	103.44	55.15	97.12	55.15 to 97.12	294,005	208,118
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	72.06	68.58	72.53	16.50	94.55	36.01	90.86	36.01 to 90.86	226,817	164,506
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	48.56	48.56	48.56			48.56	48.56	N/A	114,068	55,390
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	74.10	68.07	69.72	13.68	97.63	49.85	80.25	N/A	265,639	185,195
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	63.54	60.17	58.35	11.05	103.11	43.48	69.90	N/A	174,298	101,709
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	56.74	57.86	56.84	3.45	101.79	55.48	61.35	N/A	309,710	176,031
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	55.21	66.85	52.81	35.68	126.59	36.37	111.29	N/A	271,021	143,125
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	49.06	48.32	56.67	32.39	85.26	20.67	102.64	21.96 to 62.51	302,150	171,221
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	40.85	41.40	40.43	13.46	102.39	32.28	55.62	33.20 to 47.38	545,830	220,682
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
_____Study Years_____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	73.03	73.29	73.65	13.84	99.51	36.01	97.12	64.75 to 77.53	276,068	203,327
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	59.49	60.60	60.76	14.53	99.73	43.48	80.25	49.85 to 69.90	225,967	137,301
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	26	44.88	49.22	47.41	31.68	103.82	20.67	111.29	37.27 to 54.63	389,886	184,841
_____Calendar Yrs_____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	71.11	69.22	70.55	17.78	98.12	36.01	97.12	55.15 to 80.25	254,701	179,696
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	55.35	55.84	56.11	25.86	99.52	20.67	111.29	43.48 to 62.51	269,974	151,487
_____ALL_____	_____										
	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

# 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:	59	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.20	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 65.21	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,208,109	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.93 to 64.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,646,109	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.04	95% Mean C.I.:	55.01 to 65.19	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,035	COD:	27.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,752	PRD:	104.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:05

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3667	3	55.15	61.09	48.10	32.39	127.00	37.27	90.86	N/A	426,666	205,245
3669	2	64.15	64.15	64.35	0.94	99.69	63.54	64.75	N/A	327,500	210,732
3671	5	57.63	62.34	62.15	10.05	100.30	55.62	76.94	N/A	274,385	170,528
3673	6	49.21	51.18	42.63	26.76	120.05	32.28	80.25	32.28 to 80.25	340,004	144,957
3757	2	65.97	65.97	73.72	16.30	89.48	55.21	76.72	N/A	207,125	152,692
3759	5	74.70	70.61	67.99	17.53	103.85	42.89	94.42	N/A	224,847	152,875
3763	3	73.00	67.94	70.15	16.46	96.85	47.38	83.43	N/A	517,731	363,166
3901	2	80.28	80.28	74.33	12.03	108.00	70.62	89.93	N/A	263,000	195,480
3903	1	65.21	65.21	65.21			65.21	65.21	N/A	264,000	172,145
3905	6	50.00	53.59	49.28	25.56	108.76	36.37	74.10	36.37 to 74.10	433,723	213,726
3907	9	61.35	55.48	49.95	26.15	111.07	31.01	77.53	35.05 to 77.46	275,054	137,391
3995	8	59.63	64.37	75.10	32.63	85.71	21.96	102.64	21.96 to 102.64	290,895	218,461
3997	5	54.63	60.21	48.98	31.89	122.93	36.01	111.29	N/A	363,345	177,980
3999	2	32.08	32.08	43.40	35.56	73.91	20.67	43.48	N/A	97,875	42,475
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	31	56.74	60.33	56.98	29.95	105.88	21.96	111.29	46.09 to 70.62	327,502	186,608
2	26	63.24	62.27	58.29	21.24	106.83	32.28	94.42	55.15 to 74.70	324,563	189,186
3	2	28.34	28.34	35.80	27.06	79.15	20.67	36.01	N/A	27,447	9,827
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

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	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

# 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:	59	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.20	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 65.21	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,208,109	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.93 to 64.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,646,109	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.04	95% Mean C.I.:	55.01 to 65.19	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,035	COD:	27.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,752	PRD:	104.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:05

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
01-0090	2	60.19	60.19	59.39	21.28	101.35	47.38	73.00	N/A		429,097	254,830
18-0002	17	55.62	55.06	48.49	22.28	113.55	32.28	80.25	38.99 to 66.30		284,931	138,157
18-0011	6	64.05	61.72	61.22	10.98	100.82	42.89	76.94	42.89 to 76.94		310,333	189,977
18-0070	12	67.56	61.19	55.01	23.33	111.23	31.01	94.42	39.97 to 74.70		322,786	177,564
18-0501	17	56.74	64.56	64.95	34.05	99.41	21.96	111.29	43.66 to 89.93		307,817	199,921
30-0054												
40-0126	4	69.29	66.68	60.54	29.54	110.15	37.27	90.86	N/A		493,750	298,893
65-0005	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A		750	155
85-0047												
91-0074												
NonValid School												
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21		316,035	181,752

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
0.01 TO 10.00	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A		750	155
10.01 TO 30.00	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A		27,500	30,605
30.01 TO 50.00	2	63.16	63.16	62.48	12.59	101.09	55.21	71.11	N/A		53,156	33,210
50.01 TO 100.00	21	57.63	58.23	55.84	23.54	104.28	21.96	90.86	49.85 to 66.30		181,680	101,458
100.01 TO 180.00	26	59.85	59.94	56.75	24.79	105.62	35.05	97.12	46.09 to 73.00		345,472	196,051
180.01 TO 330.00	8	64.79	63.30	59.47	32.61	106.43	32.28	102.64	32.28 to 102.64		714,245	424,780
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21		316,035	181,752

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
DRY	7	49.85	56.20	47.94	34.42	117.24	31.01	94.42	31.01 to 94.42		231,667	111,058
DRY-N/A	8	55.98	59.28	58.14	16.56	101.95	35.05	77.53	35.05 to 77.53		241,411	140,365
GRASS	2	21.32	21.32	21.95	3.03	97.10	20.67	21.96	N/A		75,055	16,475
GRASS-N/A	5	48.56	55.08	56.00	27.95	98.37	36.01	77.46	N/A		119,191	66,742
IRRGTD	14	64.66	63.85	55.65	23.49	114.73	33.20	90.86	43.66 to 80.25		382,397	212,796
IRRGTD-N/A	23	62.51	63.76	60.90	24.62	104.69	32.28	111.29	51.91 to 73.03		391,022	238,140
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21		316,035	181,752

# 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:	59	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.20	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 65.21	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,208,109	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.93 to 64.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,646,109	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.04	95% Mean C.I.:	55.01 to 65.19	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,035	COD:	27.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,752	PRD:	104.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:06

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	49.85	53.91	46.05	31.60	117.07	31.01	94.42	35.05 to 71.11	251,130	115,642
DRY-N/A	6	60.21	63.74	66.49	14.52	95.86	54.63	77.53	54.63 to 77.53	215,465	143,257
GRASS	3	21.96	28.70	34.12	34.62	84.13	20.67	43.48	N/A	115,036	39,248
GRASS-N/A	4	59.23	57.98	62.08	26.50	93.40	36.01	77.46	N/A	100,238	62,228
IRRGTD	31	63.53	63.18	60.71	21.76	104.07	33.20	102.64	53.91 to 73.03	390,433	237,031
IRRGTD-N/A	6	59.00	66.93	49.40	39.63	135.48	32.28	111.29	32.28 to 111.29	373,938	184,734
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	14	55.98	58.03	53.35	25.46	108.78	31.01	94.42	38.99 to 74.70	234,354	125,023
DRY-N/A	1	55.15	55.15	55.15			55.15	55.15	N/A	272,000	150,005
GRASS	5	36.01	39.92	46.14	43.49	86.51	20.67	77.46	N/A	109,851	50,686
GRASS-N/A	2	59.23	59.23	57.53	18.01	102.95	48.56	69.90	N/A	98,405	56,615
IRRGTD	36	63.24	64.37	59.30	24.17	108.56	32.28	111.29	55.48 to 73.03	389,918	231,206
IRRGTD-N/A	1	42.89	42.89	42.89			42.89	42.89	N/A	310,000	132,965
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
10000 TO 29999	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A	27,500	30,605
30000 TO 59999	3	55.21	54.11	53.55	21.19	101.05	36.01	71.11	N/A	53,486	28,640
60000 TO 99999	1	69.90	69.90	69.90			69.90	69.90	N/A	82,742	57,840
100000 TO 149999	8	63.02	60.96	59.51	22.28	102.43	21.96	89.93	21.96 to 89.93	128,949	76,741
150000 TO 249999	13	63.54	69.15	68.63	22.70	100.76	43.48	97.12	55.62 to 90.86	194,137	133,237
250000 TO 499999	23	57.63	57.30	57.69	22.61	99.33	31.01	77.53	47.38 to 70.62	358,792	206,973
500000 +	9	43.66	53.02	52.42	36.07	101.15	32.28	102.64	36.37 to 83.43	729,671	382,492
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

