

# **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

### 19 Colfax

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	152	COD	11.95
Total Sales Price	\$10,904,024	PRD	102.45
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,903,024	COV	18.75
Total Assessed Value	\$10,491,290	STD	18.48
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$71,730	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.65
Avg. Assessed Value	\$69,022	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$56,456
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	96
Mean	99	Max	183
Min	35.37		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.13 to 99.38
95% Mean C.I	95.64 to 101.52
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.80 to 98.65

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	23.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.25
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.19

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	168	97	16.07	105.23
2007	188	96	15.24	104.78
2006	201	97	14.07	103.14
2005	211	97	15.46	105.14

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 19 Colfax

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	COD	13.53
Total Sales Price	\$505,450	PRD	103.59
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$505,450	COV	28.93
Total Assessed Value	\$500,145	STD	29.66
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$31,591	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.38
Avg. Assessed Value	\$31,259	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$141,418
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	99
Mean	103	Max	205
Min	62		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.61 to 104.20
95% Mean C.I	86.71 to 118.31
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.59 to 107.32

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 9.08

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 2.88

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 0.64

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	11	99	7.57	101.49
2007	15	99	9.86	100.2
2006	30	96	24.25	101.85
2005	34	96	19.82	100.75

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 19 Colfax

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	50	COD	19.83
Total Sales Price	\$10,233,057	PRD	106.72
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,166,116	COV	25.08
Total Assessed Value	\$6,969,760	STD	18.35
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$203,322	Avg. Absolute Deviation	14.22
Avg. Assessed Value	\$139,395	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$150,810
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	69
Mean	73	Max	121.23
Min	35.14		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	64.81 to 75.97
95% Mean C.I	68.08 to 78.25
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	63.75 to 73.37

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	67.57
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.29
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.38

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	58	72	14.77	98.96
2007	60	70	16.36	100.08
2006	57	75	21.35	100.1
2005	69	76	17.39	104.08



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Colfax 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 Colfax County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Colfax 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 Colfax County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Colfax 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 Colfax County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Colfax County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	154	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.16 to 100.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,925,824	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.44 to 98.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,924,824	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.77	95% Mean C.I.:	95.48 to 102.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,489,775							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,940	COD:	14.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,115	PRD:	102.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

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

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	104.39	111.44	100.98	17.37	110.36	71.82	180.00	95.83 to 134.50	55,463	56,005
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	96.79	102.31	99.53	15.54	102.79	61.03	182.71	89.70 to 105.93	76,776	76,415
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	94.74	94.38	90.46	12.68	104.34	67.05	136.70	72.71 to 104.32	55,505	50,208
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	31	98.72	99.12	96.66	14.72	102.55	35.37	169.19	91.01 to 102.95	71,530	69,140
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	28	98.07	96.45	92.43	9.56	104.35	68.47	125.20	90.09 to 101.23	78,946	72,967
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	98.83	96.49	98.28	11.03	98.17	70.08	123.17	89.65 to 102.39	72,831	71,581
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	11	95.16	95.76	96.48	5.70	99.25	82.21	106.71	88.96 to 104.98	83,318	80,389
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	18	89.97	94.37	92.95	22.24	101.52	44.81	174.61	78.29 to 106.12	65,494	60,880
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	74	99.05	102.00	97.50	15.82	104.62	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 102.63	66,808	65,137
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	80	97.44	95.90	94.79	12.28	101.16	44.81	174.61	92.55 to 99.33	74,762	70,870
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	92	98.07	97.13	95.15	12.15	102.09	35.37	169.19	95.13 to 100.42	72,370	68,857
____ALL____											
	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	11	84.95	99.34	91.27	28.12	108.84	67.05	174.61	70.08 to 137.67	43,581	39,777
HOWELLS	9	93.10	91.54	84.15	11.92	108.79	75.32	112.74	78.29 to 105.14	47,261	39,770
HOWELLS V	1	53.79	53.79	53.79			53.79	53.79	N/A	4,750	2,555
LEIGH	8	98.71	108.22	102.10	22.26	106.00	79.25	169.19	79.25 to 169.19	43,750	44,668
LEIGH V	1	61.03	61.03	61.03			61.03	61.03	N/A	6,800	4,150
RICHLAND	2	67.05	67.05	63.15	47.25	106.18	35.37	98.74	N/A	32,500	20,525
RURAL	14	98.63	100.22	99.11	8.88	101.12	86.45	123.17	87.49 to 114.02	126,842	125,709
RURAL V	2	126.02	126.02	81.16	42.83	155.27	72.04	180.00	N/A	7,100	5,762
SCHUYLER	94	99.12	100.62	98.31	10.48	102.35	64.75	182.71	95.21 to 101.21	72,099	70,879
SCHUYLER SUB	6	93.16	88.98	85.71	13.95	103.81	68.47	104.39	68.47 to 104.39	135,900	116,485
SCHUYLER SUB V	3	97.37	88.85	86.64	8.75	102.55	71.82	97.37	N/A	43,666	37,833
SCHUYLER V	3	93.37	91.63	53.47	32.80	171.37	44.81	136.70	N/A	26,583	14,213
____ALL____											
	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	154	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.16 to 100.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,925,824	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.44 to 98.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,924,824	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.77	95% Mean C.I.:	95.48 to 102.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,489,775							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,940	COD:	14.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,115	PRD:	102.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

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

## 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	129	98.62	98.95	96.55	14.01	102.48	35.37	182.71	94.94 to 100.95	63,476	61,286
2	9	97.37	88.94	85.84	11.82	103.61	68.47	104.39	71.82 to 101.99	105,155	90,268
3	16	98.63	103.45	98.96	14.61	104.53	72.04	180.00	87.49 to 114.02	111,875	110,716
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## 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	144	98.68	99.39	96.51	12.69	102.98	35.37	182.71	95.21 to 100.61	74,224	71,634
2	10	82.71	90.83	73.73	36.43	123.19	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	23,650	17,437
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	152	98.62	99.18	96.16	13.80	103.13	35.37	182.71	95.21 to 100.28	71,429	68,689
06	2	72.38	72.38	72.58	0.46	99.72	72.04	72.71	N/A	33,750	24,495
07											
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	11	99.05	109.62	100.73	27.05	108.83	61.03	180.00	79.25 to 169.19	48,909	49,267
19-0058	14	87.30	95.34	91.26	25.55	104.47	53.79	174.61	70.08 to 110.50	47,796	43,618
19-0059	12	97.45	94.63	92.39	10.77	102.42	75.32	112.74	78.94 to 105.33	61,737	57,039
19-0123	117	98.62	98.66	96.39	11.87	102.36	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.42	76,724	73,954
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## 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:	154	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.16 to 100.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,925,824	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.44 to 98.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,924,824	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.77	95% Mean C.I.:	95.48 to 102.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,489,775							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,940	COD:	14.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,115	PRD:	102.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

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

## 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	10	82.71	90.83	73.73	36.43	123.19	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	23,650	17,437
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	14	100.70	104.26	97.75	20.28	106.67	67.05	174.61	79.57 to 121.32	50,685	49,543
1900 TO 1919	36	94.47	96.99	94.52	15.28	102.61	35.37	141.46	88.96 to 104.39	56,341	53,253
1920 TO 1939	14	91.76	93.93	91.20	11.52	103.00	75.24	145.22	80.35 to 101.33	73,175	66,732
1940 TO 1949	7	105.14	105.70	103.92	9.98	101.71	78.29	138.81	78.29 to 138.81	41,232	42,849
1950 TO 1959	25	100.61	102.45	100.25	9.79	102.19	73.35	182.71	95.21 to 103.55	66,362	66,528
1960 TO 1969	12	98.78	94.40	95.93	6.43	98.40	70.08	106.71	87.25 to 99.38	94,158	90,329
1970 TO 1979	23	100.42	100.87	99.29	9.59	101.59	72.71	169.19	91.84 to 102.95	89,660	89,027
1980 TO 1989	5	99.06	103.69	96.28	13.91	107.69	78.94	140.17	N/A	100,440	96,708
1990 TO 1994	4	101.34	97.90	98.78	5.22	99.11	84.95	103.98	N/A	97,250	96,058
1995 TO 1999	1	68.47	68.47	68.47			68.47	68.47	N/A	290,000	198,565
2000 TO Present	3	101.99	104.22	100.72	11.66	103.48	87.49	123.17	N/A	201,666	203,111
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## 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	3	93.37	109.05	85.51	45.06	127.53	53.79	180.00	N/A	3,566	3,050
5000 TO 9999	3	112.74	103.49	101.85	22.37	101.61	61.03	136.70	N/A	7,100	7,231
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	103.06	106.27	96.39	35.78	110.25	53.79	180.00	53.79 to 180.00	5,333	5,140
10000 TO 29999	16	113.60	118.73	119.68	19.62	99.21	72.04	174.61	98.74 to 140.17	21,267	25,451
30000 TO 59999	45	98.03	98.52	97.52	17.27	101.02	35.37	182.71	94.34 to 102.78	45,258	44,138
60000 TO 99999	60	94.56	93.55	93.64	8.45	99.91	44.81	114.92	89.97 to 99.17	78,462	73,474
100000 TO 149999	20	99.81	99.65	99.78	7.64	99.87	78.94	123.17	91.84 to 105.33	119,282	119,017
150000 TO 249999	5	96.61	97.37	97.55	2.46	99.81	94.02	101.99	N/A	173,500	169,254
250000 TO 499999	2	77.98	77.98	77.55	12.20	100.55	68.47	87.49	N/A	277,500	215,212
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	154	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.16 to 100.19	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,925,824	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.44 to 98.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,924,824	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.77	95% Mean C.I.:	95.48 to 102.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,489,775							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,940	COD:	14.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,115	PRD:	102.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

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

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	77.20	97.05	76.00	51.34	127.69	53.79	180.00	N/A	4,375	3,325
5000 TO 9999	2	104.37	104.37	90.00	30.98	115.97	72.04	136.70	N/A	9,000	8,100
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	82.71	99.49	83.10	44.98	119.72	53.79	180.00	53.79 to 180.00	5,916	4,916
10000 TO 29999	14	95.92	90.96	82.47	19.80	110.29	35.37	134.50	67.05 to 111.45	25,744	21,232
30000 TO 59999	51	97.52	101.86	96.36	17.47	105.70	44.81	174.61	94.94 to 101.87	45,919	44,248
60000 TO 99999	58	98.03	98.31	96.78	9.75	101.58	75.24	182.71	91.84 to 100.99	79,118	76,574
100000 TO 149999	17	99.33	98.33	97.88	6.27	100.46	78.94	114.02	89.65 to 105.33	120,185	117,638
150000 TO 249999	8	97.83	97.66	94.22	11.26	103.64	68.47	123.17	68.47 to 123.17	194,375	183,149
ALL											
	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	82.71	90.83	73.73	36.43	123.19	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	23,650	17,437
20	60	98.69	99.89	96.54	15.20	103.48	35.37	169.19	93.07 to 103.49	50,830	49,069
25	2	90.34	90.34	90.72	4.24	99.58	86.51	94.17	N/A	86,450	78,425
30	78	98.67	99.46	97.42	10.94	102.09	73.35	182.71	95.16 to 100.99	86,668	84,435
35	1	99.05	99.05	99.05			99.05	99.05	N/A	180,000	178,285
40	3	101.23	93.39	85.66	13.83	109.03	68.47	110.47	N/A	175,166	150,040
ALL											
	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	82.71	90.83	73.73	36.43	123.19	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	23,650	17,437
100	2	86.94	86.94	77.49	16.37	112.20	72.71	101.18	N/A	32,750	25,377
101	91	99.33	100.76	97.43	11.80	103.42	35.37	182.71	97.34 to 101.23	78,188	76,177
102	10	90.47	100.07	93.33	19.84	107.22	79.57	174.61	79.93 to 118.29	62,840	58,650
103	2	96.94	96.94	96.47	1.84	100.49	95.16	98.72	N/A	122,500	118,177
104	36	95.38	96.72	95.13	14.27	101.67	64.75	142.94	89.65 to 103.93	69,195	65,826
301	1	100.95	100.95	100.95			100.95	100.95	N/A	55,000	55,525
307	2	95.43	95.43	95.60	0.88	99.82	94.59	96.27	N/A	44,125	42,182
ALL											
	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19	70,940	68,115

# 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:	154	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.16 to 100.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,925,824	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.44 to 98.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,924,824	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.77	95% Mean C.I.:	95.48 to 102.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,489,775							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,940	COD:	14.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,115	PRD:	102.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

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

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	10	82.71	90.83	73.73	36.43	123.19	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70		23,650	17,437
20	10	99.06	106.50	102.82	17.67	103.59	73.35	174.61	79.93 to 125.20		40,912	42,064
30	125	98.03	98.84	95.66	12.52	103.32	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 100.61		74,328	71,104
40	9	100.42	99.02	101.88	10.06	97.19	79.25	123.17	81.98 to 110.47		109,788	111,857
ALL	154	98.33	98.83	96.02	14.00	102.93	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 100.19		70,940	68,115

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

### **Residential**

For 2009 the county conducted a market study of the Residential class of property. To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, Colfax County completed the following assessment actions:

- Schuyler:
  - Questionnaires were sent to residential properties in the flood plain areas of Schuyler. The entire town was recently reappraised in 2007, so any changes in value are likely attributable to the pick-up work of new construction.
- Clarkson, Howells, Leigh:
  - The county reviewed all houses with a drive-by inspection process. As a result, values were increased or decreased based on the condition of the property and based on comparable sales information.
- Rural:
  - The county reviewed and revalued rural residential parcels by creating a uniform value for additional land beyond the site acres.

