

# **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

### 20 Cuming

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	168	COD	18.55
Total Sales Price	\$12,044,750	PRD	108.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$12,008,500	COV	30.08
Total Assessed Value	\$11,311,510	STD	30.82
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$71,479	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.04
Avg. Assessed Value	\$67,330	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$62,300
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	102	Max	323
Min	35.72		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.35 to 100.14
95% Mean C.I	97.81 to 107.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.53 to 97.86

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	16.90
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.50
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.95

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	197	95	24.76	113.21
2007	199	94	15.32	104.72
2006	207	100	15.84	104.69
2005	218	99	19.9	107.22

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 20 Cuming

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	27	COD	19.51
Total Sales Price	\$1,556,000	PRD	96.48
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,556,000	COV	39.97
Total Assessed Value	\$1,658,310	STD	41.10
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$57,630	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.61
Avg. Assessed Value	\$61,419	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$103,105
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	107
Mean	103	Max	286
Min	60		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.90 to 100.93
95% Mean C.I	86.56 to 119.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	75.49 to 137.66

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 5.95

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.15

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 2.47

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	42	98	28.97	102.06
2007	37	98	39.08	120.24
2006	40	101	33.24	107.87
2005	35	93	24.86	100.71



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Cuming 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 Cuming County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Cuming 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 Cuming County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Cuming 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 Cuming County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Cuming County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	180	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	36.41	95% Median C.I.:	91.72 to 98.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,479,750	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.80 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,573,500	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.12	95% Mean C.I.:	97.69 to 108.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,628,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	69,852	COD:	22.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	362.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	64,603	PRD:	111.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.50		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:24

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	36	97.37	102.89	101.50	21.58	101.36	35.72	223.20	88.55 to 107.27	75,088	76,216
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	98.82	117.08	95.88	29.58	122.11	70.86	261.67	88.89 to 132.44	62,938	60,346
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	91.72	104.62	89.92	30.71	116.35	19.50	248.17	85.00 to 116.05	49,838	44,816
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	26	93.94	101.99	89.46	19.32	114.01	64.68	222.10	86.86 to 103.63	83,348	74,559
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	25	103.25	115.57	101.37	25.88	114.01	56.93	362.23	93.57 to 113.93	54,364	55,110
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	98.02	99.92	90.51	13.97	110.40	67.21	161.00	88.76 to 104.82	64,268	58,167
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	18	86.93	88.73	83.50	12.32	106.25	69.95	117.57	77.02 to 97.32	83,583	69,795
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	22	87.43	91.50	82.30	18.51	111.18	38.57	143.19	77.77 to 101.93	74,952	61,686
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	96	95.20	105.99	95.50	24.32	110.98	19.50	261.67	90.49 to 100.43	71,248	68,043
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	84	94.79	99.98	88.88	19.82	112.48	38.57	362.23	89.23 to 100.17	68,257	60,670
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	83	95.86	106.02	92.75	22.85	114.31	19.50	362.23	92.48 to 102.02	65,001	60,290
_____ALL_____											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BANCROFT	17	96.81	105.14	94.82	16.85	110.88	80.66	175.00	89.05 to 109.16	32,147	30,482
BEEMER	18	99.09	98.57	93.36	17.81	105.58	35.72	158.89	86.05 to 107.43	44,472	41,521
HIDDEN MEADOWS	2	127.65	127.65	128.34	0.67	99.46	126.80	128.50	N/A	13,250	17,005
RURAL	24	87.63	92.85	94.09	29.34	98.68	19.50	248.17	77.13 to 107.36	103,416	97,303
WEST POINT	87	95.14	102.74	93.43	17.54	109.97	67.15	223.20	91.39 to 101.93	73,236	68,422
WISNER	28	95.46	111.83	89.01	32.20	125.64	67.21	362.23	85.60 to 105.73	64,692	57,580
WISNER V	4	85.40	114.39	80.13	48.22	142.75	64.68	222.10	N/A	133,750	107,177
_____ALL_____											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	154	95.52	104.47	91.99	21.03	113.56	35.72	362.23	92.48 to 99.90	65,357	60,125
2	1	56.93	56.93	56.93			56.93	56.93	N/A	37,000	21,065
3	25	88.76	97.07	95.01	29.88	102.16	19.50	248.17	83.68 to 109.08	98,860	93,928
_____ALL_____											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## 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:	180	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	36.41	95% Median C.I.:	91.72 to 98.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,479,750	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.80 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,573,500	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.12	95% Mean C.I.:	97.69 to 108.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,628,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	69,852	COD:	22.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	362.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	64,603	PRD:	111.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.50		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:24

## 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	166	94.65	100.91	93.33	18.14	108.12	35.72	362.23	91.35 to 98.28	73,797	68,874
2	14	127.65	130.15	60.49	47.62	215.15	19.50	261.67	41.38 to 221.82	23,075	13,958
____ALL____											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	176	95.22	104.00	93.09	21.89	111.71	19.50	362.23	92.41 to 99.82	70,429	65,565
06	2	63.67	63.67	44.48	39.42	143.13	38.57	88.76	N/A	73,675	32,770
07	2	70.81	70.81	77.13	49.55	91.80	35.72	105.89	N/A	15,250	11,762
____ALL____											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0014											
11-0020											
19-0059											
20-0001	120	94.99	101.46	94.27	19.89	107.63	19.50	248.17	91.39 to 100.43	71,271	67,186
20-0020	20	96.34	104.77	95.81	17.82	109.35	80.66	175.00	89.05 to 104.78	40,325	38,637
20-0030	39	95.11	108.48	87.69	31.40	123.71	38.57	362.23	85.60 to 105.73	78,574	68,901
27-0046	1	70.86	70.86	70.86			70.86	70.86	N/A	150,000	106,285
27-0062											
27-0594											
87-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## 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:	180	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	36.41	95% Median C.I.:	91.72 to 98.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,479,750	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.80 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,573,500	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.12	95% Mean C.I.:	97.69 to 108.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,628,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	69,852	COD:	22.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	362.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	64,603	PRD:	111.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.50		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:24

## 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	15	126.80	128.92	67.77	45.53	190.23	19.50	261.67	56.93 to 175.00	25,103	17,013
Prior TO 1860	1	117.57	117.57	117.57			117.57	117.57	N/A	87,500	102,870
1860 TO 1899	16	101.21	118.67	95.92	29.88	123.72	67.21	362.23	86.86 to 118.55	49,268	47,257
1900 TO 1919	43	99.82	108.96	100.12	19.65	108.83	76.16	222.10	93.47 to 108.47	44,360	44,414
1920 TO 1939	21	91.72	95.07	89.70	15.32	105.98	64.68	167.86	84.79 to 107.36	74,623	66,935
1940 TO 1949	8	94.00	99.85	95.87	8.21	104.15	88.18	132.44	88.18 to 132.44	66,175	63,443
1950 TO 1959	16	91.12	101.74	91.61	18.75	111.06	77.13	223.20	83.67 to 106.34	59,365	54,383
1960 TO 1969	23	88.77	91.52	88.19	10.59	103.78	69.95	142.18	85.60 to 96.45	80,476	70,974
1970 TO 1979	14	88.97	87.21	85.29	14.91	102.25	35.72	118.07	71.30 to 105.89	81,307	69,344
1980 TO 1989	12	88.32	93.00	89.93	16.00	103.41	70.84	138.73	74.55 to 109.41	107,212	96,420
1990 TO 1994	3	94.46	94.62	94.43	12.17	100.20	77.46	111.95	N/A	96,333	90,970
1995 TO 1999	7	104.82	99.67	99.90	10.70	99.78	76.56	122.70	76.56 to 122.70	238,714	238,465
2000 TO Present	1	90.32	90.32	90.32			90.32	90.32	N/A	131,500	118,775
ALL	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## 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	6	168.00	176.37	174.73	30.90	100.94	85.60	261.67	85.60 to 261.67	2,133	3,727
5000 TO 9999	8	136.40	169.96	163.22	49.08	104.13	83.92	362.23	83.92 to 362.23	6,875	11,221
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	14	150.68	172.71	165.39	42.11	104.42	83.92	362.23	90.92 to 248.17	4,842	8,009
10000 TO 29999	37	106.95	112.55	108.97	21.41	103.29	35.72	222.10	100.00 to 116.05	20,804	22,669
30000 TO 59999	28	101.98	103.47	102.19	17.23	101.25	19.50	142.18	95.86 to 116.04	41,921	42,840
60000 TO 99999	63	89.75	92.92	92.74	10.05	100.20	68.88	138.73	87.20 to 93.92	77,288	71,676
100000 TO 149999	26	86.00	84.54	83.96	10.70	100.70	38.57	104.82	78.86 to 91.35	118,615	99,585
150000 TO 249999	9	80.54	84.44	85.84	18.24	98.36	64.68	109.41	67.21 to 107.36	164,333	141,066
250000 TO 499999	3	81.75	93.67	97.67	18.81	95.90	76.56	122.70	N/A	376,666	367,896
ALL	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## 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:	180	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	36.41	95% Median C.I.:	91.72 to 98.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,479,750	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.80 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,573,500	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.12	95% Mean C.I.:	97.69 to 108.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,628,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	69,852	COD:	22.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	362.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	64,603	PRD:	111.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.50		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:25

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	143.90	140.97	86.93	40.49	162.16	35.72	261.67	35.72 to 261.67	3,716	3,230
5000 TO 9999	4	97.85	131.95	113.41	45.51	116.35	83.92	248.17	N/A	6,125	6,946
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	115.79	137.36	100.79	49.37	136.28	35.72	261.67	83.92 to 248.17	4,680	4,717
10000 TO 29999	41	105.89	119.30	101.01	31.17	118.11	19.50	362.23	99.82 to 116.05	20,567	20,774
30000 TO 59999	38	101.23	104.99	96.67	19.33	108.61	38.57	167.86	91.72 to 116.04	48,839	47,214
60000 TO 99999	67	89.23	91.45	89.91	10.08	101.72	67.15	138.73	86.55 to 93.35	86,903	78,130
100000 TO 149999	18	90.07	88.08	86.13	11.99	102.26	64.68	117.57	80.54 to 95.29	128,888	111,016
150000 TO 249999	4	107.32	101.45	99.02	6.46	102.45	81.75	109.41	N/A	210,000	207,935
250000 TO 499999	1	76.56	76.56	76.56			76.56	76.56	N/A	360,000	275,605
500000 +	1	122.70	122.70	122.70			122.70	122.70	N/A	485,000	595,085
ALL											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	127.65	130.15	60.49	47.62	215.15	19.50	261.67	41.38 to 221.82	23,075	13,958
10	4	123.06	138.73	121.15	42.51	114.51	85.60	223.20	N/A	12,375	14,992
20	26	101.49	108.55	107.73	16.91	100.77	78.53	162.32	94.43 to 127.41	26,788	28,858
30	121	92.77	98.99	91.44	17.49	108.26	35.72	362.23	89.70 to 96.81	72,805	66,573
40	13	94.46	92.02	91.72	10.39	100.32	64.68	107.36	81.75 to 105.73	142,307	130,526
50	1	76.56	76.56	76.56			76.56	76.56	N/A	360,000	275,605
60	1	122.70	122.70	122.70			122.70	122.70	N/A	485,000	595,085
ALL											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	127.65	130.15	60.49	47.62	215.15	19.50	261.67	41.38 to 221.82	23,075	13,958
100	3	105.89	103.19	109.61	10.22	94.14	85.60	118.07	N/A	11,833	12,970
101	86	92.96	96.65	91.04	15.03	106.16	35.72	223.20	89.04 to 97.32	80,236	73,049
102	13	107.36	105.95	97.79	15.00	108.34	64.68	142.69	86.86 to 126.04	82,230	80,413
104	58	97.42	107.59	97.79	22.81	110.02	67.21	362.23	92.56 to 100.52	62,424	61,046
111	6	88.03	85.25	84.13	5.22	101.33	70.86	90.49	70.86 to 90.49	104,175	87,646
ALL											
	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

# 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:	180	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	36.41	95% Median C.I.:	91.72 to 98.88
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,479,750	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.80 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,573,500	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.12	95% Mean C.I.:	97.69 to 108.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,628,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	69,852	COD:	22.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	362.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	64,603	PRD:	111.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.50		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:25

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	14	127.65	130.15	60.49	47.62	215.15	19.50	261.67	41.38 to 221.82	23,075	13,958
10	2	106.47	106.47	107.33	1.59	99.20	104.78	108.16	N/A	18,250	19,587
20	26	100.44	123.68	112.10	31.38	110.33	83.67	362.23	93.47 to 134.50	19,730	22,117
30	113	92.77	97.45	92.09	15.58	105.83	35.72	222.10	89.23 to 97.32	69,910	64,377
40	19	93.44	92.19	90.78	12.05	101.56	64.68	118.55	84.29 to 105.73	114,660	104,084
50	3	76.56	76.38	77.34	4.75	98.76	70.84	81.75	N/A	265,000	204,956
60	3	107.27	109.62	115.02	7.40	95.30	98.88	122.70	N/A	275,833	317,265
ALL	180	95.13	103.18	92.48	22.20	111.56	19.50	362.23	91.72 to 98.88	69,852	64,603

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

### **Residential:**

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

Annually, the county conducts the pick-up of new construction of the residential property in a timely manner.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. During 2008, they continued the field work to inspect and revalue all agricultural and rural residential parcels, as well as all of the agricultural improvements. For 2009, the residential and agricultural houses and outbuildings in the remaining township in Range 5 and all townships in Range 6 were inspected. This project does not include an on-site inspection of the improvements, rather a review of aerial photos to confirm the existence of the buildings in the record file. If a discrepancy exists, it is resolved on site. Parcels are updated using 2005 costs and a depreciation schedule prepared in 2006. Each year's work is being implemented as it is completed. The remaining areas are analyzed to determine if an adjustment is needed to keep the values uniform based on the current market.