# 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:	59	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.20	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 65.21	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,208,109	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	19.95	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.93 to 64.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,646,109	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.04	95% Mean C.I.:	55.01 to 65.19	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,723,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,035	COD:	27.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,752	PRD:	104.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:06

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
10000 TO 29999	1	36.01	36.01	36.01			36.01	36.01	N/A	54,145	19,500
30000 TO 59999	6	62.56	63.01	50.64	33.72	124.42	21.96	111.29	21.96 to 111.29	79,997	40,508
60000 TO 99999	8	58.57	57.66	53.32	22.05	108.12	31.01	89.93	31.01 to 89.93	158,520	84,528
100000 TO 149999	15	57.63	62.18	58.56	21.09	106.17	33.20	94.42	51.91 to 76.94	218,716	128,085
150000 TO 249999	14	50.65	56.31	50.97	30.62	110.46	35.05	97.12	38.99 to 77.49	386,989	197,266
250000 TO 499999	12	67.69	61.92	55.95	18.10	110.67	32.28	77.53	43.66 to 74.10	557,621	311,965
500000 +	2	93.04	93.04	93.45	10.32	99.56	83.43	102.64	N/A	726,500	678,920
ALL	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21	316,035	181,752

# 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:	67	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.32	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 64.83	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,121,237	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.05 to 62.00	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,559,237	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.84	95% Mean C.I.:	54.61 to 64.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,198,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	351,630	COD:	27.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	196,988	PRD:	105.94	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:18

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	9	76.72	75.54	75.45	7.59	100.12	64.83	89.93	65.21 to 83.43	303,912	229,288	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	64.75	73.22	70.79	17.94	103.44	55.15	97.12	55.15 to 97.12	294,005	208,118	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	72.06	68.58	72.53	16.50	94.55	36.01	90.86	36.01 to 90.86	226,817	164,506	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	48.56	48.56	48.56			48.56	48.56	N/A	114,068	55,390	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	74.10	68.07	69.72	13.68	97.63	49.85	80.25	N/A	265,639	185,195	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	63.54	58.28	55.37	14.13	105.26	39.69	69.90	39.69 to 69.90	382,410	211,755	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	58.44	61.66	63.87	9.60	96.54	55.48	80.33	55.48 to 80.33	284,045	181,428	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	55.21	66.85	52.81	35.68	126.59	36.37	111.29	N/A	271,021	143,125	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	49.06	48.32	56.67	32.39	85.26	20.67	102.64	21.96 to 62.51	302,150	171,221	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	12	39.53	39.66	39.14	15.38	101.33	22.90	55.62	33.20 to 46.09	619,515	242,490	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	22	73.02	72.90	73.24	13.72	99.54	36.01	97.12	64.75 to 77.53	279,734	204,885	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	60.14	60.63	60.12	15.24	100.84	39.69	80.33	49.85 to 69.90	311,301	187,166	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	43.28	47.92	45.48	32.59	105.36	20.67	111.29	37.27 to 53.91	432,605	196,748	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	71.11	69.22	70.55	17.78	98.12	36.01	97.12	55.15 to 80.25	254,701	179,696	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	29	55.93	56.68	57.06	24.70	99.33	20.67	111.29	49.06 to 62.51	312,410	178,272	
<u>ALL</u>												
	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988	



# 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:	67	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.32	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 64.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,121,237	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.05 to 62.00	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,559,237	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.84	95% Mean C.I.:	54.61 to 64.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,198,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	351,630	COD:	27.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	196,988	PRD:	105.94	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:18

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
3667	3	55.15	61.09	48.10	32.39	127.00	37.27	90.86	N/A		426,666	205,245
3669	2	64.15	64.15	64.35	0.94	99.69	63.54	64.75	N/A		327,500	210,732
3671	6	57.28	61.27	61.36	8.92	99.85	55.62	76.94	55.62 to 76.94		261,971	160,749
3673	7	48.56	47.14	38.38	30.79	122.81	22.90	80.25	22.90 to 80.25		371,418	142,567
3757	2	65.97	65.97	73.72	16.30	89.48	55.21	76.72	N/A		207,125	152,692
3759	6	71.08	70.08	68.11	17.06	102.90	42.89	94.42	42.89 to 94.42		328,198	223,529
3763	3	73.00	67.94	70.15	16.46	96.85	47.38	83.43	N/A		517,731	363,166
3901	4	75.47	76.43	74.93	11.53	102.00	64.83	89.93	N/A		333,791	250,115
3903	2	62.68	62.68	64.34	4.04	97.41	60.14	65.21	N/A		193,397	124,430
3905	6	50.00	53.59	49.28	25.56	108.76	36.37	74.10	36.37 to 74.10		433,723	213,726
3907	9	61.35	55.48	49.95	26.15	111.07	31.01	77.53	35.05 to 77.46		275,054	137,391
3995	8	59.63	64.37	75.10	32.63	85.71	21.96	102.64	21.96 to 102.64		290,895	218,461
3997	6	49.15	56.69	45.31	34.81	125.12	36.01	111.29	36.01 to 111.29		538,785	244,122
3999	3	39.69	34.61	41.68	19.16	83.05	20.67	43.48	N/A		385,391	160,630
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83		351,630	196,988

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	35	60.14	60.42	56.37	27.37	107.19	21.96	111.29	49.06 to 69.90		357,157	201,312
2	29	62.95	60.88	57.11	21.96	106.59	22.90	94.42	55.15 to 73.00		346,323	197,783
3	3	36.01	32.12	41.03	17.61	78.29	20.67	39.69	N/A		338,440	138,865
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83		351,630	196,988

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.			
1	8	58.04	53.79	50.37	24.80	106.79	22.90	80.33	22.90 to 80.33		614,141	309,359
2	59	57.63	60.10	57.51	27.83	104.50	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 65.21		316,035	181,752
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83		351,630	196,988

## 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:	67	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.32	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 64.83	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,121,237	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.05 to 62.00	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,559,237	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.84	95% Mean C.I.:	54.61 to 64.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,198,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	351,630	COD:	27.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	196,988	PRD:	105.94	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:18

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	2	60.19	60.19	59.39	21.28	101.35	47.38	73.00	N/A	429,097	254,830
18-0002	18	55.42	53.27	45.84	24.40	116.22	22.90	80.25	38.99 to 63.53	300,207	137,606
18-0011	7	63.54	60.89	60.71	11.20	100.30	42.89	76.94	42.89 to 76.94	294,557	178,817
18-0070	14	66.33	61.56	57.51	21.16	107.04	31.01	94.42	39.97 to 74.70	345,799	198,877
18-0501	21	56.74	62.93	59.15	33.14	106.38	21.96	111.29	43.66 to 77.53	400,879	237,140
30-0054											
40-0126	4	69.29	66.68	60.54	29.54	110.15	37.27	90.86	N/A	493,750	298,893
65-0005	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

## 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	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
10.01 TO 30.00	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A	27,500	30,605
30.01 TO 50.00	2	63.16	63.16	62.48	12.59	101.09	55.21	71.11	N/A	53,156	33,210
50.01 TO 100.00	23	57.63	58.22	56.05	21.81	103.87	21.96	90.86	51.91 to 63.54	179,912	100,834
100.01 TO 180.00	28	59.85	58.79	55.19	25.52	106.52	22.90	97.12	46.09 to 70.62	353,532	195,112
180.01 TO 330.00	10	70.78	65.42	62.00	25.70	105.51	32.28	102.64	37.27 to 83.43	701,136	434,694
330.01 TO 650.00	2	39.39	39.39	40.89	0.76	96.33	39.09	39.69	N/A	1,188,206	485,887
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	49.85	56.20	47.94	34.42	117.24	31.01	94.42	31.01 to 94.42	231,667	111,058
DRY-N/A	10	55.98	55.73	50.80	19.90	109.70	22.90	77.53	35.05 to 74.70	261,398	132,786
GRASS	2	21.32	21.32	21.95	3.03	97.10	20.67	21.96	N/A	75,055	16,475
GRASS-N/A	5	48.56	55.08	56.00	27.95	98.37	36.01	77.46	N/A	119,191	66,742
IRRGTD	15	64.75	64.09	57.37	22.17	111.71	33.20	90.86	47.38 to 77.49	413,234	237,063
IRRGTD-N/A	28	61.93	62.37	57.92	24.62	107.67	32.28	111.29	51.91 to 70.62	442,106	256,084
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

