

# **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

### 21 Custer

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	320	COD	21.85
Total Sales Price	\$17,230,641	PRD	111.71
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$17,424,641	COV	38.46
Total Assessed Value	\$16,103,646	STD	39.70
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$54,452	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.18
Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,324	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$42,304
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	92
Mean	103	Max	349
Min	18.22		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.48 to 98.43
95% Mean C.I	98.89 to 107.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.92 to 94.91

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	15.82
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.07

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	368	98	20.87	111.19
2007	365	96	17.84	111.34
2006	439	97	33.81	119.78
2005	428	97	33.72	117.28

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 21 Custer

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	69	COD	25.73
Total Sales Price	\$6,725,530	PRD	125.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,725,530	COV	39.83
Total Assessed Value	\$5,346,749	STD	39.67
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$97,471	Avg. Absolute Deviation	24.55
Avg. Assessed Value	\$77,489	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$79,552
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	80
Mean	100	Max	244
Min	38		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.95 to 97.73
95% Mean C.I	90.23 to 108.95
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	57.96 to 101.04

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.92
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.62

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	69	97	24.01	129.77
2007	62	98	13	127.24
2006	59	99	24.4	111.71
2005	46	86	33.22	97.75

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 21 Custer

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	124	COD	25.38
Total Sales Price	\$29,240,267	PRD	102.60
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$29,240,267	COV	80.79
Total Assessed Value	\$21,405,103	STD	60.68
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$235,809	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.13
Avg. Assessed Value	\$172,622	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$114,503
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	75	Max	719.13
Min	30.21		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	66.99 to 73.77
95% Mean C.I	64.43 to 85.79
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	59.58 to 86.83

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	79.26
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.42
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.73

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	119	69	18.11	103.13
2007	140	71	20.55	101.62
2006	166	76	22.34	102.5
2005	149	74	17.24	102.32



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Custer 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 Custer County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Custer 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 Custer County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Custer 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 Custer County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Custer County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	320	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	44.47	95% Median C.I.:	94.76 to 98.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,857,792	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	46.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.38 to 93.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,051,792	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.50	95% Mean C.I.:	98.58 to 108.68
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,391,333						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,286	COD:	26.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	376.47		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,097	PRD:	114.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.22		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:27

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	50	98.24	105.43	96.32	19.96	109.46	25.93	261.14	94.70 to 100.60	47,367	45,623
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	43	96.52	96.38	94.05	12.81	102.47	18.22	170.89	93.04 to 99.06	51,862	48,778
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	28	98.24	107.90	95.69	26.27	112.76	52.56	261.93	91.35 to 114.50	60,583	57,971
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	45	93.73	95.60	92.11	14.57	103.79	45.70	205.02	88.37 to 99.52	49,234	45,349
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	52	98.40	110.40	92.79	30.59	118.98	40.40	376.47	92.87 to 102.60	58,016	53,832
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	93.34	91.50	78.85	21.63	116.05	44.52	194.42	78.54 to 99.99	65,329	51,510
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	34	94.34	121.77	86.47	56.46	140.83	35.87	349.00	70.93 to 126.00	48,527	41,960
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	41	89.52	99.32	82.05	35.87	121.05	24.33	317.14	74.61 to 102.28	51,482	42,244
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	166	97.01	100.84	94.50	17.84	106.70	18.22	261.93	94.89 to 98.72	51,266	48,449
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	154	95.95	106.65	86.04	35.76	123.96	24.33	376.47	91.16 to 98.45	55,464	47,719
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	152	96.46	102.20	90.35	23.77	113.11	40.40	376.47	93.34 to 98.73	57,188	51,671
____ALL____											
	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ANSELMO	4	99.58	98.91	71.27	23.90	138.78	52.97	143.50	N/A	18,325	13,059
ANSLEY	22	96.80	93.99	83.87	28.37	112.06	18.22	214.00	78.96 to 105.20	22,435	18,817
ARNOLD	33	94.99	104.91	91.02	31.88	115.27	24.33	261.93	81.33 to 107.40	27,890	25,385
BERWYN	5	87.42	79.64	87.84	16.68	90.66	40.40	98.98	N/A	18,300	16,075
BROKEN BOW	141	96.16	102.14	90.25	21.21	113.18	43.48	349.00	93.36 to 98.36	76,194	68,761
CALLAWAY	25	97.74	104.94	95.09	22.90	110.36	35.87	205.37	92.24 to 101.87	71,536	68,022
COMSTOCK	16	94.46	92.28	78.84	12.13	117.05	53.00	118.40	87.38 to 103.37	28,033	22,102
MASON CITY	7	72.69	99.64	107.14	68.18	93.00	25.93	186.12	25.93 to 186.12	9,957	10,668
MERNA	14	94.75	96.51	90.53	17.54	106.61	68.65	141.63	72.76 to 131.65	43,771	39,626
OCONTO	7	99.75	125.80	95.61	37.39	131.57	79.40	303.50	79.40 to 303.50	30,428	29,092
RURAL RES	10	84.38	90.82	78.03	33.93	116.39	43.86	163.46	58.64 to 128.38	83,951	65,507
SARGENT	36	103.16	124.99	101.53	41.21	123.11	52.56	376.47	95.69 to 114.50	21,046	21,367
____ALL____											
	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	320	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	44.47	95% Median C.I.:	94.76 to 98.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,857,792	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	46.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.38 to 93.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,051,792	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.50	95% Mean C.I.:	98.58 to 108.68
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,391,333						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,286	COD:	26.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	376.47		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,097	PRD:	114.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.22		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:27

## 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	288	96.76	104.54	93.43	25.74	111.89	18.22	376.47	94.95 to 98.45	47,704	44,571
2	22	92.28	97.55	76.81	33.70	127.00	44.52	293.77	65.92 to 101.87	112,422	86,349
3	10	84.38	90.82	78.03	33.93	116.39	43.86	163.46	58.64 to 128.38	83,951	65,507
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

## 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	296	96.28	103.22	90.05	24.57	114.64	25.93	376.47	94.80 to 98.27	57,240	51,542
2	24	96.07	108.68	124.02	50.12	87.63	18.22	317.14	73.47 to 113.28	4,523	5,610
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	316	96.21	103.56	90.01	26.48	115.06	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.03	53,591	48,237
06											
07	4	114.64	109.10	126.70	21.95	86.11	67.00	140.14	N/A	29,250	37,060
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 320 **MEDIAN: 96** COV: 44.47 95% Median C.I.: 94.76 to 98.27  
 TOTAL Sales Price: 16,857,792 WGT. MEAN: 90 STD: 46.09 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 87.38 to 93.14  
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 17,051,792 MEAN: 104 AVG.ABS.DEV: 25.50 95% Mean C.I.: 98.58 to 108.68  
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 15,391,333  
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 53,286 COD: 26.48 MAX Sales Ratio: 376.47  
 AVG. Assessed Value: 48,097 PRD: 114.81 MIN Sales Ratio: 18.22

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:27

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0015	18	94.88	97.04	88.47	19.48	109.69	52.97	143.50	76.85 to 101.91	38,116	33,722
21-0025	147	95.85	101.49	89.98	20.87	112.79	43.48	349.00	93.34 to 97.99	75,444	67,884
21-0044	26	96.47	95.03	86.77	30.67	109.53	18.22	214.00	78.96 to 102.97	24,299	21,084
21-0084	37	102.28	122.80	95.10	41.99	129.12	43.86	376.47	95.69 to 112.37	23,045	21,916
21-0089	35	95.85	107.25	94.51	32.80	113.49	24.33	261.93	82.34 to 110.23	28,268	26,716
21-0180	34	97.88	106.61	91.26	26.81	116.82	35.87	303.50	91.39 to 101.25	66,762	60,924
24-0011											
24-0020											
24-0101	1	116.22	116.22	116.22			116.22	116.22	N/A	19,000	22,082
58-0025											
82-0015	6	65.56	85.23	100.11	59.36	85.14	25.93	155.79	25.93 to 155.79	10,666	10,678
88-0005	16	94.46	92.28	78.84	12.13	117.05	53.00	118.40	87.38 to 103.37	28,033	22,102
88-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

## 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	37	94.40	107.89	104.41	52.28	103.33	18.22	317.14	75.15 to 112.05	5,929	6,190
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	11	95.35	118.68	94.13	37.18	126.07	62.19	349.00	80.68 to 155.68	63,131	59,428
1900 TO 1919	64	96.46	110.83	87.65	35.27	126.45	42.20	376.47	90.84 to 102.29	31,652	27,743
1920 TO 1939	76	99.81	106.25	90.99	24.83	116.76	43.86	239.31	95.85 to 104.73	39,126	35,601
1940 TO 1949	28	95.13	95.92	90.00	18.20	106.57	52.97	185.24	89.55 to 100.10	53,105	47,796
1950 TO 1959	33	93.01	99.25	94.36	14.70	105.18	64.09	261.14	91.86 to 97.75	66,039	62,316
1960 TO 1969	28	98.78	98.36	93.89	11.45	104.77	62.27	172.44	93.73 to 100.41	83,364	78,267
1970 TO 1979	19	94.48	89.35	82.91	11.11	107.77	44.52	106.02	82.58 to 100.75	107,413	89,060
1980 TO 1989	14	95.54	95.58	88.39	14.24	108.13	65.92	173.13	72.73 to 99.75	112,564	99,500
1990 TO 1994	5	92.50	85.81	81.59	23.72	105.18	44.61	128.38	N/A	171,780	140,154
1995 TO 1999	4	95.37	104.48	98.68	15.53	105.88	87.06	140.14	N/A	122,750	121,135
2000 TO Present	1	99.45	99.45	99.45			99.45	99.45	N/A	171,500	170,550
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 320 **MEDIAN: 96** COV: 44.47 95% Median C.I.: 94.76 to 98.27  
 TOTAL Sales Price: 16,857,792 WGT. MEAN: 90 STD: 46.09 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 87.38 to 93.14  
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 17,051,792 MEAN: 104 AVG.ABS.DEV: 25.50 95% Mean C.I.: 98.58 to 108.68  
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 15,391,333  
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 53,286 COD: 26.48 MAX Sales Ratio: 376.47  
 AVG. Assessed Value: 48,097 PRD: 114.81 MIN Sales Ratio: 18.22

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:28

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	26	109.84	143.63	149.37	61.85	96.16	24.33	376.47	81.67 to 167.27		1,940	2,899
5000 TO 9999	22	109.80	121.29	118.70	51.00	102.18	18.22	349.00	60.10 to 155.68		6,998	8,307
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	48	109.80	133.39	126.27	56.89	105.63	18.22	376.47	92.36 to 143.50		4,259	5,378
10000 TO 29999	95	101.91	114.92	112.03	28.17	102.58	35.87	293.77	98.36 to 108.25		18,876	21,148
30000 TO 59999	72	94.97	93.59	93.41	15.34	100.19	42.20	140.14	91.35 to 99.06		43,170	40,325
60000 TO 99999	55	93.36	88.47	87.93	11.28	100.61	43.86	106.02	91.45 to 96.75		76,880	67,601
100000 TO 149999	28	93.40	87.99	87.73	9.86	100.30	44.45	100.08	87.38 to 96.16		124,562	109,276
150000 TO 249999	20	91.07	79.85	80.32	17.69	99.41	44.52	99.45	65.92 to 95.24		185,232	148,781
250000 TO 499999	2	88.71	88.71	88.99	6.82	99.68	82.66	94.76	N/A		262,500	233,611
ALL												
	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27		53,286	48,097

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	29	82.34	101.38	72.04	56.98	140.72	18.22	317.14	60.10 to 113.28		2,812	2,026
5000 TO 9999	12	86.44	107.21	82.39	53.37	130.12	35.87	280.17	56.26 to 118.58		8,339	6,870
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	41	82.34	103.08	77.74	56.70	132.60	18.22	317.14	72.69 to 106.40		4,430	3,444
10000 TO 29999	105	100.37	115.84	99.45	32.09	116.48	42.20	376.47	96.76 to 105.20		19,693	19,585
30000 TO 59999	78	96.58	102.88	92.13	24.42	111.67	43.86	293.77	91.86 to 100.41		46,734	43,056
60000 TO 99999	55	96.05	92.86	88.70	10.99	104.69	44.45	140.14	92.53 to 98.83		83,429	74,005
100000 TO 149999	28	92.87	87.08	84.84	10.90	102.64	44.52	100.08	87.38 to 96.16		138,119	117,187
150000 TO 249999	12	94.86	92.31	91.63	6.00	100.75	65.56	99.45	92.27 to 98.73		202,179	185,257
250000 TO 499999	1	94.76	94.76	94.76			94.76	94.76	N/A		275,000	260,577
ALL												
	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27		53,286	48,097

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	38	96.07	107.94	105.28	50.44	102.53	18.22	317.14	75.15 to 112.05		6,825	7,185
10	1	92.36	92.36	92.36			92.36	92.36	N/A		5,000	4,618
20	133	97.30	111.86	93.68	31.78	119.40	42.20	376.47	94.89 to 100.89		32,056	30,030
30	142	95.41	95.20	88.49	15.91	107.58	43.86	239.31	92.87 to 97.83		83,389	73,787
40	6	98.29	95.53	94.00	4.75	101.62	82.06	102.38	82.06 to 102.38		113,783	106,959
ALL												
	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27		53,286	48,097

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	320	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	44.47	95% Median C.I.:	94.76 to 98.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,857,792	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	46.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.38 to 93.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,051,792	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.50	95% Mean C.I.:	98.58 to 108.68
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,391,333						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	53,286	COD:	26.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	376.47		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,097	PRD:	114.81	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.22		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:28

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	36	96.07	108.45	105.83	52.59	102.48	18.22	317.14	73.85 to 113.28	5,621	5,949
100	10	97.57	102.97	88.23	25.73	116.70	44.61	173.13	67.00 to 140.14	51,860	45,756
101	207	96.25	102.54	90.16	23.05	113.73	42.20	376.47	94.48 to 98.60	58,890	53,096
102	8	96.36	100.47	96.03	16.35	104.63	78.96	129.42	78.96 to 129.42	54,537	52,370
104	58	96.24	105.36	89.36	24.35	117.91	44.45	349.00	94.25 to 98.73	63,572	56,805
106	1	87.42	87.42	87.42			87.42	87.42	N/A	17,000	14,862
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	37	94.40	107.89	104.41	52.28	103.33	18.22	317.14	75.15 to 112.05	5,929	6,190
10	4	166.25	169.92	174.77	51.98	97.22	67.00	280.17	N/A	4,355	7,611
20	6	110.37	120.06	120.81	33.22	99.38	72.69	186.12	72.69 to 186.12	13,783	16,651
30	199	97.27	104.69	89.91	24.47	116.44	42.20	376.47	94.95 to 98.83	49,280	44,307
35	1	90.84	90.84	90.84			90.84	90.84	N/A	15,000	13,626
40	60	95.32	93.93	90.00	14.57	104.36	50.65	163.46	92.24 to 97.75	87,968	79,175
50	13	95.24	93.21	88.87	13.75	104.88	58.64	140.14	76.41 to 98.89	125,569	111,593
ALL	320	96.28	103.63	90.26	26.48	114.81	18.22	376.47	94.76 to 98.27	53,286	48,097

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

### **Residential**

For assessment year 2009 the assessor appears to be on track with planned assessment work.