Cuming County had one other residential valuation project for 2009. They revalued the all of the residential property including the lots in the town of Wisner. This consisted mostly of using available records and viewing photos taken during the last off site inspection in 2007. If the record review revealed any discrepancy, the parcel was reviewed on site and valued for use in 2009.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Cuming County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Appraiser
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	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>
	The last overall depreciation schedules were developed in 2000. Since then the county has been updating some of the locations each year using a 2006 depreciation schedule. The 2006 schedule will be used as the inspection and update are completed. All subclasses are reviewed and analyzed each year for possible adjustment if the need to do so is demonstrated.
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The process used in Cuming County is to develop a cost approach and derive the depreciation from analysis of the sales occurring in the market. Cuming County also has prepared a sales comparison approach to value. In this approach, the CAMA selects 5 comparable sales for each parcel. These comps are used to give the indication of a probable range of value. The results of the two approaches are correlated to see if the results achieved in the cost approach are within the range indicated in the sales comparison approach. The cost calculations are used if the sales comparison model validates them. Otherwise, further review and modification of the results is done until an acceptable value is achieved.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	7 plus Assessor Locations; There is some internal analysis done at the neighborhood level. This consists of the grouping of like subdivisions together, but usually the outcome supports the use of the broader assessor location.

8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	There are 6 identified assessor locations in the R&O. Among the Assessor Locations; are 4 town names; Bancroft, Beemer, West Point, and Wisner, as well as Rural. There are also two lake subdivisions but only Hidden Meadows is represented in 2009. It had also been the county's practice to separate the vacant land parcels from improved parcels using the town name plus "V". In 2009, only Wisner V was been identified in the preliminary R&O, but that location has been merged into the Wisner Assessor Location for the final statistics.
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	The Residential Assessor Locations are considered the best groupings to make broad adjustments or adjustments in the Statewide Equalization process. The sales file does not contain sufficient detail to make appropriate adjustments at the Neighborhood level and is best utilized by the county after detailed analysis. There is really no other grouping that should be considered usable for adjustment without careful analysis of the sub-groups that it contains.
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	The location defined as suburban is not considered a useful identity for valuation purposes. In Cumming County, parcels in the location defined as suburban are grouped with the Assessor Location "Rural".
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: Procedurally, the valuation process is the same in the same geographic areas. There is still one rural township that still has to be inspected and revalued. Until then. The prior values are considered for adjustment if there is information to support it.

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
57	96	26	179



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	168	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	30.08	95% Median C.I.:	93.35 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,044,750	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	30.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,008,500	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.04	95% Mean C.I.:	97.81 to 107.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,311,510						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,479	COD:	18.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	323.06		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,330	PRD:	108.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.72		

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

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

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	33	98.28	103.27	102.21	21.22	101.04	35.72	223.20	88.55 to 107.27		77,763	79,478
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	102.41	122.73	98.26	31.99	124.90	72.97	323.06	93.44 to 132.44		65,185	64,053
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	90.71	97.73	93.55	12.58	104.48	83.67	139.50	85.00 to 112.67		53,940	50,458
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	25	96.78	103.31	93.43	15.79	110.57	78.21	176.40	89.88 to 103.63		82,282	76,878
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	24	102.83	104.51	100.32	14.68	104.17	56.93	167.86	93.57 to 116.35		54,212	54,387
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	99.82	101.42	91.62	13.45	110.70	67.21	161.00	89.75 to 107.43		64,268	58,882
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	17	87.20	89.13	84.29	11.54	105.74	69.95	117.57	77.02 to 99.90		86,882	73,235
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	20	90.66	92.09	85.03	15.34	108.30	42.00	126.04	83.92 to 101.93		77,147	65,601
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	88	97.94	107.07	97.90	21.74	109.37	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 101.32		73,481	71,936
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	80	96.57	97.40	89.88	14.95	108.37	42.00	167.86	90.92 to 100.25		69,276	62,263
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	78	98.09	102.50	94.76	15.15	108.17	56.93	176.40	93.35 to 103.25		65,623	62,187
____ALL____												
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14		71,479	67,330

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
BANCROFT	17	96.81	105.14	94.82	16.85	110.88	80.66	175.00	89.05 to 109.16		32,147	30,482
BEEEMER	18	99.09	98.91	93.75	17.47	105.51	35.72	158.89	86.05 to 107.43		44,472	41,693
HIDDEN MEADOWS	1	126.80	126.80	126.80			126.80	126.80	N/A		2,500	3,170
RURAL	21	98.15	94.39	99.53	19.12	94.84	42.00	142.31	85.89 to 110.08		111,428	110,900
WEST POINT	79	94.43	102.65	93.05	17.98	110.31	67.15	223.20	91.33 to 100.52		75,602	70,349
WISNER	32	98.44	107.15	91.76	20.80	116.77	67.21	323.06	89.43 to 103.49		73,325	67,286
____ALL____												
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14		71,479	67,330

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	146	96.97	103.46	92.90	18.40	111.38	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.09		66,205	61,502
2	1	56.93	56.93	56.93			56.93	56.93	N/A		37,000	21,065
3	21	101.32	97.71	100.24	17.78	97.48	42.00	142.31	87.14 to 110.39		109,785	110,048
____ALL____												
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14		71,479	67,330

## 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:	168	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	30.08	95% Median C.I.:	93.35 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,044,750	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	30.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,008,500	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.04	95% Mean C.I.:	97.81 to 107.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,311,510						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,479	COD:	18.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	323.06		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,330	PRD:	108.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.72		

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

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

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	157	96.78	100.00	94.81	15.12	105.48	35.72	223.20	92.56 to 99.90	74,932	71,044
2	11	126.80	137.67	64.56	46.95	213.24	42.00	323.06	49.95 to 221.82	22,186	14,324
____ALL____											
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	164	97.22	103.21	94.80	18.17	108.88	49.95	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	72,138	68,386
06	2	72.94	72.94	49.29	42.42	148.00	42.00	103.89	N/A	73,675	36,312
07	2	70.81	70.81	77.13	49.55	91.80	35.72	105.89	N/A	15,250	11,762
____ALL____											
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0014											
11-0020											
19-0059											
20-0001	108	94.99	101.23	95.04	18.18	106.51	35.72	223.20	91.72 to 100.52	73,959	70,290
20-0020	20	96.34	105.27	96.86	17.68	108.68	80.66	175.00	89.70 to 104.78	40,325	39,059
20-0030	39	98.89	105.23	92.34	20.38	113.96	42.00	323.06	96.00 to 108.40	78,574	72,551
27-0046	1	72.97	72.97	72.97			72.97	72.97	N/A	150,000	109,460
27-0062											
27-0594											
87-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	168	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	30.08	95% Median C.I.:	93.35 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,044,750	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	30.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,008,500	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.04	95% Mean C.I.:	97.81 to 107.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,311,510						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,479	COD:	18.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	323.06		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,330	PRD:	108.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.72		

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

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

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	11	126.80	137.67	64.56	46.95	213.24	42.00	323.06	49.95 to 221.82	22,186	14,324
Prior TO 1860	1	117.57	117.57	117.57			117.57	117.57	N/A	87,500	102,870
1860 TO 1899	16	100.48	103.79	96.99	13.68	107.00	67.21	141.39	88.23 to 116.35	49,268	47,788
1900 TO 1919	41	100.00	107.66	100.32	17.89	107.32	78.53	176.40	90.92 to 109.16	43,597	43,736
1920 TO 1939	18	92.14	96.44	93.42	13.89	103.23	73.22	167.86	85.25 to 100.14	82,477	77,049
1940 TO 1949	8	94.00	99.85	95.87	8.21	104.15	88.18	132.44	88.18 to 132.44	66,175	63,443
1950 TO 1959	15	92.48	103.70	93.63	18.02	110.76	83.29	223.20	85.89 to 106.34	57,523	53,856
1960 TO 1969	21	95.74	92.34	88.92	10.41	103.85	69.95	117.38	80.66 to 101.93	81,330	72,316
1970 TO 1979	14	91.34	88.66	86.78	15.21	102.16	35.72	118.07	71.30 to 105.89	81,307	70,557
1980 TO 1989	12	89.10	94.94	92.54	13.46	102.59	72.97	142.31	84.29 to 106.91	107,212	99,215
1990 TO 1994	3	103.49	99.91	100.04	9.81	99.87	82.89	113.35	N/A	96,333	96,376
1995 TO 1999	7	104.82	100.23	100.39	11.23	99.84	76.56	123.94	76.56 to 123.94	238,714	239,652
2000 TO Present	1	96.78	96.78	96.78			96.78	96.78	N/A	131,500	127,260
ALL	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

## 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	5	161.00	177.65	167.81	33.40	105.87	102.40	323.06	N/A	1,960	3,289
5000 TO 9999	8	118.61	135.71	130.84	36.88	103.72	83.92	223.20	83.92 to 223.20	6,875	8,995
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	13	132.44	151.84	136.43	37.60	111.30	83.92	323.06	90.92 to 221.82	4,984	6,800
10000 TO 29999	32	106.42	111.60	108.20	19.48	103.14	35.72	176.40	100.09 to 122.00	20,164	21,818
30000 TO 59999	25	101.93	105.23	104.75	15.04	100.45	56.93	140.86	94.43 to 117.38	40,732	42,668
60000 TO 99999	61	92.77	94.95	94.75	9.76	100.21	73.22	142.31	89.43 to 97.13	77,002	72,957
100000 TO 149999	25	88.39	86.06	85.49	11.22	100.66	42.00	104.82	78.86 to 93.57	118,960	101,704
150000 TO 249999	9	86.67	90.36	91.65	15.59	98.59	67.21	110.39	72.97 to 110.08	164,333	150,612
250000 TO 499999	3	81.75	94.08	98.20	19.32	95.81	76.56	123.94	N/A	376,666	369,896
ALL	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

## 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:	168	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	30.08	95% Median C.I.:	93.35 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,044,750	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	30.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,008,500	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.04	95% Mean C.I.:	97.81 to 107.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,311,510						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,479	COD:	18.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	323.06		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,330	PRD:	108.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.72		

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

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

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	126.80	120.18	73.63	31.21	163.22	35.72	175.00	N/A	4,100	3,019
5000 TO 9999	5	90.92	138.18	107.01	56.25	129.13	83.92	323.06	N/A	5,960	6,378
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	103.59	129.18	93.41	47.25	138.30	35.72	323.06	83.92 to 175.00	5,030	4,698
10000 TO 29999	35	105.89	116.35	104.61	23.62	111.22	49.95	223.20	100.09 to 118.07	19,550	20,450
30000 TO 59999	33	100.52	104.01	96.18	18.48	108.15	42.00	167.86	90.41 to 117.38	48,193	46,351
60000 TO 99999	63	92.41	93.03	91.41	9.77	101.77	67.15	142.31	88.39 to 95.74	84,738	77,463
100000 TO 149999	20	92.45	92.55	90.77	11.21	101.96	67.21	117.57	85.89 to 100.17	124,750	113,238
150000 TO 249999	5	107.27	101.17	99.25	7.90	101.93	81.75	110.39	N/A	201,000	199,493
250000 TO 499999	1	76.56	76.56	76.56			76.56	76.56	N/A	360,000	275,605
500000 +	1	123.94	123.94	123.94			123.94	123.94	N/A	485,000	601,085
ALL											
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	126.80	137.67	64.56	46.95	213.24	42.00	323.06	49.95 to 221.82	22,186	14,324
10	3	158.89	161.50	167.28	25.34	96.54	102.40	223.20	N/A	7,166	11,988
20	24	101.49	109.34	108.60	17.47	100.68	78.53	162.32	94.43 to 127.41	27,125	29,457
30	116	93.51	96.87	92.43	13.59	104.80	35.72	176.40	89.88 to 97.90	73,335	67,787
40	12	97.83	96.15	96.03	8.81	100.12	78.86	110.39	85.66 to 107.27	145,000	139,245
50	1	76.56	76.56	76.56			76.56	76.56	N/A	360,000	275,605
60	1	123.94	123.94	123.94			123.94	123.94	N/A	485,000	601,085
ALL											
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	126.80	137.67	64.56	46.95	213.24	42.00	323.06	49.95 to 221.82	22,186	14,324
100	3	105.89	108.79	110.79	4.93	98.19	102.40	118.07	N/A	11,833	13,110
101	79	94.83	97.25	92.13	14.08	105.56	35.72	223.20	90.92 to 97.98	82,712	76,200
102	13	107.66	107.33	103.67	11.89	103.53	86.86	140.86	90.41 to 124.09	77,615	80,464
104	56	98.52	103.00	98.43	17.05	104.64	67.21	176.40	89.87 to 101.32	63,582	62,585
111	6	88.32	88.04	87.02	7.56	101.17	72.97	101.91	72.97 to 101.91	104,175	90,655
ALL											
	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330