## 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:	67	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.32	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 64.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,121,237	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.05 to 62.00	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,559,237	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.84	95% Mean C.I.:	54.61 to 64.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,198,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	351,630	COD:	27.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	196,988	PRD:	105.94	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:18

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	49.85	53.91	46.05	31.60	117.07	31.01	94.42	35.05 to 71.11	251,130	115,642
DRY-N/A	8	57.68	58.18	53.88	19.44	107.98	22.90	77.53	22.90 to 77.53	246,935	133,061
GRASS	3	21.96	28.70	34.12	34.62	84.13	20.67	43.48	N/A	115,036	39,248
GRASS-N/A	4	59.23	57.98	62.08	26.50	93.40	36.01	77.46	N/A	100,238	62,228
IRRGTD	35	62.95	61.74	58.03	22.14	106.40	33.20	102.64	53.91 to 70.62	443,563	257,383
IRRGTD-N/A	8	63.67	68.34	56.27	31.49	121.45	32.28	111.29	32.28 to 111.29	381,599	214,738
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	16	55.98	55.97	49.33	26.44	113.46	22.90	94.42	38.99 to 71.11	247,728	122,204
DRY-N/A	1	55.15	55.15	55.15			55.15	55.15	N/A	272,000	150,005
GRASS	5	36.01	39.92	46.14	43.49	86.51	20.67	77.46	N/A	109,851	50,686
GRASS-N/A	2	59.23	59.23	57.53	18.01	102.95	48.56	69.90	N/A	98,405	56,615
IRRGTD	42	63.24	63.44	57.99	23.65	109.41	32.28	111.29	55.62 to 70.62	434,940	252,222
IRRGTD-N/A	1	42.89	42.89	42.89			42.89	42.89	N/A	310,000	132,965
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
10000 TO 29999	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A	27,500	30,605
30000 TO 59999	3	55.21	54.11	53.55	21.19	101.05	36.01	71.11	N/A	53,486	28,640
60000 TO 99999	1	69.90	69.90	69.90			69.90	69.90	N/A	82,742	57,840
100000 TO 149999	9	62.51	60.87	59.83	20.39	101.74	21.96	89.93	48.56 to 80.25	128,265	76,738
150000 TO 249999	14	62.45	68.21	67.70	22.32	100.75	43.48	97.12	55.62 to 90.86	194,549	131,710
250000 TO 499999	25	62.95	58.52	59.26	20.60	98.75	31.01	80.33	49.06 to 70.62	362,455	214,796
500000 +	13	39.97	49.72	49.47	36.79	100.50	22.90	102.64	36.37 to 67.45	796,023	393,787
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

# 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:	67	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>58</b>	COV:	33.32	95% Median C.I.:	53.91 to 64.83	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,121,237	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.05 to 62.00	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,559,237	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.84	95% Mean C.I.:	54.61 to 64.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,198,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	351,630	COD:	27.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29			
AVG. Assessed Value:	196,988	PRD:	105.94	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:18

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	20.67	20.67	20.67			20.67	20.67	N/A	750	155
10000 TO 29999	1	36.01	36.01	36.01			36.01	36.01	N/A	54,145	19,500
30000 TO 59999	6	62.56	63.01	50.64	33.72	124.42	21.96	111.29	21.96 to 111.29	79,997	40,508
60000 TO 99999	9	60.14	57.93	54.13	19.09	107.02	31.01	89.93	43.48 to 66.30	154,551	83,660
100000 TO 149999	17	56.93	59.50	53.49	22.53	111.23	22.90	94.42	49.06 to 76.94	237,679	127,139
150000 TO 249999	15	53.91	56.87	51.94	28.20	109.50	35.05	97.12	39.97 to 65.21	384,971	199,955
250000 TO 499999	15	70.62	64.38	59.70	20.74	107.84	32.28	102.64	43.66 to 76.72	590,822	352,695
500000 +	3	67.45	63.32	58.58	21.91	108.10	39.09	83.43	N/A	985,314	577,158
ALL	67	57.63	59.35	56.02	27.49	105.94	20.67	111.29	53.91 to 64.83	351,630	196,988

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

### **Agricultural**

The Clay County staff physically reviewed the townships of Inland, Lynn, Lewis and Sutton. The staff's physical review consisted of visiting each property with a copy of the record card, physically inspecting all property from the outside, and taking pictures of all improvements. New additions were measured and assessed; other improvements no longer physically there were deleted from the record card. Owners were interviewed at the time of the inspection, if possible. If the owner was not available, the Clay County staff left a questionnaire with the changes made to the property assessment and noted if any additional information was needed from the owner. All "No Trespassing" signs were honored. In addition to land used gathered during physical inspection, certified acres and maps from the FSA office were used by requesting this information from the owner/renter, well permits as well as FSA and GIS digitals and NRD reports of irrigated acres were used. Parcels reviewed = 918.

As each township was reviewed new property cards were made for each parcel. All information pertinent to the property was updated. A sketch of the house was put in the parcel folder along with a photo page of improvements. In addition a diagram of placement on property was included with a list of outbuildings with description, size and any information unique to the structure.

All rural acres, 25 acres or less, were reviewed to determine the highest and best use. All agland was assessed according to LB777. Implementation of the new soil survey is under way but not quite ready to use for assessment year 2009. The GIS has discovered a few new acres.

The Clay County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the buyer and seller. If there was no response, a follow-up phone call was made to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A spreadsheet analysis of all usable sales within the study period was completed, analyzing existing and potential market areas. Ag land within city limits was also updated. The assessor also plotted agricultural sales within the study period with a visual analysis. This visual aid is available on a map for public viewing in the office.

All pickup work was completed by the Assessor and staff in a timely manner.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Clay County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	ASSESSOR/STAFF
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	ASSESSOR/STAFF WITH ASSESSOR RESPONSIBLE FOR FINAL VALUE
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	ASSESSOR & DEPUTY
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	YES, 25 ACRES OR LESS IS CONSIDERED RURAL RESIDENTIAL
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	BY LOCATION AND LAND USE
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	N/A
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1978
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	PHYSICAL, FSA DIGITALS, GIS, WELL LISTS FROM NRD'S
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	ASSESSOR AND STAFF
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100%
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	3
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	LOCATION-TOPOGRAPHY -SALES
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	Yes or No NO
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>

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

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>115</b>

**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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.72 to 78.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,183,246	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.36 to 73.49	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,621,246	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.10	95% Mean C.I.:	66.46 to 76.75	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,532,990							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,138	COD:	19.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	234,066	PRD:	106.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.83			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:34

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	84.10	84.45	85.85	6.01	98.37	71.88	94.47	71.88 to 94.47	297,312	255,240
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	83.13	86.88	85.02	16.20	102.18	68.28	113.25	68.28 to 113.25	297,673	253,095
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	80.52	79.94	80.80	6.36	98.94	71.15	87.57	N/A	284,689	230,025
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	66.70	66.70	73.67	21.96	90.54	52.05	81.35	N/A	335,459	247,117
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	70.02	66.89	65.22	10.70	102.56	45.41	75.97	N/A	174,298	113,675
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	66.50	66.50	67.44	2.67	98.61	64.72	68.27	N/A	373,315	251,745
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	84.50	83.84	81.87	23.95	102.40	61.76	104.59	N/A	186,776	152,918
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	64.27	62.76	58.89	13.69	106.57	49.61	74.60	N/A	455,900	268,476
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	48.36	50.63	50.62	11.38	100.02	42.83	62.82	43.65 to 58.10	555,811	281,360
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	83.46	84.26	84.49	9.59	99.73	68.28	113.25	76.37 to 89.89	294,627	248,921
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	68.27	66.76	68.42	11.73	97.57	45.41	81.35	52.05 to 75.97	254,337	174,011
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	57.26	61.38	55.88	22.29	109.85	42.83	104.59	48.36 to 65.44	446,050	249,238
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	79.92	81.20	81.57	13.62	99.55	52.05	113.25	71.15 to 89.89	299,643	244,409
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	68.16	69.79	65.15	15.74	107.12	45.41	104.59	61.76 to 74.97	290,295	189,120
____ALL____	_____										
	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066