After completing the assessment actions for 2009 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2005
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2005
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Cost approach
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	14
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By town-village boundaries, and vacant are separated
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>
	Yes, only around the town of Schuyler
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. Both areas are valued using the same costing and depreciation schedule.

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
78	29		107



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	18.75	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 99.38	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,904,024	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.80 to 98.65	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,903,024	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.65	95% Mean C.I.:	95.64 to 101.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,491,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,730	COD:	11.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,021	PRD:	102.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:45

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	16	104.19	110.00	100.43	16.69	109.52	71.82	180.00	95.83 to 121.32		57,992	58,244
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	15	97.24	105.17	100.39	12.53	104.76	88.54	182.71	94.02 to 105.93		81,441	81,760
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	94.74	94.38	90.46	12.68	104.34	67.05	136.70	72.71 to 104.32		55,505	50,208
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	31	97.98	97.84	95.96	12.27	101.96	35.37	140.17	92.22 to 102.63		71,530	68,642
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	28	97.60	97.28	93.25	8.31	104.32	68.47	125.20	93.05 to 101.12		78,946	73,616
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	98.83	98.69	99.73	8.20	98.96	83.44	123.17	90.41 to 102.39		72,831	72,633
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	11	95.16	95.76	96.48	5.70	99.25	82.21	106.71	88.96 to 104.98		83,318	80,389
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	18	89.31	90.12	92.19	16.78	97.75	44.81	142.94	80.35 to 101.21		65,494	60,380
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	72	98.35	101.59	97.28	13.98	104.43	35.37	182.71	95.21 to 101.99		68,361	66,504
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	80	97.37	95.87	95.35	10.01	100.54	44.81	142.94	93.05 to 99.17		74,762	71,287
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	92	97.60	97.51	95.55	10.22	102.05	35.37	140.17	95.02 to 99.56		72,370	69,150
____ALL____												
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38		71,730	69,021

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
CLARKSON	11	95.02	96.19	95.48	12.83	100.74	67.05	126.72	79.93 to 110.50		43,581	41,612
HOWELLS	9	94.37	96.01	92.52	8.98	103.78	78.29	123.91	82.29 to 105.14		47,261	43,726
HOWELLS V	1	53.79	53.79	53.79			53.79	53.79	N/A		4,750	2,555
LEIGH	8	96.37	103.48	99.81	14.31	103.67	84.83	134.48	84.83 to 134.48		43,750	43,666
RICHLAND	2	67.05	67.05	63.15	47.25	106.18	35.37	98.74	N/A		32,500	20,525
RURAL	14	97.61	98.14	97.52	7.01	100.64	86.45	123.17	87.49 to 105.66		126,842	123,694
RURAL V	2	131.56	131.56	91.30	36.82	144.09	83.12	180.00	N/A		7,100	6,482
SCHUYLER	93	99.06	100.36	98.30	10.10	102.10	64.75	182.71	95.21 to 100.99		72,713	71,476
SCHUYLER SUB	6	93.16	88.98	85.71	13.95	103.81	68.47	104.39	68.47 to 104.39		135,900	116,485
SCHUYLER SUB V	3	97.37	88.85	86.64	8.75	102.55	71.82	97.37	N/A		43,666	37,833
SCHUYLER V	3	93.37	91.63	53.47	32.80	171.37	44.81	136.70	N/A		26,583	14,213
____ALL____												
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38		71,730	69,021

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	18.75	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 99.38	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,904,024	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.80 to 98.65	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,903,024	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.65	95% Mean C.I.:	95.64 to 101.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,491,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,730	COD:	11.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,021	PRD:	102.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:45

## 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	127	97.69	98.79	97.15	11.88	101.68	35.37	182.71	94.94 to 100.28	64,304	62,473
2	9	97.37	88.94	85.84	11.82	103.61	68.47	104.39	71.82 to 101.99	105,155	90,268
3	16	97.61	102.32	97.47	12.33	104.97	83.12	180.00	87.49 to 105.66	111,875	109,043
ALL	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## 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	143	97.98	98.78	96.69	10.76	102.17	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 99.68	74,638	72,165
2	9	93.37	95.37	74.73	30.69	127.62	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	25,522	19,073
ALL	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	150	97.60	98.85	96.36	11.83	102.59	35.37	182.71	95.16 to 99.56	72,236	69,605
06	2	77.91	77.91	74.71	6.68	104.29	72.71	83.12	N/A	33,750	25,215
07											
ALL	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	10	99.40	110.69	99.76	19.23	110.96	84.83	180.00	88.96 to 134.48	53,120	52,990
19-0058	14	93.12	93.03	94.48	14.27	98.46	53.79	126.72	79.93 to 110.46	47,796	45,158
19-0059	12	96.76	97.08	95.57	7.77	101.59	78.29	123.91	93.06 to 105.14	61,737	58,999
19-0123	116	98.33	98.36	96.20	11.32	102.24	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 100.42	77,257	74,320
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
ALL	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	18.75	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 99.38	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,904,024	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.80 to 98.65	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,903,024	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.65	95% Mean C.I.:	95.64 to 101.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,491,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,730	COD:	11.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,021	PRD:	102.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:45

## 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	9	93.37	95.37	74.73	30.69	127.62	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	25,522	19,073
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	14	97.31	99.34	97.06	13.45	102.35	67.05	142.94	86.77 to 115.75	50,685	49,196
1900 TO 1919	35	94.34	95.23	93.90	12.75	101.41	35.37	141.46	89.97 to 97.98	57,522	54,016
1920 TO 1939	14	92.87	94.98	92.18	10.08	103.04	75.24	145.22	84.83 to 101.33	73,175	67,453
1940 TO 1949	7	105.14	105.08	103.49	9.39	101.54	78.29	134.48	78.29 to 134.48	41,232	42,670
1950 TO 1959	25	100.61	102.77	100.44	9.31	102.32	83.44	182.71	95.21 to 103.55	66,362	66,655
1960 TO 1969	12	98.78	95.89	96.81	4.93	99.05	87.15	106.71	87.78 to 99.38	94,158	91,155
1970 TO 1979	23	100.42	99.78	98.38	8.36	101.42	72.71	133.56	92.22 to 102.95	89,660	88,204
1980 TO 1989	5	99.06	107.44	101.03	10.13	106.35	96.30	140.17	N/A	100,440	101,470
1990 TO 1994	4	101.34	100.80	101.04	2.35	99.76	96.56	103.98	N/A	97,250	98,265
1995 TO 1999	1	68.47	68.47	68.47			68.47	68.47	N/A	290,000	198,565
2000 TO Present	3	101.99	104.22	100.72	11.66	103.48	87.49	123.17	N/A	201,666	203,111
ALL											
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## 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	3	93.37	109.05	85.51	45.06	127.53	53.79	180.00	N/A	3,566	3,050
5000 TO 9999	2	115.54	115.54	108.97	18.32	106.03	94.37	136.70	N/A	7,250	7,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	94.37	111.65	99.01	35.93	112.76	53.79	180.00	N/A	5,040	4,990
10000 TO 29999	15	105.93	111.49	112.88	16.14	98.77	83.12	145.22	93.10 to 134.48	21,685	24,478
30000 TO 59999	45	98.03	99.60	98.83	15.48	100.79	35.37	182.71	93.82 to 102.78	45,258	44,726
60000 TO 99999	60	95.07	93.87	93.95	7.58	99.91	44.81	109.35	90.41 to 99.17	78,462	73,718
100000 TO 149999	20	99.19	99.82	100.04	6.22	99.78	86.77	123.17	96.30 to 103.98	119,282	119,325
150000 TO 249999	5	96.61	97.38	97.57	2.47	99.81	94.02	101.99	N/A	173,500	169,280
250000 TO 499999	2	77.98	77.98	77.55	12.20	100.55	68.47	87.49	N/A	277,500	215,212
ALL											
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## 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>97</b>	COV:	18.75	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 99.38	(/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,904,024	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.80 to 98.65	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,903,024	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.65	95% Mean C.I.:	95.64 to 101.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,491,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,730	COD:	11.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,021	PRD:	102.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:45

## 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	3	93.37	109.05	85.51	45.06	127.53	53.79	180.00	N/A	3,566	3,050
5000 TO 9999	2	115.54	115.54	108.97	18.32	106.03	94.37	136.70	N/A	7,250	7,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	94.37	111.65	99.01	35.93	112.76	53.79	180.00	N/A	5,040	4,990
10000 TO 29999	14	92.16	88.74	82.38	17.95	107.72	35.37	123.91	67.05 to 105.93	25,280	20,826
30000 TO 59999	49	97.37	100.50	96.60	14.06	104.04	44.81	145.22	94.34 to 101.33	46,303	44,728
60000 TO 99999	59	97.34	98.35	96.88	9.04	101.51	75.24	182.71	92.55 to 100.99	78,930	76,470
100000 TO 149999	17	99.06	98.53	98.18	4.55	100.35	86.77	107.17	95.16 to 103.98	120,185	118,000
150000 TO 249999	8	97.87	97.67	94.23	11.26	103.64	68.47	123.17	68.47 to 123.17	194,375	183,165
ALL											
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	93.37	95.37	74.73	30.69	127.62	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	25,522	19,073
20	59	97.52	98.82	96.37	12.72	102.54	35.37	145.22	93.10 to 101.12	51,437	49,572
25	2	90.34	90.34	90.72	4.24	99.58	86.51	94.17	N/A	86,450	78,425
30	78	98.01	99.17	97.77	9.33	101.43	75.24	182.71	95.13 to 100.62	86,668	84,736
35	1	99.12	99.12	99.12			99.12	99.12	N/A	180,000	178,415
40	3	101.23	93.39	85.66	13.83	109.03	68.47	110.47	N/A	175,166	150,040
ALL											
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	93.37	95.37	74.73	30.69	127.62	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70	25,522	19,073
100	2	98.31	98.31	81.31	26.04	120.91	72.71	123.91	N/A	32,750	26,627
101	91	99.17	100.62	97.84	10.52	102.84	35.37	182.71	97.24 to 100.99	78,188	76,496
102	10	90.09	92.87	91.65	9.84	101.33	79.93	118.29	80.35 to 104.39	62,840	57,592
103	2	96.94	96.94	96.47	1.84	100.49	95.16	98.72	N/A	122,500	118,177
104	35	94.94	95.95	95.03	10.83	100.97	64.75	142.94	89.97 to 101.33	70,743	67,229
301	1	100.95	100.95	100.95			100.95	100.95	N/A	55,000	55,525
307	2	95.43	95.43	95.60	0.88	99.82	94.59	96.27	N/A	44,125	42,182
ALL											
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38	71,730	69,021

**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>97</b>	COV:	18.75	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 99.38	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,904,024	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	18.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.80 to 98.65	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,903,024	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.65	95% Mean C.I.:	95.64 to 101.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,491,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,730	COD:	11.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.71			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,021	PRD:	102.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:45

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	9	93.37	95.37	74.73	30.69	127.62	44.81	180.00	53.79 to 136.70		25,522	19,073
20	10	99.06	97.99	98.12	8.54	99.87	79.93	125.20	83.44 to 105.93		40,912	40,145
30	124	97.43	98.73	96.03	11.18	102.81	35.37	182.71	94.94 to 100.19		74,807	71,838
40	9	99.06	100.30	102.23	7.65	98.11	84.83	123.17	89.89 to 110.47		109,788	112,238
ALL												
	152	97.44	98.58	96.22	11.95	102.45	35.37	182.71	95.13 to 99.38		71,730	69,021



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL:In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population.