**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:	168	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	30.08	95% Median C.I.:	93.35 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,044,750	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	30.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.53 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,008,500	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.04	95% Mean C.I.:	97.81 to 107.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,311,510						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	71,479	COD:	18.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	323.06		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,330	PRD:	108.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.72		

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

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

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	11	126.80	137.67	64.56	46.95	213.24	42.00	323.06	49.95 to 221.82	22,186	14,324
10	1	104.78	104.78	104.78			104.78	104.78	N/A	9,000	9,430
20	25	100.45	112.74	107.07	19.82	105.29	83.67	223.20	99.90 to 118.07	19,800	21,199
30	106	94.79	98.07	93.30	14.48	105.12	35.72	176.40	91.33 to 98.02	70,371	65,654
40	19	94.83	95.08	94.50	11.29	100.61	69.95	118.55	85.66 to 108.40	114,660	108,354
50	3	81.75	81.66	80.33	4.12	101.66	76.56	86.67	N/A	265,000	212,868
60	3	107.27	110.03	115.75	7.79	95.06	98.88	123.94	N/A	275,833	319,265
ALL	168	97.22	102.47	94.20	18.55	108.78	35.72	323.06	93.35 to 100.14	71,479	67,330



## 2009 Correlation Section for Cuming County

---

### Residential Real Property

#### I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the residential class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the residential class indicates that the median ratio is 97% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 18.55 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 108.78 is not in the acceptable range. In this report are several stratifications that can be reviewed and analyzed: Under the stratification of Assessor Location; each of the named strata are likely to be relevant subclasses because they are assessor defined and should have both locational and organizational integrity. There are two other stratifications that may be of interest in the residential class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments. The biggest problem that is common to both is that none of the sub strata in either stratification are related to a common location. The most important factor relating to value is and always has been location. The second but equally important problem is that assessors and appraisers rarely organize an analysis or valuation project according to those criteria. That means that some parts of each of these groupings are probably being reviewed, updated or appraised at different times and with different sets of considerations. Among the Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, the members of the urban group contain all of the individual towns scattered throughout the county and each subject to their own economic conditions. Suburban is similar with the same locational and economic disparity. Rural gathers everything else together as a catchall and then is often used to predict the valuation of agricultural houses. The grouping called rural may relate to the agricultural houses in some counties or in some parts of counties, but that is best left to the judgment of local experts. Nothing that is contained in the residential R&O Statistics can define those relationships. That leaves Assessor Location as the only stratification that is defined and supported by the assessor. Assessor Location will be the only stratification from which adjustment recommendations will be offered. Other groups with a reasonable number of sales and questionable statistics will be pointed out in order to be thorough but likely not recommended for adjustment.

#### Analysis:

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

Under the stratification of Location: Urban, suburban & Rural; the substratum #3 Rural, with 21 sales has a median ratio of 101.32% which is outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. No recommendation for adjustment.

Under the stratification of Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL; the substratum #2, Unimproved, with 11 sales has a median ratio of 126.80% which is outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. No recommendation for adjustment.

No recommendations are offered for adjustments to the class of residential.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>260</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>64.62</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>70.11</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>66.56</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>67.21</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>79.27</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table II is indicative that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available arms length sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms? length sales. The percentage used in this county has ranged from 65 to 89% and number of qualified sales has ranged from 168 to 264 over the history of this statistic. In 2009, 65% is at the low end of the utilization percentage and the use of 168 qualified sales is also at the low end of the range. While both statistics are low for Cuming County, they are fairly typical among peer counties. There were 12 sales removed between the preparation of the preliminary and final statistics. This happened because the county identifies substantially changed parcels during sale verification and pick-up work processes. They had not completed their pick-up work until after the preliminary statistics were prepared in 2009. In the end, nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming 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 Cuming 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>95</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>95.05</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>95.18</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>-0.04</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming 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 Cuming County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
1.12	2009	1.42
0.78	2008	0.96
1.44	2007	0.46
2.69	2006	1.30
-0.10	2005	-0.04

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming 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 Cuming County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>102</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range, while the mean is above the range. The mean was calculated above the acceptable range largely based on a few high ratios, and most of the high ratios occurred on lower price sales. Approximately 27% of the sales in this class sold for less than \$30,000. It only takes a few high ratios to have a noticeable impact on the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by these outliers, and in this class, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>18.55</b>	<b>108.78</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>5.78</b>

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming County**

---

RESIDENTIAL: In this class of property, both the coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are outside the acceptable range. The interpretation of high CODs and PRDs that this class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. Like many counties with similar demographics, the county has done a statistically respectable job on residences which sold for \$10,000 or more. They struggle with the lower price parcels. While, it would be good to have better indicators of uniform valuation, the positive view is that these sales have not been trimmed or selectively revalued. Taking into account the presence of small dollar sales and the population range of towns from 520 to 3,660, it is difficult to manage the quality statistics in databases with these characteristics. It might be said that there is typically very little organized market structure in small villages and the balance between supply and demand is more coincidence than market forces. A review of the assessment actions reveals a very proactive assessment process for 2009. Even though the quality of the residential valuation may be considered less than acceptable, the assessment practices are solid and consistent in spite of the measured COD and PRD.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>180</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>-12</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>22.20</b>	<b>18.55</b>	<b>-3.65</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>111.56</b>	<b>108.78</b>	<b>-2.78</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>19.50</b>	<b>35.72</b>	<b>16.22</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>362.23</b>	<b>323.06</b>	<b>-39.17</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the Preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. The county tends to complete sale review and pick up later in the process so between the preparation of the preliminary statistics and the final statistics they identified and removed 12 substantially changed or non-qualified sales. The other changes are consistent with the assessment actions taken in this class of property. All of changes between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were favorable or at worst neutral.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>168</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>-13</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>-11</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>18.55</b>	<b>33.06</b>	<b>-14.51</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>108.78</b>	<b>121.05</b>	<b>-12.27</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>35.72</b>	<b>18.25</b>	<b>17.47</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>323.06</b>	<b>635.70</b>	<b>-312.64</b>

There are numerous small dollar sales in this sample (just under 9% below \$10,000) which accounts for a large portion of the outlier ratios and consequently inferior quality statistics. The maximum ratio alone adds about 3% to the mean ratio. The data gathering is done in such a way that some sales that might be substantially changed are wrongly included and others that should be included are not discovered. With that in mind, it is not surprising that the quality statistics are inferior to the R&O statistics. In Cuming County, the median and weighted mean are in the acceptable range but nothing else is. This table lends fair support for the R&O statistics, as they parallel each other. The trended statistics on their own suggest that perhaps the level of value is very similar to the level that the R&O statistics suggest. The quality of assessment may also not be represented by either of the two sets of statistics, rather exists somewhere in between. Since this is the first year preparing these statistics, no precedence exists from which one might draw any strong conclusions.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	58.21	95% Median C.I.:	79.46 to 101.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,375,462	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	57.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.07 to 109.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,370,462	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.69	95% Mean C.I.:	79.92 to 116.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,059,045						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,380	COD:	38.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	305.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,185	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.79		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:33

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	3	102.50	148.77	183.99	58.54	80.86	81.90	261.90	N/A		71,000	130,630
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	82.47	85.35	84.36	7.86	101.17	78.28	98.18	N/A		62,250	52,516
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	101.37	157.40	91.84	78.97	171.39	65.33	305.50	N/A		21,900	20,113
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	39.88	39.88	30.00	47.87	132.92	20.79	58.97	N/A		62,125	18,640
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	98.02	98.02	103.62	6.52	94.59	91.62	104.41	N/A		53,250	55,180
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	93.85	93.85	91.12	8.01	103.00	86.33	101.37	N/A		55,000	50,115
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	97.10	91.68	92.46	20.60	99.16	58.97	118.98	N/A		35,000	32,360
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	57.49	67.98	78.58	19.31	86.50	56.57	89.87	N/A		153,583	120,691
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	103.63	81.24	81.65	35.52	99.49	24.50	134.30	N/A		28,000	22,863
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	79.86	79.86	46.68	50.67	171.09	39.40	120.33	N/A		166,710	77,822
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	93.70	110.80	99.70	27.80	111.13	80.64	187.13	N/A		44,368	44,236
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	78.64	101.08	82.40	51.59	122.67	54.15	192.90	N/A		60,250	49,646
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	83.69	111.64	107.30	56.78	104.04	20.79	305.50	65.33 to 102.50		54,329	58,297
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	90.75	86.27	85.62	18.10	100.76	56.57	118.98	57.49 to 104.41		78,225	66,974
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	92.06	95.27	73.67	38.97	129.32	24.50	192.90	54.15 to 120.33		58,516	43,107
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	91.62	103.97	75.83	46.23	137.10	20.79	305.50	58.97 to 104.41		45,161	34,245
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	89.87	80.38	70.16	35.24	114.56	24.50	134.30	39.40 to 118.98		79,936	56,085
_____ALL_____												
	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BANCROFT	3	102.50	129.01	159.36	32.94	80.95	91.62	192.90	N/A		12,833	20,451
BEEMER	3	85.48	104.00	51.57	57.61	201.66	39.40	187.13	N/A		117,473	60,586
RURAL	1	101.37	101.37	101.37			101.37	101.37	N/A		35,000	35,480
WEST POINT	23	84.40	88.58	96.08	32.51	92.19	24.50	261.90	65.33 to 98.18		67,371	64,732
WISNER	8	93.85	111.11	73.82	53.37	150.51	20.79	305.50	20.79 to 305.50		49,375	36,450
_____ALL_____												
	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185

## 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	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185
_____ALL_____												
	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	58.21	95% Median C.I.:	79.46 to 101.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,375,462	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	57.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.07 to 109.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,370,462	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.69	95% Mean C.I.:	79.92 to 116.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,059,045						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,380	COD:	38.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	305.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,185	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.79		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:34

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	31	91.62	105.04	88.50	37.34	118.69	20.79	305.50	81.90 to 102.50	70,443	62,341
2	7	58.97	67.21	67.73	42.42	99.23	24.50	118.98	24.50 to 118.98	26,671	18,065
____ALL____	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37	62,380	54,185

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0014											
11-0020											
19-0059											
20-0001	26	84.94	90.36	87.84	35.31	102.87	24.50	261.90	65.33 to 98.18	73,152	64,254
20-0020	3	102.50	129.01	159.36	32.94	80.95	91.62	192.90	N/A	12,833	20,451
20-0030	9	101.37	110.03	76.07	43.92	144.65	20.79	305.50	57.49 to 134.30	47,777	36,342
27-0046											
27-0062											
27-0594											
87-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37	62,380	54,185

**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	62.15	71.00	71.76	38.72	98.95	24.50	118.98	34.75 to 109.00	26,495	19,012
Prior TO 1860	1	305.50	305.50	305.50			305.50	305.50	N/A	2,000	6,110
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	7	120.33	128.73	103.62	29.43	124.24	66.87	192.90	66.87 to 192.90	36,714	38,042
1920 TO 1939	2	100.91	100.91	100.95	2.70	99.95	98.18	103.63	N/A	61,000	61,580
1940 TO 1949	3	84.40	90.24	93.17	8.89	96.85	81.90	104.41	N/A	67,833	63,203
1950 TO 1959	1	93.70	93.70	93.70			93.70	93.70	N/A	96,000	89,950
1960 TO 1969	3	78.28	71.02	72.62	11.28	97.81	54.15	80.64	N/A	57,000	41,391
1970 TO 1979	3	108.15	151.84	208.48	54.38	72.83	85.48	261.90	N/A	59,113	123,240
1980 TO 1989	5	86.33	73.29	61.90	29.05	118.39	20.79	101.37	N/A	74,850	46,333
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	3	79.46	69.58	66.66	21.17	104.38	39.40	89.87	N/A	234,140	156,078
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37	62,380	54,185