# 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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.72 to 78.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,183,246	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.36 to 73.49	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,621,246	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.10	95% Mean C.I.:	66.46 to 76.75	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,532,990							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,138	COD:	19.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	234,066	PRD:	106.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.83			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:35

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3667	1	49.61	49.61	49.61			49.61	49.61	N/A	840,000	416,690
3669	2	73.19	73.19	74.24	4.34	98.60	70.02	76.37	N/A	327,500	243,127
3671	5	74.60	73.66	73.43	8.56	100.32	62.82	87.23	N/A	274,385	201,471
3673	4	48.82	52.90	50.23	17.82	105.32	42.83	71.15	N/A	449,990	226,041
3757	2	74.97	74.97	81.85	12.71	91.60	65.44	84.50	N/A	207,125	169,522
3759	5	78.79	80.54	80.31	20.58	100.29	53.15	104.59	N/A	224,847	180,578
3763	3	82.55	77.81	80.21	15.37	97.01	56.41	94.47	N/A	517,731	415,273
3901	2	87.76	87.76	85.27	4.62	102.92	83.71	91.82	N/A	263,000	224,262
3903	1	71.88	71.88	71.88			71.88	71.88	N/A	264,000	189,755
3905	5	61.76	64.21	60.31	19.55	106.47	48.36	81.35	N/A	398,867	240,571
3907	7	74.97	68.13	62.74	17.44	108.60	43.65	87.57	43.65 to 87.57	252,070	158,137
3995	4	81.03	84.89	78.99	20.58	107.47	64.27	113.25	N/A	372,826	294,497
3997	3	68.27	76.64	62.43	22.20	122.76	58.10	103.56	N/A	542,514	338,713
3999	1	45.41	45.41	45.41			45.41	45.41	N/A	195,000	88,540
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	23	72.16	72.19	66.53	20.45	108.51	43.65	113.25	61.76 to 83.20	341,855	227,424
2	22	70.59	71.00	68.34	18.90	103.89	42.83	104.59	56.41 to 82.55	352,662	241,010
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

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	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

**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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.72 to 78.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,183,246	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.36 to 73.49	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,621,246	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.10	95% Mean C.I.:	66.46 to 76.75	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,532,990							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,138	COD:	19.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	234,066	PRD:	106.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.83			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:35

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	2	69.48	69.48	68.66	18.81	101.19	56.41	82.55	N/A	429,097	294,630
18-0002	14	65.08	62.90	57.62	17.96	109.17	42.83	84.50	45.58 to 74.97	296,268	170,706
18-0011	6	72.81	71.74	71.56	10.98	100.25	53.15	87.23	53.15 to 87.23	310,333	222,077
18-0070	10	77.23	75.02	69.58	17.10	107.82	48.36	104.59	51.11 to 97.90	301,044	209,466
18-0501	11	83.71	79.82	72.57	19.32	110.00	45.41	113.25	58.10 to 103.56	382,531	277,587
30-0054											
40-0126	2	72.04	72.04	69.92	31.14	103.03	49.61	94.47	N/A	767,500	536,625
65-0005											
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	103.56	103.56	103.56			103.56	103.56	N/A	27,500	28,480
30.01 TO 50.00	2	71.97	71.97	71.40	9.07	100.79	65.44	78.49	N/A	53,156	37,952
50.01 TO 100.00	13	70.02	69.66	66.71	12.96	104.41	42.83	91.82	62.82 to 75.97	186,442	124,381
100.01 TO 180.00	21	75.59	72.38	69.42	21.74	104.27	43.65	113.25	53.15 to 83.71	349,986	242,954
180.01 TO 330.00	8	66.27	68.65	64.92	21.52	105.75	45.58	94.47	45.58 to 94.47	714,245	463,701
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

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	7	74.97	71.06	56.84	26.19	125.02	43.65	103.56	43.65 to 103.56	199,167	113,210
DRY-N/A	4	75.34	75.92	79.51	9.64	95.49	65.44	87.57	N/A	221,437	176,060
GRASS-N/A	3	75.97	68.19	64.57	16.58	105.61	45.41	83.20	N/A	142,580	92,065
IRRGTD	12	75.10	72.31	66.54	18.70	108.67	42.83	104.59	56.41 to 87.23	421,630	280,566
IRRGTD-N/A	19	68.28	70.99	68.67	18.54	103.38	45.58	113.25	61.76 to 83.71	413,369	283,857
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

**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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.72 to 78.49	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,183,246	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.36 to 73.49	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,621,246	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.10	95% Mean C.I.:	66.46 to 76.75	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,532,990							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,138	COD:	19.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	234,066	PRD:	106.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.83			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:35

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	74.97	71.06	56.84	26.19	125.02	43.65	103.56	43.65 to 103.56	199,167	113,210
DRY-N/A	4	75.34	75.92	79.51	9.64	95.49	65.44	87.57	N/A	221,437	176,060
GRASS	1	45.41	45.41	45.41			45.41	45.41	N/A	195,000	88,540
GRASS-N/A	2	79.59	79.59	80.63	4.54	98.71	75.97	83.20	N/A	116,371	93,827
IRRGTD	27	70.02	70.73	67.22	18.83	105.23	42.83	104.59	61.76 to 82.55	431,683	290,173
IRRGTD-N/A	4	70.22	76.71	73.55	22.78	104.29	53.15	113.25	N/A	314,532	231,347
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

**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	11	74.97	72.83	65.65	20.19	110.94	43.65	103.56	46.83 to 97.90	207,265	136,064
GRASS	2	64.31	64.31	61.84	29.38	103.99	45.41	83.20	N/A	172,500	106,667
GRASS-N/A	1	75.97	75.97	75.97			75.97	75.97	N/A	82,742	62,860
IRRGTD	30	70.59	72.11	68.20	19.03	105.74	42.83	113.25	64.27 to 81.35	420,119	286,510
IRRGTD-N/A	1	53.15	53.15	53.15			53.15	53.15	N/A	310,000	164,775
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

**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	1	103.56	103.56	103.56			103.56	103.56	N/A	27,500	28,480
30000 TO 59999	2	71.97	71.97	71.40	9.07	100.79	65.44	78.49	N/A	53,156	37,952
60000 TO 99999	1	75.97	75.97	75.97			75.97	75.97	N/A	82,742	62,860
100000 TO 149999	4	73.57	76.81	75.65	8.95	101.52	68.28	91.82	N/A	126,781	95,916
150000 TO 249999	11	74.60	75.45	75.59	20.15	99.82	45.41	113.25	52.05 to 97.90	197,571	149,344
250000 TO 499999	18	73.74	71.21	71.01	18.87	100.28	42.83	104.59	56.41 to 83.71	375,846	266,900
500000 +	8	54.61	59.97	59.32	20.71	101.09	45.58	94.47	45.58 to 94.47	744,880	441,884
ALL	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

**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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.72 to 78.49	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,183,246	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.36 to 73.49	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,621,246	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.10	95% Mean C.I.:	66.46 to 76.75	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,532,990							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,138	COD:	19.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	234,066	PRD:	106.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.83			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:35

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	103.56	103.56	103.56			103.56	103.56	N/A	27,500	28,480
30000 TO 59999	2	71.97	71.97	71.40	9.07	100.79	65.44	78.49	N/A	53,156	37,952
60000 TO 99999	7	72.16	68.67	65.22	15.25	105.28	45.41	91.82	45.41 to 91.82	137,266	89,525
100000 TO 149999	3	64.72	63.58	57.58	20.79	110.43	42.83	83.20	N/A	223,986	128,963
150000 TO 249999	13	70.02	68.30	64.30	15.96	106.21	43.65	97.90	53.15 to 78.79	275,934	177,431
250000 TO 499999	17	76.37	74.29	68.52	20.66	108.42	45.58	113.25	51.11 to 87.57	502,532	344,340
500000 +	2	76.29	76.29	72.76	23.84	104.85	58.10	94.47	N/A	862,206	627,317
ALL _____	_____										
	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066