It was scheduled within the three-year plan of assessment to review the towns of Arnold and Anselmo, this work has been completed and the properties were re-priced with 2007 costing.

Work that is progressing on the six-year cycle continues as such; in 2008 Delight, Custer and Wood River townships were done, for 2009 the townships of Grant, Wayne, Elim, Arnold, Hayes, Cliff, Triumph, Kilfoil, and Ryno were all reviewed.

After analyses of the residential market the following actions were taken; land values in Mason City and Arnold were changed, good quality homes in Callaway were adjusted, and rural residential properties and the older homes and mobile homes in Sargent were revalued with 2007 costing.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Custer County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	2 part-time listers
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The assessor makes the final determination of value.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	All pickup work will be done by the part-time listers.
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	July of 2004; going into the new six-year cycle as the towns and rural homes are re-priced the July of 2007 costing tables will be utilized.
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	This would vary by town depending upon the statistical analyses and re-calibration of depreciation tables manually prepared by the assessor using data derived from the market. The new depreciation tables are not entered into the CAMA system, instead the assessor will manually override the CAMA generated depreciation as the parcels are reviewed.
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The cost approach and utilizing sales to establish depreciation. The sales comparison approach as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties to arrive at a value for a subject property is not utilized. The TerraScan CAMA System has this capability, but the procedures to set the parameters to pull comparables for subject properties are not known.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	There are eleven towns or villages, the suburban area which is designated as a three mile area outside the city limits of Broken Bow and a one mile area outside the limits of each of the other towns or villages, and the rural area out in the remainder of the county.
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	These areas are defined by the political boundaries of each town or village, the suburban area is that area outside of the city limits where a city may be granted legal zoning jurisdiction for a specific area based on the class of the city, and the rural



	area is anything past these described boundaries, including unincorporated villages. Each town is uniquely different in its distance from Broken Bow and its proximity to major highways.
9.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</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> )
	No - Suburban properties seem to experience similar market influences as those properties located within the town or village they are associated with. Therefore under the substrata “Assessor Location” the suburban sales have been included with the adjoining town or village.
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 – the same costing tables and processes to develop depreciation are used so both would have the same relationship to market.

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>57</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>

## 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:	320	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.48 to 98.43
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,230,641	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	39.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.92 to 94.91
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,424,641	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.18	95% Mean C.I.:	98.89 to 107.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,103,646						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,452	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	349.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,323	PRD:	111.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.22		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:07

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	50	98.24	104.99	96.35	18.81	108.98	25.93	214.00	95.24 to 100.60	47,367	45,635
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	44	98.15	97.00	96.07	10.49	100.97	18.22	170.89	94.89 to 99.67	63,361	60,871
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	28	97.44	100.38	96.63	16.71	103.87	52.56	188.11	92.72 to 99.70	60,583	58,542
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	45	96.91	96.98	93.13	11.81	104.14	45.70	205.02	92.77 to 100.00	49,234	45,849
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	51	98.43	107.82	94.45	22.86	114.16	40.40	239.31	95.85 to 100.89	55,526	52,442
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	94.23	95.80	84.75	17.00	113.03	48.98	194.42	90.21 to 99.99	65,329	55,369
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	34	98.22	122.84	93.97	47.85	130.72	35.87	349.00	88.73 to 118.04	48,527	45,602
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	41	89.65	99.55	81.54	32.52	122.10	43.48	317.14	75.15 to 100.56	51,482	41,976
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	167	97.57	99.95	95.53	14.43	104.63	18.22	214.00	95.58 to 98.72	54,300	51,871
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	153	96.49	106.82	89.05	29.96	119.96	35.87	349.00	92.87 to 99.15	54,617	48,634
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	151	96.99	101.06	92.53	17.54	109.22	40.40	239.31	94.56 to 98.73	56,341	52,132
____ALL____											
	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ANSELMO	4	101.40	111.19	99.87	12.36	111.33	98.48	143.50	N/A	18,325	18,302
ANSLEY	22	96.80	96.17	84.11	30.63	114.33	18.22	214.00	78.96 to 105.20	22,435	18,871
ARNOLD	33	99.41	110.57	102.11	16.83	108.28	81.33	212.63	95.85 to 110.71	27,890	28,479
BERWYN	5	87.42	79.64	87.84	16.68	90.66	40.40	98.98	N/A	18,300	16,075
BROKEN BOW	140	96.23	102.64	90.97	20.90	112.83	43.48	349.00	93.89 to 98.42	75,417	68,604
CALLAWAY	25	96.82	102.51	94.99	20.61	107.92	35.87	205.37	92.28 to 99.70	71,536	67,953
COMSTOCK	16	94.46	92.28	78.84	12.13	117.05	53.00	118.40	87.38 to 103.37	28,033	22,102
MASON CITY	7	91.00	93.59	102.18	36.41	91.59	25.93	156.79	25.93 to 156.79	9,957	10,174
MERNA	14	94.75	96.51	90.53	17.54	106.61	68.65	141.63	72.76 to 131.65	43,771	39,626
OCONTO	7	99.75	125.80	95.61	37.39	131.57	79.40	303.50	79.40 to 303.50	30,428	29,092
RURAL RES	11	95.28	98.02	97.74	9.01	100.29	73.47	132.54	91.89 to 105.60	127,032	124,156
SARGENT	36	100.20	112.62	98.00	28.87	114.91	52.56	317.14	95.21 to 110.47	21,046	20,625
____ALL____											
	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## 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:	320	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.48 to 98.43
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,230,641	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	39.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.92 to 94.91
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,424,641	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.18	95% Mean C.I.:	98.89 to 107.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,103,646						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,452	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	349.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,323	PRD:	111.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.22		

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

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:07

## 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	288	97.01	103.75	94.34	21.50	109.98	18.22	349.00	95.71 to 98.54	47,704	45,003
2	21	92.28	98.87	77.65	34.15	127.33	48.98	293.77	65.92 to 101.87	108,966	84,612
3	11	95.28	98.02	97.74	9.01	100.29	73.47	132.54	91.89 to 105.60	127,032	124,156
ALL	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## 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	296	96.77	102.16	91.92	19.99	111.15	25.93	349.00	95.35 to 98.36	56,627	52,049
2	24	100.28	116.48	105.13	43.17	110.80	18.22	317.14	81.67 to 118.40	27,621	29,038
ALL	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	315	96.82	103.33	92.03	22.01	112.28	18.22	349.00	95.47 to 98.37	53,173	48,934
06	1	100.99	100.99	100.99			100.99	100.99	N/A	557,849	563,360
07	4	101.20	96.86	107.72	12.76	89.92	67.00	118.04	N/A	29,250	31,507
ALL	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## 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:	320	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	95.48 to 98.43
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,230,641	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	39.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.92 to 94.91
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,424,641	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.18	95% Mean C.I.:	98.89 to 107.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,103,646						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,452	COD:	21.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	349.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,323	PRD:	111.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.22		

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

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:07

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0015	19	96.76	99.84	95.77	16.43	104.25	68.65	143.50	87.06 to 103.95	65,471	62,702
21-0025	146	96.03	102.14	91.06	20.38	112.17	43.48	349.00	93.89 to 98.27	74,694	68,013
21-0044	26	93.94	93.30	86.12	29.81	108.34	18.22	214.00	78.96 to 100.00	24,299	20,926
21-0084	37	100.00	112.06	97.34	28.36	115.13	52.56	317.14	95.21 to 108.25	23,045	22,431
21-0089	35	99.53	110.93	102.85	16.85	107.86	81.33	212.63	96.49 to 110.71	28,268	29,075
21-0180	34	97.28	106.39	94.67	23.16	112.38	35.87	303.50	92.28 to 99.75	66,762	63,206
24-0011											
24-0020											
24-0101	1	116.22	116.22	116.22			116.22	116.22	N/A	19,000	22,082
58-0025											
82-0015	6	85.58	93.69	103.00	44.79	90.96	25.93	156.79	25.93 to 156.79	10,666	10,986
88-0005	16	94.46	92.28	78.84	12.13	117.05	53.00	118.40	87.38 to 103.37	28,033	22,102
88-0021											
NonValid School											
ALL	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## 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	38	99.22	113.69	102.38	46.94	111.04	18.22	317.14	81.67 to 113.28	20,453	20,940
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	11	95.48	120.02	95.03	35.74	126.30	62.19	349.00	85.12 to 155.68	63,131	59,993
1900 TO 1919	64	96.46	105.33	90.55	26.75	116.32	42.20	237.70	92.36 to 100.37	31,652	28,660
1920 TO 1939	76	98.91	104.75	93.27	20.28	112.30	44.45	239.31	95.85 to 103.05	39,126	36,494
1940 TO 1949	28	95.95	100.57	94.57	13.66	106.35	56.48	185.24	93.30 to 100.10	53,105	50,219
1950 TO 1959	33	94.95	99.44	96.27	10.17	103.29	70.52	212.63	92.19 to 98.54	66,039	63,572
1960 TO 1969	28	98.78	98.37	93.89	11.45	104.77	62.27	172.44	93.89 to 100.41	83,364	78,272
1970 TO 1979	19	94.48	90.32	84.99	9.87	106.28	62.67	106.02	82.58 to 100.40	107,413	91,286
1980 TO 1989	13	95.85	91.82	87.28	10.82	105.21	65.92	121.01	72.73 to 99.75	106,992	93,382
1990 TO 1994	5	94.12	87.36	87.47	12.69	99.87	48.98	101.50	N/A	171,780	150,256
1995 TO 1999	4	95.37	98.96	96.57	9.74	102.47	87.06	118.04	N/A	122,750	118,539
2000 TO Present	1	99.45	99.45	99.45			99.45	99.45	N/A	171,500	170,550
ALL	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 320 **MEDIAN: 97** COV: 38.46 95% Median C.I.: 95.48 to 98.43  
TOTAL Sales Price: 17,230,641 WGT. MEAN: 92 STD: 39.70 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 89.92 to 94.91  
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 17,424,641 MEAN: 103 AVG. ABS. DEV: 21.18 95% Mean C.I.: 98.89 to 107.59  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 16,103,646  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 54,452 COD: 21.85 MAX Sales Ratio: 349.00  
AVG. Assessed Value: 50,323 PRD: 111.71 MIN Sales Ratio: 18.22

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

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:07

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	26	113.89	140.75	138.99	46.13	101.27	40.40	317.14	94.40 to 174.00	1,940	2,697
5000 TO	9999	22	98.87	111.91	108.55	49.70	103.10	18.22	349.00	60.10 to 147.84	6,998	7,597
Total \$ _____												
1 TO	9999	48	104.41	127.54	116.07	49.51	109.88	18.22	349.00	93.06 to 136.38	4,259	4,943
10000 TO	29999	95	100.89	112.54	110.55	25.08	101.80	35.87	293.77	97.03 to 107.40	18,876	20,868
30000 TO	59999	72	96.70	94.80	94.61	12.03	100.20	42.20	130.17	94.23 to 99.25	43,170	40,845
60000 TO	99999	55	94.70	92.03	91.81	7.65	100.24	50.65	106.02	92.35 to 97.99	76,880	70,581
100000 TO	149999	28	93.92	88.07	87.81	9.72	100.30	44.45	100.08	87.38 to 96.16	124,562	109,374
150000 TO	249999	19	92.28	83.46	83.94	13.96	99.43	48.98	99.45	65.92 to 96.99	185,244	155,492
250000 TO	499999	2	91.18	91.18	91.59	9.34	99.56	82.66	99.70	N/A	262,500	240,411
500000 +		1	100.99	100.99	100.99			100.99	100.99	N/A	557,849	563,360
ALL _____												
		320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