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	58.21	95% Median C.I.:	79.46 to 101.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,375,462	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	57.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.07 to 109.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,370,462	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.69	95% Mean C.I.:	79.92 to 116.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,059,045						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,380	COD:	38.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	305.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,185	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.79		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:34

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	305.50	305.50	305.50			305.50	305.50	N/A		2,000	6,110
5000 TO 9999	2	97.06	97.06	97.26	5.60	99.80	91.62	102.50	N/A		6,750	6,565
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	102.50	166.54	124.13	69.55	134.17	91.62	305.50	N/A		5,166	6,413
10000 TO 29999	10	96.82	104.87	103.88	42.79	100.95	24.50	192.90	57.49 to 187.13		21,829	22,675
30000 TO 59999	10	93.76	83.64	83.76	25.80	99.86	34.75	120.33	54.15 to 118.98		36,100	30,237
60000 TO 99999	9	81.90	80.32	78.27	16.64	102.62	20.79	103.63	78.28 to 98.18		77,027	60,292
100000 TO 149999	4	85.64	122.44	121.11	70.90	101.09	56.57	261.90	N/A		118,750	143,823
250000 TO 499999	2	64.64	64.64	64.66	39.04	99.96	39.40	89.87	N/A		303,710	196,375
ALL												
	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185
ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	24.50	24.50	24.50			24.50	24.50	N/A		18,000	4,410
5000 TO 9999	3	102.50	166.54	124.13	69.55	134.17	91.62	305.50	N/A		5,166	6,413
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	4	97.06	131.03	70.60	75.18	185.60	24.50	305.50	N/A		8,375	5,912
10000 TO 29999	11	58.97	69.42	54.97	38.90	126.29	20.79	134.30	34.75 to 109.00		32,472	17,850
30000 TO 59999	12	101.37	114.57	104.72	23.25	109.41	78.28	192.90	90.41 to 120.33		40,278	42,177
60000 TO 99999	7	81.90	81.21	77.95	14.09	104.18	56.57	103.63	56.57 to 103.63		95,571	74,497
100000 TO 149999	2	71.91	71.91	55.51	45.21	129.53	39.40	104.41	N/A		201,710	111,975
250000 TO 499999	2	175.89	175.89	138.56	48.90	126.94	89.87	261.90	N/A		212,000	293,742
ALL												
	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	11	65.33	79.31	70.94	57.22	111.81	20.79	187.13	24.50 to 118.98		37,541	26,630
20	27	91.62	105.71	90.22	35.61	117.17	39.40	305.50	80.64 to 102.50		72,500	65,411
ALL												
	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37		62,380	54,185

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	58.21	95% Median C.I.:	79.46 to 101.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,375,462	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	57.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.07 to 109.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,370,462	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.69	95% Mean C.I.:	79.92 to 116.22
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,059,045						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,380	COD:	38.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	305.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,185	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.79		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:31:34

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	62.15	70.11	72.52	41.54	96.68	24.50	118.98	24.50 to 118.98	29,587	21,458
300	1	103.63	103.63	103.63			103.63	103.63	N/A	62,000	64,250
306	1	93.70	93.70	93.70			93.70	93.70	N/A	96,000	89,950
326	3	89.87	92.26	89.85	6.71	102.68	84.40	102.50	N/A	109,500	98,383
344	2	116.24	116.24	103.34	15.54	112.48	98.18	134.30	N/A	35,000	36,170
350	1	108.15	108.15	108.15			108.15	108.15	N/A	28,340	30,650
352	1	81.90	81.90	81.90			81.90	81.90	N/A	86,000	70,435
353	5	97.10	129.46	81.67	62.09	158.51	57.49	305.50	N/A	43,750	35,731
386	3	101.37	80.71	51.02	20.38	158.21	39.40	101.37	N/A	124,473	63,501
406	3	86.33	85.80	82.83	4.70	103.59	79.46	91.62	N/A	58,833	48,730
442	1	192.90	192.90	192.90			192.90	192.90	N/A	25,000	48,225
471	1	80.64	80.64	80.64			80.64	80.64	N/A	60,000	48,385
472	1	20.79	20.79	20.79			20.79	20.79	N/A	94,250	19,590
494	1	261.90	261.90	261.90			261.90	261.90	N/A	120,000	314,280
528	3	78.28	106.52	86.42	56.63	123.25	54.15	187.13	N/A	43,666	37,738
530	1	85.48	85.48	85.48			85.48	85.48	N/A	29,000	24,790
541	1	56.57	56.57	56.57			56.57	56.57	N/A	135,000	76,365
883	1	104.41	104.41	104.41			104.41	104.41	N/A	100,000	104,405
ALL	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37	62,380	54,185

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	90.41	90.41	90.41			90.41	90.41	N/A	50,000	45,205
03	36	88.10	93.73	77.24	36.13	121.36	20.79	305.50	78.28 to 101.37	61,123	47,210
04	1	261.90	261.90	261.90			261.90	261.90	N/A	120,000	314,280
ALL	38	90.14	98.07	86.86	38.49	112.90	20.79	305.50	79.46 to 101.37	62,380	54,185

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

### **Commercial:**

Annually, all subclasses are monitored for problem areas that are revealed by analysis of the sales activity.

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

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. For 2009, they revalued all of the commercial property including the lots in the town of Wisner. This consisted mostly of using available records and viewing photos taken during the last off site inspection in 2007. If the record review revealed any discrepancy, the parcel was reviewed on site, and valued for use in 2009.



## 2009 Assessment Survey for Cuming County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Appraiser
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2000 & 2008: Wisner commercial property is now costed using 2008 costs. As the inspection and update of commercial property is completed all parcels will be costed using the 2008 costs. Parcels not revalued using 2008 costs will be analyzed and adjusted if necessary to insure that they have a comparable level of value.
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2000 & 2008: Wisner commercial property depreciation is now derived from market data through the current measurement period. The county considers that to be a 2008 schedule of depreciation. As the inspection and update of commercial property is completed all parcels will be costed using the 2008 costs and depreciated using the 2008 schedules of depreciation.
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>
	The county prepares an income approach, and it is applied on the groupings of property where sufficient data is available. One of the regular applications of the income approach is for apartments, particularly for Sec. 42 Housing. There is a lot of owner occupied property among the commercial class, making rent and expense data scarce so developing an income approach for all commercial property is difficult. The county routinely collects any available rental and expense data, but the income approach is mostly used to back up the other approaches.
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The cost approach less depreciation derived from the market is the primary approach used. The cost approach is used on all commercial properties. A very general sales comparison approach has been prepared for the more prevalent types

	of commercial property. The county does collect rental data and where possible prepares an income approach. Both the sales comparison and the income approach, when applicable, are correlated as a test of the consistency of the cost approach.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	5 -Assessor Locations
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	The Assessor Locations are named using the 4 town names; Bancroft, Beemer, West Point, and Wisner, as well as Rural.
10.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Assessor Location is the best valuation criteria displayed in the R&O
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	No, the occupancy codes by themselves as displayed in the R&O would not be certain to have common value characteristics. While they may depict common construction characteristics, location and condition are better correlated to value.
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>
	The location defined as suburban is not considered a useful identity for valuation purposes. In Cumming County, parcels in the location defined as suburban are grouped with the Assessor Location “Rural”.

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
5	1	0	6

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.97	95% Median C.I.:	89.90 to 100.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,556,000	WGT. MEAN:	107	STD:	41.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.49 to 137.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,556,000	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.61	95% Mean C.I.:	86.56 to 119.09
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,658,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,629	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	286.11		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,418	PRD:	96.48	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.09		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:03:21

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	102.50	160.36	201.89	62.98	79.43	92.46	286.11	N/A	71,000	143,340	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	93.25	96.56	98.31	11.75	98.22	85.48	114.26	N/A	62,250	61,200	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	108.58	108.58	96.84	12.13	112.13	95.41	121.75	N/A	18,500	17,915	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	76.19	76.19	69.29	17.52	109.95	62.84	89.53	N/A	62,125	43,045	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	91.62	91.62	91.62			91.62	91.62	N/A	6,500	5,955	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	93.94	93.94	93.41	1.56	100.57	92.47	95.41	N/A	55,000	51,375	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	102.54	106.36	105.82	6.96	100.51	97.57	118.98	N/A	35,000	37,036	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	99.56	87.71	89.65	12.82	97.84	62.63	100.93	N/A	153,583	137,683	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	96.43	115.02	106.77	21.13	107.73	93.76	154.88	N/A	32,333	34,523	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	92.80	92.80	92.80			92.80	92.80	N/A	30,000	27,840	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	89.85	89.85	89.88	0.06	99.97	89.80	89.90	N/A	38,750	34,827	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	60.09	60.09	60.09			60.09	60.09	N/A	46,000	27,640	
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	11	95.41	112.44	127.84	29.48	87.96	62.84	286.11	85.48 to 121.75	56,659	72,430	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	97.57	95.75	92.76	9.10	103.22	62.63	118.98	91.62 to 102.54	75,805	70,318	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	92.80	96.81	91.30	16.21	106.03	60.09	154.88	60.09 to 154.88	35,785	32,672	
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	92.47	92.72	83.03	10.59	111.66	62.84	121.75	62.84 to 121.75	39,678	32,946	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	98.57	102.01	94.63	13.56	107.79	62.63	154.88	92.80 to 118.98	69,275	65,557	
_____ALL_____												
	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418	

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
BANCROFT	2	97.06	97.06	97.26	5.60	99.80	91.62	102.50	N/A	6,750	6,565
BEEMER	1	85.48	85.48	85.48			85.48	85.48	N/A	29,000	24,790
WEST POINT	15	92.80	109.21	114.29	29.10	95.56	60.09	286.11	89.53 to 114.26	71,900	82,173
WISNER	9	95.41	95.38	89.15	8.62	106.99	62.84	121.75	92.47 to 100.77	48,333	43,087
_____ALL_____											
	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418
_____ALL_____											
	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.97	95% Median C.I.:	89.90 to 100.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,556,000	WGT. MEAN:	107	STD:	41.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.49 to 137.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,556,000	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.61	95% Mean C.I.:	86.56 to 119.09
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,658,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,629	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	286.11		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,418	PRD:	96.48	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.09		

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:03:21

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	23	93.76	100.66	106.19	19.01	94.80	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.77	62,869	66,761
2	4	108.28	115.24	111.64	20.03	103.23	89.53	154.88	N/A	27,500	30,700
____ALL____	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0014											
11-0020											
19-0059											
20-0001	16	92.63	107.73	113.53	27.83	94.89	60.09	286.11	85.73 to 114.26	69,218	78,586
20-0020	2	97.06	97.06	97.26	5.60	99.80	91.62	102.50	N/A	6,750	6,565
20-0030	9	95.41	95.38	89.15	8.62	106.99	62.84	121.75	92.47 to 100.77	48,333	43,087
27-0046											
27-0062											
27-0594											
87-0001											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

**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	6	98.57	108.69	108.80	16.01	99.90	89.53	154.88	89.53 to 154.88	23,041	25,068
Prior TO 1860	1	121.75	121.75	121.75			121.75	121.75	N/A	2,000	2,435
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	99.47	98.57	98.58	3.97	99.98	92.80	102.54	N/A	24,250	23,906
1920 TO 1939	2	104.01	104.01	103.84	9.85	100.16	93.76	114.26	N/A	61,000	63,342
1940 TO 1949	2	91.13	91.13	92.01	1.46	99.04	89.80	92.46	N/A	51,750	47,615
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	3	85.73	78.57	80.30	11.59	97.86	60.09	89.90	N/A	57,000	45,768
1970 TO 1979	2	185.80	185.80	247.06	53.99	75.20	85.48	286.11	N/A	74,500	184,060
1980 TO 1989	5	92.47	81.75	74.80	14.13	109.30	62.63	95.41	N/A	74,850	55,986
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	100.85	100.85	100.89	0.08	99.96	100.77	100.93	N/A	199,500	201,285
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.97	95% Median C.I.:	89.90 to 100.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,556,000	WGT. MEAN:	107	STD:	41.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.49 to 137.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,556,000	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.61	95% Mean C.I.:	86.56 to 119.09
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,658,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,629	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	286.11		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,418	PRD:	96.48	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.09		