**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:	49	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.81	95% Median C.I.:	65.44 to 76.37	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,140,306	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.34 to 72.86	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,578,306	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.11	95% Mean C.I.:	66.36 to 76.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,706,480							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	358,740	COD:	19.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	238,907	PRD:	107.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.77			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:45

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	9	83.71	83.35	84.34	6.59	98.83	71.88	94.47	74.52 to 91.82	305,000	257,224	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	83.13	86.88	85.02	16.20	102.18	68.28	113.25	68.28 to 113.25	297,673	253,095	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	80.52	79.94	80.80	6.36	98.94	71.15	87.57	N/A	284,689	230,025	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	66.70	66.70	73.67	21.96	90.54	52.05	81.35	N/A	335,459	247,117	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	69.04	62.37	51.62	16.35	120.82	39.77	75.97	39.77 to 75.97	311,915	161,009	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	68.01	72.66	75.25	9.46	96.56	64.72	89.91	N/A	334,297	251,550	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	84.50	83.84	81.87	23.95	102.40	61.76	104.59	N/A	186,776	152,918	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	64.27	62.76	58.89	13.69	106.57	49.61	74.60	N/A	455,900	268,476	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	48.36	50.63	50.62	11.38	100.02	42.83	62.82	43.65 to 58.10	555,811	281,360	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	83.20	83.75	83.84	9.66	99.88	68.28	113.25	75.59 to 89.89	298,410	250,194	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	68.16	66.52	63.58	15.01	104.63	39.77	89.91	52.05 to 75.97	323,300	205,540	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	57.26	61.38	55.88	22.29	109.85	42.83	104.59	48.36 to 65.44	446,050	249,238	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	79.92	81.20	81.57	13.62	99.55	52.05	113.25	71.15 to 89.89	299,643	244,409	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	68.06	69.16	62.97	17.18	109.83	39.77	104.59	61.76 to 74.97	328,173	206,647	
____ALL____	_____											
	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907	

# 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:	49	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.81	95% Median C.I.:	65.44 to 76.37	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,140,306	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.34 to 72.86	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,578,306	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.11	95% Mean C.I.:	66.36 to 76.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,706,480							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	358,740	COD:	19.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	238,907	PRD:	107.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.77			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:46

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3667	1	49.61	49.61	49.61			49.61	49.61	N/A	840,000	416,690
3669	2	73.19	73.19	74.24	4.34	98.60	70.02	76.37	N/A	327,500	243,127
3671	5	74.60	73.66	73.43	8.56	100.32	62.82	87.23	N/A	274,385	201,471
3673	4	48.82	52.90	50.23	17.82	105.32	42.83	71.15	N/A	449,990	226,041
3757	2	74.97	74.97	81.85	12.71	91.60	65.44	84.50	N/A	207,125	169,522
3759	5	78.79	80.54	80.31	20.58	100.29	53.15	104.59	N/A	224,847	180,578
3763	3	82.55	77.81	80.21	15.37	97.01	56.41	94.47	N/A	517,731	415,273
3901	4	86.81	84.99	83.95	6.77	101.24	74.52	91.82	N/A	338,875	284,481
3903	2	69.81	69.81	70.53	2.97	98.98	67.74	71.88	N/A	195,780	138,082
3905	5	61.76	64.21	60.31	19.55	106.47	48.36	81.35	N/A	398,867	240,571
3907	7	74.97	68.13	62.74	17.44	108.60	43.65	87.57	43.65 to 87.57	252,070	158,137
3995	4	81.03	84.89	78.99	20.58	107.47	64.27	113.25	N/A	372,826	294,497
3997	3	68.27	76.64	62.43	22.20	122.76	58.10	103.56	N/A	542,514	338,713
3999	2	42.59	42.59	40.69	6.62	104.67	39.77	45.41	N/A	597,500	243,110
ALL											
	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	26	73.34	72.79	68.10	19.09	106.88	43.65	113.25	64.27 to 83.20	339,220	231,022
2	22	70.59	71.00	68.34	18.90	103.89	42.83	104.59	56.41 to 82.55	352,662	241,010
3	1	39.77	39.77	39.77			39.77	39.77	N/A	1,000,000	397,680
ALL											
	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	4	71.13	67.98	59.96	20.01	113.38	39.77	89.91	N/A	489,265	293,372
2	45	71.88	71.61	67.43	19.62	106.20	42.83	113.25	64.72 to 78.49	347,138	234,066
ALL											
	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

# 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:	49	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.81	95% Median C.I.:	65.44 to 76.37	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,140,306	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.34 to 72.86	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,578,306	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.11	95% Mean C.I.:	66.36 to 76.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,706,480							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	358,740	COD:	19.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	238,907	PRD:	107.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.77			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:46

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0090	2	69.48	69.48	68.66	18.81	101.19	56.41	82.55	N/A	429,097	294,630
18-0002	14	65.08	62.90	57.62	17.96	109.17	42.83	84.50	45.58 to 74.97	296,268	170,706
18-0011	6	72.81	71.74	71.56	10.98	100.25	53.15	87.23	53.15 to 87.23	310,333	222,077
18-0070	11	75.97	74.36	69.51	16.79	106.98	48.36	104.59	51.11 to 97.90	285,272	198,279
18-0501	14	79.11	77.30	68.58	21.42	112.71	39.77	113.25	58.10 to 91.82	431,239	295,753
30-0054											
40-0126	2	72.04	72.04	69.92	31.14	103.03	49.61	94.47	N/A	767,500	536,625
65-0005											
85-0047											
91-0074											
NonValid School											
ALL	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	103.56	103.56	103.56			103.56	103.56	N/A	27,500	28,480
30.01 TO 50.00	2	71.97	71.97	71.40	9.07	100.79	65.44	78.49	N/A	53,156	37,952
50.01 TO 100.00	14	69.15	69.52	66.76	12.42	104.13	42.83	91.82	62.82 to 75.97	182,236	121,668
100.01 TO 180.00	22	75.06	72.48	69.66	20.96	104.05	43.65	113.25	53.15 to 83.71	350,737	244,324
180.01 TO 330.00	9	68.27	71.01	66.80	22.09	106.32	45.58	94.47	49.61 to 89.91	686,328	458,434
330.01 TO 650.00	1	39.77	39.77	39.77			39.77	39.77	N/A	1,000,000	397,680
ALL	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

## 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	7	74.97	71.06	56.84	26.19	125.02	43.65	103.56	43.65 to 103.56	199,167	113,210
DRY-N/A	5	71.88	74.28	78.03	9.23	95.20	65.44	87.57	N/A	202,662	158,130
GRASS-N/A	3	75.97	68.19	64.57	16.58	105.61	45.41	83.20	N/A	142,580	92,065
IRRGTD	12	75.10	72.31	66.54	18.70	108.67	42.83	104.59	56.41 to 87.23	421,630	280,566
IRRGTD-N/A	22	69.15	70.59	66.92	19.51	105.48	39.77	113.25	61.76 to 83.71	440,159	294,562
ALL	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

**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:	49	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.81	95% Median C.I.:	65.44 to 76.37	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,140,306	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.34 to 72.86	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,578,306	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.11	95% Mean C.I.:	66.36 to 76.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,706,480							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	358,740	COD:	19.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	238,907	PRD:	107.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.77			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:46

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	74.97	71.06	56.84	26.19	125.02	43.65	103.56	43.65 to 103.56	199,167	113,210
DRY-N/A	5	71.88	74.28	78.03	9.23	95.20	65.44	87.57	N/A	202,662	158,130
GRASS	1	45.41	45.41	45.41			45.41	45.41	N/A	195,000	88,540
GRASS-N/A	2	79.59	79.59	80.63	4.54	98.71	75.97	83.20	N/A	116,371	93,827
IRRGTD	28	69.15	69.63	65.05	19.94	107.03	39.77	104.59	61.76 to 81.35	451,980	294,013
IRRGTD-N/A	6	73.34	78.54	77.35	19.11	101.54	53.15	113.25	53.15 to 113.25	347,938	269,131
ALL	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

**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	12	73.43	72.41	65.76	19.71	110.11	43.65	103.56	52.05 to 87.57	200,623	131,926
GRASS	2	64.31	64.31	61.84	29.38	103.99	45.41	83.20	N/A	172,500	106,667
GRASS-N/A	1	75.97	75.97	75.97			75.97	75.97	N/A	82,742	62,860
IRRGTD	33	71.15	71.75	67.08	19.44	106.95	39.77	113.25	64.27 to 81.35	437,366	293,405
IRRGTD-N/A	1	53.15	53.15	53.15			53.15	53.15	N/A	310,000	164,775
ALL	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