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	28	93.73	108.48	75.34	49.28	144.00	18.22	317.14	79.43 to 113.28	2,770	2,086
5000 TO	9999	18	98.87	112.72	90.47	41.41	124.59	35.87	237.70	75.15 to 136.38	7,515	6,798
Total \$ _____												
1 TO	9999	46	96.07	110.14	84.96	46.09	129.64	18.22	317.14	81.23 to 109.36	4,626	3,930
10000 TO	29999	98	99.34	110.47	100.01	24.65	110.45	42.20	349.00	96.76 to 104.03	19,817	19,819
30000 TO	59999	77	97.83	104.32	95.85	19.88	108.84	50.65	293.77	94.80 to 100.68	44,875	43,010
60000 TO	99999	58	95.54	92.72	89.32	9.34	103.82	44.45	130.17	92.73 to 98.03	84,016	75,039
100000 TO	149999	26	94.92	89.66	88.17	8.16	101.68	62.67	100.08	88.37 to 96.78	135,475	119,451
150000 TO	249999	13	94.48	92.42	91.76	5.62	100.72	65.56	99.45	91.89 to 98.73	198,934	182,545
250000 TO	499999	1	99.70	99.70	99.70			99.70	99.70	N/A	275,000	274,177
500000 +		1	100.99	100.99	100.99			100.99	100.99	N/A	557,849	563,360
ALL _____												
		320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales: 320 **MEDIAN: 97** COV: 38.46 95% Median C.I.: 95.48 to 98.43  
 TOTAL Sales Price: 17,230,641 WGT. MEAN: 92 STD: 39.70 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 89.92 to 94.91  
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 17,424,641 MEAN: 103 AVG.ABS.DEV: 21.18 95% Mean C.I.: 98.89 to 107.59  
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 16,103,646  
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 54,452 COD: 21.85 MAX Sales Ratio: 349.00  
 AVG. Assessed Value: 50,323 PRD: 111.71 MIN Sales Ratio: 18.22

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

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:07

QUALITY										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	39	100.00	113.60	102.76	45.63	110.55	18.22	317.14	81.67 to 113.28	20,954	21,532
10	1	92.36	92.36	92.36			92.36	92.36	N/A	5,000	4,618
20	133	97.30	108.56	95.89	24.29	113.21	42.20	349.00	95.69 to 99.70	32,056	30,739
30	141	95.75	95.76	90.33	13.36	106.01	44.45	239.31	94.12 to 98.07	82,668	74,675
40	6	98.29	95.53	94.00	4.75	101.62	82.06	102.38	82.06 to 102.38	113,783	106,959
ALL											
	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	37	100.00	114.40	102.72	47.49	111.37	18.22	317.14	81.67 to 113.28	20,546	21,105
100	10	97.57	93.30	83.69	14.92	111.48	48.98	121.01	67.00 to 118.04	51,860	43,399
101	207	96.91	101.66	92.78	17.91	109.57	42.20	239.31	95.21 to 98.54	58,890	54,636
102	8	96.36	100.47	96.03	16.35	104.63	78.96	129.42	78.96 to 129.42	54,537	52,370
104	57	96.52	104.14	89.80	20.65	115.96	44.45	349.00	94.56 to 98.98	61,441	55,177
106	1	87.42	87.42	87.42			87.42	87.42	N/A	17,000	14,862
ALL											
	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	38	99.22	113.69	102.38	46.94	111.04	18.22	317.14	81.67 to 113.28	20,453	20,940
10	4	142.04	145.89	158.22	43.93	92.21	67.00	232.50	N/A	4,355	6,890
20	6	92.67	101.30	100.76	16.64	100.53	80.16	155.68	80.16 to 155.68	13,783	13,888
30	198	97.70	103.48	91.75	19.73	112.78	42.20	349.00	95.58 to 98.72	48,594	44,585
35	1	90.84	90.84	90.84			90.84	90.84	N/A	15,000	13,626
40	60	95.97	95.37	91.99	12.13	103.67	50.65	144.16	93.30 to 99.41	87,968	80,920
50	13	95.24	94.07	91.90	9.28	102.36	62.27	118.04	91.35 to 98.89	125,569	115,398
ALL											
	320	96.91	103.24	92.42	21.85	111.71	18.22	349.00	95.48 to 98.43	54,452	50,323



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 97% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio and somewhat by the trended statistics produced by the Division using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. The sample is representative of the population. Low dollar sales are effecting the qualitative measures and the effects are mitigated after their hypothetical removal from the analysis and the measures improve considerably even though still just out of range. It is believed that the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the verification and review process conducted by the office. No funds are allowed to have the contracted appraiser (Stanard Appraisal Service) assist with the residential properties. The assessor tries to stay on task with purposed goals in the three-year plan of assessment and six-year review and physical inspection. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the residential class of property in Custer County.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>493</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>64.91</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>72.44</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>72.13</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>80.26</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>80.30</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The table indicates that residential transactions are declining, as is the percent of usable sales. The greatest percent of non-usable sales occurs with family transactions (approximately 24%), transactions involving foreclosures, sheriff sales, or other legal actions account for approximately 19%, and then substantially changed parcels that are no longer representative of the property at time of sale (approximately 13%), the remainder of those disqualified are a mixture of such things as; gifts, corrective deeds, combination sales, splits, use changes, centrally assessed (Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad), estates, partial interests, and land exchanges. The assessor states the review process in Custer County is done by mailing a survey document to the new owner and in some instances sending the lister out to determine if the data on the property record card is accurate. Occasionally phone calls will be made to other parties involved in the sale, such as the seller, the title company, or to the attorney.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer 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>96</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>94.93</b>	<b>6.23</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>97.78</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>8.18</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>10.35</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>97</b>

RESIDENTIAL: There is less than a one point (.32) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, this comparison indicates the two measures are very similar and strongly support one another and an acceptable level of value has been attained.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer 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)
3.49	2009	1.37
17.89	2008	6.52
6.51	2007	3.39
9.98	2006	8.18
15.31	2005	10.35

RESIDENTIAL: There is a 2.12 point difference between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File and the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) and appears to be more pronounced in the sales file. The percent change in the sales file is a reflection of the assessment actions and routine maintenance, there would be a lesser effect to the population as whole.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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 Custer 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>92</b>	<b>103</b>

RESIDENTIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency only the mean is outside of the acceptable range. The mean is heavily affected by the low dollar sales that are scattered among the twelve assessor locations throughout the county. Excluding Broken Bow and the rural residential the remaining ten towns have a population ranging from approximately 110 to 649. If all sales under \$7000 (35 in number) were hypothetically removed from the analysis the median would be 96.51, the weighted mean 91.89 (both virtually no change when rounded), and the mean would move to 98.98. Therefore, all three measures would be supportive of one another and supported by the trended preliminary ratio. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used as the best indicator in determining the level of value for the residential class of property and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>21.85</b>	<b>111.71</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>6.85</b>	<b>8.71</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are above the acceptable ranges and would typically indicate issues with uniformity. The preliminary coefficient of dispersion was 26.48 and the price related differential was 114.81. The qualitative measures are more an indication of the disparity within the twelve assessor locations in the county and the disproportionate measurements between low dollar sales. Hypothetically removing the low dollar sales under \$7,000 would move the COD to 16.83 and the PRD to 107.72, however still above the range. It is believed the residential properties are being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner as possible.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>320</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>26.48</b>	<b>21.85</b>	<b>-4.63</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>114.81</b>	<b>111.71</b>	<b>-3.10</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>18.22</b>	<b>18.22</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>376.47</b>	<b>349.00</b>	<b>-27.47</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for 2009 in that after analyses of the residential market the following actions were taken: Arnold and Anselmo were reviewed and re-priced with 2007 costing; rural residential properties and the older homes and mobile homes in Sargent were revalued with 2007 costing.

Land values in Mason City and Arnold were changed, and good quality homes in Callaway were adjusted.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>320</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>-7</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>21.85</b>	<b>43.61</b>	<b>-21.76</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>111.71</b>	<b>128.55</b>	<b>-16.84</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>18.22</b>	<b>20.51</b>	<b>-2.29</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>349.00</b>	<b>563.76</b>	<b>-214.76</b>

The table is a direct comparison of the statistics in the Reports and Opinions, created using the 2009 assessed values, and the statistics produced using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. In Custer County the trending percent is within reason and has a direct relationship to the assessed value ratio suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. The qualitative measures are significantly different and suggest a lack of assessment uniformity and vertical inequities within the residential class.



**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>85</b>	COV:	51.54	95% Median C.I.:	68.10 to 94.10	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	45.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.24 to 92.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.34	95% Mean C.I.:	78.11 to 99.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,990,089							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	38.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,320	PRD:	119.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:38

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	4	95.41	89.10	87.26	9.77	102.11	66.53	99.06	N/A		84,277	73,542
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	102.47	102.47	98.43	4.62	104.10	97.73	107.20	N/A		13,500	13,288
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	78.54	77.58	64.97	16.37	119.41	54.03	96.28	54.03 to 96.28		622,750	404,584
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	89.97	81.41	83.47	11.72	97.54	61.31	92.95	N/A		20,333	16,971
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	8	100.39	111.98	110.67	31.50	101.19	54.36	216.09	54.36 to 216.09		35,465	39,247
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	85.60	107.55	85.29	40.30	126.10	67.70	182.67	N/A		39,460	33,654
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	87.03	93.12	71.13	42.65	130.92	34.75	149.83	34.75 to 149.83		38,666	27,504
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	40.45	79.02	50.29	114.92	157.12	27.62	147.90	N/A		22,580	11,356
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	66.79	79.51	74.28	32.56	107.03	49.88	134.56	N/A		40,375	29,991
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	86.69	97.59	107.86	47.75	90.48	22.86	232.84	22.86 to 232.84		81,016	87,385
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	69.42	84.12	75.81	57.35	110.97	31.48	243.98	31.48 to 98.69		44,415	33,671
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	74.93	68.54	78.92	25.93	86.85	31.48	93.39	31.48 to 93.39		73,285	57,835
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	92.95	84.73	67.26	13.97	125.98	54.03	107.20	66.53 to 97.73		277,440	186,611
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	24	95.44	99.48	85.25	41.38	116.70	27.62	216.09	67.70 to 129.65		34,413	29,336
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	30	72.18	82.57	85.55	47.35	96.51	22.86	243.98	54.02 to 90.03		57,933	49,561
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	91.46	97.42	69.20	28.88	140.79	54.03	216.09	72.13 to 104.11		194,478	134,576
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	68.10	88.45	87.26	59.37	101.36	22.86	232.84	49.88 to 134.56		47,261	41,242
____ALL____												
	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10		97,471	72,320

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
ANSELMO	1	61.31	61.31	61.31			61.31	61.31	N/A		18,000	11,036
ANSLEY	6	76.17	84.60	60.93	49.76	138.85	27.62	147.90	27.62 to 147.90		21,166	12,897
ARNOLD	4	80.55	82.29	84.13	39.34	97.81	33.50	134.56	N/A		26,625	22,398
BROKEN BOW	37	83.36	81.51	69.05	31.14	118.04	31.48	232.84	67.95 to 93.03		141,952	98,019
CALLAWAY	2	37.85	37.85	36.18	39.60	104.61	22.86	52.84	N/A		9,000	3,256
COMSTOCK	1	182.67	182.67	182.67			182.67	182.67	N/A		300	548
MASON CITY	7	96.66	119.37	116.33	42.79	102.62	54.36	216.09	54.36 to 216.09		14,785	17,199
MERNA	3	99.06	109.52	104.38	23.61	104.92	79.66	149.83	N/A		29,000	30,271
OCONTO	1	86.20	86.20	86.20			86.20	86.20	N/A		4,000	3,448
RURAL RES	1	54.02	54.02	54.02			54.02	54.02	N/A		25,000	13,504
SARGENT	6	97.49	109.79	96.56	41.20	113.71	49.88	243.98	49.88 to 243.98		164,000	158,351
____ALL____												
	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10		97,471	72,320

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>85</b>	COV:	51.54	95% Median C.I.:	68.10 to 94.10	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	45.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.24 to 92.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.34	95% Mean C.I.:	78.11 to 99.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,990,089							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	38.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,320	PRD:	119.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:38

## 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	65	84.99	89.49	74.16	39.03	120.67	22.86	243.98	69.42 to 94.10	100,977	74,883
2	4	78.87	79.74	75.73	23.94	105.30	54.02	107.20	N/A	40,500	30,669
____ALL____											
	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## 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	58	88.09	95.01	75.02	33.85	126.65	27.62	243.98	76.22 to 95.06	113,019	84,790
2	11	33.50	56.80	42.40	79.70	133.97	22.86	147.90	31.48 to 107.20	15,490	6,567
____ALL____											
	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0015	3	79.66	96.93	94.90	37.04	102.15	61.31	149.83	N/A	17,333	16,448
21-0025	38	83.56	81.97	69.35	30.74	118.20	31.48	232.84	67.95 to 94.10	139,611	96,822
21-0044	10	76.17	91.41	60.43	54.77	151.26	27.62	163.20	50.11 to 147.90	17,150	10,364
21-0084	6	97.49	109.79	96.56	41.20	113.71	49.88	243.98	49.88 to 243.98	164,000	158,351
21-0089	4	80.55	82.29	84.13	39.34	97.81	33.50	134.56	N/A	26,625	22,398
21-0180	3	52.84	53.97	45.28	39.96	119.19	22.86	86.20	N/A	7,333	3,320
24-0011											
24-0020											
24-0101											
58-0025											
82-0015	4	94.81	120.78	128.15	37.55	94.25	77.41	216.09	N/A	21,000	26,910
88-0005	1	182.67	182.67	182.67			182.67	182.67	N/A	300	548
88-0021											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>85</b>	COV:	51.54	95% Median C.I.:	68.10 to 94.10	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	45.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.24 to 92.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.34	95% Mean C.I.:	78.11 to 99.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,990,089							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	38.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,320	PRD:	119.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:38