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:03:21

## 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	121.75	121.75	121.75			121.75	121.75	N/A	2,000	2,435
5000 TO 9999	2	97.06	97.06	97.26	5.60	99.80	91.62	102.50	N/A	6,750	6,565
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	102.50	105.29	100.42	9.80	104.85	91.62	121.75	N/A	5,166	5,188
10000 TO 29999	5	96.43	105.23	104.21	16.42	100.98	85.48	154.88	N/A	20,650	21,520
30000 TO 59999	8	95.41	94.04	92.61	10.04	101.54	60.09	118.98	60.09 to 118.98	35,125	32,530
60000 TO 99999	8	92.47	91.52	90.44	9.51	101.19	62.84	114.26	62.84 to 114.26	74,656	67,522
100000 TO 149999	2	174.37	174.37	167.80	64.08	103.92	62.63	286.11	N/A	127,500	213,942
250000 TO 499999	1	100.93	100.93	100.93			100.93	100.93	N/A	304,000	306,840
ALL											
	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	121.75	121.75	121.75			121.75	121.75	N/A	2,000	2,435
5000 TO 9999	2	97.06	97.06	97.26	5.60	99.80	91.62	102.50	N/A	6,750	6,565
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	102.50	105.29	100.42	9.80	104.85	91.62	121.75	N/A	5,166	5,188
10000 TO 29999	8	91.30	88.91	85.85	8.41	103.56	60.09	99.56	60.09 to 99.56	27,406	23,529
30000 TO 59999	9	95.41	99.94	91.12	16.25	109.68	62.84	154.88	85.73 to 118.98	49,583	45,181
60000 TO 99999	5	92.47	92.52	88.18	12.96	104.91	62.63	114.26	N/A	90,200	79,542
250000 TO 499999	2	193.52	193.52	153.34	47.85	126.20	100.93	286.11	N/A	212,000	325,085
ALL											
	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	95.66	102.93	90.20	21.83	114.11	62.84	154.88	62.84 to 154.88	44,375	40,026
20	21	95.41	102.79	109.96	18.83	93.49	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	61,416	67,530
ALL											
	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## 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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.97	95% Median C.I.:	89.90 to 100.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,556,000	WGT. MEAN:	107	STD:	41.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.49 to 137.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,556,000	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.61	95% Mean C.I.:	86.56 to 119.09
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,658,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	57,629	COD:	19.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	286.11		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,418	PRD:	96.48	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.09		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 14:03:21

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	108.28	115.24	111.64	20.03	103.23	89.53	154.88	N/A	27,500	30,700
300	1	93.76	93.76	93.76			93.76	93.76	N/A	62,000	58,130
326	3	100.93	97.74	100.37	4.19	97.38	89.80	102.50	N/A	109,500	109,910
344	2	105.35	105.35	110.69	8.46	95.17	96.43	114.26	N/A	37,500	41,510
352	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	86,000	79,515
353	4	101.05	104.16	99.32	7.90	104.88	92.80	121.75	N/A	24,687	24,518
386	2	95.41	95.41	95.41	0.00	100.00	95.41	95.41	N/A	35,000	33,395
406	3	92.47	94.95	96.91	3.30	97.98	91.62	100.77	N/A	58,833	57,013
471	1	89.90	89.90	89.90			89.90	89.90	N/A	60,000	53,940
472	1	62.84	62.84	62.84			62.84	62.84	N/A	94,250	59,230
494	1	286.11	286.11	286.11			286.11	286.11	N/A	120,000	343,330
528	2	72.91	72.91	75.10	17.58	97.08	60.09	85.73	N/A	55,500	41,682
530	1	85.48	85.48	85.48			85.48	85.48	N/A	29,000	24,790
541	1	62.63	62.63	62.63			62.63	62.63	N/A	135,000	84,555
ALL	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418

## 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	26	94.59	95.77	91.57	12.68	104.59	60.09	154.88	89.90 to 100.77	55,230	50,576
04	1	286.11	286.11	286.11			286.11	286.11	N/A	120,000	343,330
ALL	27	95.41	102.82	106.58	19.51	96.48	60.09	286.11	89.90 to 100.93	57,629	61,418



## 2009 Correlation Section for Cuming County

---

### Commerical Real Property

#### I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the commercial class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the commercial class indicates that the median ratio is 95% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 21.19 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 95.83 is not in the acceptable range.

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

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

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. This suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and each relevant subclass.

No recommendations are offered for adjustments to the residential class of property.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>84</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32.14</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41.18</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>44.58</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>54.79</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>58.33</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table II is intended to indicate that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. The percentage used in this county has ranged from 32 to 68% and number of qualified sales has ranged from 27 to 54 over the history of this statistic. In 2009, 32% is at the low end of the utilization percentage and the use of 27 qualified sales is also at the low end of the range. Both statistics are low for Cuming County and they are fairly low for commercial property among peer counties. There were 12 sales removed between the preparation of the preliminary and final statistics. This happened because the county identifies substantially changed parcels during sale verification and pick-up work processes. They had not completed their pick-up work until after the preliminary statistics were prepared in 2009. In the end, the 2009 statistic standing alone or as a pattern would raise the concern of excessive trimming of sales. Since the historical utilization pattern is fairly typical, it is premature to conclude that the county is trimming good sales. The 3 lowest utilization percentages have occurred in the last 3 years so this practice bears watching.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming 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 Cuming 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>90</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>98.22</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98.22</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>7.37</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5.89</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>93</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming 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 Cuming 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>22.97</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>5.15</b>
<b>0.01</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>0.24</b>
<b>0.00</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>0.16</b>
<b>0.21</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>7.37</b>
<b>9.56</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>5.89</b>

COMMERCIAL:Historically the percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties has been fairly similar. In 2009, the sale file change statistic is more than 17% higher than the Assessed base statistic. Taken alone this statistic depicts disparate treatment of the sales file and the assessed base. The calculation done here is an aberration driven by the removal of substantially changed sales between the preliminary and final statistics. The original preliminary statistics had 12 more sales 9 of which were in the final study year. The weighted mean changed from 73.67 to 89.28 after this action. A recalculation of the change to the sales file using the weighted mean from the current preliminary statistics produces a change percentage of 2.25. This is lower than the assessed base, and tends to conform to the historical trend. If the verification was done properly, and the sales file is representative, it indicates that the statistical calculations from either set of statistics may be equally reliable as an accurate measure of the population. The likelihood that the sale file is representative is remote since the 27 qualified sales cannot possibly be a surrogate for all of the diverse locations and uses that are present in the parcels in the assessed base.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming 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 Cuming 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>95</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>103</b>

COMMERCIAL: The median is in the acceptable range, while the mean and weighted mean are above the range. The mean was calculated above the acceptable range largely based on a few high ratios, and most of the high ratios occurred on lower price sales. Over 10% of the 27 sales in this class sold for less than \$10,000, and about 30% sold for less than \$30,000. It only takes a few high ratios to have a noticeable impact on the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by these outliers, and in this class, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>19.51</b>	<b>96.48</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-1.52</b>



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Cuming County**

---

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the range and the price related differential is fractionally out of the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. That said, commercial quality statistics (good or bad), are often more a coincidence of the data than good indicators of assessment performance. Before making any blanket statements about the assessment uniformity of the overall county, certain demographics should be mentioned. First, the commercial property is represented by sales in extremely diverse locations, including the county seat, several towns and rural locations. Among the 27 commercial sales, there were 13 different occupancy codes listed plus unimproved parcels, each with the potential to be operating in a different economic environment. It might be said that there is very little organized market structure that is common to all of the far reaching locations or to all of the different property uses. With all of these variables, the commercial class is far too small to make either realistic adjustments or profound statements about the quality of assessment. It is difficult to manage the quality statistics in databases with these characteristics. Considering all of these variables and the size of the sample, there is little chance that the COD and the PRD tell much about the actual quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Cuming 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>38</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>-11</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>38.49</b>	<b>19.51</b>	<b>-18.98</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>112.90</b>	<b>96.48</b>	<b>-16.42</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>20.79</b>	<b>60.09</b>	<b>39.30</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>305.50</b>	<b>286.11</b>	<b>-19.39</b>

COMMERCIAL: The change between the Preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. The county tends to complete sale review and pick up later in the process so between the preparation of the preliminary statistics and the final statistics they identified and removed 11 substantially changed or non-qualified sales. The other changes are consistent with the assessment actions taken in this class of property. All of changes between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were favorable or at worst neutral.

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

### **Agricultural:**

Annually, all subclasses are monitored for problem areas that are revealed by analysis of the sales activity.

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

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. During 2008, they continued the field work to inspect and revalue all agricultural residences and rural residential parcels, as well as all of the agricultural improvements. For 2009, they completed 1 remaining township in Range 5 and all of Range 6 and 7. This work is being implemented as the inspection is completed.

The county has continued to prepare for the implementation of additional layers to their GIS system.

The agricultural sales were verified and analyzed, resulting in an alteration to the 4 market areas, and then a new schedule of LCG values for each area. The changes that resulted varied from market area to market area and among the LCGs. In the end, Cuming County again made a significant change to most classes and subclasses throughout the county.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Cuming County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Appraiser
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Appraiser
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	The county has been implementing GIS and identifying parcels and land usage. They expect to identify the different uses as this process progresses and then form a written policy. To date, they have reviewed a variety of data sources that may have a bearing on agricultural versus non-agricultural use. Among those sources are FSA reports, NRD data, current regulations and directives and zoning considerations. The county is still unresolved about a parcel size criteria or devising another test for a standard that they can defend.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	The county implements the relevant Statutes and Regulations that pertain to agricultural land
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>
	Cuming County has not implemented an income approach for agricultural land.
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1975: Cuming County will implement the new survey for use in 2010.
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	The county continues the implementation of a GIS system and expects to use it extensively for land use updates in the future. Currently it has been several years since a full study was completed, but the county has the practice of doing updates continuously using all means available to keep land use current.

a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	The county relies on a combination of physical inspection, FSA maps, aerial photos, self reporting, third party reporting, and now GIS to keep land use up to date.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	The Appraiser, Assessor and Office Clerk all have responsibility for parts of the land use study and update.
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	About 1/3 of the GIS is implemented, but the other ongoing efforts continue. To date, the parcel layer is done, the ownership layer is done, and the county is working on the land use layer.
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	4 -Market Areas; This is the same number as last year, but through recent market analysis, there were realignments made for use in 2009.
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	The county does annual market analysis of agricultural land. This is done to determine market value, but also to continually test the market areas. As stated, they were realigned for 2009. The market areas in Cuming County are differentiated along township lines and can be related to Geo Codes.
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>
	N/A
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	N/A
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	Special value has been implemented, but only the area around the edge of West Point has been determined to have land values affected by non-agricultural influences.

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
52	241	18	311

**Agricultural or  
Special Valuation Reports**

**PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics**

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:12:25

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	110.16	108.17	100.80	8.71	107.31	93.47	118.88	N/A	158,845	160,113
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	13	73.63	76.54	72.92	13.17	104.96	60.73	116.35	65.87 to 81.99	189,984	138,545
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	24	84.43	84.94	83.64	12.99	101.55	59.31	122.24	74.50 to 90.86	186,621	156,093
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	86.27	91.35	89.01	9.26	102.63	81.59	119.16	81.59 to 119.16	179,539	159,805
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	87.83	92.34	93.37	20.97	98.90	61.17	135.11	N/A	202,697	189,250
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	75.57	75.09	76.12	13.40	98.65	57.78	91.71	58.97 to 87.06	285,193	217,093
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	69.04	69.64	68.48	11.31	101.69	56.00	100.20	63.69 to 74.43	247,752	169,668
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	61.11	60.97	60.69	4.44	100.46	57.79	63.88	N/A	246,685	149,713
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	85.18	85.18	85.18			85.18	85.18	N/A	238,000	202,735
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	60.22	61.09	59.13	11.16	103.31	45.99	75.06	52.56 to 73.70	264,643	156,484
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	22	60.78	60.48	59.77	14.73	101.19	42.48	77.82	50.90 to 69.81	282,381	168,781
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	56.14	54.73	54.77	3.99	99.92	50.66	57.38	N/A	237,410	130,028
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	49	83.42	85.66	82.77	14.86	103.49	59.31	122.24	78.47 to 90.23	184,089	152,372
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	39	70.29	73.06	72.49	15.64	100.78	56.00	135.11	63.72 to 76.45	251,467	182,292
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	36	59.97	60.86	59.85	14.15	101.68	42.48	85.18	55.75 to 67.39	272,473	163,079
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	47	83.76	84.72	83.24	13.60	101.78	57.78	135.11	79.72 to 87.83	208,098	173,231
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	35	63.88	66.65	65.26	12.60	102.13	45.99	100.20	60.35 to 70.29	252,177	164,565
<u>ALL</u>											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:12:25