The County made minimal valuation changes in the residential class for 2009. The county changed the classification of some improved agricultural parcels to rural residential causing a perceived increase in the assessed base. Removing that influence, both the statistics and assessed base appear to have been treated similarly.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>321</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>47.35</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>48.00</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>53.71</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>61.28</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>65.73</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the sales utilization grid indicates the County has used a historically decreasing percentage of qualified sales for analysis purposes. A review of the non-qualified sales file indicates that several family transactions and private sales are present in the file. These types of transactions are appropriately coded as non-qualified sales. The Division assumes that while this percentage is generally low compared to surrounding counties, the measurement of the class has been done with all available arm's length sales.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>5.25</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.39</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97.19</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>4.82</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5.10</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value, as reflected in this table, is attributable to the reclassification of several properties from improved agricultural to rural residential. This table gives the appearance that the sold parcels are treated disproportionately to the unsolds, however further examination suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax 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 Colfax 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	5.25
0.47	2008	0.86
8.06	2007	4.82
2.52	2006	2.07
8.69	2005	5.10

RESIDENTIAL: The increase in the assessed base, as reflected in this table, is attributable to the reclassification of several properties from improved agricultural to rural residential. This table gives the appearance that the sold parcels are treated disproportionately to the unsolds, but after further examination the actual percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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 Colfax County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	96	99

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>11.95</b>	<b>102.45</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>154</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>11.95</b>	<b>-2.05</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>102.93</b>	<b>102.45</b>	<b>-0.48</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>35.37</b>	<b>35.37</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>182.71</b>	<b>182.71</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. There were minimal assessment actions to this class for 2009.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>137</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>-5</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>-7</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>11.95</b>	<b>20.33</b>	<b>-8.38</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>102.45</b>	<b>110.83</b>	<b>-8.38</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>35.37</b>	<b>38.59</b>	<b>-3.22</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>182.71</b>	<b>233.00</b>	<b>-50.29</b>

The table above is a direct comparison of the statistics generated using the 2009 assessed values reported by the assessor to the statistics generated using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population.

In Colfax County the measures of central tendency are similar suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. Further, this analysis suggests sold properties are treated similarly to the unsold properties and the assessor has no bias in the assignment of residential assessments.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	31.30	95% Median C.I.:	88.30 to 104.20	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	545,450	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	31.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.41 to 105.67	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	545,450	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.30	95% Mean C.I.:	83.55 to 115.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	521,125							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,085	COD:	15.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,654	PRD:	104.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:39

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	2	98.85	98.85	98.80	0.11	100.05	98.75	98.96	N/A	24,250	23,960
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	95.41	95.41	99.96	7.46	95.45	88.30	102.53	N/A	36,600	36,585
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	97.07	97.07	97.07			97.07	97.07	N/A	45,000	43,680
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	109.37	122.33	96.17	46.56	127.20	52.43	205.20	N/A	24,250	23,321
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	103.29	100.38	94.55	3.43	106.17	93.61	104.24	N/A	44,000	41,601
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	98.49	90.79	98.94	11.11	91.77	62.00	104.20	N/A	22,875	22,632
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.75	93.61	93.68	6.82	99.93	79.52	102.53	N/A	34,340	32,170
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	96.68	96.68	96.74	0.40	99.94	96.29	97.07	N/A	38,750	37,487
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	101.28	103.13	96.30	21.85	107.09	52.43	205.20	62.00 to 109.37	29,625	28,530
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	92.69	91.85	93.11	8.57	98.65	79.52	102.53	N/A	42,050	39,152
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	103.29	109.20	95.29	24.41	114.61	52.43	205.20	52.43 to 205.20	33,892	32,295
____ALL____											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	5	98.75	121.46	113.62	24.42	106.90	96.29	205.20	N/A	21,250	24,145
LEIGH	2	103.77	103.77	103.96	0.46	99.81	103.29	104.24	N/A	6,000	6,237
RICHLAND	1	62.00	62.00	62.00			62.00	62.00	N/A	5,500	3,410
SCHUYLER	8	98.01	90.95	91.28	10.50	99.64	52.43	104.20	52.43 to 104.20	51,062	46,607
SCHUYLER V	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
____ALL____											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## 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	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654
____ALL____											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	31.30	95% Median C.I.:	88.30 to 104.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	545,450	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	31.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.41 to 105.67	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	545,450	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.30	95% Mean C.I.:	83.55 to 115.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	521,125							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,085	COD:	15.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,654	PRD:	104.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:39

## 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	16	98.85	100.28	95.72	15.79	104.76	52.43	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	33,265	31,841
2	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
____ALL____											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	2	103.77	103.77	103.96	0.46	99.81	103.29	104.24	N/A	6,000	6,237
19-0058	5	98.75	121.46	113.62	24.42	106.90	96.29	205.20	N/A	21,250	24,145
19-0059											
19-0123	10	95.34	87.79	90.81	13.23	96.68	52.43	104.20	62.00 to 102.53	42,720	38,792
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## 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	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	102.53	114.33	115.24	29.21	99.21	62.00	205.20	N/A	18,550	21,377
1920 TO 1939	4	103.75	92.32	84.34	13.94	109.46	52.43	109.37	N/A	24,875	20,980
1940 TO 1949	5	97.07	94.22	92.82	4.62	101.51	79.52	99.27	N/A	36,800	34,157
1950 TO 1959	2	96.18	96.18	94.79	2.67	101.46	93.61	98.75	N/A	78,000	73,940
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	31.30	95% Median C.I.:	88.30 to 104.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	545,450	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	31.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.41 to 105.67	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	545,450	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.30	95% Mean C.I.:	83.55 to 115.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	521,125							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,085	COD:	15.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,654	PRD:	104.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:39

## 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	103.29	103.29	103.29			103.29	103.29	N/A	3,500	3,615
5000 TO 9999	3	97.70	87.98	90.29	14.41	97.44	62.00	104.24	N/A	6,333	5,718
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	100.50	91.81	92.31	11.90	99.45	62.00	104.24	N/A	5,625	5,192
10000 TO 29999	4	104.17	125.46	124.93	30.55	100.42	88.30	205.20	N/A	14,612	18,255
30000 TO 59999	7	97.07	89.65	89.10	10.89	100.61	52.43	104.20	52.43 to 104.20	40,642	36,212
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
100000 TO 149999	1	93.61	93.61	93.61			93.61	93.61	N/A	120,000	112,330
ALL											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## 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	3	97.70	87.66	85.07	14.09	103.05	62.00	103.29	N/A	4,666	3,970
5000 TO 9999	1	104.24	104.24	104.24			104.24	104.24	N/A	8,500	8,860
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	100.50	91.81	92.31	11.90	99.45	62.00	104.24	N/A	5,625	5,192
10000 TO 29999	5	98.96	110.85	95.47	35.13	116.11	52.43	205.20	N/A	19,690	18,798
30000 TO 59999	6	97.91	95.85	95.10	4.99	100.79	79.52	104.20	79.52 to 104.20	40,750	38,753
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
100000 TO 149999	1	93.61	93.61	93.61			93.61	93.61	N/A	120,000	112,330
ALL											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
20	16	98.85	100.28	95.72	15.79	104.76	52.43	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	33,265	31,841
ALL											
	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

# 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	31.30	95% Median C.I.:	88.30 to 104.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	545,450	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	31.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.41 to 105.67	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	545,450	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.30	95% Mean C.I.:	83.55 to 115.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	521,125							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,085	COD:	15.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,654	PRD:	104.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:30:39

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
306	1	93.61	93.61	93.61			93.61	93.61	N/A	120,000	112,330
326	1	98.96	98.96	98.96			98.96	98.96	N/A	12,500	12,370
344	1	103.29	103.29	103.29			103.29	103.29	N/A	3,500	3,615
353	5	102.53	112.42	97.80	31.08	114.95	52.43	205.20	N/A	25,450	24,889
406	2	98.17	98.17	98.16	1.12	100.01	97.07	99.27	N/A	44,500	43,680
442	2	83.10	83.10	98.74	25.39	84.16	62.00	104.20	N/A	21,250	20,982
471	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760
528	2	104.06	104.06	102.42	5.10	101.60	98.75	109.37	N/A	27,500	28,165
555	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295
ALL	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

## 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	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654
04											
ALL	17	98.75	99.57	95.54	15.50	104.22	52.43	205.20	88.30 to 104.20	32,085	30,654

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

**Commercial**

No changes to the commercial and industrial class of property were reported for 2009. The County conducted a market analysis of this class of property and determined the median was within the acceptable range for the class and that no individual valuation groupings had a representative number of sales to indicate an adjustment was necessary.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2005
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2007
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>
	2007
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Reconciles all 3 approaches to value
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	14
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	Each town is a market area, and unimproved are included in a separate market area
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>
	Land is a common characteristic
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

### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
23			23



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	28.93	95% Median C.I.:	93.61 to 104.20	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	505,450	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	29.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.59 to 107.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	505,450	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.38	95% Mean C.I.:	86.71 to 118.31	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	500,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,590	COD:	13.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,259	PRD:	103.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.82			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:55

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	2	98.85	98.85	98.80	0.11	100.05	98.75	98.96	N/A	24,250	23,960
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	95.41	95.41	99.96	7.46	95.45	88.30	102.53	N/A	36,600	36,585
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	97.07	97.07	97.07			97.07	97.07	N/A	45,000	43,680
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	157.29	157.29	149.60	30.46	105.13	109.37	205.20	N/A	16,375	24,497
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	103.29	100.38	94.55	3.43	106.17	93.61	104.24	N/A	44,000	41,601
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	98.49	90.75	98.93	11.16	91.73	61.82	104.20	N/A	22,875	22,630
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.75	93.61	93.68	6.82	99.93	79.52	102.53	N/A	34,340	32,170
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	96.68	96.68	96.74	0.40	99.94	96.29	97.07	N/A	38,750	37,487
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	103.29	108.74	103.15	18.35	105.42	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 109.37	28,472	29,368
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	92.69	91.85	93.11	8.57	98.65	79.52	102.53	N/A	42,050	39,152
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	103.77	118.67	103.98	20.18	114.13	93.61	205.20	93.61 to 205.20	32,875	34,182
____ALL____											
	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	5	98.75	121.46	113.62	24.42	106.90	96.29	205.20	N/A	21,250	24,145
LEIGH	2	103.77	103.77	103.96	0.46	99.81	103.29	104.24	N/A	6,000	6,237
RICHLAND	1	61.82	61.82	61.82			61.82	61.82	N/A	5,500	3,400
SCHUYLER	7	98.96	96.45	95.49	5.17	101.00	79.52	104.20	79.52 to 104.20	52,642	50,270
SCHUYLER V	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
____ALL____											
	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## 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	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259
____ALL____											
	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	28.93	95% Median C.I.:	93.61 to 104.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	505,450	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	29.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.59 to 107.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	505,450	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.38	95% Mean C.I.:	86.71 to 118.31	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	500,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,590	COD:	13.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,259	PRD:	103.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.82			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:57

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	15	98.96	103.45	99.24	13.70	104.25	61.82	205.20	96.29 to 104.20	32,816	32,566
2	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
____ALL____	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	2	103.77	103.77	103.96	0.46	99.81	103.29	104.24	N/A	6,000	6,237
19-0058	5	98.75	121.46	113.62	24.42	106.90	96.29	205.20	N/A	21,250	24,145
19-0059											
19-0123	9	97.07	91.70	94.77	9.35	96.76	61.82	104.20	79.52 to 102.53	43,022	40,771
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

**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	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	102.53	114.30	115.23	29.24	99.19	61.82	205.20	N/A	18,550	21,375
1920 TO 1939	3	104.20	105.62	105.80	1.94	99.83	103.29	109.37	N/A	19,833	20,983
1940 TO 1949	5	97.07	94.22	92.82	4.62	101.51	79.52	99.27	N/A	36,800	34,157
1950 TO 1959	2	96.18	96.18	94.79	2.67	101.46	93.61	98.75	N/A	78,000	73,940
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	28.93	95% Median C.I.:	93.61 to 104.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	505,450	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	29.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.59 to 107.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	505,450	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.38	95% Mean C.I.:	86.71 to 118.31	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	500,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,590	COD:	13.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,259	PRD:	103.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.82			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:57