**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	1	103.56	103.56	103.56			103.56	103.56	N/A	27,500	28,480
30000 TO 59999	2	71.97	71.97	71.40	9.07	100.79	65.44	78.49	N/A	53,156	37,952
60000 TO 99999	1	75.97	75.97	75.97			75.97	75.97	N/A	82,742	62,860
100000 TO 149999	5	72.16	74.99	74.06	8.53	101.26	67.74	91.82	N/A	126,937	94,015
150000 TO 249999	11	74.60	75.45	75.59	20.15	99.82	45.41	113.25	52.05 to 97.90	197,571	149,344
250000 TO 499999	20	75.06	72.31	72.33	17.71	99.97	42.83	104.59	61.76 to 83.71	379,736	274,680
500000 +	9	51.11	57.73	56.51	22.13	102.15	39.77	94.47	45.58 to 68.27	773,226	436,972
ALL	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907



**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:	49	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.81	95% Median C.I.:	65.44 to 76.37	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,140,306	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.34 to 72.86	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,578,306	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.11	95% Mean C.I.:	66.36 to 76.26	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,706,480							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	358,740	COD:	19.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.25			
AVG. Assessed Value:	238,907	PRD:	107.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.77			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:44:46

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	_____										
____Total \$____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	103.56	103.56	103.56			103.56	103.56	N/A	27,500	28,480
30000 TO 59999	2	71.97	71.97	71.40	9.07	100.79	65.44	78.49	N/A	53,156	37,952
60000 TO 99999	8	70.22	68.55	65.52	14.50	104.63	45.41	91.82	45.41 to 91.82	136,053	89,136
100000 TO 149999	3	64.72	63.58	57.58	20.79	110.43	42.83	83.20	N/A	223,986	128,963
150000 TO 249999	13	70.02	68.30	64.30	15.96	106.21	43.65	97.90	53.15 to 78.79	275,934	177,431
250000 TO 499999	20	75.98	73.36	66.92	21.07	109.63	39.77	113.25	56.41 to 84.50	518,627	347,043
500000 +	2	76.29	76.29	72.76	23.84	104.85	58.10	94.47	N/A	862,206	627,317
____ALL____	_____										
	49	71.88	71.31	66.60	19.64	107.08	39.77	113.25	65.44 to 76.37	358,740	238,907

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The calculated median indicates that the level of value for agricultural unimproved real property in Clay County is 72%. Although the tables indicate some issues with representativeness, it is believed that the calculated ratio is an accurate reflection of the agricultural level of value in Clay County.

This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county.

Clay County has long had excellent cyclical physical inspection. They are diligent in annually physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. The Assessor has done an excellent job in cross training her staff to be able to handle all facets of the job.

Clay County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have begun the process of implementing a GIS program and offered the personal property schedules online this year.

Clay County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values. They should be commended for their diligence, willingness to move forward technologically, and solid assessment practices.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>29.61</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>29.82</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>45.30</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>33.74</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>49.65</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**The number of qualified unimproved agricultural sales in Clay County has declined the past two years. The percentage of sales used is consistent with the percentage used last year. Of the total sales, 43 of them were removed for having been substantially changed since the date of the sale. This would include sales that went from dry/grass to irrigated or parcels that were combined with other parcels. The remaining disqualified sales are a mixture of family sales, foreclosure and other legal actions, estate planning and estate settlements. Clay County is diligent in their sales review. Questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and the seller, if the questionnaire is not returned, follow up phone calls are made to both parties. The Assessor also physically inspected each sale.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>14.38</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>65.71</b>	<b>9.96</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>-4.62</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11.54</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>78</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 3 indicates that there is a difference in the trended preliminary ratios and the calculated ratio. This can be attributed to the fact that the sales file is not completely representative of the agricultural land makeup in Clay County. According to the abstract the majority of the value of agricultural land in Clay County is from irrigated land. The sales file also contains a majority of irrigated land but also the market is strong for dry and grass land which are both slightly over-represented in the sales file causing the base of the agricultural land to not move as much as the sales file. Dry agricultural land increased across the county from .5% to 25% depending on market area and grass values increased 4% to 40% also depending on market area thus causing the trended median to not move to the level of value shown by the calculated median.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>19.15</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>14.38</b>
<b>9.26</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>9.96</b>
<b>7.58</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>-1.83</b>
<b>10.41</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>8.00</b>
<b>10.06</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>11.54</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 4 indicates disproportionate movement between the sales file and the base of agricultural land in Clay County. As has been previously discussed, this uneven movement may be attributed to the over-representation of dry and grass sales in the sales file.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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 Clay County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>72</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Of the three measures of central tendency, the median and the mean both calculate to the midpoint of the range at 72%. The weighted mean is slightly lower at 67%. A review of the statistical page shows outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 42.83% and the maximum sales ratio at 113.25%. It is the policy of the Clay County Assessor to use every possible sale and she is diligent in her sales verification. These three measures are sufficiently close to give credibility to the calculated level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>19.62</b>	<b>106.20</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.20</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**A review of the qualitative measures indicates good assessment uniformity. The coefficient of dispersion is within the range and the price-related differential is slightly above the range. The qualitative measures indicate that the Clay County Assessor has valued agricultural property in Clay County uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>-14</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>27.83</b>	<b>19.62</b>	<b>-8.21</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>104.50</b>	<b>106.20</b>	<b>1.70</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>20.67</b>	<b>42.83</b>	<b>22.16</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>111.29</b>	<b>113.25</b>	<b>1.96</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table reflects that fourteen sales were removed from the preliminary sales database. These sales included partial interest sales, parcels that are now irrigated and parcels that were combined with adjoining land. The R & O statistics accurately reflect the assessment actions taken for the agricultural class of property in Clay County.



**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 7,315

Value : 784,124,920

Growth 6,241,765

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	587	1,827,255	0	0	132	356,310	719	2,183,565	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,243	7,243,325	0	0	466	10,693,835	2,709	17,937,160	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,254	100,084,470	0	0	473	40,386,895	2,727	140,471,365	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,841	109,155,050	0	0	605	51,437,040	3,446	160,592,090	1,812,331
<b>% of Res Total</b>	82.44	67.97	0.00	0.00	17.56	32.03	47.11	20.48	29.04
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	140	775,485	0	0	17	159,780	157	935,265	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	390	1,070,180	0	0	65	3,530,705	455	4,600,885	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	390	33,485,090	0	0	66	9,578,405	456	43,063,495	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	530	35,330,755	0	0	83	13,268,890	613	48,599,645	514,140
<b>% of Com Total</b>	86.46	72.70	0.00	0.00	13.54	27.30	8.38	6.20	8.24
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	11	50,600	11	50,600	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	78	579,165	78	579,165	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	78	10,819,195	78	10,819,195	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	89	11,448,960	89	11,448,960	130,005
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	1.22	1.46	2.08
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,841	109,155,050	0	0	605	51,437,040	3,446	160,592,090	1,812,331
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	82.44	67.97	0.00	0.00	17.56	32.03	47.11	20.48	29.04
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	530	35,330,755	0	0	172	24,717,850	702	60,048,605	644,145
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	75.50	58.84	0.00	0.00	24.50	41.16	9.60	7.66	10.32
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,371	144,485,805	0	0	777	76,154,890	4,148	220,640,695	2,456,476
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	81.27	65.48	0.00	0.00	18.73	34.52	56.71	28.14	39.36

## 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	382,210	682,275		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	382,210	682,275
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					4	382,210	682,275

## 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	381	0	154	535

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	2,466	397,401,920	2,466	397,401,920
28. Ag-Improved Land	2	0	0	0	699	120,469,595	701	120,469,595
29. Ag Improvements	2	68,545	0	0	699	45,544,165	701	45,612,710
30. Ag Total							3,167	563,484,225

## 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	2	0.00	68,545	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	17	18.00	144,000	17	18.00	144,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	307	323.00	2,584,000	307	323.00	2,584,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	318	0.00	23,165,755	318	0.00	23,165,755	256,740
34. HomeSite Total				335	341.00	25,893,755	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	18	27.17	54,340	18	27.17	54,340	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	591	1,427.40	2,854,790	591	1,427.40	2,854,790	
37. FarmSite Improvements	690	0.00	22,378,410	692	0.00	22,446,955	3,528,549
38. FarmSite Total				710	1,454.57	25,356,085	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,987.67	0	0	7,987.67	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,045	9,783.24	51,249,840	3,785,289