## 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	36	78.54	82.96	68.47	42.82	121.15	22.86	216.09	54.36 to 97.73	137,278	93,999
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	94.22	94.22	94.22			94.22	94.22	N/A	31,290	29,483
1900 TO 1919	4	85.90	91.42	91.77	17.05	99.61	67.95	125.92	N/A	47,500	43,592
1920 TO 1939	10	94.81	111.36	95.07	39.54	117.13	62.15	243.98	62.37 to 145.65	33,350	31,705
1940 TO 1949	6	67.42	63.64	70.65	24.95	90.07	27.62	93.03	27.62 to 93.03	51,571	36,435
1950 TO 1959	5	83.36	71.20	82.62	20.99	86.18	42.70	95.06	N/A	112,000	92,530
1960 TO 1969	1	105.95	105.95	105.95			105.95	105.95	N/A	26,000	27,546
1970 TO 1979	3	182.67	168.51	166.23	26.06	101.38	90.03	232.84	N/A	50,100	83,280
1980 TO 1989	2	79.28	79.28	69.95	17.81	113.34	65.16	93.39	N/A	59,000	41,268
1990 TO 1994	1	67.70	67.70	67.70			67.70	67.70	N/A	65,000	44,008
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## 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	9	134.95	132.17	129.05	34.65	102.42	33.50	243.98	86.20 to 182.67	2,088	2,695
5000 TO 9999	5	62.37	64.89	67.16	18.17	96.62	49.88	96.66	N/A	7,200	4,835
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	14	93.32	108.15	88.40	48.92	122.34	33.50	243.98	52.84 to 163.20	3,914	3,460
10000 TO 29999	22	67.14	78.99	78.20	53.84	101.01	22.86	216.09	40.45 to 97.73	21,250	16,616
30000 TO 59999	15	94.22	89.02	87.71	22.59	101.50	34.75	129.65	68.10 to 104.11	45,526	39,929
60000 TO 99999	10	71.96	87.60	88.23	40.40	99.29	27.62	232.84	65.16 to 98.69	75,643	66,741
100000 TO 149999	2	88.40	88.40	88.66	5.24	99.70	83.76	93.03	N/A	121,950	108,123
150000 TO 249999	3	92.07	87.35	86.17	7.29	101.38	74.93	95.06	N/A	190,000	163,719
250000 TO 499999	1	83.36	83.36	83.36			83.36	83.36	N/A	300,000	250,077
500000 +	2	75.16	75.16	64.45	28.11	116.62	54.03	96.28	N/A	1,825,000	1,176,123
ALL	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>85</b>	COV:	51.54	95% Median C.I.:	68.10 to 94.10	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	45.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.24 to 92.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.34	95% Mean C.I.:	78.11 to 99.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,990,089							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	38.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,320	PRD:	119.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:39

## 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	12	88.09	94.46	62.22	49.03	151.82	22.86	182.67	49.88 to 147.90	3,650	2,271
5000 TO 9999	9	54.36	73.45	48.61	72.53	151.11	31.48	243.98	31.48 to 96.66	16,444	7,993
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	21	62.71	85.46	51.72	70.50	165.24	22.86	243.98	33.50 to 107.20	9,133	4,723
10000 TO 29999	20	75.90	79.74	70.32	37.25	113.40	27.62	149.83	54.02 to 94.22	28,789	20,243
30000 TO 59999	13	95.37	100.68	91.91	27.14	109.55	65.63	216.09	67.95 to 128.29	50,464	46,380
60000 TO 99999	7	85.60	87.96	84.37	16.55	104.26	65.16	125.92	65.16 to 125.92	81,842	69,047
100000 TO 149999	1	93.03	93.03	93.03			93.03	93.03	N/A	129,000	120,004
150000 TO 249999	4	93.57	123.73	104.22	42.99	118.72	74.93	232.84	N/A	162,500	169,356
250000 TO 499999	1	83.36	83.36	83.36			83.36	83.36	N/A	300,000	250,077
500000 +	2	75.16	75.16	64.45	28.11	116.62	54.03	96.28	N/A	1,825,000	1,176,123
ALL	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	46.65	66.29	61.86	73.90	107.17	22.86	163.20	31.48 to 107.20	35,278	21,821
10	8	132.30	135.29	124.67	38.49	108.52	50.11	243.98	50.11 to 243.98	19,437	24,233
15	3	90.03	135.41	110.97	55.34	122.02	83.36	232.84	N/A	150,000	166,456
20	44	85.29	84.52	70.94	25.39	119.14	27.62	182.67	68.10 to 94.22	127,866	90,712
ALL	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>85</b>	COV:	51.54	95% Median C.I.:	68.10 to 94.10	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	45.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.24 to 92.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	89	AVG.ABS.DEV:	32.34	95% Mean C.I.:	78.11 to 99.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,990,089							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	38.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,320	PRD:	119.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:32:39

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	40.45	66.38	61.04	87.08	108.75	22.86	163.20	31.48 to 107.20	30,453	18,588
300	3	66.53	67.04	66.46	2.13	100.86	65.16	69.42	N/A	78,333	52,062
309	1	96.66	96.66	96.66			96.66	96.66	N/A	9,000	8,699
326	2	143.39	143.39	104.58	27.39	137.11	104.11	182.67	N/A	25,150	26,301
330	2	75.16	75.16	64.45	28.11	116.62	54.03	96.28	N/A	1,825,000	1,176,123
341	1	95.06	95.06	95.06			95.06	95.06	N/A	165,000	156,850
344	6	68.03	79.15	83.43	41.59	94.87	34.75	128.29	34.75 to 128.29	40,166	33,511
350	4	110.38	125.93	182.98	52.34	68.82	50.11	232.84	N/A	30,875	56,494
351	3	105.95	144.56	92.16	50.41	156.85	83.76	243.98	N/A	48,300	44,515
352	3	85.60	105.41	93.72	23.62	112.48	84.99	145.65	N/A	42,533	39,860
353	11	83.36	76.48	82.32	20.24	92.91	42.70	99.06	54.36 to 94.22	82,844	68,193
406	6	81.05	85.85	82.58	24.81	103.95	62.37	134.95	62.37 to 134.95	14,000	11,561
426	1	97.73	97.73	97.73			97.73	97.73	N/A	25,000	24,433
442	3	149.83	165.19	163.67	19.23	100.93	129.65	216.09	N/A	24,333	39,827
451	1	95.37	95.37	95.37			95.37	95.37	N/A	50,500	48,164
470	5	79.66	77.84	81.26	16.59	95.79	54.02	97.78	N/A	47,422	38,534
499	1	76.22	76.22	76.22			76.22	76.22	N/A	62,430	47,585
528	3	77.41	67.91	64.18	30.60	105.81	27.62	98.69	N/A	46,666	29,948
ALL	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	3	84.99	100.02	89.58	29.90	111.66	69.42	145.65	N/A	31,200	27,948
03	66	84.68	88.42	73.98	38.56	119.51	22.86	243.98	67.95 to 94.10	100,483	74,337
04											
ALL	69	84.99	88.92	74.20	38.05	119.84	22.86	243.98	68.10 to 94.10	97,471	72,320



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

### **Commercial**

After an analysis of the commercial sales by the assessor and contracted appraisal company the determination was made to adjusted the highway land values along the downtown square in Broken Bow. The values for the apartments known as Callie Court in Broken Bow were also updated.

When the residential lot values were changed in Mason City the few commercial lots there were changed as well, and the commercial lots in Arnold were also reviewed.

There was nothing significant planned within the three-year plan of assessment or the six-year physical inspection and review agenda for the commercial class.

Funding is still allowed for the continued assistance of Stanard Appraisal Service in the maintenance of the commercial class of property.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Custer County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Service
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Service will assist the assessor in establishing value.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Service with the possible assistance of one of the part-time listers.
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June of 2004.
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	In 2006 Stanard Appraisal Service established new depreciation tables. The new tables were not entered into the CAMA system. The assessor manually overrode the CAMA generated depreciation as the parcels were reviewed.
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 income approach will be utilized on some properties where rents and income and expense data can be obtained from the market. However, there is not enough data available for the income approach to be utilized for all properties.
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Along with the income approach the cost approach will be utilized and depreciation set from the sales. A true sales comparison approach is not used even though the TerraScan CAMA System has the capability. The procedures to set the parameters to use this function are not known. The appraisal service has also done spreadsheet analyses.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	There are eleven towns or villages, the suburban area which is designated as a three mile area outside the city limits of Broken Bow and a one mile area outside the limits of each of the other towns or villages, and the rural area out in the remainder of the county.

9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	These areas are defined by the political boundaries of each town or village, the suburban area is that area outside of the city limits where a city may be granted legal zoning jurisdiction for a specific area based on the class of the city, and the rural area is anything past these described boundaries, including unincorporated villages. Each town is uniquely different in its distance from Broken Bow and its proximity to major highways.
10.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Not always will there be enough sales of a particular occupancy code to determine if there are common value characteristics; especially in some of the smaller less populated towns and villages.
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	No - Suburban properties seem to experience similar market influences as those properties located within the town or village they are associated with. Therefore under the substrata “Assessor Location” the suburban sales have been included with the adjoining town or village.

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.83	95% Median C.I.:	92.95 to 97.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	39.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 101.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.55	95% Mean C.I.:	90.23 to 108.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,346,749							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	25.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	77,489	PRD:	125.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.90			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:18

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	4	98.42	97.43	96.75	2.05	100.70	93.03	99.83	N/A		84,277	81,534
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	102.47	102.47	98.43	4.62	104.10	97.73	107.20	N/A		13,500	13,288
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	81.09	78.43	64.98	15.98	120.69	54.03	96.28	54.03 to 96.28		622,750	404,669
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	89.97	81.41	83.47	11.72	97.54	61.31	92.95	N/A		20,333	16,971
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	8	102.75	112.84	110.97	30.19	101.68	55.46	217.08	55.46 to 217.08		35,465	39,355
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	85.60	107.55	85.29	40.30	126.10	67.70	182.67	N/A		39,460	33,654
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	101.12	108.27	95.36	21.73	113.54	68.10	149.83	68.10 to 149.83		38,666	36,870
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	96.92	93.76	90.27	44.41	103.87	37.90	147.90	N/A		22,580	20,383
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	82.11	89.29	89.72	31.81	99.52	58.40	134.56	N/A		40,375	36,224
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	92.07	110.35	109.44	34.50	100.84	62.37	232.84	62.37 to 232.84		81,016	88,660
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	96.10	108.16	94.04	25.93	115.01	54.02	243.98	86.20 to 118.89		44,415	41,769
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	95.42	82.54	95.32	15.94	86.60	50.11	99.72	50.11 to 99.72		73,285	69,855
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	93.03	87.29	68.04	12.19	128.30	54.03	107.20	79.66 to 97.78		277,440	188,776
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	24	99.15	106.62	97.62	33.11	109.22	37.90	217.08	76.22 to 129.65		34,413	33,594
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	30	95.37	100.10	98.32	25.47	101.81	50.11	243.98	86.20 to 96.26		57,933	56,961
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	91.46	97.96	69.23	28.86	141.50	54.03	217.08	72.13 to 104.11		194,478	134,638
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	96.26	101.80	100.76	32.01	101.03	37.90	232.84	68.10 to 134.56		47,261	47,619
____ALL____												
	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73		97,471	77,489

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
ANSELMO	1	61.31	61.31	61.31			61.31	61.31	N/A		18,000	11,036
ANSLEY	6	93.44	96.15	96.40	30.68	99.74	50.11	147.90	50.11 to 147.90		21,166	20,405
ARNOLD	4	81.56	83.90	84.59	38.13	99.18	37.90	134.56	N/A		26,625	22,522
BROKEN BOW	37	95.37	96.73	74.80	16.46	129.33	40.45	232.84	93.03 to 96.29		141,952	106,173
CALLAWAY	2	76.12	76.12	78.71	30.58	96.71	52.84	99.40	N/A		9,000	7,083
COMSTOCK	1	182.67	182.67	182.67			182.67	182.67	N/A		300	548
MASON CITY	7	101.38	121.08	117.65	40.06	102.91	55.46	217.08	55.46 to 217.08		14,785	17,395
MERNA	3	99.06	109.52	104.38	23.61	104.92	79.66	149.83	N/A		29,000	30,271
OCONTO	1	86.20	86.20	86.20			86.20	86.20	N/A		4,000	3,448
RURAL RES	1	54.02	54.02	54.02			54.02	54.02	N/A		25,000	13,504
SARGENT	6	97.49	111.21	96.60	39.75	115.13	58.40	243.98	58.40 to 243.98		164,000	158,422
____ALL____												
	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73		97,471	77,489

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.83	95% Median C.I.:	92.95 to 97.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	39.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 101.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.55	95% Mean C.I.:	90.23 to 108.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,346,749							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	25.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	77,489	PRD:	125.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.90			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:18

## 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	65	96.10	100.81	79.59	25.73	126.65	37.90	243.98	93.03 to 97.73	100,977	80,370
2	4	78.87	79.74	75.73	23.94	105.30	54.02	107.20	N/A	40,500	30,669
____ALL____	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## 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	58	95.35	101.85	79.36	26.52	128.34	50.11	243.98	90.03 to 97.78	113,019	89,692
2	11	96.10	87.65	84.86	21.31	103.29	37.90	147.90	40.45 to 107.20	15,490	13,145
____ALL____	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0015	3	79.66	96.93	94.90	37.04	102.15	61.31	149.83	N/A	17,333	16,448
21-0025	38	95.74	96.79	75.04	16.07	128.99	40.45	232.84	93.03 to 97.73	139,611	104,760
21-0044	10	93.44	98.46	86.81	38.60	113.42	50.11	163.20	54.02 to 147.90	17,150	14,887
21-0084	6	97.49	111.21	96.60	39.75	115.13	58.40	243.98	58.40 to 243.98	164,000	158,422
21-0089	4	81.56	83.90	84.59	38.13	99.18	37.90	134.56	N/A	26,625	22,522
21-0180	3	86.20	79.48	80.07	18.00	99.27	52.84	99.40	N/A	7,333	5,871
24-0011											
24-0020											
24-0101											
58-0025											
82-0015	4	97.16	123.48	129.55	36.79	95.31	82.51	217.08	N/A	21,000	27,206
88-0005	1	182.67	182.67	182.67			182.67	182.67	N/A	300	548
88-0021											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.83	95% Median C.I.:	92.95 to 97.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	39.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 101.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.55	95% Mean C.I.:	90.23 to 108.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,346,749							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	25.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	77,489	PRD:	125.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.90			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:19