## 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	103.29	103.29	103.29			103.29	103.29	N/A	3,500	3,615
5000 TO 9999	3	97.70	87.92	90.24	14.47	97.43	61.82	104.24	N/A	6,333	5,715
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	100.50	91.76	92.27	11.94	99.45	61.82	104.24	N/A	5,625	5,190
10000 TO 29999	4	104.17	125.46	124.93	30.55	100.42	88.30	205.20	N/A	14,612	18,255
30000 TO 59999	6	97.91	95.85	95.10	4.99	100.79	79.52	104.20	79.52 to 104.20	40,750	38,753
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
100000 TO 149999	1	93.61	93.61	93.61			93.61	93.61	N/A	120,000	112,330
ALL											
	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## 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	3	97.70	87.60	85.00	14.15	103.06	61.82	103.29	N/A	4,666	3,966
5000 TO 9999	1	104.24	104.24	104.24			104.24	104.24	N/A	8,500	8,860
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	100.50	91.76	92.27	11.94	99.45	61.82	104.24	N/A	5,625	5,190
10000 TO 29999	4	104.17	125.46	124.93	30.55	100.42	88.30	205.20	N/A	14,612	18,255
30000 TO 59999	6	97.91	95.85	95.10	4.99	100.79	79.52	104.20	79.52 to 104.20	40,750	38,753
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
100000 TO 149999	1	93.61	93.61	93.61			93.61	93.61	N/A	120,000	112,330
ALL											
	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
20	15	98.96	103.45	99.24	13.70	104.25	61.82	205.20	96.29 to 104.20	32,816	32,566
ALL											
	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	28.93	95% Median C.I.:	93.61 to 104.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	505,450	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	29.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.59 to 107.32	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	505,450	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.38	95% Mean C.I.:	86.71 to 118.31	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	500,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,590	COD:	13.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.20			
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,259	PRD:	103.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	61.82			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:51:57

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	88.30	88.30	88.30			88.30	88.30	N/A	13,200	11,655
306	1	93.61	93.61	93.61			93.61	93.61	N/A	120,000	112,330
326	1	98.96	98.96	98.96			98.96	98.96	N/A	12,500	12,370
344	1	103.29	103.29	103.29			103.29	103.29	N/A	3,500	3,615
353	4	103.39	127.42	118.60	26.41	107.44	97.70	205.20	N/A	21,812	25,868
406	2	98.17	98.17	98.16	1.12	100.01	97.07	99.27	N/A	44,500	43,680
442	2	83.01	83.01	98.72	25.53	84.09	61.82	104.20	N/A	21,250	20,977
471	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760
528	2	104.06	104.06	102.42	5.10	101.60	98.75	109.37	N/A	27,500	28,165
555	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295
ALL	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259

## 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	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259
04											
ALL	16	98.85	102.51	98.95	13.53	103.59	61.82	205.20	93.61 to 104.20	31,590	31,259



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL:In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. There are very few commercial sales in this class, but a sufficient amount to determine a representative level of value.

There were no assessment actions reported for the commercial class in 2009 and the statistics reflect that report. The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>76</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21.05</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14.86</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18.29</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>34.09</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38.20</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of the sales utilization grid indicates the County has used a historically low percentage of qualified sales for analysis purposes. A further review of the non-qualified sales file indicates that several private transactions, sales from corporate affiliates to parent companies, and sales involving excess amounts of personal property are present in the file. These types of transactions are appropriately coded as non-qualified sales. The Division assumes that while this percentage is generally low compared to surrounding counties, the measurement of the class has been done with all available arm's length sales.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>99</b>	<b>-0.42</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>98.75</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98.75</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>96</b>

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>7.29</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>-0.42</b>
<b>0.00</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>-0.25</b>
<b>17.91</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>3.85</b>
<b>-1.80</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>0.31</b>
<b>0.00</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>0.56</b>

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in the sales file is directly attributable to one sale that was removed prior to the creation of the R&O statistics. When comparing the base of 16 sales there was no difference in the current years weighted mean. This result is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>103</b>

COMMERCIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency, the median and weighted mean are within the range while the mean is outside the range. The three measures are considered relatively similar which suggests the median is the best indicator of the level of value in this property class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>13.53</b>	<b>103.59</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.59</b>

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is well within the acceptable range, while the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>15.50</b>	<b>13.53</b>	<b>-1.97</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>104.22</b>	<b>103.59</b>	<b>-0.63</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>52.43</b>	<b>61.82</b>	<b>9.39</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>205.20</b>	<b>205.20</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

**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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,455,537	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	15.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.08 to 62.71	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,388,596	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.75	95% Mean C.I.:	58.48 to 67.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,118,090							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	199,780	COD:	21.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	117,655	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

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

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	63.97	64.84	60.23	15.69	107.65	46.69	89.77	54.90 to 76.42	200,232	120,609	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	73.32	70.67	63.34	15.40	111.58	45.93	93.76	45.93 to 93.76	229,257	145,205	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	66.64	67.64	64.76	11.42	104.44	56.72	79.55	N/A	145,333	94,120	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	60.00	60.00	60.01	3.38	99.98	57.97	62.03	N/A	314,999	189,045	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	72.59	67.52	68.10	7.26	99.15	55.65	73.09	N/A	119,406	81,314	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	75.09	75.16	74.03	18.30	101.53	54.11	102.54	N/A	169,931	125,798	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	73.30	73.30	72.93	1.80	100.51	71.98	74.62	N/A	146,641	106,940	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	52.09	54.74	54.58	16.03	100.30	42.67	77.89	42.67 to 77.89	155,900	85,089	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	47.85	53.43	50.43	18.63	105.96	40.22	98.47	41.15 to 55.35	274,630	138,485	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	39.23	42.63	40.25	23.43	105.93	30.55	58.12	N/A	189,474	76,258	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	68.77	67.30	61.95	15.53	108.63	45.93	93.76	56.72 to 73.99	202,156	125,244	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	72.29	70.00	68.67	12.39	101.93	54.11	102.54	57.97 to 75.09	169,283	116,252	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	49.43	52.07	49.95	19.43	104.25	30.55	98.47	42.67 to 55.35	220,860	110,315	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	70.94	67.95	63.76	13.14	106.58	45.93	93.76	56.72 to 73.99	192,225	122,556	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	61.89	65.45	65.12	22.32	100.51	42.67	102.54	51.00 to 77.89	159,872	104,108	
____ALL____	_____											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655	

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,455,537	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	15.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.08 to 62.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,388,596	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.75	95% Mean C.I.:	58.48 to 67.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,118,090							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	199,780	COD:	21.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	117,655	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:02

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2069	3	47.38	53.87	53.46	22.47	100.77	41.15	73.09	N/A	220,477	117,870
2071	5	59.37	53.55	52.73	23.19	101.56	30.55	71.98	N/A	217,341	114,607
2073	1	54.30	54.30	54.30			54.30	54.30	N/A	475,800	258,375
2111	5	55.35	55.78	53.06	9.18	105.13	47.85	68.98	N/A	286,400	151,961
2113	2	77.83	77.83	75.37	20.48	103.26	61.89	93.76	N/A	170,257	128,317
2115	1	82.45	82.45	82.45			82.45	82.45	N/A	74,000	61,015
2353	7	73.99	69.89	68.82	9.44	101.56	54.11	79.55	54.11 to 79.55	131,857	90,739
2355	12	56.61	60.22	56.54	18.37	106.51	45.51	82.18	47.65 to 72.59	144,319	81,598
2357	12	63.39	66.72	60.63	27.88	110.05	40.22	102.54	46.69 to 89.77	216,108	131,035
2399	1	56.72	56.72	56.72			56.72	56.72	N/A	192,000	108,905
2401	1	73.32	73.32	73.32			73.32	73.32	N/A	248,000	181,835
2403	2	60.00	60.00	60.01	3.38	99.98	57.97	62.03	N/A	314,999	189,045
ALL	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	35	62.03	64.65	61.02	20.50	105.93	40.22	102.54	55.65 to 72.59	180,518	110,160
2	17	55.50	58.86	55.58	22.38	105.90	30.55	93.76	47.38 to 71.98	239,438	133,086
ALL	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

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	1	47.85	47.85	47.85			47.85	47.85	N/A	480,000	229,665
2	51	59.37	63.05	59.43	21.51	106.09	30.55	102.54	55.50 to 70.64	194,286	115,459
ALL	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,455,537	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	15.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.08 to 62.71	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,388,596	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.75	95% Mean C.I.:	58.48 to 67.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,118,090							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	199,780	COD:	21.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	117,655	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:02

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	3	47.38	56.99	49.65	29.06	114.78	41.15	82.45	N/A	174,800	86,795
19-0058	4	72.54	75.18	73.85	11.37	101.79	61.89	93.76	N/A	184,957	136,600
19-0059	4	57.44	58.95	57.93	7.06	101.76	54.30	66.64	N/A	230,200	133,356
19-0123	38	58.05	62.18	58.12	22.10	106.98	30.55	102.54	54.11 to 70.94	191,692	111,417
27-0046	1	47.85	47.85	47.85			47.85	47.85	N/A	480,000	229,665
27-0595	2	72.49	72.49	71.56	5.42	101.29	68.56	76.42	N/A	219,634	157,177
NonValid School											
ALL											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

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	3	57.58	61.24	61.19	8.76	100.08	55.50	70.64	N/A	36,254	22,183
30.01 TO 50.00	20	58.17	61.22	56.66	23.63	108.05	30.55	98.47	47.65 to 72.59	121,931	69,088
50.01 TO 100.00	24	67.60	66.30	62.70	19.17	105.73	39.23	102.54	54.11 to 74.62	218,540	137,028
100.01 TO 180.00	4	52.95	52.28	52.42	4.82	99.72	47.85	55.35	N/A	445,950	233,763
180.01 TO 330.00	1	54.90	54.90	54.90			54.90	54.90	N/A	812,432	446,045
ALL											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

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	22	56.89	61.36	57.05	21.19	107.54	39.23	98.47	51.00 to 73.09	185,585	105,884
DRY-N/A	13	66.64	63.92	58.63	19.52	109.01	40.22	93.76	47.38 to 74.62	186,722	109,479
GRASS	2	72.63	72.63	79.77	23.59	91.06	55.50	89.77	N/A	34,250	27,320
GRASS-N/A	2	44.07	44.07	38.22	30.67	115.29	30.55	57.58	N/A	97,750	37,362
IRRGTD	8	65.30	66.19	63.18	20.44	104.76	45.93	102.54	45.93 to 102.54	222,738	140,732
IRRGTD-N/A	5	59.37	63.91	60.59	11.60	105.49	54.90	73.99	N/A	366,484	222,036
ALL											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,455,537	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	15.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.08 to 62.71	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,388,596	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.75	95% Mean C.I.:	58.48 to 67.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,118,090							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	199,780	COD:	21.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	117,655	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:02

## 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	29	58.22	63.76	58.66	22.26	108.68	39.23	98.47	53.17 to 72.59	186,064	109,147
DRY-N/A	6	54.64	55.32	52.71	22.70	104.94	40.22	74.62	40.22 to 74.62	185,732	97,901
GRASS	2	72.63	72.63	79.77	23.59	91.06	55.50	89.77	N/A	34,250	27,320
GRASS-N/A	2	44.07	44.07	38.22	30.67	115.29	30.55	57.58	N/A	97,750	37,362
IRRGTD	11	62.03	65.07	61.33	18.95	106.09	45.93	102.54	46.69 to 76.42	286,847	175,925
IRRGTD-N/A	2	66.68	66.68	65.55	10.96	101.73	59.37	73.99	N/A	229,500	150,430
____ALL____											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

## 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	34	58.17	62.32	57.51	22.58	108.36	39.23	98.47	51.60 to 72.59	185,698	106,796
DRY-N/A	1	61.89	61.89	61.89			61.89	61.89	N/A	196,514	121,615
GRASS	3	55.50	58.61	46.72	35.57	125.44	30.55	89.77	N/A	69,500	32,470
GRASS-N/A	1	57.58	57.58	57.58			57.58	57.58	N/A	55,500	31,955
IRRGTD	13	62.03	65.31	61.87	17.84	105.57	45.93	102.54	54.90 to 73.99	278,025	172,003
____ALL____											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