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1509	2	66.19	66.19	64.56	4.43	102.54	63.26	69.13	N/A	443,256	286,152
1511	17	59.78	64.20	63.96	15.50	100.37	47.94	90.45	54.10 to 75.06	263,264	168,382
1513	1	82.58	82.58	82.58			82.58	82.58	N/A	159,600	131,795
1515	11	87.09	87.36	86.50	15.20	100.99	50.90	116.65	73.70 to 105.81	190,762	165,003
1537	6	77.75	77.60	77.85	18.33	99.67	56.00	100.20	56.00 to 100.20	220,510	171,672
1539	7	74.85	75.76	74.45	10.65	101.77	65.08	95.59	65.08 to 95.59	194,824	145,037
1541	11	70.42	75.26	71.99	14.62	104.54	56.67	135.11	63.69 to 79.51	294,797	212,238
1543	4	80.85	79.48	61.87	17.57	128.46	50.82	105.39	N/A	361,202	223,480
1789	15	72.20	73.78	65.47	20.39	112.69	42.99	119.16	60.73 to 85.43	164,575	107,747
1791	10	77.82	75.31	76.15	17.77	98.91	50.66	97.86	59.31 to 91.71	178,746	136,107
1793	3	85.18	73.78	75.95	20.03	97.14	42.48	93.67	N/A	134,296	101,996
1795	12	67.25	77.27	73.49	23.25	105.14	58.94	122.24	60.35 to 87.68	269,674	198,190
1821	11	70.29	74.91	72.92	19.51	102.73	55.75	116.35	58.72 to 90.86	199,367	145,381
1823	4	74.96	75.96	76.00	12.88	99.94	58.97	94.94	N/A	244,931	186,151
1825	3	72.32	73.19	72.71	5.75	100.65	67.39	79.86	N/A	157,833	114,766
1827	7	65.87	67.49	68.60	10.35	98.38	57.78	87.83	57.78 to 87.83	300,134	205,902
ALL											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	37	71.44	74.37	73.76	18.35	100.82	50.66	116.35	62.24 to 83.42	218,549	161,210
2	11	74.85	76.67	74.36	10.05	103.11	65.08	95.59	65.82 to 93.67	202,378	150,480
3	49	73.41	73.66	68.23	20.44	107.96	42.99	119.16	63.26 to 79.72	232,118	158,367
4	27	70.46	75.29	72.89	18.76	103.29	42.48	135.11	63.69 to 79.51	257,420	187,645
ALL											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
2	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891
ALL											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891



**PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics**

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:12:25

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0014	4	59.44	66.22	64.72	15.11	102.30	55.75	90.23	N/A	213,209	137,998
11-0020	3	74.43	84.89	75.11	23.76	113.02	63.59	116.65	N/A	284,666	213,811
19-0059	5	67.68	70.16	74.28	10.58	94.46	57.78	87.83	N/A	249,388	185,234
20-0001	56	70.38	75.41	73.82	19.96	102.14	42.48	135.11	65.08 to 79.51	220,431	162,731
20-0020	13	77.82	79.32	78.84	17.53	100.61	50.90	105.81	61.96 to 100.20	198,748	156,698
20-0030	35	72.12	70.84	64.29	17.92	110.19	42.99	119.16	60.73 to 75.85	248,333	159,655
27-0046	3	72.32	70.53	65.01	9.43	108.49	59.40	79.86	N/A	291,166	189,273
27-0062	1	80.38	80.38	80.38			80.38	80.38	N/A	60,000	48,225
27-0594	1	74.50	74.50	74.50			74.50	74.50	N/A	360,000	268,200
87-0001	3	90.45	89.05	91.53	3.77	97.29	83.23	93.47	N/A	256,616	234,886
NonValid School											
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

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	7	80.38	81.01	79.90	11.12	101.38	60.73	97.70	60.73 to 97.70	63,017	50,352
30.01 TO 50.00	33	65.08	70.77	67.99	20.43	104.09	42.48	119.16	61.17 to 72.32	128,852	87,611
50.01 TO 100.00	60	72.81	75.83	73.06	18.29	103.79	45.99	135.11	68.62 to 81.59	219,648	160,478
100.01 TO 180.00	22	76.16	75.94	73.12	16.40	103.86	42.99	105.81	61.96 to 87.83	411,320	300,750
180.01 TO 330.00	2	57.04	57.04	55.82	10.90	102.18	50.82	63.26	N/A	857,736	478,817
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

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	76	72.95	74.93	71.89	18.74	104.23	42.99	135.11	67.68 to 78.47	234,622	168,679
DRY-N/A	34	72.20	76.67	74.42	17.98	103.03	50.66	122.24	65.42 to 83.23	206,755	153,871
GRASS-N/A	5	60.16	62.41	64.57	18.26	96.66	42.48	79.72	N/A	114,362	73,842
IRRGTD	1	93.67	93.67	93.67			93.67	93.67	N/A	64,890	60,780
IRRGTD-N/A	8	63.18	66.21	62.61	17.38	105.76	50.82	94.94	50.82 to 94.94	392,378	245,651
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:12:26

## 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	101	73.41	76.16	73.09	18.81	104.20	42.99	135.11	70.29 to 76.72	228,757	167,200
DRY-N/A	9	65.42	67.73	66.27	13.24	102.20	50.66	82.58	59.31 to 79.89	195,156	129,331
GRASS	2	58.09	58.09	58.09	26.87	100.00	42.48	73.70	N/A	100,000	58,087
GRASS-N/A	3	60.16	65.29	68.05	13.14	95.94	56.00	79.72	N/A	123,936	84,345
IRRGTD	7	67.39	70.68	66.80	18.47	105.80	54.08	94.94	54.08 to 94.94	246,988	164,992
IRRGTD-N/A	2	64.32	64.32	59.05	20.99	108.92	50.82	77.82	N/A	737,500	435,525
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

## 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	110	72.26	75.47	72.61	18.63	103.94	42.99	135.11	69.81 to 76.29	226,008	164,102
GRASS	4	58.08	58.08	58.06	15.23	100.04	42.48	73.70	N/A	100,000	58,061
GRASS-N/A	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	171,810	136,965
IRRGTD	8	63.18	68.19	60.85	20.51	112.07	50.82	94.94	50.82 to 94.94	344,239	209,475
IRRGTD-N/A	1	77.82	77.82	77.82			77.82	77.82	N/A	450,000	350,190
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

## 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	83.23	80.55	79.40	14.81	101.45	60.73	97.70	N/A	49,076	38,968
60000 TO 99999	12	87.03	87.51	85.27	21.75	102.63	57.78	119.16	61.17 to 116.65	81,881	69,820
100000 TO 149999	17	73.70	75.26	75.49	18.79	99.70	42.48	122.24	61.40 to 81.99	121,419	91,660
150000 TO 249999	53	73.41	76.18	76.13	16.61	100.07	44.86	135.11	69.13 to 82.58	193,430	147,259
250000 TO 499999	32	64.71	68.30	68.79	17.85	99.28	42.99	94.94	58.97 to 74.50	332,955	229,034
500000 +	7	59.40	63.29	61.72	12.21	102.55	50.82	79.51	50.82 to 79.51	648,048	399,946
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

**PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics**

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:12:26

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	10	60.95	67.95	64.15	20.54	105.93	42.48	97.70	56.00 to 83.23	77,199	49,522
60000 TO 99999	22	71.78	75.77	70.51	23.25	107.47	44.86	119.16	60.35 to 93.67	116,478	82,125
100000 TO 149999	28	70.44	71.08	68.86	13.25	103.22	45.99	105.39	65.08 to 73.41	183,028	126,028
150000 TO 249999	45	76.29	77.80	74.20	19.46	104.86	42.99	135.11	65.87 to 84.21	242,402	179,863
250000 TO 499999	18	74.47	74.92	72.79	13.80	102.93	54.08	93.47	63.26 to 87.68	458,015	333,388
500000 +	1	50.82	50.82	50.82			50.82	50.82	N/A	1,025,000	520,860
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:11:41

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	110.16	108.17	100.80	8.71	107.31	93.47	118.88	N/A	158,845	160,113
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	13	73.63	76.54	72.92	13.17	104.96	60.73	116.35	65.87 to 81.99	189,984	138,545
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	24	84.43	84.94	83.64	12.99	101.55	59.31	122.24	74.50 to 90.86	186,621	156,093
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	86.27	91.35	89.01	9.26	102.63	81.59	119.16	81.59 to 119.16	179,539	159,805
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	87.83	92.34	93.37	20.97	98.90	61.17	135.11	N/A	202,697	189,250
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	75.57	75.09	76.12	13.40	98.65	57.78	91.71	58.97 to 87.06	285,193	217,093
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	69.04	69.64	68.48	11.31	101.69	56.00	100.20	63.69 to 74.43	247,752	169,668
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	61.11	60.97	60.69	4.44	100.46	57.79	63.88	N/A	246,685	149,713
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	85.18	85.18	85.18			85.18	85.18	N/A	238,000	202,735
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	60.22	61.09	59.13	11.16	103.31	45.99	75.06	52.56 to 73.70	264,643	156,484
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	22	60.78	60.48	59.77	14.73	101.19	42.48	77.82	50.90 to 69.81	282,381	168,781
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	56.14	54.73	54.77	3.99	99.92	50.66	57.38	N/A	237,410	130,028
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	49	83.42	85.66	82.77	14.86	103.49	59.31	122.24	78.47 to 90.23	184,089	152,372
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	39	70.29	73.06	72.49	15.64	100.78	56.00	135.11	63.72 to 76.45	251,467	182,292
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	36	59.97	60.86	59.85	14.15	101.68	42.48	85.18	55.75 to 67.39	272,473	163,079
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	47	83.76	84.72	83.24	13.60	101.78	57.78	135.11	79.72 to 87.83	208,098	173,231
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	35	63.88	66.65	65.26	12.60	102.13	45.99	100.20	60.35 to 70.29	252,177	164,565
<u>ALL</u>											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:11:41

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1509	2	66.19	66.19	64.56	4.43	102.54	63.26	69.13	N/A	443,256	286,152
1511	17	59.78	64.20	63.96	15.50	100.37	47.94	90.45	54.10 to 75.06	263,264	168,382
1513	1	82.58	82.58	82.58			82.58	82.58	N/A	159,600	131,795
1515	11	87.09	87.36	86.50	15.20	100.99	50.90	116.65	73.70 to 105.81	190,762	165,003
1537	6	77.75	77.60	77.85	18.33	99.67	56.00	100.20	56.00 to 100.20	220,510	171,672
1539	7	74.85	75.76	74.45	10.65	101.77	65.08	95.59	65.08 to 95.59	194,824	145,037
1541	11	70.42	75.26	71.99	14.62	104.54	56.67	135.11	63.69 to 79.51	294,797	212,238
1543	4	80.85	79.48	61.87	17.57	128.46	50.82	105.39	N/A	361,202	223,480
1789	15	72.20	73.78	65.47	20.39	112.69	42.99	119.16	60.73 to 85.43	164,575	107,747
1791	10	77.82	75.31	76.15	17.77	98.91	50.66	97.86	59.31 to 91.71	178,746	136,107
1793	3	85.18	73.78	75.95	20.03	97.14	42.48	93.67	N/A	134,296	101,996
1795	12	67.25	77.27	73.49	23.25	105.14	58.94	122.24	60.35 to 87.68	269,674	198,190
1821	11	70.29	74.91	72.92	19.51	102.73	55.75	116.35	58.72 to 90.86	199,367	145,381
1823	4	74.96	75.96	76.00	12.88	99.94	58.97	94.94	N/A	244,931	186,151
1825	3	72.32	73.19	72.71	5.75	100.65	67.39	79.86	N/A	157,833	114,766
1827	7	65.87	67.49	68.60	10.35	98.38	57.78	87.83	57.78 to 87.83	300,134	205,902
ALL											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	37	71.44	74.37	73.76	18.35	100.82	50.66	116.35	62.24 to 83.42	218,549	161,210
2	11	74.85	76.67	74.36	10.05	103.11	65.08	95.59	65.82 to 93.67	202,378	150,480
3	49	73.41	73.66	68.23	20.44	107.96	42.99	119.16	63.26 to 79.72	232,118	158,367
4	27	70.46	75.29	72.89	18.76	103.29	42.48	135.11	63.69 to 79.51	257,420	187,645
ALL											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
2	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891
ALL											
	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:11:41

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
11-0014	4	59.44	66.22	64.72	15.11	102.30	55.75	90.23	N/A	213,209	137,998
11-0020	3	74.43	84.89	75.11	23.76	113.02	63.59	116.65	N/A	284,666	213,811
19-0059	5	67.68	70.16	74.28	10.58	94.46	57.78	87.83	N/A	249,388	185,234
20-0001	56	70.38	75.41	73.82	19.96	102.14	42.48	135.11	65.08 to 79.51	220,431	162,731
20-0020	13	77.82	79.32	78.84	17.53	100.61	50.90	105.81	61.96 to 100.20	198,748	156,698
20-0030	35	72.12	70.84	64.29	17.92	110.19	42.99	119.16	60.73 to 75.85	248,333	159,655
27-0046	3	72.32	70.53	65.01	9.43	108.49	59.40	79.86	N/A	291,166	189,273
27-0062	1	80.38	80.38	80.38			80.38	80.38	N/A	60,000	48,225
27-0594	1	74.50	74.50	74.50			74.50	74.50	N/A	360,000	268,200
87-0001	3	90.45	89.05	91.53	3.77	97.29	83.23	93.47	N/A	256,616	234,886
NonValid School											
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