## 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	36	96.18	96.89	72.99	23.00	132.75	37.90	217.08	94.10 to 99.06	137,278	100,195
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	94.22	94.22	94.22			94.22	94.22	N/A	31,290	29,483
1900 TO 1919	4	85.90	91.42	91.77	17.05	99.61	67.95	125.92	N/A	47,500	43,592
1920 TO 1939	10	110.14	118.66	103.94	31.45	114.16	62.37	243.98	68.10 to 145.65	33,350	34,664
1940 TO 1949	6	74.18	75.19	85.21	18.25	88.24	50.11	96.92	50.11 to 96.92	51,571	43,943
1950 TO 1959	5	84.99	82.95	87.63	10.88	94.66	58.40	95.06	N/A	112,000	98,143
1960 TO 1969	1	105.95	105.95	105.95			105.95	105.95	N/A	26,000	27,546
1970 TO 1979	3	182.67	168.51	166.23	26.06	101.38	90.03	232.84	N/A	50,100	83,280
1980 TO 1989	2	95.86	95.86	96.15	0.45	99.70	95.42	96.29	N/A	59,000	56,726
1990 TO 1994	1	67.70	67.70	67.70			67.70	67.70	N/A	65,000	44,008
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## 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	9	134.95	132.66	129.52	34.29	102.43	37.90	243.98	86.20 to 182.67	2,088	2,705
5000 TO 9999	5	62.37	67.54	69.53	16.95	97.14	52.84	101.38	N/A	7,200	5,006
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	14	95.68	109.41	90.11	47.10	121.41	37.90	243.98	58.40 to 163.20	3,914	3,527
10000 TO 29999	22	96.10	97.21	97.34	27.25	99.87	40.45	217.08	72.13 to 105.95	21,250	20,685
30000 TO 59999	15	94.49	96.35	95.51	14.79	100.88	67.95	129.65	84.99 to 104.11	45,526	43,484
60000 TO 99999	10	96.28	104.04	105.69	21.68	98.44	67.70	232.84	76.22 to 99.83	75,643	79,944
100000 TO 149999	2	94.18	94.18	94.11	1.22	100.07	93.03	95.32	N/A	121,950	114,763
150000 TO 249999	3	98.62	97.80	98.02	1.58	99.77	95.06	99.72	N/A	190,000	186,244
250000 TO 499999	1	83.36	83.36	83.36			83.36	83.36	N/A	300,000	250,077
500000 +	2	75.16	75.16	64.45	28.11	116.62	54.03	96.28	N/A	1,825,000	1,176,123
ALL	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.83	95% Median C.I.:	92.95 to 97.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	39.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 101.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.55	95% Mean C.I.:	90.23 to 108.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,346,749							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	25.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	77,489	PRD:	125.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.90			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:19

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	11	89.97	102.15	75.38	44.28	135.50	37.90	182.67	52.84 to 163.20	3,072	2,316
5000 TO 9999	6	90.96	107.57	88.83	44.73	121.10	55.46	243.98	55.46 to 243.98	9,666	8,586
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	17	89.97	104.06	83.88	44.61	124.06	37.90	243.98	58.40 to 147.90	5,400	4,529
10000 TO 29999	20	94.82	90.70	88.20	21.78	102.83	40.45	149.83	72.13 to 96.10	24,239	21,379
30000 TO 59999	15	95.37	103.37	96.25	23.38	107.40	67.70	217.08	76.22 to 118.89	46,802	45,048
60000 TO 99999	8	96.61	98.69	97.77	6.88	100.94	85.60	125.92	85.60 to 125.92	75,375	73,697
100000 TO 149999	2	94.18	94.18	94.11	1.22	100.07	93.03	95.32	N/A	121,950	114,763
150000 TO 249999	4	99.17	131.56	114.62	35.01	114.78	95.06	232.84	N/A	162,500	186,250
250000 TO 499999	1	83.36	83.36	83.36			83.36	83.36	N/A	300,000	250,077
500000 +	2	75.16	75.16	64.45	28.11	116.62	54.03	96.28	N/A	1,825,000	1,176,123
ALL	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	96.10	94.53	93.98	22.02	100.59	37.90	163.20	52.84 to 107.20	35,278	33,153
10	8	132.30	135.42	124.83	38.58	108.48	50.11	243.98	50.11 to 243.98	19,437	24,264
15	3	90.03	135.41	110.97	55.34	122.02	83.36	232.84	N/A	150,000	166,456
20	44	94.35	92.24	74.46	18.29	123.88	54.02	182.67	84.99 to 97.73	127,866	95,207
ALL	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	39.83	95% Median C.I.:	92.95 to 97.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,725,530	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	39.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 101.04	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,725,530	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.55	95% Mean C.I.:	90.23 to 108.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,346,749							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	97,471	COD:	25.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	243.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	77,489	PRD:	125.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.90			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:19

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	96.10	94.39	93.40	23.70	101.06	37.90	163.20	52.84 to 107.20	30,453	28,444
300	3	96.29	88.51	93.05	10.53	95.13	69.42	99.83	N/A	78,333	72,888
309	1	101.38	101.38	101.38			101.38	101.38	N/A	9,000	9,124
326	2	143.39	143.39	104.58	27.39	137.11	104.11	182.67	N/A	25,150	26,301
330	2	75.16	75.16	64.45	28.11	116.62	54.03	96.28	N/A	1,825,000	1,176,123
341	1	95.06	95.06	95.06			95.06	95.06	N/A	165,000	156,850
344	6	81.29	90.52	94.27	31.62	96.03	58.40	128.29	58.40 to 128.29	40,166	37,864
350	4	110.38	125.93	182.98	52.34	68.82	50.11	232.84	N/A	30,875	56,494
351	3	105.95	148.42	101.33	46.77	146.47	95.32	243.98	N/A	48,300	48,942
352	3	85.60	105.41	93.72	23.62	112.48	84.99	145.65	N/A	42,533	39,860
353	11	94.22	89.87	91.14	11.78	98.61	55.46	118.89	61.31 to 99.06	82,844	75,505
406	6	81.05	85.85	82.58	24.81	103.95	62.37	134.95	62.37 to 134.95	14,000	11,561
426	1	97.73	97.73	97.73			97.73	97.73	N/A	25,000	24,433
442	3	149.83	165.52	164.01	19.45	100.92	129.65	217.08	N/A	24,333	39,910
451	1	95.37	95.37	95.37			95.37	95.37	N/A	50,500	48,164
470	5	79.66	77.84	81.26	16.59	95.79	54.02	97.78	N/A	47,422	38,534
499	1	76.22	76.22	76.22			76.22	76.22	N/A	62,430	47,585
528	3	96.92	92.71	96.72	5.56	95.85	82.51	98.69	N/A	46,666	45,134
ALL	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	3	84.99	100.02	89.58	29.90	111.66	69.42	145.65	N/A	31,200	27,948
03	66	95.76	99.57	79.36	25.43	125.47	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	100,483	79,740
04											
ALL	69	95.42	99.59	79.50	25.73	125.27	37.90	243.98	92.95 to 97.73	97,471	77,489





**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the commercial class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 95% and is reflective of the assessment actions. A high dollar sale is affecting the qualitative measures, when it is hypothetically removed from the "mix" the qualitative measures are improved. It is believed the dispersion among the assessor locations and the diversity of the commercial properties are having an effect on these measures. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the verification and review process conducted by the office and with the assistance of the contracted appraiser (Stanard Appraisal Service). The assessor tries to stay on task with purposed goals in the three-year plan of assessment and six-year review and physical inspection. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>115</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>60.00</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>65.09</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>58.49</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>67.05</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>53.49</b>

COMMERCIAL: The above table indicates that over the previous four years there has been a continuous up and down movement in the percent of usable commercial sales, and the trend continues for 2009. Of those deemed to be non-qualified the highest percentage goes to sales that have been substantially changed and no longer represent what was sold (approximately 35%), next are sales involving foreclosures, sheriff sales, or other legal actions (approximately 15%), the remainder of those disqualified are a mixture of such things as; corrective deeds, splits, use changes, government entity (Custer County), partial interests, family, and land exchanges. The assessor states the review process in Custer County is done by mailing a survey document to the new owner and many times sending the lister out to determine if the data on the property record card is accurate. Occasionally phone calls will be made to other parties involved in the sale, such as the seller, the title company, the attorney, and maybe an accountant to determine allocation of personal property. Stanard Appraisal Service also assistances in the verification and maintenance of the commercial properties.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer 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>85</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.72</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97.03</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>18.14</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>6.18</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>86</b>

COMMERCIAL: There is an approximate eight point (7.9) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, the statistics are dissimilar and do not support each other. However, the R&O Ratio is reflective of the assessment actions to the base and there is no other information available to suggest that the R&O Ratio is not the best indicator of the level of value for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
13.95	2009	2.46
5.71	2008	1.30
0.64	2007	0.63
24.10	2006	18.14
20.00	2005	6.18

COMMERCIAL: An examination of the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File compared to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) reveals an 11.49 point difference and appears more pronounced in the sales file. The assessment actions and their effect need to be taken into account. The calculation for the percent change in the sales file is based on 30 sales within the last year of the study period, 07/01/07 to 06/30/08, in which approximately ninety-percent of the value of these thirty sales is attributable to Broken Bow, and the remaining value is attributable to seven other assessor locations. In the assessment actions it has been noted that after a review of the sales by the assessor and contracted appraisal company land values were adjusted on the highway along the downtown square in Broken Bow, and values for the apartments known as Callie Court in Broken Bow were also updated. Lots values in Mason City and Arnold were also addressed. The percent change in the base would best reflect the assessment actions to the county as a whole.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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 Custer 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>80</b>	<b>100</b>

COMMERCIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency the median and arithmetic mean are within the prescribed parameter. The weighted mean is being effected by a high dollar sale in the amount of \$2,750,000 (a care home for the elderly) book 216 page 996 sale date 03/14/06. When this sale is hypothetically removed the effects are mitigated and the weighted mean is improved 97.14, the median and mean are 95.76 and 100.30 respectively. All three measures are similar and supportive of each other. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>25.73</b>	<b>125.27</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>5.73</b>	<b>22.27</b>

COMMERCIAL:Both of the qualitative measures, the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential, are above the prescribed standards. However, when the outlier, a high dollar sale in the amount of \$2,750,000 (a care home for the elderly) book 216 page 995 sale date 03/14/06, is hypothetically removed from the "mix" the coefficient of dispersion is slightly improved (25.43) but still above the standard. The PRD is greatly improved (103.25) and when rounded meets the acceptable requirement. It is believed the dispersion among the assessor locations and the diversity of the commercial properties are having an affect on these measurements.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>69</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>38.05</b>	<b>25.73</b>	<b>-12.32</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>119.84</b>	<b>125.27</b>	<b>5.43</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>22.86</b>	<b>37.90</b>	<b>15.04</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>243.98</b>	<b>243.98</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The table is a reflection of the assessment action taken within the commercial class of property. After a review of the sales by the assessor and contracted appraisal company land values were adjusted on the highway along the downtown square in Broken Bow, and the values for the apartments known as Callie Court in Broken Bow were also updated.

When the residential lot values were changed in Mason City the few commercial lots there were changed as well, and the commercial lots in Arnold were also reviewed.