## 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	55.50	55.50	55.50			55.50	55.50	N/A	20,000	11,100
30000 TO 59999	3	70.64	72.66	72.12	15.19	100.76	57.58	89.77	N/A	45,754	32,996
60000 TO 99999	9	72.59	75.62	74.56	11.83	101.42	58.12	98.47	63.69 to 82.45	84,333	62,881
100000 TO 149999	8	56.94	60.05	59.57	24.31	100.81	30.55	93.76	30.55 to 93.76	126,599	75,418
150000 TO 249999	19	61.89	62.13	61.82	22.39	100.51	40.22	102.54	46.69 to 73.99	194,076	119,969
250000 TO 499999	10	52.95	53.81	53.07	12.54	101.40	39.23	68.56	45.93 to 62.03	343,164	182,102
500000 +	2	55.13	55.13	55.08	0.41	100.09	54.90	55.35	N/A	670,216	369,137
____ALL____											
	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,455,537	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	15.74	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.08 to 62.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,388,596	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.75	95% Mean C.I.:	58.48 to 67.03	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,118,090							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	199,780	COD:	21.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	117,655	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:02

## 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	2	63.07	63.07	64.95	12.00	97.10	55.50	70.64	N/A	26,631	17,297
30000 TO 59999	4	57.85	59.01	51.17	25.83	115.30	30.55	89.77	N/A	84,750	43,370
60000 TO 99999	18	66.34	63.79	58.57	21.49	108.91	40.22	98.47	47.65 to 74.62	118,081	69,159
100000 TO 149999	15	61.89	63.08	60.19	20.17	104.79	39.23	93.76	51.22 to 75.09	204,344	123,002
150000 TO 249999	10	60.70	64.23	61.00	19.25	105.30	45.93	102.54	47.85 to 73.32	298,945	182,345
250000 TO 499999	3	54.90	54.85	54.87	0.64	99.96	54.30	55.35	N/A	605,410	332,216
ALL	52	58.80	62.76	58.89	21.68	106.56	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.64	199,780	117,655

# 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:	55	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	24.62	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.94	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,822,037	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	15.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 63.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,755,096	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.86 to 67.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,028,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,729	COD:	21.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,794	PRD:	105.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:13

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	10	63.97	64.84	60.23	15.69	107.65	46.69	89.77	54.90 to 76.42	200,232	120,609	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	72.44	70.78	65.63	13.94	107.85	45.93	93.76	45.93 to 93.76	265,562	174,276	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	66.64	67.64	64.76	11.42	104.44	56.72	79.55	N/A	145,333	94,120	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	60.00	60.00	60.01	3.38	99.98	57.97	62.03	N/A	314,999	189,045	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	72.59	68.78	70.91	6.62	97.00	55.65	75.09	55.65 to 75.09	159,088	112,815	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	75.09	75.16	74.03	18.30	101.53	54.11	102.54	N/A	169,931	125,798	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	73.30	73.30	72.93	1.80	100.51	71.98	74.62	N/A	146,641	106,940	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	52.09	54.74	54.58	16.03	100.30	42.67	77.89	42.67 to 77.89	155,900	85,089	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	49.54	53.34	50.96	17.13	104.67	40.22	98.47	41.15 to 55.35	296,097	150,885	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	39.23	42.63	40.25	23.43	105.93	30.55	58.12	N/A	189,474	76,258	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	68.98	67.50	63.18	14.92	106.85	45.93	93.76	56.72 to 73.99	217,277	137,269	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	72.59	70.34	69.58	11.74	101.09	54.11	102.54	61.89 to 75.09	181,831	126,523	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	51.00	52.09	50.35	17.99	103.45	30.55	98.47	42.67 to 55.35	234,989	118,324	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	71.55	68.52	65.90	11.96	103.97	45.93	93.76	57.97 to 73.99	218,159	143,765	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	61.89	65.45	65.12	22.32	100.51	42.67	102.54	51.00 to 77.89	159,872	104,108	
____ALL____	_____											
	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794	

# 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:	55	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	24.62	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.94	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,822,037	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	15.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 63.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,755,096	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.86 to 67.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,028,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,729	COD:	21.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,794	PRD:	105.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:13

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2069	3	47.38	53.87	53.46	22.47	100.77	41.15	73.09	N/A		220,477	117,870
2071	5	59.37	53.55	52.73	23.19	101.56	30.55	71.98	N/A		217,341	114,607
2073	1	54.30	54.30	54.30			54.30	54.30	N/A		475,800	258,375
2111	5	55.35	55.78	53.06	9.18	105.13	47.85	68.98	N/A		286,400	151,961
2113	2	77.83	77.83	75.37	20.48	103.26	61.89	93.76	N/A		170,257	128,317
2115	1	82.45	82.45	82.45			82.45	82.45	N/A		74,000	61,015
2353	8	72.77	70.10	70.21	8.82	99.83	54.11	79.55	54.11 to 79.55		180,337	126,618
2355	13	57.58	61.36	59.80	19.01	102.61	45.51	82.18	47.65 to 75.09		160,718	96,115
2357	12	63.39	66.72	60.63	27.88	110.05	40.22	102.54	46.69 to 89.77		216,108	131,035
2399	1	56.72	56.72	56.72			56.72	56.72	N/A		192,000	108,905
2401	2	62.90	62.90	60.26	16.58	104.37	52.47	73.32	N/A		368,650	222,162
2403	2	60.00	60.00	60.01	3.38	99.98	57.97	62.03	N/A		314,999	189,045
ALL												
	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94		213,729	127,794

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	38	62.86	64.78	62.02	19.98	104.45	40.22	102.54	55.65 to 72.59		202,227	125,426
2	17	55.50	58.86	55.58	22.38	105.90	30.55	93.76	47.38 to 71.98		239,438	133,086
ALL												
	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94		213,729	127,794

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	4	62.01	61.74	61.75	18.67	99.98	47.85	75.09	N/A		461,625	285,062
2	51	59.37	63.05	59.43	21.51	106.09	30.55	102.54	55.50 to 70.64		194,286	115,459
ALL												
	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94		213,729	127,794

# 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:	55	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	24.62	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.94	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,822,037	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	15.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 63.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,755,096	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.86 to 67.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,028,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,729	COD:	21.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,794	PRD:	105.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:13

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	3	47.38	56.99	49.65	29.06	114.78	41.15	82.45	N/A	174,800	86,795
19-0058	4	72.54	75.18	73.85	11.37	101.79	61.89	93.76	N/A	184,957	136,600
19-0059	4	57.44	58.95	57.93	7.06	101.76	54.30	66.64	N/A	230,200	133,356
19-0123	41	58.12	62.49	59.47	21.97	105.08	30.55	102.54	54.11 to 71.55	210,995	125,474
27-0046	1	47.85	47.85	47.85			47.85	47.85	N/A	480,000	229,665
27-0595	2	72.49	72.49	71.56	5.42	101.29	68.56	76.42	N/A	219,634	157,177
NonValid School											
ALL	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794

## 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	3	57.58	61.24	61.19	8.76	100.08	55.50	70.64	N/A	36,254	22,183
30.01 TO 50.00	20	58.17	61.22	56.66	23.63	108.05	30.55	98.47	47.65 to 72.59	121,931	69,088
50.01 TO 100.00	24	67.60	66.30	62.70	19.17	105.73	39.23	102.54	54.11 to 74.62	218,540	137,028
100.01 TO 180.00	6	53.39	56.11	55.80	10.25	100.56	47.85	75.09	47.85 to 75.09	438,433	244,644
180.01 TO 330.00	2	63.22	63.22	61.84	13.17	102.24	54.90	71.55	N/A	666,066	411,910
ALL	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794

## 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	23	58.12	61.96	58.55	21.11	105.82	39.23	98.47	51.22 to 73.09	193,059	113,033
DRY-N/A	13	66.64	63.92	58.63	19.52	109.01	40.22	93.76	47.38 to 74.62	186,722	109,479
GRASS	2	72.63	72.63	79.77	23.59	91.06	55.50	89.77	N/A	34,250	27,320
GRASS-N/A	2	44.07	44.07	38.22	30.67	115.29	30.55	57.58	N/A	97,750	37,362
IRRGTD	9	62.03	64.67	61.13	20.84	105.79	45.93	102.54	46.69 to 76.42	252,356	154,261
IRRGTD-N/A	6	65.46	65.18	63.26	11.87	103.04	54.90	73.99	54.90 to 73.99	392,020	247,992
ALL	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794



# 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:	55	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	24.62	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.94	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,822,037	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	15.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 63.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,755,096	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.86 to 67.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,028,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,729	COD:	21.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,794	PRD:	105.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:13

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	30	60.96	64.13	59.71	21.47	107.40	39.23	98.47	54.11 to 72.59	191,779	114,519
DRY-N/A	6	54.64	55.32	52.71	22.70	104.94	40.22	74.62	40.22 to 74.62	185,732	97,901
GRASS	2	72.63	72.63	79.77	23.59	91.06	55.50	89.77	N/A	34,250	27,320
GRASS-N/A	2	44.07	44.07	38.22	30.67	115.29	30.55	57.58	N/A	97,750	37,362
IRRGTD	12	60.00	64.02	60.30	19.28	106.16	45.93	102.54	52.47 to 73.32	303,718	183,139
IRRGTD-N/A	3	71.55	68.30	69.34	6.81	98.50	59.37	73.99	N/A	326,233	226,211
____ALL____	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794

## 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	35	58.22	62.69	58.48	22.74	107.19	39.23	98.47	53.17 to 72.59	190,607	111,468
DRY-N/A	1	61.89	61.89	61.89			61.89	61.89	N/A	196,514	121,615
GRASS	3	55.50	58.61	46.72	35.57	125.44	30.55	89.77	N/A	69,500	32,470
GRASS-N/A	1	57.58	57.58	57.58			57.58	57.58	N/A	55,500	31,955
IRRGTD	15	62.03	64.87	62.21	17.52	104.28	45.93	102.54	54.90 to 73.32	308,221	191,753
____ALL____	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794

## 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	55.50	55.50	55.50			55.50	55.50	N/A	20,000	11,100
30000 TO 59999	3	70.64	72.66	72.12	15.19	100.76	57.58	89.77	N/A	45,754	32,996
60000 TO 99999	9	72.59	75.62	74.56	11.83	101.42	58.12	98.47	63.69 to 82.45	84,333	62,881
100000 TO 149999	8	56.94	60.05	59.57	24.31	100.81	30.55	93.76	30.55 to 93.76	126,599	75,418
150000 TO 249999	19	61.89	62.13	61.82	22.39	100.51	40.22	102.54	46.69 to 73.99	194,076	119,969
250000 TO 499999	11	54.30	55.74	55.19	14.60	100.99	39.23	75.09	45.93 to 68.56	344,468	190,122
500000 +	4	55.13	58.57	58.68	8.86	99.82	52.47	71.55	N/A	587,358	344,635
____ALL____	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794

# 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:	55	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>59</b>	COV:	24.62	95% Median C.I.:	55.35 to 70.94	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,822,037	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	15.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 63.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,755,096	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	58.86 to 67.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,028,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,729	COD:	21.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.54			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,794	PRD:	105.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.55			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:13

## 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	2	63.07	63.07	64.95	12.00	97.10	55.50	70.64	N/A	26,631	17,297
30000 TO 59999	4	57.85	59.01	51.17	25.83	115.30	30.55	89.77	N/A	84,750	43,370
60000 TO 99999	18	66.34	63.79	58.57	21.49	108.91	40.22	98.47	47.65 to 74.62	118,081	69,159
100000 TO 149999	15	61.89	63.08	60.19	20.17	104.79	39.23	93.76	51.22 to 75.09	204,344	123,002
150000 TO 249999	10	60.70	64.23	61.00	19.25	105.30	45.93	102.54	47.85 to 73.32	298,945	182,345
250000 TO 499999	6	55.13	60.61	59.92	12.19	101.14	52.47	75.09	52.47 to 75.09	530,455	317,872
ALL	55	59.37	62.95	59.79	21.36	105.28	30.55	102.54	55.35 to 70.94	213,729	127,794

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

### **Agricultural**

For the 2009 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using unimproved agricultural sales and sales with minimal non-agricultural components, the market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be below the statutory range at 59%. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the two market areas.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, Colfax County completed the following assessment actions:

- The assessor reviewed sales in the two market areas and determined the range of values was very similar in each market area, and determined there was no longer defensible evidence to support two market areas in Colfax County.
- After combining market areas, the county arrived at values for irrigated and dryland land that increased approximately 20% compared to the values for last year's Market Area One. In general Irrigated, Dry, and Grass land increased a larger percentage for parcels previously in Market Area Two.