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	7	80.38	81.01	79.90	11.12	101.38	60.73	97.70	60.73 to 97.70	63,017	50,352
30.01 TO 50.00	33	65.08	70.77	67.99	20.43	104.09	42.48	119.16	61.17 to 72.32	128,852	87,611
50.01 TO 100.00	60	72.81	75.83	73.06	18.29	103.79	45.99	135.11	68.62 to 81.59	219,648	160,478
100.01 TO 180.00	22	76.16	75.94	73.12	16.40	103.86	42.99	105.81	61.96 to 87.83	411,320	300,750
180.01 TO 330.00	2	57.04	57.04	55.82	10.90	102.18	50.82	63.26	N/A	857,736	478,817
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

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	76	72.95	74.93	71.89	18.74	104.23	42.99	135.11	67.68 to 78.47	234,622	168,679
DRY-N/A	34	72.20	76.67	74.42	17.98	103.03	50.66	122.24	65.42 to 83.23	206,755	153,871
GRASS-N/A	5	60.16	62.41	64.57	18.26	96.66	42.48	79.72	N/A	114,362	73,842
IRRGTD	1	93.67	93.67	93.67			93.67	93.67	N/A	64,890	60,780
IRRGTD-N/A	8	63.18	66.21	62.61	17.38	105.76	50.82	94.94	50.82 to 94.94	392,378	245,651
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:11:41

## 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	101	73.41	76.16	73.09	18.81	104.20	42.99	135.11	70.29 to 76.72	228,757	167,200
DRY-N/A	9	65.42	67.73	66.27	13.24	102.20	50.66	82.58	59.31 to 79.89	195,156	129,331
GRASS	2	58.09	58.09	58.09	26.87	100.00	42.48	73.70	N/A	100,000	58,087
GRASS-N/A	3	60.16	65.29	68.05	13.14	95.94	56.00	79.72	N/A	123,936	84,345
IRRGTD	7	67.39	70.68	66.80	18.47	105.80	54.08	94.94	54.08 to 94.94	246,988	164,992
IRRGTD-N/A	2	64.32	64.32	59.05	20.99	108.92	50.82	77.82	N/A	737,500	435,525
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

## 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	110	72.26	75.47	72.61	18.63	103.94	42.99	135.11	69.81 to 76.29	226,008	164,102
GRASS	4	58.08	58.08	58.06	15.23	100.04	42.48	73.70	N/A	100,000	58,061
GRASS-N/A	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	171,810	136,965
IRRGTD	8	63.18	68.19	60.85	20.51	112.07	50.82	94.94	50.82 to 94.94	344,239	209,475
IRRGTD-N/A	1	77.82	77.82	77.82			77.82	77.82	N/A	450,000	350,190
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

## 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	83.23	80.55	79.40	14.81	101.45	60.73	97.70	N/A	49,076	38,968
60000 TO 99999	12	87.03	87.51	85.27	21.75	102.63	57.78	119.16	61.17 to 116.65	81,881	69,820
100000 TO 149999	17	73.70	75.26	75.49	18.79	99.70	42.48	122.24	61.40 to 81.99	121,419	91,660
150000 TO 249999	53	73.41	76.18	76.13	16.61	100.07	44.86	135.11	69.13 to 82.58	193,430	147,259
250000 TO 499999	32	64.71	68.30	68.79	17.85	99.28	42.99	94.94	58.97 to 74.50	332,955	229,034
500000 +	7	59.40	63.29	61.72	12.21	102.55	50.82	79.51	50.82 to 79.51	648,048	399,946
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891

# PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7353

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	23.65	95% Median C.I.:	68.94 to 75.06	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	28,721,689	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	17.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.23 to 74.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	28,636,689	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.50	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 77.60	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,446,485							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,941	COD:	18.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,891	PRD:	104.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.48			

Printed: 04/02/2009 12:11:41

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	10	60.95	67.95	64.15	20.54	105.93	42.48	97.70	56.00 to 83.23	77,199	49,522
60000 TO 99999	22	71.78	75.77	70.51	23.25	107.47	44.86	119.16	60.35 to 93.67	116,478	82,125
100000 TO 149999	28	70.44	71.08	68.86	13.25	103.22	45.99	105.39	65.08 to 73.41	183,028	126,028
150000 TO 249999	45	76.29	77.80	74.20	19.46	104.86	42.99	135.11	65.87 to 84.21	242,402	179,863
250000 TO 499999	18	74.47	74.92	72.79	13.80	102.93	54.08	93.47	63.26 to 87.68	458,015	333,388
500000 +	1	50.82	50.82	50.82			50.82	50.82	N/A	1,025,000	520,860
ALL	124	72.16	74.49	71.40	18.71	104.33	42.48	135.11	68.94 to 75.06	230,941	164,891



## CUMING COUNTY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

Cherie Kreikemeier, Assessor  
200 S. Lincoln Street, Room 101  
West Point, Ne 68788  
(402) 372-6000 Fax (402) 372-6013

February 26, 2009

Nebraska Department of Revenue  
Property Assessment Division  
1033 "O" Street, Suite 600  
Lincoln, NE 68508

Our method of determining Greenbelt values for Cuming County, Nebraska is as follows:

The Greenbelt area in Cuming County is located adjacent to West Point City to the eastern city limits and is monitored by the City of West Point.

The uninfluenced values are derived from the sales file and equalized with the surrounding lands, using 69-74% of the indicated market values. This is done on a yearly basis, just as is the valuing of agricultural land.

The recapture values are derived from the sales file and equalized to the surrounding market values of land. This is also done on a yearly basis at the time the agricultural land is valued.

Cherie J. Kreikemeier  
CUMING COUNTY ASSESSOR



## 2009 CORRELATION SECTION

### For Cuming County

---

#### Agricultural or Special Valuation

##### I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL LAND: The agricultural unimproved statistic includes 124 uninfluenced sales. The median, at 72, is within the acceptable range. The mean, at 74, is within the acceptable range, and the weighted mean, at 71, is within the acceptable range. This would suggest that all three measures are somewhat similar and supportive of each other. The minimally improved statistics include five additional sales, and the same measures of central tendency. The median, at 72, is within the acceptable range. The mean, at 74, is within the acceptable range, and the weighted mean, at 71, is within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is within the accepted parameters and price related differential is slightly above the accepted parameters in both the agricultural unimproved and minimally improved statistic. In the unimproved statistic the COD is 18.71 and the PRD is 104.33.

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

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Market Area; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 69 to 75%.

Collectively the data suggests that the median still holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and each relevant subclass and no adjustments are recommended.

The use of special valuation in Cuming County did not impact any of the calculations in the R&O as there were no sales that were subject to special valuation. The only area in Cuming County is minor and exists adjacent to the town of West Point.



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

Records : 8,554

Value : 1,125,763,000

Growth 8,734,705

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>	328	2,592,305	17	251,020	33	450,875	378	3,294,200	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,298	19,589,940	63	1,165,290	223	4,538,355	2,584	25,293,585	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,343	134,990,295	68	7,574,255	243	18,732,665	2,654	161,297,215	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,671	157,172,540	85	8,990,565	276	23,721,895	3,032	189,885,000	1,839,565
<b>% of Res Total</b>	88.09	82.77	2.80	4.73	9.10	12.49	35.45	16.87	21.06
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	100	1,658,085	7	76,205	9	157,790	116	1,892,080	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	464	6,321,740	19	519,240	25	382,265	508	7,223,245	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	474	42,746,575	20	3,679,290	29	2,014,905	523	48,440,770	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	574	50,726,400	27	4,274,735	38	2,554,960	639	57,556,095	4,081,230
<b>% of Com Total</b>	89.83	88.13	4.23	7.43	5.95	4.44	7.47	5.11	46.72
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	7	233,140	3	273,360	0	0	10	506,500	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	8	3,973,625	3	4,981,815	0	0	11	8,955,440	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	8	4,206,765	3	5,255,175	0	0	11	9,461,940	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	72.73	44.46	27.27	55.54	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.84	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	5,800	3	42,980	4	48,780	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	4,760	1	32,965	2	37,725	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	1	375	17	291,520	18	291,895	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	2	10,935	20	367,465	22	378,400	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	9.09	2.89	90.91	97.11	0.26	0.03	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,671	157,172,540	87	9,001,500	296	24,089,360	3,054	190,263,400	1,839,565
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	87.46	82.61	2.85	4.73	9.69	12.66	35.70	16.90	21.06
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	582	54,933,165	30	9,529,910	38	2,554,960	650	67,018,035	4,081,230
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	89.54	81.97	4.62	14.22	5.85	3.81	7.60	5.95	46.72
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,253	212,105,705	117	18,531,410	334	26,644,320	3,704	257,281,435	5,920,795
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	87.82	82.44	3.16	7.20	9.02	10.36	43.30	22.85	67.78

## 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	11	846,365	5,437,160		0	0	0
20. Industrial	3	7,675	4,358,380		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		11	846,365	5,437,160
20. Industrial	0	0	0		3	7,675	4,358,380
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					14	854,040	9,795,540

## 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	105	0	14	119

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	14,150	2	141,220	3,274	487,065,420	3,277	487,220,790
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	31	2,403,720	1,609	280,370,370	1,640	282,774,090
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	2	68,005	1,571	98,418,680	1,573	98,486,685
30. Ag Total							4,850	868,481,565

## Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban				SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total								
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0		2	6.00	21,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0		2	0.00	68,005	
38. FarmSite Total								
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0		0	29.54	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	2.00	18,000		3	2.00	18,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,159	1,151.20	10,360,890		1,159	1,151.20	10,360,890	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,168	0.00	55,555,085		1,168	0.00	55,555,085	129,340
34. HomeSite Total					1,171	1,153.20	65,933,975	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	30	59.61	127,675		30	59.61	127,675	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,412	4,346.34	13,658,230		1,414	4,352.34	13,679,230	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,516	0.00	42,863,595		1,518	0.00	42,931,600	2,684,570
38. FarmSite Total					1,548	4,411.95	56,738,505	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,372.78	0		0	7,402.32	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	402.04	201,020		0	402.04	201,020	
41. Total Section VI					2,719	13,369.51	122,873,500	2,813,910

## Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game &amp; 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	1	121.69	91,655	1	121.69	91,655

## 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	42	1,827.31	3,223,470	42	1,827.31	3,223,470
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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



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

20 Cuming

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	185,410,165	189,885,000	4,474,835	2.41%	1,839,565	1.42%
02. Recreational	381,190	378,400	-2,790	-0.73%	0	-0.73%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	62,542,895	65,933,975	3,391,080	5.42%	129,340	5.22%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>248,334,250</b>	<b>256,197,375</b>	<b>7,863,125</b>	<b>3.17%</b>	<b>1,968,905</b>	<b>2.37%</b>
05. Commercial	53,629,415	57,556,095	3,926,680	7.32%	4,081,230	-0.29%
06. Industrial	6,226,105	9,461,940	3,235,835	51.97%	0	51.97%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	52,233,160	56,738,505	4,505,345	8.63%	2,684,570	3.49%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>112,088,680</b>	<b>123,756,540</b>	<b>11,667,860</b>	<b>10.41%</b>	<b>6,765,800</b>	<b>4.37%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>360,422,930</b>	<b>380,154,935</b>	<b>19,732,005</b>	<b>5.47%</b>	<b>8,734,705</b>	<b>3.05%</b>
11. Irrigated	117,143,710	130,652,015	13,508,305	11.53%		
12. Dryland	514,765,840	568,817,325	54,051,485	10.50%		
13. Grassland	26,195,785	28,531,575	2,335,790	8.92%		
14. Wasteland	3,371,400	3,873,480	502,080	14.89%		
15. Other Agland	13,824,685	13,733,670	-91,015	-0.66%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>675,301,420</b>	<b>745,608,065</b>	<b>70,306,645</b>	<b>10.41%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,035,724,350</b>	<b>1,125,763,000</b>	<b>90,038,650</b>	<b>8.69%</b>	<b>8,734,705</b>	<b>7.85%</b>

## CUMING COUNTY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

Cherie Kreikemeier, Assessor  
200 S. Lincoln Street, Room 101  
West Point, NE 68788  
(402) 372-6000 Fax (402) 372-6013  
[www.co.cuming.ne.us](http://www.co.cuming.ne.us)

### Introduction

This Plan of Assessment is required by Law – Section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 170, Section 5, as amended by Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. Purpose: Submit plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 each year and the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 each year. This is to be a 3-year plan.