**Agricultural or  
Special Valuation Reports**

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	129	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>64</b>	COV:	45.88	95% Median C.I.:	59.39 to 68.76	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,474,407	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.98 to 64.10	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,167,407	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.26	95% Mean C.I.:	59.71 to 69.98	(! : ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	18,262,787							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,855	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,571	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:10

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____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	63.17	62.27	61.37	13.22	101.47	49.24	72.92	49.24 to 72.92		75,709	46,460
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	75.38	70.19	74.26	18.53	94.52	39.64	90.80	39.64 to 90.80		182,364	135,420
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	11	63.53	62.14	57.05	17.05	108.91	33.70	87.35	46.06 to 74.57		175,847	100,327
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	13	77.56	75.32	74.80	8.23	100.70	53.45	92.32	70.58 to 79.88		215,529	161,205
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	56.89	57.46	56.51	18.20	101.67	33.77	70.92	N/A		134,989	76,285
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	72.98	71.83	75.38	14.71	95.29	42.32	91.33	42.32 to 91.33		306,186	230,817
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	68.76	69.37	67.77	9.97	102.36	49.57	82.00	62.81 to 81.41		246,367	166,963
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	14	54.73	57.39	54.62	24.65	105.07	23.21	115.54	39.30 to 69.18		210,130	114,771
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	70.31	76.18	56.21	32.78	135.52	39.02	126.08	N/A		121,886	68,510
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	50.11	52.85	51.55	33.05	102.53	0.00	77.82	36.28 to 74.44		288,408	148,673
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	23	59.39	59.34	56.69	15.01	104.67	34.00	88.03	52.76 to 66.59		316,650	179,522
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	57.10	83.33	55.96	62.89	148.91	39.80	338.08	45.93 to 70.78		243,913	136,493
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	38	70.70	68.36	68.60	15.40	99.66	33.70	92.32	62.80 to 77.08		174,983	120,036
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	36	66.55	63.60	64.43	19.13	98.71	23.21	115.54	55.98 to 69.71		230,099	148,262
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	55	58.65	63.23	54.90	30.58	115.17	0.00	338.08	52.46 to 64.36		276,990	152,071
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	37	70.58	68.23	69.04	15.26	98.83	33.70	92.32	66.24 to 76.45		212,449	146,682
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	45	61.22	60.16	56.03	26.33	107.37	0.00	126.08	51.10 to 69.18		237,144	132,877
____ALL____												
	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76		233,855	141,571

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	129	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>64</b>	COV:	45.88	95% Median C.I.:	59.39 to 68.76	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,474,407	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.98 to 64.10	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,167,407	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.26	95% Mean C.I.:	59.71 to 69.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	18,262,787							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,855	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,571	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:10

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2017	1	34.00	34.00	34.00			34.00	34.00	N/A	635,350	216,019
2023	2	40.93	40.93	42.47	11.35	96.36	36.28	45.57	N/A	450,000	191,117
2025	2	73.66	73.66	74.60	5.64	98.75	69.51	77.82	N/A	424,696	316,806
2027	2	68.47	68.47	50.40	26.81	135.86	50.11	86.82	N/A	422,671	213,005
2029	1	68.39	68.39	68.39			68.39	68.39	N/A	215,000	147,035
2031	2	61.47	61.47	59.03	38.37	104.13	37.88	85.05	N/A	362,500	213,971
2033	2	73.16	73.16	71.19	6.01	102.77	68.76	77.56	N/A	184,057	131,028
2151	1	33.77	33.77	33.77			33.77	33.77	N/A	235,200	79,426
2153	3	70.58	69.45	68.50	1.86	101.39	66.92	70.85	N/A	345,401	236,590
2155	2	77.31	77.31	71.50	13.87	108.13	66.59	88.03	N/A	196,630	140,583
2159	1	74.68	74.68	74.68			74.68	74.68	N/A	360,000	268,843
2161	1	46.06	46.06	46.06			46.06	46.06	N/A	186,500	85,899
2163	1	35.03	35.03	35.03			35.03	35.03	N/A	464,460	162,721
2303	1	74.44	74.44	74.44			74.44	74.44	N/A	83,500	62,154
2307	2	73.65	73.65	74.97	3.71	98.24	70.92	76.38	N/A	196,824	147,556
2309	3	91.33	92.55	82.59	16.34	112.06	70.78	115.54	N/A	462,539	382,001
2311	2	85.64	85.64	84.88	7.80	100.90	78.96	92.32	N/A	293,430	249,056
2313	1	66.76	66.76	66.76			66.76	66.76	N/A	143,000	95,462
2317	2	37.39	37.39	29.20	37.92	128.07	23.21	51.57	N/A	118,420	34,573
2443	3	61.22	58.28	60.81	10.26	95.84	47.39	66.24	N/A	192,936	117,325
2445	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	18,522	13,872
2447	2	53.17	53.17	60.13	17.70	88.43	43.76	62.58	N/A	46,000	27,658
2451	1	56.90	56.90	56.90			56.90	56.90	N/A	310,000	176,390
2453	2	59.61	59.61	59.91	2.20	99.50	58.30	60.92	N/A	485,250	290,723
2455	3	39.64	43.73	43.46	20.31	100.62	33.70	57.85	N/A	262,723	114,182
2591	1	49.24	49.24	49.24			49.24	49.24	N/A	106,400	52,393
2593	2	64.21	64.21	58.13	33.37	110.46	42.78	85.64	N/A	111,671	64,914
2595	4	53.76	53.16	58.32	14.76	91.15	42.32	62.80	N/A	236,536	137,940
2599	2	62.93	62.93	68.07	11.74	92.44	55.54	70.31	N/A	162,075	110,326
2601	5	69.71	55.55	59.65	26.12	93.12	0.00	79.74	N/A	69,876	41,682
2605	3	72.31	70.45	72.61	9.34	97.03	59.39	79.66	N/A	371,316	269,617
2607	4	79.88	79.75	79.28	1.98	100.59	77.08	82.15	N/A	271,622	215,340
2733	4	60.88	61.47	61.78	11.38	99.50	49.57	74.57	N/A	217,456	134,353
2735	2	66.77	66.77	66.74	1.63	100.05	65.68	67.86	N/A	49,674	33,151
2737	1	57.29	57.29	57.29			57.29	57.29	N/A	320,000	183,320
2739	4	70.35	69.76	68.62	2.05	101.66	66.33	72.01	N/A	363,296	249,305
2741	3	55.98	51.22	48.14	11.69	106.39	39.02	58.65	N/A	200,448	96,498
2743	1	39.30	39.30	39.30			39.30	39.30	N/A	336,000	132,033

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	129	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>64</b>	COV:	45.88	95% Median C.I.:	59.39 to 68.76	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,474,407	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.98 to 64.10	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,167,407	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.26	95% Mean C.I.:	59.71 to 69.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	18,262,787							

AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,855	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,571	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:11

2745	3	74.52	76.28	80.64	12.20	94.60	63.53	90.80	N/A	115,024	92,751
2747	3	62.81	64.24	61.22	12.21	104.93	53.45	76.45	N/A	253,696	155,312
2749	2	51.56	51.56	51.04	10.91	101.00	45.93	57.18	N/A	117,303	59,874
2887	2	61.80	61.80	61.04	3.25	101.24	59.79	63.81	N/A	328,000	200,226
2889	3	67.64	66.56	66.01	4.01	100.84	61.96	70.09	N/A	141,750	93,569
2891	3	52.46	62.95	52.95	24.34	118.88	49.04	87.35	N/A	239,203	126,665
2893	2	75.30	75.30	69.97	8.12	107.61	69.18	81.41	N/A	320,750	224,438
2895	4	53.24	123.47	53.74	135.83	229.74	49.34	338.08	N/A	146,402	78,683
2897	1	55.34	55.34	55.34			55.34	55.34	N/A	27,000	14,941
2901	2	53.86	53.86	55.85	5.12	96.44	51.10	56.61	N/A	65,074	36,341
2903	1	47.09	47.09	47.09			47.09	47.09	N/A	130,000	61,216
3029	2	61.81	61.81	66.65	7.96	92.74	56.89	66.73	N/A	46,910	31,264
3031	3	57.77	62.98	66.76	18.94	94.34	49.18	82.00	N/A	234,875	156,801
3033	1	77.43	77.43	77.43			77.43	77.43	N/A	78,957	61,136
3035	4	52.40	50.11	46.49	16.13	107.79	31.28	64.36	N/A	294,456	136,892
3037	5	71.09	71.09	47.44	35.88	149.84	33.12	126.08	N/A	273,232	129,633
3039	1	70.16	70.16	70.16			70.16	70.16	N/A	287,955	202,020
3041	2	65.85	65.85	64.75	7.55	101.69	60.88	70.82	N/A	147,500	95,512
3043	1	39.80	39.80	39.80			39.80	39.80	N/A	604,800	240,728
3045	4	71.90	71.83	70.84	2.52	101.40	69.15	74.36	N/A	67,881	48,084

ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571
-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

## AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	62	66.66	65.86	68.56	17.71	96.06	0.00	115.54	60.92 to 70.78	218,633	149,899
2	3	35.03	35.10	34.83	2.17	100.78	34.00	36.28	N/A	466,603	162,527
3	6	59.25	59.58	58.01	20.81	102.70	45.57	77.82	45.57 to 77.82	448,286	260,048
4	18	65.72	63.80	57.23	16.95	111.49	39.80	87.35	53.45 to 72.92	166,515	95,292
5	30	55.67	67.36	52.01	40.58	129.51	31.28	338.08	49.34 to 64.36	236,810	123,174
6	10	69.67	64.98	62.40	18.94	104.13	33.77	86.82	37.88 to 85.05	242,103	151,064

ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571
-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

## 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	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	51,065	1
2	128	64.09	65.35	60.64	23.22	107.77	23.21	338.08	59.52 to 68.76	235,283	142,678

ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571
-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	129	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>64</b>	COV:	45.88	95% Median C.I.:	59.39 to 68.76	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,474,407	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.98 to 64.10	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,167,407	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.26	95% Mean C.I.:	59.71 to 69.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	18,262,787							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,855	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,571	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:11

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	34.00	34.00	34.00			34.00	34.00	N/A	635,350	216,019
21-0015	15	69.51	64.77	64.46	24.26	100.48	35.03	115.54	45.57 to 76.38	364,108	234,690
21-0025	22	66.29	62.20	64.26	14.40	96.79	0.00	79.74	55.98 to 70.31	190,616	122,491
21-0044	16	66.77	67.25	69.93	15.04	96.16	49.57	82.15	57.29 to 79.66	213,686	149,437
21-0084	14	68.58	64.95	60.96	22.45	106.54	23.21	92.32	37.88 to 86.82	297,375	181,280
21-0089	11	57.18	54.48	52.49	19.01	103.80	33.70	76.45	39.64 to 74.44	186,683	97,987
21-0180	26	61.84	74.68	59.28	38.86	125.97	39.02	338.08	52.99 to 70.82	200,149	118,651
24-0011											
24-0020	9	69.15	65.18	56.11	9.49	116.15	39.80	74.36	59.79 to 72.92	194,730	109,267
24-0101	8	50.61	54.91	46.17	30.03	118.94	31.28	79.88	31.28 to 79.88	281,291	129,865
58-0025	1	77.56	77.56	77.56			77.56	77.56	N/A	101,700	78,876
82-0015	4	59.56	58.24	57.78	10.49	100.78	47.09	66.73	N/A	87,361	50,481
88-0005	1	51.57	51.57	51.57			51.57	51.57	N/A	50,000	25,786
88-0021	1	77.08	77.08	77.08			77.08	77.08	N/A	533,146	410,932
NonValid School											
ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.00 TO 0.00	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	51,065	1
0.01 TO 10.00	2	50.33	50.33	44.58	13.05	112.88	43.76	56.89	N/A	6,402	2,854
10.01 TO 30.00	3	74.89	70.94	66.70	15.90	106.36	51.10	86.82	N/A	14,396	9,601
30.01 TO 50.00	8	74.52	105.98	70.12	67.40	151.13	42.32	338.08	42.32 to 338.08	27,701	19,424
50.01 TO 100.00	12	68.79	74.64	81.82	18.47	91.23	51.57	115.54	63.53 to 88.03	64,519	52,790
100.01 TO 180.00	37	57.77	56.74	53.17	20.53	106.72	23.21	87.35	48.13 to 63.81	181,872	96,699
180.01 TO 330.00	26	62.10	61.70	58.36	18.45	105.72	33.12	79.88	52.99 to 72.01	234,529	136,879
330.01 TO 650.00	21	68.76	67.97	67.95	11.97	100.04	36.28	92.32	62.80 to 72.31	298,015	202,499
650.01 +	19	62.81	61.94	60.63	22.05	102.17	34.00	91.33	49.04 to 77.82	525,217	318,428
ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571



# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	129	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>64</b>	COV:	45.88	95% Median C.I.:	59.39 to 68.76	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,474,407	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.98 to 64.10	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,167,407	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.26	95% Mean C.I.:	59.71 to 69.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	18,262,787							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,855	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,571	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:11

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	51,065	1
DRY	4	62.41	74.21	57.78	36.30	128.43	45.93	126.08	N/A	83,691	48,359
DRY-N/A	10	62.75	64.34	62.93	15.81	102.24	42.78	87.35	49.24 to 74.89	147,836	93,033
GRASS	73	64.36	66.41	61.03	23.34	108.82	33.77	338.08	57.85 to 69.51	240,650	146,863
GRASS-N/A	16	68.52	63.74	65.64	16.80	97.10	23.21	82.15	51.57 to 74.36	215,401	141,395
IRRGTD	8	72.61	74.39	69.58	26.93	106.91	43.76	115.54	43.76 to 115.54	161,884	112,643
IRRGTD-N/A	17	59.52	56.60	54.29	25.18	104.24	31.28	85.64	37.88 to 70.85	352,603	191,441
ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571

## 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
! zeroes!	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	51,065	1
DRY	6	62.41	70.76	59.40	27.91	119.13	45.93	126.08	45.93 to 126.08	126,627	75,211
DRY-N/A	8	62.75	64.46	63.84	16.98	100.96	42.78	87.35	42.78 to 87.35	131,671	84,063
GRASS	81	66.33	66.81	61.89	21.23	107.95	33.77	338.08	59.39 to 69.51	235,909	146,000
GRASS-N/A	8	55.68	57.00	60.75	29.66	93.83	23.21	82.15	23.21 to 82.15	238,154	144,667
IRRGTD	17	58.30	62.60	56.55	31.12	110.69	31.28	115.54	43.76 to 81.41	237,640	134,390
IRRGTD-N/A	8	63.92	61.64	57.58	20.99	107.04	33.12	85.64	33.12 to 85.64	406,181	233,877
ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571

## 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
! zeroes!	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	51,065	1
DRY	13	61.96	66.58	58.83	21.98	113.16	42.78	126.08	49.24 to 74.89	111,779	65,763
DRY-N/A	1	74.68	74.68	74.68			74.68	74.68	N/A	360,000	268,843
GRASS	89	66.24	65.93	61.78	21.81	106.71	23.21	338.08	59.38 to 69.51	236,110	145,880
IRRGTD	25	60.92	62.29	57.01	27.47	109.26	31.28	115.54	46.06 to 70.85	291,573	166,226
ALL	129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	129	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>64</b>	COV:	45.88	95% Median C.I.:	59.39 to 68.76	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,474,407	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.98 to 64.10	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,167,407	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.26	95% Mean C.I.:	59.71 to 69.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	18,262,787							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,855	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,571	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:11