After completing the assessment actions for 2009 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor, and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Nothing written
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Agricultural is defined in the county as it is defined in statute.
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>
	The county does not conduct an income approach for agricultural land.
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1995
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	1983 was the last year it was completed, but is currently being studied with hopes for completion in 2010.
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	GIS
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	1
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	N/A
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>
	<b>Yes or No</b>
	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>
	No

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>57</b>		<b>82</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:	50	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	64.81 to 75.97	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,233,057	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.75 to 73.37	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,166,116	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.08 to 78.25	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,969,760							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,322	COD:	19.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,395	PRD:	106.72	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:24

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	71.92	77.14	73.41	15.23	105.08	57.91	93.47	62.96 to 92.31		220,258	161,696
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	88.83	81.31	73.17	12.57	111.12	56.99	99.22	56.99 to 99.22		229,257	167,742
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	74.05	80.18	76.51	12.20	104.79	69.69	96.80	N/A		145,333	111,198
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	71.15	71.15	71.16	3.44	99.98	68.70	73.59	N/A		314,999	224,155
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	73.34	73.47	74.04	3.36	99.23	67.51	77.34	N/A		119,406	88,411
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	90.11	88.47	86.53	20.28	102.24	62.34	121.23	N/A		169,931	147,046
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	79.79	79.79	78.71	4.79	101.38	75.97	83.61	N/A		146,641	115,417
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	63.50	66.19	65.97	14.76	100.32	52.08	90.11	52.08 to 90.11		155,900	102,851
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	56.03	62.72	56.44	21.14	111.13	46.99	120.99	46.99 to 120.99		283,649	160,089
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	41.96	47.92	44.41	25.03	107.89	35.14	66.65	N/A		189,474	84,146
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	84.89	79.15	73.65	14.45	107.47	56.99	99.22	69.28 to 90.07		211,743	155,950
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	74.71	79.40	78.33	13.17	101.36	62.34	121.23	68.10 to 90.11		169,283	132,602
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	17	58.34	61.33	56.99	20.83	107.62	35.14	120.99	50.57 to 66.65		221,942	126,486
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	74.05	77.61	73.39	12.87	105.75	56.99	99.22	68.70 to 89.95		192,225	141,068
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	71.75	76.85	76.17	21.00	100.89	52.08	121.23	62.18 to 90.11		159,872	121,782
____ALL____	_____											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

# 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:	50	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	64.81 to 75.97	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,233,057	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.75 to 73.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,166,116	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.08 to 78.25	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,969,760							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,322	COD:	19.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,395	PRD:	106.72	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:25

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2069	3	52.23	58.85	58.46	19.37	100.68	46.99	77.34	N/A		220,477	128,886
2071	5	71.74	59.77	58.96	20.33	101.37	35.14	75.97	N/A		217,341	128,151
2073	1	58.49	58.49	58.49			58.49	58.49	N/A		475,800	278,285
2111	4	56.03	58.64	55.82	11.59	105.05	50.57	71.92	N/A		353,000	197,037
2113	2	83.66	83.66	81.26	18.60	102.95	68.10	99.22	N/A		170,257	138,350
2115	1	90.07	90.07	90.07			90.07	90.07	N/A		74,000	66,650
2353	7	85.60	82.15	80.86	10.72	101.60	62.34	96.80	62.34 to 96.80		131,857	106,615
2355	12	66.16	70.35	67.39	14.77	104.38	56.19	100.59	60.30 to 75.83		144,319	97,260
2357	11	84.89	82.94	75.99	22.29	109.15	52.08	121.23	57.91 to 120.99		217,347	165,156
2399	1	69.69	69.69	69.69			69.69	69.69	N/A		192,000	133,805
2401	1	88.83	88.83	88.83			88.83	88.83	N/A		248,000	220,300
2403	2	71.15	71.15	71.16	3.44	99.98	68.70	73.59	N/A		314,999	224,155
ALL												
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395
ALL												
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

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	1	50.57	50.57	50.57			50.57	50.57	N/A		480,000	242,725
2	49	71.75	73.62	69.45	19.63	106.01	35.14	121.23	66.65 to 75.97		197,675	137,286
ALL												
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
19-0039	3	52.23	63.10	55.32	27.49	114.06	46.99	90.07	N/A		174,800	96,698
19-0058	4	76.66	80.16	78.80	10.60	101.73	68.10	99.22	N/A		184,957	145,738
19-0059	3	71.74	68.09	65.15	7.23	104.52	58.49	74.05	N/A		300,266	195,626
19-0123	37	69.69	73.38	68.91	20.71	106.49	35.14	121.23	62.96 to 75.83		191,400	131,886
27-0046	1	50.57	50.57	50.57			50.57	50.57	N/A		480,000	242,725
27-0595	2	89.18	89.18	88.17	4.81	101.15	84.89	93.47	N/A		219,634	193,645
NonValid School												
ALL												
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

# 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:	50	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	64.81 to 75.97	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,233,057	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.75 to 73.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,166,116	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.08 to 78.25	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,969,760							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,322	COD:	19.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,395	PRD:	106.72	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:32

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	77.64	77.64	73.96	18.90	104.97	62.96	92.31	N/A	44,381	32,825
30.01 TO 50.00	19	71.75	73.05	68.73	19.13	106.29	35.14	120.99	60.30 to 85.60	117,692	80,886
50.01 TO 100.00	24	75.01	75.82	72.44	19.40	104.67	41.96	121.23	64.81 to 89.77	218,540	158,313
100.01 TO 180.00	4	58.42	56.51	56.34	3.51	100.30	50.57	58.62	N/A	445,950	251,231
180.01 TO 330.00	1	69.28	69.28	69.28			69.28	69.28	N/A	812,432	562,820
ALL											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97	203,322	139,395

## 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	22	67.08	70.80	64.54	20.27	109.71	41.96	120.99	58.49 to 77.34	185,585	119,772
DRY-N/A	12	73.34	72.84	66.19	18.04	110.04	46.99	100.59	58.34 to 85.60	185,409	122,720
GRASS	1	89.77	89.77	89.77			89.77	89.77	N/A	48,500	43,540
GRASS-N/A	2	49.05	49.05	43.04	28.36	113.96	35.14	62.96	N/A	97,750	42,072
IRRGTD	8	79.24	81.26	76.98	21.09	105.56	56.99	121.23	56.99 to 121.23	222,738	171,459
IRRGTD-N/A	5	71.74	77.70	74.37	11.37	104.48	68.70	89.95	N/A	366,484	272,554
ALL											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97	203,322	139,395

## 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	29	71.75	72.65	65.68	19.58	110.60	41.96	120.99	60.30 to 77.34	186,064	122,209
DRY-N/A	5	68.10	65.00	61.80	17.16	105.17	46.99	83.61	N/A	182,382	112,709
GRASS	1	89.77	89.77	89.77			89.77	89.77	N/A	48,500	43,540
GRASS-N/A	2	49.05	49.05	43.04	28.36	113.96	35.14	62.96	N/A	97,750	42,072
IRRGTD	11	73.59	79.72	75.11	19.54	106.14	56.99	121.23	57.91 to 93.47	286,847	215,439
IRRGTD-N/A	2	80.85	80.85	79.44	11.26	101.77	71.74	89.95	N/A	229,500	182,307
ALL											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97	203,322	139,395

## 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	33	71.75	71.62	65.02	19.68	110.15	41.96	120.99	60.30 to 75.97	185,190	120,418
DRY-N/A	1	68.10	68.10	68.10			68.10	68.10	N/A	196,514	133,830
GRASS	2	62.46	62.46	49.20	43.74	126.94	35.14	89.77	N/A	94,250	46,370
GRASS-N/A	1	62.96	62.96	62.96			62.96	62.96	N/A	55,500	34,945
IRRGTD	13	73.59	79.89	75.66	18.44	105.60	56.99	121.23	68.70 to 92.31	278,025	210,341
ALL											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97	203,322	139,395



**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:	50	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	25.08	95% Median C.I.:	64.81 to 75.97	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,233,057	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.75 to 73.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,166,116	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.22	95% Mean C.I.:	68.08 to 78.25	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,969,760							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,322	COD:	19.83	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,395	PRD:	106.72	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:34

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
30000 TO 59999	3	89.77	81.68	79.55	10.90	102.68	62.96	92.31	N/A		45,754	36,396
60000 TO 99999	9	85.60	87.02	85.62	15.48	101.64	66.65	120.99	73.34 to 100.59		84,333	72,208
100000 TO 149999	8	69.63	68.95	68.46	18.20	100.72	35.14	99.22	35.14 to 99.22		126,599	86,673
150000 TO 249999	18	71.87	73.97	73.61	20.93	100.49	46.99	121.23	57.91 to 89.95		193,610	142,507
250000 TO 499999	10	58.56	61.93	60.65	16.36	102.10	41.96	84.89	50.57 to 73.59		343,164	208,129
500000 +	2	63.81	63.81	64.97	8.57	98.21	58.34	69.28	N/A		670,216	435,437
ALL _____	_____											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
30000 TO 59999	4	76.36	70.05	57.13	27.49	122.61	35.14	92.31	N/A		69,315	39,597
60000 TO 99999	17	73.34	76.99	73.42	17.51	104.85	52.08	120.99	62.18 to 90.07		105,458	77,431
100000 TO 149999	13	68.10	68.73	65.44	19.53	105.02	41.96	99.22	52.23 to 90.11		202,810	132,726
150000 TO 249999	13	73.59	76.13	71.92	20.42	105.84	50.57	121.23	56.99 to 89.95		280,253	201,571
250000 TO 499999	2	58.42	58.42	58.41	0.13	100.01	58.34	58.49	N/A		501,900	293,170
500000 +	1	69.28	69.28	69.28			69.28	69.28	N/A		812,432	562,820
ALL _____	_____											
	50	71.75	73.16	68.56	19.83	106.72	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 75.97		203,322	139,395

# 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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.58	95% Median C.I.:	65.07 to 77.34	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,621,357	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	18.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.11 to 74.58	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,554,416	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.15	95% Mean C.I.:	68.69 to 78.43	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,070,070							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	218,007	COD:	19.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,265	PRD:	105.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:51

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	71.92	77.14	73.41	15.23	105.08	57.91	93.47	62.96 to 92.31	220,258	161,696	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	87.22	81.77	76.09	11.75	107.46	56.99	99.22	56.99 to 99.22	266,600	202,864	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	74.05	80.18	76.51	12.20	104.79	69.69	96.80	N/A	145,333	111,198	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	71.15	71.15	71.16	3.44	99.98	68.70	73.59	N/A	314,999	224,155	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	74.59	76.32	80.26	6.60	95.10	67.51	90.57	67.51 to 90.57	159,505	128,015	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	90.11	88.47	86.53	20.28	102.24	62.34	121.23	N/A	169,931	147,046	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	79.79	79.79	78.71	4.79	101.38	75.97	83.61	N/A	146,641	115,417	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	63.50	66.19	65.97	14.76	100.32	52.08	90.11	52.08 to 90.11	155,900	102,851	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	58.34	62.98	58.00	19.33	108.59	46.99	120.99	50.57 to 65.07	307,721	178,474	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	41.96	47.92	44.41	25.03	107.89	35.14	66.65	N/A	189,474	84,146	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	84.94	79.45	74.97	13.72	105.98	56.99	99.22	69.69 to 89.95	227,556	170,589	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	75.83	80.14	79.94	13.41	100.25	62.34	121.23	68.70 to 90.11	181,998	145,498	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	58.48	61.54	57.94	20.26	106.22	35.14	120.99	52.08 to 65.07	237,406	137,545	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	75.83	78.68	76.35	13.02	103.05	56.99	99.22	69.69 to 89.95	218,727	166,995	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	71.75	76.85	76.17	21.00	100.89	52.08	121.23	62.18 to 90.11	159,872	121,782	
____ALL____	_____											
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265	

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.58	95% Median C.I.:	65.07 to 77.34	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,621,357	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	18.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.11 to 74.58	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,554,416	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.15	95% Mean C.I.:	68.69 to 78.43	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,070,070							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	218,007	COD:	19.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,265	PRD:	105.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:51