### General Description of Cuming County:

Cuming County has a total population of 10,117. We are listing 3,027 parcels of Residential property, 22 parcels of Recreational property, 637 parcels as Commercial property, 11 parcels as Industrial property, 220 rural residential properties and 4,840 parcels as Agricultural property. Cuming County also has 114 exempt parcels, 13 TIF parcels, and 1 Nebraska Games & Parks.

Cuming County has approximately 1400 Personal Property Schedules filed. We also have approximately 550 Homestead Exemption applications filed each year.

The Assessor's Office has 4 employees, in addition to the Assessor: 1 full-time appraiser, who is 95% in charge of the appraisal process; and 3 clerks, who are the all-around helpers. We all share in the responsibilities of collecting information for the real estate, personal property, homestead exemptions, etc. In 2006 we have also added a part time clerk to enter the information for the reappraisal process.

### Procedures Manual:

Cuming County has a Policies and Procedures Manual which is updated on a continual basis. A copy for review is available in the Assessor's Office at all times.

### Responsibilities:

#### Record Maintenance:

The Assessor's Office maintains a Cadastral Map in our office. It is kept up-to-date by the Assessor. The background flight is a 1975 aerial photo, which is used, primarily, for ownership records. The actual acre determination is done using the current FSA layer on the GIS maps. Currently we are assessing the number of acres by previous records and/or survey records. There is a difference between deeded acres and GIS acres. The Assessor's Office also updates and maintains the Irregular Tract Book for parcel splits. In September 2005, our office started with the GIS Workshop on updating our Cadastral Maps with the GIS system. We have all the parcels labeled, and have started to label the land use layer. We may start implementing the GIS system for land classes etc. as early as 2009. We are using the GIS for split, transfer, etc. and have been updating the GIS Records as the legal descriptions change. In June 2006 we received our oblique pictures of the rural parcels, and have been using them in the appraisal process.

#### Property Record Cards:

The Rural Property Record Cards were replaced in 1998 and the City Property Record Cards were replaced in 1990 and are still in good condition listing 5 or more years of valuation information. In 2010-2011 we will start replacing the current property record cards; this may require a bigger or different filing system to store all the permanent record cards.

#### Report Generation:

The Assessor timely files all reports due to the proper Government Entities:

Abstract – Due March 20 –Personal Property Abstract – Due June 15

Certification of Values – Due to subdivision August 20

School District Taxable Value report – Due August 25

3-Year Plan of Assessments –Due July 31 to County Board, October 31 to PAD

Certificate of Taxes Levied – Due December 1

Generate Tax Roll and Tax Statements – Deliver to Treasurer by November 22

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report – November 22

Tax List Corrections – On an as needed basis

#### Filing Homestead Exemption Applications :

Accept Homestead Applications – after Feb 1 and on before June 30

Send approved Homestead Exemption Applications to Tax Commissioner-Due August 1

#### Filing Personal Property:

Accept Personal Property Schedules on or before May 1

Apply 10% penalty if filed after May 1 and by July 31

Apply 25% penalty if filed on or after August 1

Personal Property Abstract filed by June 15

#### Centrally Assessed Value:

Review valuations certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list in an excel program.

#### Tax Increment Financing:

Management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.

#### Tax Districts and Tax Rates:

Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process, we work with the Clerk's office.

#### Real Property:

The Assessor's Office started a county/wide inspection-reappraisal project in 1997. We started in the city of West Point with the residential properties and placed the values on the tax rolls in 1998. We continued reviewing residential properties in Wisner, Beemer and Bancroft. The final city values were added to the tax rolls in the year 2000. We then proceeded to do the rural homes and buildings; this is still an ongoing project. In 2006 – 2009 we plan on updating our Marshall & Swift pricing and starting another reappraisal on all properties using the June 2005 pricing in CAMA 2000.

Our review process consists of physical inspections, aerial flights and interior inspections (if possible). Any improvements, changes, or discrepancies are corrected by measuring/remasuring, collecting data; taking digital photos, comparing the data and entering that data into our computer

database/updating our property record card files with updated information. If the property owner is not present, we leave a questionnaire for the property owner to fill out and return to our office / call our office with the information. If there continues to be questions we will set up an appointment to review the property again. We also get information from newspaper listings, sales reviews, broker information, personal knowledge, etc., before placing a value on a parcel.

The assessor's office uses a CAMA 2000 computerized program, which implements the Marshall & Swift pricing system. We use this program to develop the cost approach and sales comparison approach for all residential properties. The program was obtained in July of 2003. In 2006-2007 we have had a part time clerk finish sketching the residential properties using APEX sketching, which links the sketches to the file. The digital photos are taken during inspections, reviews, and pickup. These photos are then labeled by parcel and attached to the property record card file in CAMA. The linking of these digital photos allows us to print digital photos on our sales files and with the property record card.

Our pick-up work is started in the late summer and continues until the March deadline for the abstract filing. We use building permits, taxpayer information sheets, and in-field sightings for adding properties to the tax rolls. Our inspections are similar to the reviews, except we provide the property owner (who has reported their improvements) with a written notice that we will be inspecting properties in their township, village, or town. We ask those property owners to call us to set up an appointment. This allows us to schedule our inspections in an orderly fashion and allows the taxpayer to schedule the appointments around their schedules. The properties, where the owner doesn't schedule an appointment, are inspected as we are in the neighborhood or the area. We also obtain limited information from our Zoning Administrator and Personal Property Schedules.

#### Sales Review:

The Assessor's Office does an in-house sales review. This process includes comparing our property record card file, with any information we obtain during our sales review, and the Property Tax Sales File for any discrepancies. These discrepancies might affect the sale and ultimately the value placed on that property and similar properties.

We use a verification questionnaire which is done by phone, mail or if possible, in person. We visit with either the seller, the buyer or even the broker or lawyer for information pertaining to that particular sale.

#### County Board of Equalization

The Assessor and Appraiser attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protest. We review the properties in question a second time and spend lots of valuable time on these extra issues.

#### TERC

The Assessor and Appraiser spend lots of valuable time in preparing information for TERC hearings, plus there is lots of extra expense in defending our values. TERC hearings take lots of valuable time away from the office. The Assessor prepares for the TERC Statewide Equalization hearings if applicable to the county to defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC

## CUMING COUNTY'S 3-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN 2009 – 2011

### Rural Residential:

We are currently in the process of inspecting and reappraising all rural residences and rural buildings using the oblique photos. This is one of our primary goals at this time. For the rural residential this includes, but is not limited to, data collection, data input, sketching of the home, attaching the photos in the CAMA 2000 system, and printing the oblique photos. We are also revaluing the rural buildings using an Excel spreadsheet that we have developed. This allows us to do a complete reappraisal on each property. (Cost approach and Comparable sales approach for every rural residential property) We took aerial photos (oblique photos) in the year 2006 to assist us in this process. We started using our oblique (aerial) photos from GIS Workshop in 2007. We are adding these new values on the tax rolls as we complete them. Our goal is to do one range a year, time permitting. We finished Range 4 in 2007, and Range 5 in 2008, we plan on doing Range 6 in 2009 and Range 7 in 2010.

### Residential:

We are currently in the process of inspecting all residential properties. We completed a reappraisal in 2006 in West Point. In 2007 we inspected and did a complete reappraisal for Beemer residential and revalued the lots. For the 2007 tax year we inspected and took digital photos of all Wisner properties. We will reappraise the Wisner properties (including lots to square foot) for the 2009 tax year. For the 2008 tax year we are also inspecting and taking digital photos of all properties in West Point and Bancroft. The town and village residential properties are monitored on a yearly basis. In 2008 using the GIS we located land owned by Beemer, Wisner and West Point that was used for non public use. This will be an ongoing project. Our goal in the upcoming years will be to maintain a schedule for revaluing all residential properties in Cuming County.

### Commercial Property:

We are currently in the process of inspecting all commercial properties. In 2006 we inspected, took digital photos, and revalued the properties in Beemer for the 2007 tax year. In 2006 we inspected and took digital photos of Wisner and in 2009 we plan on implementing the reappraisal. In 2007 we inspected and took digital photos of West Point and Bancroft commercial properties. We plan to complete the West Point and Beemer commercial properties appraisal during 2009-2011. The commercial properties are reappraised using cost, comparable sales (if available), and income approach (if applicable and if we receive adequate income and expense information).

## Agricultural Property

In 2007 we reviewed the Greenbelt boundaries with GIS. Using the information from this review, we were able to create a new GIS layer for the Greenbelt.

Our agricultural land values are monitored on a yearly basis, using our sales file. We also monitor the land use (i.e. irrigated, dryland, pasture, etc) using FSA aerial photography layer, inspections, and taxpayer provided information. We are developing a sales file on feedlots and recreation land. This will provide significant insight into these properties, and provide us with data, which should be quite useful in our continued monitoring of the valuations. We did implement the intensive use areas with the GIS to revalue the feedlot and lagoon areas in 2008. We plan to continue to use the GIS land calculator and DEQ information in maintaining the intensive use area. Recreational land complete reappraisal will be later as the GIS have a few more steps to complete before we can use it to its full potential.

In 2009 we will implement the new Soil Conversion and symbols.

Each year we have a significant amount of pickup work. (nearly 600 parcels / year) As we inspect a property for new improvements or removal of any improvements, we complete a reappraisal of that parcel. We would rather revalue the property at the same time, instead of returning to the property and irritating the tax payer again. (We have enough problems with that, as it is). This does slow up the pickup process significantly, but we feel this is necessary to increase our efficiency in the continuing reappraisal process.

The Cuming County Assessor's Office is in the process of updating the cadastral maps to a Geographic Information System (GIS). This is a large project (this is what other counties implementing the system have said) and is quite expensive. The added costs include, but are not limited to, adding a full time employee, computer hardware, license fees and training. The full time employee is converting the data from the current cadastral maps and the irregular tract book to the GIS program. This is a very time consuming project, but we believe this will be very beneficial for not only our office, but other county offices as well (i.e. zoning, roads dept, E911, and the sheriff's dept). It is expected to be a couple of years of inputting before it will be used to its full capacity. In 2008-2009 we have added the GIS information to a 2<sup>nd</sup> computer for the public to use and other employees in the office. The 2<sup>nd</sup> computer is used for viewing and pictures only. We can not edit the information. This would also be available to other departments in the court house. I feel it would be beneficial to the zoning department.

Cuming County is a very progressive and prosperous county. We are seeing a significant amount of improvements each year within the county. Along with those improvements, we have seen the sale of properties, within the county, continue to be very strong and agricultural values have increased significantly over the past few years. This indicates a continual need to monitor the assessed values on an annual basis, as they will also be increasing dramatically. There is also, a significant increase in the number of irrigated acres added each year. In addition, our office has identified numerous cattle yard improvements, such as yards, bunks, lagoons, etc. (most of this is due to DEQ requirements).

All of the plans listed above for our 3-year assessment process are goals that have been established by the Assessor and her appraisal staff. They are all still contingent on time, state mandates, help and monies budgeted for these years. We have developed sales files, depreciation studies, etc. for each town, village, and township. This is a never-ending task, and some are quite time-consuming to develop, but well worth the effort in the long term. Along with these processes, the assessor's staff attends education classes to further their knowledge of the appraisal process. We work very hard to implement any process that might improve our ability to value properties fairly and equitably. We would like to stress that this is a plan and may be changed to address priority issues.

Our County Board has continued to be very cooperative in allowing the Assessor's Office the equipment and monies to keep current in our assessment process. We are quite grateful for that. We don't need to be constantly going to battle with the Board, as some counties do. Their support is much appreciated and we hope it will continue in the future. We are very appreciative for the approving of the GIS mapping program. I feel this is a definite step forward. The biggest portion of the Assessor's budget is the salaries, and I feel this will continue as it takes good quality employees to get the work done in our office. We are still in the training process for many things and it seems things continue to change, but I feel we are moving forward in every aspect of the office. The staff is doing a very good job and we hope someday to be caught up (actually unobtainable since the market changes constantly). In order to get some of the projects completed I will continue to have some part time help during the year.

Respectfully submitted

Assessor signature: Cherie Kreikemeier Date: July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2008

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Cuming County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	1
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	3
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$192,210
	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	Computer contracts, MIPS, and software all come from county general budget.
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$192,210 Insurance is paid by county general
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$58,400 Mostly county appraiser's salary, plus GIS
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>
	None Currently the county relies on their in-house appraiser and staff for most work, rather than hiring a private contractor.



12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None in the assessor's budget. There are some misc. funds in the county general that may be used if justified.
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$192,210
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes -\$383.87

## **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>
	Assessor
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes: It is currently operational but not fully implemented for land use. The ownership layer has been built, but the planned full implementation is about two years away.
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor's office clerk
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS Inc.

## **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes

	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	West Point, Wisner, Bancroft and Beemer
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

#### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Presently, all appraisal is done in house. The county may occasionally contract with an outside firm if needed for a specific or specialty project.
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	N/A



## 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 Cuming 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