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	15	1,461.37	1,494,340	15	1,461.37	1,494,340

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	25,860.73	25.85%	62,065,745	30.05%	2,400.00
46. 1A	46,114.92	46.10%	101,684,015	49.23%	2,205.01
47. 2A1	10,436.96	10.43%	19,830,225	9.60%	1,900.00
48. 2A	590.03	0.59%	958,855	0.46%	1,625.10
49. 3A1	11,551.75	11.55%	16,750,050	8.11%	1,450.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	3,319.78	3.32%	3,485,775	1.69%	1,050.00
52. 4A	2,168.68	2.17%	1,767,550	0.86%	815.03
53. Total	100,042.85	100.00%	206,542,215	100.00%	2,064.54
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,795.43	14.75%	5,560,430	18.39%	1,465.03
55. 1D	11,243.95	43.69%	15,404,245	50.94%	1,370.00
56. 2D1	2,984.41	11.60%	3,581,280	11.84%	1,200.00
57. 2D	579.88	2.25%	559,635	1.85%	965.09
58. 3D1	3,974.35	15.44%	2,961,130	9.79%	745.06
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,159.94	8.39%	1,544,455	5.11%	715.05
61. 4D	995.34	3.87%	627,060	2.07%	630.00
62. Total	25,733.30	100.00%	30,238,235	100.00%	1,175.06
Grass					
63. 1G1	886.01	0.00%	797,410	15.66%	900.00
64. 1G	1,089.83	10.13%	801,110	15.73%	735.08
65. 2G1	1,050.97	9.77%	746,185	14.65%	710.00
66. 2G	610.64	5.68%	406,155	7.97%	665.13
67. 3G1	706.19	6.57%	363,770	7.14%	515.12
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	1,596.53	14.84%	630,740	12.38%	395.07
70. 4G	4,815.16	44.77%	1,348,245	26.47%	280.00
71. Total	10,755.33	100.00%	5,093,615	100.00%	473.59
Irrigated Total	100,042.85	72.02%	206,542,215	85.16%	2,064.54
Dry Total	25,733.30	18.53%	30,238,235	12.47%	1,175.06
Grass Total	10,755.33	7.74%	5,093,615	2.10%	473.59
Waste	2,266.07	1.63%	566,555	0.23%	250.02
Other	103.27	0.07%	95,750	0.04%	927.18
Exempt	3,773.27	2.72%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	138,900.82	100.00%	242,536,370	100.00%	1,746.11

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	33,405.32	30.61%	81,342,265	36.07%	2,435.01
46. 1A	44,425.26	40.70%	99,512,540	44.13%	2,240.00
47. 2A1	11,307.69	10.36%	21,089,220	9.35%	1,865.03
48. 2A	1,054.45	0.97%	1,861,175	0.83%	1,765.07
49. 3A1	9,940.99	9.11%	14,464,475	6.41%	1,455.03
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	6,609.11	6.06%	5,485,580	2.43%	830.00
52. 4A	2,405.46	2.20%	1,744,160	0.77%	725.08
53. Total	109,148.28	100.00%	225,499,415	100.00%	2,065.99
Dry					
54. 1D1	5,860.47	20.40%	7,823,970	24.54%	1,335.04
55. 1D	11,752.24	40.91%	15,219,560	47.74%	1,295.03
56. 2D1	3,457.37	12.03%	3,803,110	11.93%	1,100.00
57. 2D	573.94	2.00%	516,545	1.62%	900.00
58. 3D1	4,252.97	14.80%	3,126,135	9.81%	735.05
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,200.46	7.66%	1,078,210	3.38%	489.99
61. 4D	632.85	2.20%	310,120	0.97%	490.04
62. Total	28,730.30	100.00%	31,877,650	100.00%	1,109.55
Grass					
63. 1G1	590.54	0.00%	531,485	14.24%	900.00
64. 1G	1,244.37	14.65%	933,300	25.01%	750.02
65. 2G1	514.27	6.05%	334,280	8.96%	650.01
66. 2G	257.07	3.03%	141,390	3.79%	550.01
67. 3G1	888.45	10.46%	386,540	10.36%	435.07
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	1,217.46	14.33%	365,240	9.79%	300.00
70. 4G	3,781.73	44.52%	1,040,165	27.87%	275.05
71. Total	8,493.89	100.00%	3,732,400	100.00%	439.42
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	109,148.28	73.91%	225,499,415	86.19%	2,065.99
Dry Total					
Dry Total	28,730.30	19.46%	31,877,650	12.18%	1,109.55
Grass Total					
Grass Total	8,493.89	5.75%	3,732,400	1.43%	439.42
Waste					
Waste	1,011.51	0.68%	252,905	0.10%	250.03
Other					
Other	289.12	0.20%	282,240	0.11%	976.20
Exempt					
Exempt	3,681.33	2.49%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total					
Market Area Total	147,673.10	100.00%	261,644,610	100.00%	1,771.78

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,259.70	61.82%	1,637,605	69.22%	1,300.00
46. 1A	87.63	4.30%	111,740	4.72%	1,275.13
47. 2A1	76.41	3.75%	91,690	3.88%	1,199.97
48. 2A	235.67	11.57%	259,235	10.96%	1,099.99
49. 3A1	94.71	4.65%	102,295	4.32%	1,080.09
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	179.02	8.79%	116,360	4.92%	649.98
52. 4A	104.51	5.13%	47,035	1.99%	450.05
53. Total	2,037.65	100.00%	2,365,960	100.00%	1,161.12
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,280.95	56.44%	3,002,080	67.72%	915.00
55. 1D	364.91	6.28%	333,895	7.53%	915.01
56. 2D1	199.75	3.44%	179,775	4.06%	900.00
57. 2D	586.07	10.08%	410,250	9.25%	700.00
58. 3D1	623.06	10.72%	305,290	6.89%	489.98
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	472.59	8.13%	129,990	2.93%	275.06
61. 4D	286.33	4.93%	71,585	1.61%	250.01
62. Total	5,813.66	100.00%	4,432,865	100.00%	762.49
Grass					
63. 1G1	376.80	0.00%	169,565	14.78%	450.01
64. 1G	34.00	0.86%	13,600	1.19%	400.00
65. 2G1	425.72	10.73%	149,005	12.98%	350.01
66. 2G	402.58	10.14%	124,800	10.88%	310.00
67. 3G1	274.10	6.91%	76,740	6.69%	279.97
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	213.72	5.39%	53,435	4.66%	250.02
70. 4G	2,241.55	56.48%	560,390	48.83%	250.00
71. Total	3,968.47	100.00%	1,147,535	100.00%	289.16
Irrigated Total	2,037.65	16.64%	2,365,960	29.38%	1,161.12
Dry Total	5,813.66	47.47%	4,432,865	55.04%	762.49
Grass Total	3,968.47	32.40%	1,147,535	14.25%	289.16
Waste	428.14	3.50%	107,045	1.33%	250.02
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	41.80	0.34%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	12,247.92	100.00%	8,053,405	100.00%	657.53

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	211,228.78	434,407,590	211,228.78	434,407,590
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	60,277.26	66,548,750	60,277.26	66,548,750
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	23,217.69	9,973,550	23,217.69	9,973,550
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,705.72	926,505	3,705.72	926,505
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	392.39	377,990	392.39	377,990
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	7,496.40	0	7,496.40	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>298,821.84</b>	<b>512,234,385</b>	<b>298,821.84</b>	<b>512,234,385</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	211,228.78	70.69%	434,407,590	84.81%	2,056.57
<b>Dry Land</b>	60,277.26	20.17%	66,548,750	12.99%	1,104.04
<b>Grass</b>	23,217.69	7.77%	9,973,550	1.95%	429.57
<b>Waste</b>	3,705.72	1.24%	926,505	0.18%	250.02
<b>Other</b>	392.39	0.13%	377,990	0.07%	963.30
<b>Exempt</b>	7,496.40	2.51%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>298,821.84</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>512,234,385</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,714.18</b>