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2069	3	52.23	58.85	58.46	19.37	100.68	46.99	77.34	N/A		220,477	128,886
2071	5	71.74	59.77	58.96	20.33	101.37	35.14	75.97	N/A		217,341	128,151
2073	1	58.49	58.49	58.49			58.49	58.49	N/A		475,800	278,285
2111	4	56.03	58.64	55.82	11.59	105.05	50.57	71.92	N/A		353,000	197,037
2113	2	83.66	83.66	81.26	18.60	102.95	68.10	99.22	N/A		170,257	138,350
2115	1	90.07	90.07	90.07			90.07	90.07	N/A		74,000	66,650
2353	8	85.29	82.51	82.36	9.51	100.18	62.34	96.80	62.34 to 96.80		181,375	149,377
2355	13	67.51	71.90	71.38	15.99	100.73	56.19	100.59	60.30 to 90.11		160,910	114,858
2357	11	84.89	82.94	75.99	22.29	109.15	52.08	121.23	57.91 to 120.99		217,347	165,156
2399	1	69.69	69.69	69.69			69.69	69.69	N/A		192,000	133,805
2401	2	76.95	76.95	72.95	15.44	105.49	65.07	88.83	N/A		374,150	272,927
2403	2	71.15	71.15	71.16	3.44	99.98	68.70	73.59	N/A		314,999	224,155
ALL												
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34		218,007	152,265

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34		218,007	152,265
ALL												
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34		218,007	152,265

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	4	75.03	72.80	71.89	19.96	101.27	50.57	90.57	N/A		467,075	335,758
2	49	71.75	73.62	69.45	19.63	106.01	35.14	121.23	66.65 to 75.97		197,675	137,286
ALL												
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34		218,007	152,265

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
19-0039	3	52.23	63.10	55.32	27.49	114.06	46.99	90.07	N/A		174,800	96,698
19-0058	4	76.66	80.16	78.80	10.60	101.73	68.10	99.22	N/A		184,957	145,738
19-0059	3	71.74	68.09	65.15	7.23	104.52	58.49	74.05	N/A		300,266	195,626
19-0123	40	70.72	73.89	70.60	20.32	104.66	35.14	121.23	64.81 to 83.61		211,752	149,503
27-0046	1	50.57	50.57	50.57			50.57	50.57	N/A		480,000	242,725
27-0595	2	89.18	89.18	88.17	4.81	101.15	84.89	93.47	N/A		219,634	193,645
NonValid School												
ALL												
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34		218,007	152,265

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.58	95% Median C.I.:	65.07 to 77.34	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,621,357	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	18.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.11 to 74.58	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,554,416	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.15	95% Mean C.I.:	68.69 to 78.43	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,070,070							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	218,007	COD:	19.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,265	PRD:	105.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:51

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	77.64	77.64	73.96	18.90	104.97	62.96	92.31	N/A	44,381	32,825
30.01 TO 50.00	19	71.75	73.05	68.73	19.13	106.29	35.14	120.99	60.30 to 85.60	117,692	80,886
50.01 TO 100.00	24	75.01	75.82	72.44	19.40	104.67	41.96	121.23	64.81 to 89.77	218,540	158,313
100.01 TO 180.00	6	58.56	63.61	62.65	13.34	101.53	50.57	90.57	50.57 to 90.57	440,683	276,086
180.01 TO 330.00	2	77.13	77.13	75.46	10.18	102.21	69.28	84.98	N/A	670,216	505,767
ALL											
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265

## 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	23	67.51	71.66	66.65	20.75	107.53	41.96	120.99	60.30 to 77.34	193,168	128,740
DRY-N/A	12	73.34	72.84	66.19	18.04	110.04	46.99	100.59	58.34 to 85.60	185,409	122,720
GRASS	1	89.77	89.77	89.77			89.77	89.77	N/A	48,500	43,540
GRASS-N/A	2	49.05	49.05	43.04	28.36	113.96	35.14	62.96	N/A	97,750	42,072
IRRGTD	9	73.59	79.46	74.37	21.48	106.85	56.99	121.23	57.91 to 93.47	253,578	188,581
IRRGTD-N/A	6	78.36	78.91	76.74	11.49	102.83	68.70	89.95	68.70 to 89.95	393,403	301,914
ALL											
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265

## 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	30	71.84	73.24	67.24	19.78	108.93	41.96	120.99	62.18 to 77.34	191,862	129,004
DRY-N/A	5	68.10	65.00	61.80	17.16	105.17	46.99	83.61	N/A	182,382	112,709
GRASS	1	89.77	89.77	89.77			89.77	89.77	N/A	48,500	43,540
GRASS-N/A	2	49.05	49.05	43.04	28.36	113.96	35.14	62.96	N/A	97,750	42,072
IRRGTD	12	71.64	78.50	73.73	19.39	106.46	56.99	121.23	65.07 to 92.31	304,635	224,615
IRRGTD-N/A	3	84.98	82.22	82.40	7.14	99.78	71.74	89.95	N/A	329,000	271,110
ALL											
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265

## 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	34	71.84	72.18	66.45	19.85	108.63	41.96	120.99	60.30 to 77.34	190,331	126,465
DRY-N/A	1	68.10	68.10	68.10			68.10	68.10	N/A	196,514	133,830
GRASS	2	62.46	62.46	49.20	43.74	126.94	35.14	89.77	N/A	94,250	46,370
GRASS-N/A	1	62.96	62.96	62.96			62.96	62.96	N/A	55,500	34,945
IRRGTD	15	73.59	79.24	75.58	17.78	104.85	56.99	121.23	68.70 to 89.95	309,508	233,914
ALL											
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265

**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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.58	95% Median C.I.:	65.07 to 77.34	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,621,357	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	18.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.11 to 74.58	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,554,416	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.15	95% Mean C.I.:	68.69 to 78.43	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,070,070							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	218,007	COD:	19.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,265	PRD:	105.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.14			

Printed: 03/15/2009 17:52:51

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	3	89.77	81.68	79.55	10.90	102.68	62.96	92.31	N/A	45,754	36,396
60000 TO 99999	9	85.60	87.02	85.62	15.48	101.64	66.65	120.99	73.34 to 100.59	84,333	72,208
100000 TO 149999	8	69.63	68.95	68.46	18.20	100.72	35.14	99.22	35.14 to 99.22	126,599	86,673
150000 TO 249999	18	71.87	73.97	73.61	20.93	100.49	46.99	121.23	57.91 to 89.95	193,610	142,507
250000 TO 499999	11	58.62	64.53	63.49	19.81	101.64	41.96	90.57	50.57 to 84.89	344,695	218,848
500000 +	4	67.18	69.42	69.45	11.48	99.95	58.34	84.98	N/A	592,183	411,286
ALL _____	_____										
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265

**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 \$ _____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	4	76.36	70.05	57.13	27.49	122.61	35.14	92.31	N/A	69,315	39,597
60000 TO 99999	17	73.34	76.99	73.42	17.51	104.85	52.08	120.99	62.18 to 90.07	105,458	77,431
100000 TO 149999	13	68.10	68.73	65.44	19.53	105.02	41.96	99.22	52.23 to 90.11	202,810	132,726
150000 TO 249999	13	73.59	76.13	71.92	20.42	105.84	50.57	121.23	56.99 to 89.95	280,253	201,571
250000 TO 499999	5	65.07	71.49	70.51	18.05	101.39	58.34	90.57	N/A	478,420	337,330
500000 +	1	69.28	69.28	69.28			69.28	69.28	N/A	812,432	562,820
ALL _____	_____										
	53	71.75	73.56	69.84	19.72	105.32	35.14	121.23	65.07 to 77.34	218,007	152,265

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Considering the analyses in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency of the Minimal Non-Ag sample.

Unimproved sales, along with sales where the non-agricultural assessed value calculated to be less than 5% of the adjusted sale price, were used to establish land values in Colfax County for tax year 2009. The assessor and the Division agree on the premise that generally, sales with minimal improvements sell on the open market without regard to the improvements. Furthermore, the addition of these sales broadens the sample for assessment and measurement purposes by creating a better representation of the population.

The systematic valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and develop a schedule of values assures the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics studied by the Division confirm that the various land uses in the county are valued within the acceptable range indicating uniformity and proportionality in the class exists. The assessment practices employed by the County are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>187</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>26.74</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>29.59</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>30.61</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>29.38</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>31.08</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percentage of sales used chart displays that 26.74 percent of the available sales were used for the development of the qualified unimproved agricultural sales file. While the qualified percentage has been historically decreasing and is relatively low compared to most counties in the state, the percentage is consistent with counties surrounding Colfax County. A majority of the disqualified sales are family transactions and are appropriately coded as non-qualified. The Department assumes the County has used all available arm's length sales.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>59</b>	<b>14.63</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>67.06</b>	<b>7.52</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71.79</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>22.79</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>6.20</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>76</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>14</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>14.63</b>
<b>5.46</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>7.52</b>
<b>7.45</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>4.70</b>
<b>23.36</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>22.79</b>
<b>9.51</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>6.20</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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 Colfax 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>69</b>	<b>73</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>19.83</b>	<b>106.72</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.72</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, while the price related differential is 3.72 points above the acceptable range. However, given the systematic methodology the county uses to value agricultural land, one can reasonably assume the assessment practices in this county do not lend an assessment bias based on the size of the parcel.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Colfax 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>52</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>21.68</b>	<b>19.83</b>	<b>-1.85</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>106.56</b>	<b>106.72</b>	<b>0.16</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>30.55</b>	<b>35.14</b>	<b>4.59</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>102.54</b>	<b>121.23</b>	<b>18.69</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. Several per acre value increases were implemented in the agricultural class of property for 2009.





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

Records : 8,015

Value : 865,732,963

Growth 6,487,187

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>	321	1,507,890	76	1,077,220	2	2,380	399	2,587,490	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,462	12,717,945	63	1,486,485	298	5,155,680	2,823	19,360,110	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,621	139,723,645	68	8,770,940	367	28,717,075	3,056	177,211,660	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,942	153,949,480	144	11,334,645	369	33,875,135	3,455	199,159,260	1,451,920
<b>% of Res Total</b>	85.15	77.30	4.17	5.69	10.68	17.01	43.11	23.00	22.38
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	63	483,510	5	182,000	5	131,890	73	797,400	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	420	3,743,305	26	854,475	20	422,150	466	5,019,930	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	429	32,695,621	30	6,248,145	22	3,164,945	481	42,108,711	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	492	36,922,436	35	7,284,620	27	3,718,985	554	47,926,041	1,461,670
<b>% of Com Total</b>	88.81	77.04	6.32	15.20	4.87	7.76	6.91	5.54	22.53
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	2	419,700	0	0	2	419,700	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	2	30,282,775	0	0	2	30,282,775	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	2	30,702,475	0	0	2	30,702,475	386,615
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	3.55	5.96
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	1	5,180	3	8,175	37	388,875	41	402,230	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	21	165,000	20	335,685	41	500,685	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	61	903,960	23	1,147,295	84	2,051,255	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	1	5,180	64	1,077,135	60	1,871,855	125	2,954,170	55,575
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.80	0.18	51.20	36.46	48.00	63.36	1.56	0.34	0.86
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,943	153,954,660	208	12,411,780	429	35,746,990	3,580	202,113,430	1,507,495
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	82.21	76.17	5.81	6.14	11.98	17.69	44.67	23.35	23.24
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	492	36,922,436	37	37,987,095	27	3,718,985	556	78,628,516	1,848,285
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	88.49	46.96	6.65	48.31	4.86	4.73	6.94	9.08	28.49
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,435	190,877,096	245	50,398,875	456	39,465,975	4,136	280,741,946	3,355,780
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	83.05	67.99	5.92	17.95	11.03	14.06	51.60	32.43	51.73

## 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	1	14,390	938,455		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		1	14,390	938,455
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					1	14,390	938,455

## 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	238	0	206	444

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	6	390,755	8	1,029,615	2,899	355,543,780	2,913	356,964,150
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	2	110,355	939	148,394,475	941	148,504,830
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	28,545	965	79,493,492	966	79,522,037
30. Ag Total							3,879	584,991,017