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	2	197.49	197.49	288.93	71.19	68.35	56.89	338.08	N/A	2,302	6,652
5000 TO	9999	1	86.82	86.82	86.82			86.82	86.82	N/A	6,517	5,658
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	3	86.82	160.60	170.50	107.96	94.19	56.89	338.08	N/A	3,707	6,321
10000 TO	29999	7	74.36	72.11	69.33	24.98	104.01	43.76	126.08	43.76 to 126.08	19,015	13,183
30000 TO	59999	14	65.02	60.76	60.34	19.64	100.70	0.00	87.35	51.57 to 72.92	44,728	26,990
60000 TO	99999	8	72.66	74.17	74.23	9.93	99.92	62.58	88.03	62.58 to 88.03	81,934	60,821
100000 TO	149999	24	61.72	63.55	63.18	20.40	100.58	39.64	115.54	49.24 to 70.92	123,518	78,043
150000 TO	249999	19	60.88	59.67	59.39	19.64	100.48	23.21	90.80	52.04 to 70.85	202,453	120,227
250000 TO	499999	39	59.79	60.52	59.80	21.11	101.20	31.28	92.32	55.98 to 70.16	324,599	194,110
500000 +		15	66.33	61.03	59.97	21.76	101.77	33.12	91.33	45.57 to 77.08	618,071	370,628
ALL												
		129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571

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	2	28.45	28.45	0.88	100.00	3214.47	0.00	56.89	N/A	25,935	229
5000 TO	9999	3	51.10	60.56	55.05	28.09	110.01	43.76	86.82	N/A	12,222	6,728
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	5	51.10	47.71	23.32	39.12	204.64	0.00	86.82	N/A	17,707	4,128
10000 TO	29999	14	67.04	87.39	65.18	46.97	134.09	42.32	338.08	55.34 to 79.25	30,960	20,178
30000 TO	59999	12	64.13	59.57	51.07	23.05	116.63	23.21	87.35	45.93 to 72.92	89,141	45,528
60000 TO	99999	26	64.48	63.26	60.21	17.77	105.06	33.77	88.03	56.61 to 70.92	125,316	75,455
100000 TO	149999	23	59.52	59.53	54.08	25.37	110.07	31.28	115.54	49.18 to 70.09	223,331	120,779
150000 TO	249999	29	62.81	61.09	57.09	17.96	107.01	33.12	92.32	56.90 to 70.30	340,603	194,442
250000 TO	499999	18	70.75	68.93	66.65	14.04	103.41	45.57	85.05	59.79 to 78.96	501,431	334,211
500000 +		2	81.06	81.06	79.75	12.68	101.64	70.78	91.33	N/A	638,809	509,456
ALL												
		129	63.81	64.85	60.54	23.91	107.12	0.00	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	233,855	141,571

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	144	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	42.99	95% Median C.I.:	59.79 to 69.18	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,684,368	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	28.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.67 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	35,377,368	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	61.43 to 70.71	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,979,784							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	245,676	COD:	22.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,637	PRD:	106.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.21			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:28

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	63.17	62.27	61.37	13.22	101.47	49.24	72.92	49.24 to 72.92		75,709	46,460
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	79.66	72.88	75.37	17.64	96.69	39.64	94.39	51.57 to 90.80		169,798	127,977
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	62.75	61.76	57.20	16.61	107.96	33.70	87.35	49.18 to 70.82		182,585	104,443
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	12	78.26	75.72	75.09	8.09	100.84	53.45	92.32	70.88 to 79.88		218,392	163,983
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	63.53	60.07	63.98	17.85	93.90	33.77	73.16	33.77 to 73.16		194,651	124,535
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	76.45	74.89	77.04	15.80	97.20	42.32	99.32	66.24 to 91.33		290,598	223,878
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	74.40	75.06	76.34	12.39	98.32	49.57	107.99	66.92 to 82.00		270,988	206,877
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	16	56.88	58.46	55.80	22.94	104.75	23.21	115.54	49.34 to 69.18		204,911	114,346
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	70.31	76.18	56.21	32.78	135.52	39.02	126.08	N/A		121,886	68,510
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	56.39	56.22	53.00	23.29	106.08	31.28	77.82	45.29 to 72.01		321,829	170,568
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	26	59.39	58.54	56.45	15.99	103.69	29.87	88.03	52.76 to 66.59		326,716	184,441
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	11	57.29	81.82	57.65	58.48	141.92	39.80	338.08	45.93 to 70.78		257,316	148,355
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	39	70.82	68.70	68.47	16.30	100.34	33.70	94.39	62.58 to 77.56		174,209	119,273
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	45	68.76	67.12	68.98	19.38	97.31	23.21	115.54	61.22 to 72.90		241,237	166,398
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	60	58.92	63.58	55.51	27.77	114.54	29.87	338.08	54.27 to 64.36		295,458	164,002
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	39	70.82	68.82	69.61	16.02	98.87	33.70	99.32	63.53 to 77.08		220,385	153,416
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	53	62.81	63.75	60.40	24.15	105.55	23.21	126.08	55.98 to 70.40		254,241	153,558
_____ALL_____												
	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18		245,676	152,637

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	144	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	42.99	95% Median C.I.:	59.79 to 69.18	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,684,368	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	28.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.67 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	35,377,368	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	61.43 to 70.71	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,979,784							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	245,676	COD:	22.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,637	PRD:	106.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.21			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:28

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2017	1	34.00	34.00	34.00			34.00	34.00	N/A	635,350	216,019
2023	2	40.93	40.93	42.47	11.35	96.36	36.28	45.57	N/A	450,000	191,117
2025	2	73.66	73.66	74.60	5.64	98.75	69.51	77.82	N/A	424,696	316,806
2027	3	57.41	64.78	52.22	21.31	124.05	50.11	86.82	N/A	374,530	195,587
2029	1	68.39	68.39	68.39			68.39	68.39	N/A	215,000	147,035
2031	2	61.47	61.47	59.03	38.37	104.13	37.88	85.05	N/A	362,500	213,971
2033	2	73.16	73.16	71.19	6.01	102.77	68.76	77.56	N/A	184,057	131,028
2151	1	33.77	33.77	33.77			33.77	33.77	N/A	235,200	79,426
2153	2	68.88	68.88	68.06	2.85	101.22	66.92	70.85	N/A	427,515	290,949
2155	2	77.31	77.31	71.50	13.87	108.13	66.59	88.03	N/A	196,630	140,583
2157	1	74.43	74.43	76.53			74.43	74.43	N/A	326,812	250,095
2159	1	74.68	74.68	74.68			74.68	74.68	N/A	360,000	268,843
2161	1	46.06	46.06	46.06			46.06	46.06	N/A	186,500	85,899
2163	1	35.03	35.03	35.03			35.03	35.03	N/A	464,460	162,721
2303	1	74.44	74.44	74.44			74.44	74.44	N/A	83,500	62,154
2307	2	73.65	73.65	74.97	3.71	98.24	70.92	76.38	N/A	196,824	147,556
2309	3	91.33	92.55	82.59	16.34	112.06	70.78	115.54	N/A	462,539	382,001
2311	2	85.64	85.64	84.88	7.80	100.90	78.96	92.32	N/A	293,430	249,056
2313	1	66.76	66.76	66.76			66.76	66.76	N/A	143,000	95,462
2317	3	51.57	44.65	49.92	23.25	89.46	23.21	59.18	N/A	243,759	121,675
2443	3	61.22	58.28	60.81	10.26	95.84	47.39	66.24	N/A	192,936	117,325
2445	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	18,522	13,872
2447	3	54.27	53.54	56.11	11.56	95.41	43.76	62.58	N/A	179,540	100,741
2451	1	56.90	56.90	56.90			56.90	56.90	N/A	310,000	176,390
2453	2	59.61	59.61	59.91	2.20	99.50	58.30	60.92	N/A	485,250	290,723
2455	6	48.75	55.97	59.55	44.23	93.98	29.87	107.99	29.87 to 107.99	328,309	195,508
2591	1	49.24	49.24	49.24			49.24	49.24	N/A	106,400	52,393
2593	2	64.21	64.21	58.13	33.37	110.46	42.78	85.64	N/A	111,671	64,914
2595	4	53.76	53.16	58.32	14.76	91.15	42.32	62.80	N/A	236,536	137,940
2597	3	76.78	81.97	79.12	12.82	103.60	69.80	99.32	N/A	394,400	312,041
2599	2	62.93	62.93	68.07	11.74	92.44	55.54	70.31	N/A	162,075	110,326
2601	4	69.75	69.44	69.86	7.64	99.39	58.50	79.74	N/A	74,579	52,103
2605	3	72.31	70.45	72.61	9.34	97.03	59.39	79.66	N/A	371,316	269,617
2607	4	79.88	79.75	79.28	1.98	100.59	77.08	82.15	N/A	271,622	215,340
2733	6	60.88	65.43	65.45	15.48	99.97	49.57	87.75	49.57 to 87.75	208,512	136,467
2735	2	66.77	66.77	66.74	1.63	100.05	65.68	67.86	N/A	49,674	33,151
2737	1	57.29	57.29	57.29			57.29	57.29	N/A	320,000	183,320
2739	4	70.35	69.76	68.62	2.05	101.66	66.33	72.01	N/A	363,296	249,305

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	144	MEDIAN:	66	COV:	42.99	95% Median C.I.:	59.79 to 69.18	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,684,368	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	28.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.67 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	35,377,368	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	61.43 to 70.71	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,979,784							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	245,676	COD:	22.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,637	PRD:	106.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.21			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:28

2741	3	55.98	51.22	48.14	11.69	106.39	39.02	58.65	N/A	200,448	96,498
2743	2	56.10	56.10	49.66	29.95	112.97	39.30	72.90	N/A	233,793	116,101
2745	4	82.66	80.81	83.67	14.26	96.58	63.53	94.39	N/A	103,585	86,671
2747	3	62.81	64.24	61.22	12.21	104.93	53.45	76.45	N/A	253,696	155,312
2749	2	51.56	51.56	51.04	10.91	101.00	45.93	57.18	N/A	117,303	59,874
2887	2	61.80	61.80	61.04	3.25	101.24	59.79	63.81	N/A	328,000	200,226
2889	3	67.64	66.56	66.01	4.01	100.84	61.96	70.09	N/A	141,750	93,569
2891	3	52.46	62.95	52.95	24.34	118.88	49.04	87.35	N/A	239,203	126,665
2893	3	73.16	74.58	71.81	5.57	103.86	69.18	81.41	N/A	378,152	271,552
2895	4	53.24	123.47	53.74	135.83	229.74	49.34	338.08	N/A	146,402	78,683
2897	1	55.34	55.34	55.34			55.34	55.34	N/A	27,000	14,941
2901	2	53.86	53.86	55.85	5.12	96.44	51.10	56.61	N/A	65,074	36,341
2903	1	47.09	47.09	47.09			47.09	47.09	N/A	130,000	61,216
3029	2	61.81	61.81	66.65	7.96	92.74	56.89	66.73	N/A	46,910	31,264
3031	4	68.67	67.13	69.63	19.88	96.40	49.18	82.00	N/A	226,012	157,379
3033	1	77.43	77.43	77.43			77.43	77.43	N/A	78,957	61,136
3035	4	52.40	50.11	46.49	16.13	107.79	31.28	64.36	N/A	294,456	136,892
3037	5	71.09	71.09	47.44	35.88	149.84	33.12	126.08	N/A	273,232	129,633
3039	2	63.87	63.87	64.58	9.85	98.90	57.58	70.16	N/A	272,333	175,870
3041	2	65.85	65.85	64.75	7.55	101.69	60.88	70.82	N/A	147,500	95,512
3043	1	39.80	39.80	39.80			39.80	39.80	N/A	604,800	240,728
3045	4	71.90	71.83	70.84	2.52	101.40	69.15	74.36	N/A	67,881	48,084

ALL

144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637
-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

## AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	73	67.86	68.66	70.40	17.12	97.53	23.21	115.54	62.58 to 72.01	238,179	167,676
2	3	35.03	35.10	34.83	2.17	100.78	34.00	36.28	N/A	466,603	162,527
3	6	59.25	59.58	58.01	20.81	102.70	45.57	77.82	45.57 to 77.82	448,286	260,048
4	18	65.72	63.80	57.23	16.95	111.49	39.80	87.35	53.45 to 72.92	166,515	95,292
5	34	57.72	66.31	52.86	37.52	125.43	29.87	338.08	49.34 to 69.18	246,628	130,374
6	10	67.84	63.66	61.30	20.86	103.85	33.77	86.82	37.88 to 85.05	251,811	154,352

ALL

144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637
-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	144	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	42.99	95% Median C.I.:	59.79 to 69.18	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,684,368	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	28.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.67 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	35,377,368	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	61.43 to 70.71	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,979,784							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	245,676	COD:	22.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,637	PRD:	106.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.21			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:28