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

18 Clay

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	155,798,025	160,592,090	4,794,065	3.08%	1,812,331	1.91%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	23,507,425	25,893,755	2,386,330	10.15%	256,740	9.06%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>179,305,450</b>	<b>186,485,845</b>	<b>7,180,395</b>	<b>4.00%</b>	<b>2,069,071</b>	<b>2.85%</b>
05. Commercial	47,237,025	48,599,645	1,362,620	2.88%	514,140	1.80%
06. Industrial	11,301,775	11,448,960	147,185	1.30%	130,005	0.15%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	20,891,255	25,356,085	4,464,830	21.37%	3,528,549	4.48%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>79,430,055</b>	<b>85,404,690</b>	<b>5,974,635</b>	<b>7.52%</b>	<b>4,172,694</b>	<b>2.27%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>258,735,505</b>	<b>271,890,535</b>	<b>13,155,030</b>	<b>5.08%</b>	<b>6,241,765</b>	<b>2.67%</b>
11. Irrigated	373,112,620	434,407,590	61,294,970	16.43%		
12. Dryland	64,115,215	66,548,750	2,433,535	3.80%		
13. Grassland	9,351,925	9,973,550	621,625	6.65%		
14. Wasteland	767,380	926,505	159,125	20.74%		
15. Other Agland	477,475	377,990	-99,485	-20.84%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>447,824,615</b>	<b>512,234,385</b>	<b>64,409,770</b>	<b>14.38%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>706,560,120</b>	<b>784,124,920</b>	<b>77,564,800</b>	<b>10.98%</b>	<b>6,241,765</b>	<b>10.09%</b>

## **CLAY COUNTY**

### **3-YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT**

The Clay County office staff consists of the County Assessor, Deputy Assessor and two full time clerks. We use part-time employees to assist with physical review, field listing, ag land use updating and other duties as needed. The Assessor and Deputy have current certification and are taking continued education classes to meet those requirements. We currently do not have an appraiser to do our pickup work. Our office staff does the needed pickup work in the urban and rural areas. Stanard Appraisal will be used for any commercial pickup work. Zoning and building permits are made available to us. Improvements not needing permits are reported to our office by owner, staff, concerned citizens etc.

The Clay County Assessor's staff has been physically reviewing properties as an on-going rotation process since 1997. A copy of the property card, worksheets and permits are first made in the office. This copy is then taken with us for the on-site reviews. These reviews consist of interviewing the property owner if at home (leaving a questionnaire with noted changes and/or information needed if not at home), physically inspecting all property from the outside, taking new pictures of the house and the outbuildings as well, making any corrections to the information on the property card and if in the rural area drawing a ground plan and noting any land use change. In the event that the property owner refuses a review, a refusal form is given him to sign (sometimes mailed) to document the attempt. These are later given to our County Attorney to enact an Inspection Warrant.

After returning to the office, the information gathered is then entered in the P.C. on the 2000 CAMA pricing, the pictures are downloaded in the P.C.--printed off and attached to the property card. The sketching of the house is done on the CAMA also. Any updates of information are recorded from the copy to the original property card. If needed a call to the property owner is made to gain any additional information needed. Properties are compared as to year built, quality, condition, square foot, style, etc. to be able to value them equally per market value. New cards for each parcel (urban, rural and commercial) are being made as they are reviewed. New cards have not been made since 1981.

In the rural areas, we gather information on the improvements the same way as we do in the urban area. Our ag-land is measured by soil map and we are on the most recent soil conversion. We check certified acres with the FSA office for land use changes after obtaining signed permission from land owner or renter. In September 2007, our office purchased the GIS Workshop for cadastral mapping.

Our office makes a concerted effort to research sales as they are filed. Questionnaires are sent to both the grantor and grantee requesting specific information on the sale. We receive more than 80% return on the questionnaires. The information attained is then used to represent the sales going into the ratio study. This has proven to be an effective

tool not only for sales study, but we are also able to check current land use and residential data from the information provided. Assessment required levels for residential and commercial/industrial property is 100% of actual value while agricultural/horticultural requirement is 75% of actual value. In the 2008 Reports & Opinions the county of Clay level of value for residential real property was 97%, commercial real property was 94%, and the agricultural land was 73%. We will maintain the level of value and quality of assessment to meet the required statutes.

**Our 3-year plan is as follows for the tax year:**

**2009**

Residential---The following residential properties will be up for review in our rotation of residential properties:

Harvard City – 700 parcels – Market Area 2

Ong Village – 157 parcels – Market Area 1

Verona Village-Market Area 1

A lateral filing system has been established. New record cards will be made as each residential property is reviewed. Updated pictures of the front and back of the house and all outbuildings will be taken and place in the folder. Any changes to the property will be noted and updated in the CAMA pricing.

Rural Residential and Agricultural land---The following townships will be up for review in our rotation of rural properties:

Sutton -278 parcels-Market Area 2

Lewis-346 parcels-Market Area 2

Lynn -163 parcels-Market Area 2

Inland-131 parcels-Market Area 2

New record cards will be made with all updated information, including new pictures of all improvements. The lateral filing system will allow all pertinent information about the parcel to be found in one folder. For example it may include certifications, aerial maps, soils maps, surveys, transfer statements etc.

Commercial---Stanard Appraisals will be contracted to do any new construction and the assessor and staff will do the pickup work.

**2010**

Residential---The following residential properties will be up for review in our rotation of residential properties:

Edgar-503 parcels-Market Area 1



Saronville-91 parcels-Market Area 2  
Eldorado Village-Market Area 2

New record cards will be made with all updated information and pictures. All pertinent information about the parcel will be put in one folder.

Rural Residential & Agricultural Land-The following townships will be up for review in our rotation of rural properties:

School Creek-325 parcels-Market Area 2  
Eldorado-310 parcels-Market Area 2  
Harvard-323 parcels-Market Area 2  
Leicester-255 parcels-Market Area 2

New record cards will be made with all updated information, including new pictures of all improvements. The lateral filing system will allow all pertinent information about the parcel to be found in one folder. For example it may include certifications, aerial maps, soils maps, surveys, transfer statements etc. This will complete new record cards for Market Area 2.

Commercial-Stanard Appraisals will be contracted for any new construction and the assessor and staff will do the pickup work.

## **2011**

Residential—the following residential properties will be up for review in our rotation of residential properties:

Deweese-103 parcels-Market Area 1  
NAD –Inland-Lynn-Area B-1-Area B-2 (Mostly commercial/industrial)

## **COMMENTS**

Since acquiring the GIS Workshop last September not much time has been devoted to getting the information on the computer until recently. In order to be able to utilize the GIS, we would have to devote more time to it. As an office decision, one personnel will be working on the GIS every day unless another project needs her help to meet a deadline. Two full time and one part time person attended a two-day workshop given by Claire Brown in April. This class helped a lot to build up enthusiasm and incentive to complete this project. We have contacted our County Surveyor to find the GPS points and he will do so as soon as possible this summer and if it stays in our budget. We are also looking at surveying the Little Blue River that runs in the south part of the county as our budget will allow since much has changed since our cadastral maps were made in 1964.

As gas prices rise, we are having more and more phone calls for parcel information. This takes up a lot of time that we could be spending on other projects. Our intention is to get as much of our information on line to serve the public better. Hopefully, all our information will be available on line by the end of this year. Personal property schedules will be available for the individuals to access for 2009 year. This will also help out the accountants.

Reviews are going rather quickly this year. We have four townships reviewed and are now in the process of working our data. After June protest month we will continue. We are going to be taking a closer look at the commercials for each area and will get Stanard Appraisals to do maintenance for us in other areas.

The assessor and deputy will take continuing education hours as needed. We also will attend the fall workshop and any meetings held of the Central District.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Clay County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$182,565
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$37,250
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	SAME
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$5000
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$2000
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	----
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	----
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$182565
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	NO

#### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	COUNTY SOLUTIONS
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	CAMA 2000

3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	YES
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	ASSESSOR/STAFF
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	YES, BUT NOT IMPLEMENTED YET
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	FULL TIME EMPLOYEE WHO IS PUTTING ON INFORMATION
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	COUNTY SOLUTIONS—SCHEDULES AVAILABLE ON-LINE

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	YES
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	YES
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	ALL WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SUTTON (HAS OWN) ONG HAS NONE
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1975 UPDATED IN 2004

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	COMMERCIAL APPRAISAL DONE BY STANARD APPRAISALS
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	GIS-GIS WORKSHOP; COUNTY SOLUTIONS-CAMA-PERSONAL PROPERTY SCHEDULES ON-LINE-ANDY PFEIFER



## 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 Clay 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