## 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	1	1.00	10,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	28,345	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	200	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	9.00	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	3	6.00	60,000	3	6.00	60,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	684	696.97	6,970,000	685	697.97	6,980,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	645	0.00	52,102,635	646	0.00	52,130,980	1,574,460
34. HomeSite Total				649	703.97	59,170,980	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	33	77.39	154,780	33	77.39	154,780	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	854	3,247.14	6,494,280	854	3,247.14	6,494,280	
37. FarmSite Improvements	935	0.00	27,390,857	936	0.00	27,391,057	1,556,947
38. FarmSite Total				969	3,324.53	34,040,117	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,400.93	0	0	5,409.93	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,618	9,438.43	93,211,097	3,131,407

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	9,827.52	13.87%	31,841,155	16.43%	3,240.00
46. 1A	11,840.84	16.71%	35,877,755	18.51%	3,030.00
47. 2A1	14,976.74	21.14%	43,058,270	22.22%	2,875.01
48. 2A	8,782.42	12.40%	24,371,265	12.58%	2,775.01
49. 3A1	5,697.94	8.04%	14,358,815	7.41%	2,520.00
50. 3A	16,646.60	23.50%	39,285,990	20.27%	2,360.00
51. 4A1	2,937.40	4.15%	4,817,335	2.49%	1,640.00
52. 4A	131.94	0.19%	176,140	0.09%	1,335.00
53. Total	70,841.40	100.00%	193,786,725	100.00%	2,735.50
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,332.88	4.75%	15,873,920	5.91%	2,506.59
55. 1D	32,967.72	24.74%	76,697,870	28.54%	2,326.45
56. 2D1	8,086.73	6.07%	18,417,550	6.85%	2,277.50
57. 2D	6,658.57	5.00%	14,242,715	5.30%	2,139.01
58. 3D1	14,664.37	11.01%	30,633,105	11.40%	2,088.95
59. 3D	45,781.90	34.36%	86,978,985	32.36%	1,899.86
60. 4D1	17,083.54	12.82%	24,052,530	8.95%	1,407.94
61. 4D	1,667.45	1.25%	1,880,760	0.70%	1,127.93
62. Total	133,243.16	100.00%	268,777,435	100.00%	2,017.19
Grass					
63. 1G1	641.59	0.00%	576,345	2.01%	898.31
64. 1G	5,080.75	13.04%	4,168,105	14.53%	820.37
65. 2G1	3,513.69	9.02%	2,844,960	9.92%	809.68
66. 2G	4,063.45	10.43%	3,150,345	10.98%	775.29
67. 3G1	2,311.00	5.93%	1,804,770	6.29%	780.95
68. 3G	11,518.04	29.56%	8,686,570	30.28%	754.17
69. 4G1	5,481.51	14.07%	3,750,440	13.07%	684.20
70. 4G	6,348.40	16.30%	3,706,935	12.92%	583.92
71. Total	38,958.43	100.00%	28,688,470	100.00%	736.39
Irrigated Total	70,841.40	28.69%	193,786,725	39.41%	2,735.50
Dry Total	133,243.16	53.96%	268,777,435	54.65%	2,017.19
Grass Total	38,958.43	15.78%	28,688,470	5.83%	736.39
Waste	3,667.56	1.49%	183,400	0.04%	50.01
Other	229.26	0.09%	343,890	0.07%	1,500.00
Exempt	2,722.39	1.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	246,939.81	100.00%	491,779,920	100.00%	1,991.50

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	128.20	330,465	163.12	420,095	70,550.08	193,036,165	70,841.40	193,786,725
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	32.85	58,720	323.57	625,500	132,886.74	268,093,215	133,243.16	268,777,435
<b>78. Grass</b>	2.00	1,540	110.57	83,560	38,845.86	28,603,370	38,958.43	28,688,470
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.63	30	16.25	815	3,650.68	182,555	3,667.56	183,400
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	229.26	343,890	229.26	343,890
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.07	0	0.00	0	2,722.32	0	2,722.39	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>163.68</b>	<b>390,755</b>	<b>613.51</b>	<b>1,129,970</b>	<b>246,162.62</b>	<b>490,259,195</b>	<b>246,939.81</b>	<b>491,779,920</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	70,841.40	28.69%	193,786,725	39.41%	2,735.50
<b>Dry Land</b>	133,243.16	53.96%	268,777,435	54.65%	2,017.19
<b>Grass</b>	38,958.43	15.78%	28,688,470	5.83%	736.39
<b>Waste</b>	3,667.56	1.49%	183,400	0.04%	50.01
<b>Other</b>	229.26	0.09%	343,890	0.07%	1,500.00
<b>Exempt</b>	2,722.39	1.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>246,939.81</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>491,779,920</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,991.50</b>

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

19 Colfax

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	187,985,290	199,159,260	11,173,970	5.94%	1,451,920	5.17%
02. Recreational	2,612,695	2,954,170	341,475	13.07%	55,575	10.94%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	66,101,665	59,170,980	-6,930,685	-10.48%	1,574,460	-12.87%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>256,699,650</b>	<b>261,284,410</b>	<b>4,584,760</b>	<b>1.79%</b>	<b>3,081,955</b>	<b>0.59%</b>
05. Commercial	46,790,496	47,926,041	1,135,545	2.43%	1,461,670	-0.70%
06. Industrial	30,315,860	30,702,475	386,615	1.28%	386,615	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	33,690,577	34,040,117	349,540	1.04%	1,556,947	-3.58%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>110,796,933</b>	<b>112,668,633</b>	<b>1,871,700</b>	<b>1.69%</b>	<b>3,405,232</b>	<b>-1.38%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>367,496,583</b>	<b>373,953,043</b>	<b>6,456,460</b>	<b>1.76%</b>	<b>6,487,187</b>	<b>-0.01%</b>
11. Irrigated	154,710,460	193,786,725	39,076,265	25.26%		
12. Dryland	247,494,395	268,777,435	21,283,040	8.60%		
13. Grassland	26,301,375	28,688,470	2,387,095	9.08%		
14. Wasteland	177,220	183,400	6,180	3.49%		
15. Other Agland	321,390	343,890	22,500	7.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>429,004,840</b>	<b>491,779,920</b>	<b>62,775,080</b>	<b>14.63%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>796,501,423</b>	<b>865,732,963</b>	<b>69,231,540</b>	<b>8.69%</b>	<b>6,487,187</b>	<b>7.88%</b>



COLFAX COUNTY ASSESSOR  
VIOLA M. BENDER  
411 E. 11<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
SCHUYLER, NE. 68661

June 1, 2008

I, Viola M. Bender, duly elected assessor of Colfax County, present this plan of assessment, pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, to the Colfax County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year and to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 of each year.

Respectively Submitted



Colfax County Assessor  
Viola M. Bender

RECEIVED

OCT 21 2008

NEBRASKA DEPT. OF REVENUE  
PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION

## **GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF COUNTY**

Based on the counties abstract  
Colfax County has a total parcel count of 8,419 parcels.

Residential-----	3,370
Commercial-----	564
Agricultural-----	4,051
Exempt-----	434

Colfax County also processes approximately 1,100 Personal Property filings and 500 Homestead Exemptions each year.

The Colfax County Assessor's Office consists of the Assessor, Deputy Assessor, one full time clerk, and one part time Appraiser.

### **Budget**

2008 General Budget: 118,264.

The general budget includes the salaries for the administrative personal, educational classes, office supplies, office equipment and the data processing costs.

### **Procedures Manual**

Colfax County has a written policy manual, which is updated each year.

### **Responsibilities**

Record maintenance: Cadastral Maps

The office staff maintains the maps by keeping the ownership and descriptions current (Reg 10-004.03).

Property Record Cards: The office staff maintains the property record cards by keeping current the required legal, ownership, classification codes and changes made to the assessment information of the property (Reg. 10-004).

### **Report Generation**

County Abstract of Assessment Report for Real Property must be completed and certified by the county assessor on or before March 19, to the Property Tax Administrator (Reg. 60-004.03), (Statute 77-1514).

**Certification of Values:** Pursuant to section 13-509 and 13-518 the county assessor must certify taxable valuations to political subdivisions on or before August 20 of each year.

**School District Taxable Value Report:** Pursuant to Section 79-1016 the assessor on or before Aug. 25, shall provide the current values, by property class, for the county, school districts and supplement TIF information if applicable, to the Property Tax Administrator.

**Tax List Corrections:** Tax list corrections are generated to correct clerical error (77-128) and any overvalued, undervalued, and omitted real property.

**Generate Tax Roll:** The assessor's office will on or before November 22 completes and deliver to the county treasurer the Tax List.

**Certificate of Taxes Levied:** On or before December 1 of each year the assessor will certify to the Property Tax Administrator, the total taxable valuation and the Certificate of Taxes Levied.

As of July 1, 2004 MIPS/County Solutions LLC of 725 S. 14<sup>th</sup> Street Lincoln, NE. 68508 will maintain all of our administrative programs.

### **Homestead Exemptions**

The assessor's office on or before June 30 of each year, accepts applications for Homestead Exemption (77-3510 thru 77-3528). The assessor's office staff also helps the applicant complete the necessary forms.

### **Filing for Personal Property**

The assessor's office on or before February 1 of each year sends a letter to all persons with personal property, explaining the procedure for filing Personal Property, the penalties for late filing and requesting they bring in or mail their depreciation worksheets to the assessor's office. We then complete the Personal Property Schedule and return a copy to the taxpayer.

### **Real Property**

**Residential:** For the 2009 tax year the Assessor's office will be reviewing the sales and doing drive-by reviews of the towns of Clarkson, Howells, Leigh, Richland & Rogers. In 2010 tax year we will be doing a drive-by review of the city of Schuyler. For the 2011 tax year we hope to be starting to implement the new CAMA program that MIPS has available. We will also continue to review all sales and address any problem areas.

When doing a drive-by review if we feel there is a discrepancy in the square footage, addition or property updated, we will re-measure and recalculate the square footage.

The 2008 level of value is Assessment Ratio: 97, COD: 16.07 and the PRD: 105.23

### **Computerized**

Colfax County now has all properties in the county data entered into the CAMA 2000 for pricing. New digital photos of all residential property was taken spring of 2007.

### **Commercial Property**

For the 2009 assessment year we will continue to review sales and address any problems areas. In the 2010 assessment year we will be working on new computer drawings. For the 2011 tax year we will be doing drive-by reviews of commercial property. The 2008 level of value is, Assessment Ratio: 99, COD: 7.57 and the PRD: 101.49

### **Agricultural**

Our agricultural land use was last completed in 1983; we are unable to get land use verification from our local FSA office. We have two market areas in the county. When we verify our agland sales we also check with the buyer or seller on the land use.

We are in the beginning stages of implementing a GIS system. We are working with GIS Workshop, Inc from Lincoln, NE. We hope to have this up and running within the next two years.

For 2008 the level of value was Assessment Ratio: 72, COD: 14.77 and the PRD: 98.96.

The Assessor's office receives yearly updated well registration list, which also helps us track any changes in agland.

In the assessment years ahead we plan on continuing reviewing our agland sales, and keeping the land use and classifications as current as possible. We will be implementing the new soil survey for 2009.

### **Pick-up Work**

Pick-up work is started in August of each year and completed by February 1. We receive

Building permits monthly from the city clerk's. The county in 1999 implemented zoning, which requires a zoning permit before any construction can be started, the zoning office will then submit a copy of this permit to the assessor's office, which helps us tract new construction in the rural areas.

### **Sales Review**

Real Estate Transfers (Form 521) are delivered to the assessor's office each month from the clerk's office. The assessor and the deputy complete the Real Estate Transfer Statements. The assessor or deputy does verification of sales information by contacting the buyer or seller by telephone or in person. If no response from buyer or seller we try to contact the abstractor or the realtor involved in the sales.

The assessor and appraiser complete drive by reviews checking for changes that are different than the current property record card. Things we look for are additional buildings, heating & cooling changes, also changes in square footage (additions to house).

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$118,263.98
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$11,746.
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	None
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$1,500.
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	Contract appraiser is paid \$22,830.
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$118,264
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used: No</b>

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS, INC.
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	MIPS, INC.

3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Office staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	County is in the beginning stages of GIS.
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS, Inc.

### 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>
	Schuyler, Clarkson, Howells & Richland
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Kaiser Appraisal Services is contracted 1-1-09 thru 12-31-09. Great Plains Appraisal Inc. is contracted to appraise Cargill Meat Solutions for a cost of \$5,000.
2.	<b>Other services</b>





## 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 Colfax 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