## 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	17	72.90	71.77	70.65	19.33	101.58	29.87	107.99	57.58 to 87.75	320,129	226,168
2	127	63.81	65.31	60.58	23.42	107.81	23.21	338.08	59.39 to 68.76	235,709	142,794
____ALL____											
	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	34.00	34.00	34.00			34.00	34.00	N/A	635,350	216,019
21-0015	17	69.80	65.77	66.19	21.93	99.37	35.03	115.54	45.57 to 76.78	381,113	252,241
21-0025	23	66.24	64.36	63.80	10.79	100.88	47.39	79.74	57.58 to 70.30	210,688	134,409
21-0044	16	66.77	67.25	69.93	15.04	96.16	49.57	82.15	57.29 to 79.66	213,686	149,437
21-0084	16	67.66	64.36	61.33	22.13	104.93	23.21	92.32	50.11 to 85.05	317,599	194,799
21-0089	14	57.52	57.42	58.99	25.74	97.35	29.87	107.99	39.64 to 74.44	231,085	136,312
21-0180	29	62.81	75.41	62.05	37.43	121.54	39.02	338.08	53.45 to 73.16	206,701	128,250
24-0011											
24-0020	9	69.15	65.18	56.11	9.49	116.15	39.80	74.36	59.79 to 72.92	194,730	109,267
24-0101	9	52.04	57.65	48.90	31.83	117.89	31.28	79.88	33.12 to 79.56	272,195	133,115
58-0025	1	77.56	77.56	77.56			77.56	77.56	N/A	101,700	78,876
82-0015	6	60.58	63.27	66.14	14.80	95.65	47.09	87.75	47.09 to 87.75	121,782	80,552
88-0005	1	51.57	51.57	51.57			51.57	51.57	N/A	50,000	25,786
88-0021	2	85.74	85.74	79.57	10.10	107.74	77.08	94.39	N/A	301,206	239,683
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	2	50.33	50.33	44.58	13.05	112.88	43.76	56.89	N/A	6,402	2,854
10.01 TO 30.00	3	74.89	70.94	66.70	15.90	106.36	51.10	86.82	N/A	14,396	9,601
30.01 TO 50.00	9	79.25	104.69	76.95	58.46	136.05	42.32	338.08	55.34 to 126.08	32,319	24,870
50.01 TO 100.00	12	68.79	74.64	81.82	18.47	91.23	51.57	115.54	63.53 to 88.03	64,519	52,790
100.01 TO 180.00	44	58.04	58.00	55.23	21.55	105.00	23.21	87.75	49.24 to 66.74	202,227	111,697
180.01 TO 330.00	29	61.96	62.76	59.47	19.07	105.54	33.12	99.32	53.48 to 72.01	231,915	137,914
330.01 TO 650.00	22	69.46	69.79	70.60	13.88	98.86	36.28	107.99	62.80 to 74.57	302,222	213,372
650.01 +	23	66.33	63.30	62.41	19.31	101.41	34.00	91.33	52.76 to 73.16	521,035	325,198
____ALL____											
	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	144	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	42.99	95% Median C.I.:	59.79 to 69.18	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,684,368	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	28.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.67 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	35,377,368	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	61.43 to 70.71	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,979,784							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	245,676	COD:	22.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,637	PRD:	106.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.21			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:28

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	6	62.61	71.22	61.31	28.20	116.16	45.93	126.08	45.93 to 126.08	120,510	73,887
DRY-N/A	11	63.53	65.25	65.39	15.75	99.79	42.78	87.35	49.24 to 74.89	164,107	107,311
GRASS	74	63.59	66.31	61.00	23.41	108.72	33.77	338.08	58.50 to 69.15	244,079	148,877
GRASS-N/A	23	70.09	68.93	72.45	17.60	95.13	23.21	107.99	62.58 to 76.78	257,291	186,417
IRRGTD	11	66.74	73.97	68.70	26.35	107.67	43.76	115.54	53.45 to 94.39	184,903	127,028
IRRGTD-N/A	19	57.29	55.97	53.46	27.98	104.70	29.87	87.75	37.88 to 70.85	359,767	192,326
ALL	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	62.61	69.38	61.07	23.93	113.60	45.93	126.08	45.93 to 126.08	143,508	87,644
DRY-N/A	9	63.53	65.56	66.85	16.82	98.08	42.78	87.35	49.24 to 74.89	153,353	102,511
GRASS	85	66.59	67.26	62.82	21.10	107.06	33.77	338.08	59.39 to 69.79	244,544	153,623
GRASS-N/A	12	64.94	64.63	70.35	27.50	91.87	23.21	107.99	48.13 to 82.00	266,110	187,208
IRRGTD	23	58.30	63.24	57.03	31.01	110.90	29.87	115.54	46.06 to 76.38	252,227	143,841
IRRGTD-N/A	7	60.92	60.36	56.81	22.91	106.24	33.12	85.64	33.12 to 85.64	438,325	249,021
ALL	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	16	62.75	66.90	62.49	20.41	107.06	42.78	126.08	56.90 to 74.43	135,515	84,682
DRY-N/A	1	74.68	74.68	74.68			74.68	74.68	N/A	360,000	268,843
GRASS	97	66.59	66.93	63.82	21.81	104.87	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.79	247,212	157,778
IRRGTD	30	60.22	62.57	56.95	28.57	109.86	29.87	115.54	53.45 to 70.85	295,650	168,383
ALL	144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	144	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	42.99	95% Median C.I.:	59.79 to 69.18	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,684,368	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	28.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.67 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	35,377,368	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.00	95% Mean C.I.:	61.43 to 70.71	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,979,784							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	245,676	COD:	22.73	MAX Sales Ratio:	338.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,637	PRD:	106.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.21			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:33:28

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	2	197.49	197.49	288.93	71.19	68.35	56.89	338.08	N/A	2,302	6,652
5000 TO	9999	1	86.82	86.82	86.82			86.82	86.82	N/A	6,517	5,658
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	3	86.82	160.60	170.50	107.96	94.19	56.89	338.08	N/A	3,707	6,321
10000 TO	29999	7	74.36	72.11	69.33	24.98	104.01	43.76	126.08	43.76 to 126.08	19,015	13,183
30000 TO	59999	13	65.68	65.44	65.70	13.24	99.60	42.32	87.35	55.54 to 72.92	44,241	29,066
60000 TO	99999	9	74.44	76.42	76.58	11.59	99.79	62.58	94.39	66.73 to 88.03	80,526	61,667
100000 TO	149999	25	62.23	63.92	63.73	20.11	100.29	39.64	115.54	56.61 to 70.92	123,841	78,928
150000 TO	249999	22	61.42	63.12	62.68	22.45	100.71	23.21	99.32	52.46 to 72.01	200,546	125,696
250000 TO	499999	46	59.59	61.05	60.78	21.96	100.45	29.87	107.99	56.90 to 69.51	329,335	200,180
500000 +		19	66.92	62.86	61.98	19.17	101.41	33.12	91.33	50.11 to 76.78	593,461	367,833
ALL												
		144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637

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	56.89	56.89	56.89			56.89	56.89	N/A	805	458
5000 TO	9999	3	51.10	60.56	55.05	28.09	110.01	43.76	86.82	N/A	12,222	6,728
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	4	54.00	59.64	55.09	22.62	108.27	43.76	86.82	N/A	9,367	5,160
10000 TO	29999	14	67.04	87.39	65.18	46.97	134.09	42.32	338.08	55.34 to 79.25	30,960	20,178
30000 TO	59999	12	64.13	59.57	51.07	23.05	116.63	23.21	87.35	45.93 to 72.92	89,141	45,528
60000 TO	99999	27	66.73	64.41	61.02	18.07	105.57	33.77	94.39	56.61 to 74.44	123,240	75,195
100000 TO	149999	25	58.93	58.41	52.61	25.75	111.02	29.87	115.54	49.18 to 68.39	227,678	119,785
150000 TO	249999	34	64.53	63.33	58.75	18.96	107.79	33.12	99.32	57.41 to 70.31	322,173	189,282
250000 TO	499999	26	71.06	70.12	68.74	14.13	102.01	45.57	107.99	60.92 to 77.08	484,069	332,726
500000 +		2	81.06	81.06	79.75	12.68	101.64	70.78	91.33	N/A	638,809	509,456
ALL												
		144	65.96	66.07	62.13	22.73	106.35	23.21	338.08	59.79 to 69.18	245,676	152,637



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

### Agricultural

A software program, AgriData, is being used to convert soil types from an alpha/numeric system to a seamless numeric system that will be recognized across the United States. The new conversion will be completed for assessment year 2010.

An analysis of each market area was done and as a result of the changing market conditions the values changed per each market area as follows:

	area - 1		% Chg	area - 2		% Chg	area - 3		% Chg
	2008	2009		2008	2009		2008	2009	
<b>1A1</b>									
<b>1A</b>	1872	<b>1755</b>	-6.25%	800	<b>800</b>	0.00%	955	<b>960</b>	0.52%
<b>2A1</b>	1658	<b>1554</b>	-6.27%	670	<b>670</b>	0.00%	925	<b>935</b>	1.08%
<b>2A</b>	1487	<b>1394</b>	-6.25%	550	<b>550</b>	0.00%	874	<b>880</b>	0.69%
<b>3A1</b>	1394	<b>1307</b>	-6.24%	500	<b>500</b>	0.00%	815	<b>820</b>	0.61%
<b>3A</b>	1227	<b>1150</b>	-6.28%	430	<b>430</b>	0.00%	788	<b>790</b>	0.25%
<b>4A1</b>	1224	<b>1147</b>	-6.29%	385	<b>385</b>	0.00%	551	<b>560</b>	1.63%
<b>4A</b>	1115	<b>1045</b>	-6.28%	340	<b>340</b>	0.00%	416	<b>505</b>	21.39%
<b>1D1</b>									
<b>1D</b>	714	<b>720</b>	0.84%	500	<b>450</b>	10.00%	470	<b>470</b>	0.00%
<b>2D1</b>	661	<b>661</b>	0.00%	440	<b>440</b>	0.00%	465	<b>465</b>	0.00%
<b>2D</b>	642	<b>642</b>	0.00%	400	<b>400</b>	0.00%	460	<b>460</b>	0.00%
<b>3D1</b>	590	<b>589</b>	-0.17%	305	<b>305</b>	0.00%	335	<b>335</b>	0.00%
<b>3D</b>	489	<b>488</b>	-0.20%	285	<b>285</b>	0.00%	330	<b>330</b>	0.00%
<b>4D1</b>	354	<b>354</b>	0.00%	255	<b>255</b>	0.00%	300	<b>305</b>	1.67%
<b>4D</b>	307	<b>307</b>	0.00%	155	<b>155</b>	0.00%	250	<b>250</b>	0.00%
<b>1G1</b>									
<b>1G</b>	421	<b>465</b>	10.45%	210	<b>235</b>	11.90%	350	<b>360</b>	2.86%
<b>2G1</b>	416	<b>460</b>	10.58%	205	<b>235</b>	14.63%	345	<b>355</b>	2.90%
<b>2G</b>	410	<b>455</b>	10.98%	200	<b>235</b>	17.50%	340	<b>350</b>	2.94%
<b>3G1</b>	405	<b>450</b>	11.11%	195	<b>235</b>	20.51%	330	<b>348</b>	5.45%
<b>3G</b>	403	<b>445</b>	10.42%	190	<b>235</b>	23.68%	330	<b>345</b>	4.55%
<b>4G1</b>	400	<b>440</b>	10.00%	180	<b>235</b>	30.56%	325	<b>343</b>	5.54%
<b>4G</b>	394	<b>435</b>	10.41%	170	<b>235</b>	38.24%	320	<b>340</b>	6.25%
<b>waste</b>	35	<b>35</b>	0.00%	25	<b>25</b>	0.00%	35	<b>35</b>	0.00%
<b>accret</b>									

	area - 4		% Chg		area - 5		% Chg		area - 6		% Chg
	2008	2009			2008	2009			2008	2009	
<b>1A1</b>											
<b>1A</b>	1380	<b>1420</b>	2.90%		1045	<b>1155</b>	10.53%		1390	<b>1455</b>	4.68%
<b>2A1</b>	1260	<b>1265</b>	0.40%		1025	<b>1135</b>	10.73%		1220	<b>1225</b>	0.41%
<b>2A</b>	1050	<b>1055</b>	0.48%		875	<b>915</b>	4.57%		1105	<b>1215</b>	9.95%
<b>3A1</b>	840	<b>900</b>	7.14%		850	<b>910</b>	7.06%		1080	<b>1085</b>	0.46%
<b>3A</b>	835	<b>850</b>	1.80%		785	<b>800</b>	1.91%		1075	<b>1080</b>	0.47%
<b>4A1</b>	830	<b>840</b>	1.20%		745	<b>790</b>	6.04%		865	<b>885</b>	2.31%
<b>4A</b>	540	<b>600</b>	11.11%		645	<b>720</b>	11.63%		785	<b>805</b>	2.55%
<b>1D1</b>											
<b>1D</b>	470	<b>560</b>	19.15%		635	<b>670</b>	5.51%		655	<b>655</b>	0.00%
<b>2D1</b>	410	<b>420</b>	2.44%		615	<b>640</b>	4.07%		630	<b>630</b>	0.00%
<b>2D</b>	395	<b>415</b>	5.06%		605	<b>630</b>	4.13%		620	<b>620</b>	0.00%
<b>3D1</b>	390	<b>410</b>	5.13%		555	<b>590</b>	6.31%		570	<b>570</b>	0.00%
<b>3D</b>	345	<b>405</b>	17.39%		450	<b>475</b>	5.56%		470	<b>470</b>	0.00%
<b>4D1</b>	340	<b>360</b>	5.88%		310	<b>320</b>	3.23%		330	<b>330</b>	0.00%
<b>4D</b>	300	<b>355</b>	18.33%		265	<b>315</b>	18.87%		280	<b>280</b>	0.00%
<b>1G1</b>											
<b>1G</b>	340	<b>365</b>	7.35%		405	<b>445</b>	9.88%		380	<b>395</b>	3.95%
<b>2G1</b>	305	<b>325</b>	6.56%		390	<b>440</b>	12.82%		375	<b>390</b>	4.00%
<b>2G</b>	280	<b>322</b>	15.00%		380	<b>440</b>	15.79%		370	<b>385</b>	4.05%
<b>3G1</b>	275	<b>320</b>	16.36%		350	<b>435</b>	24.29%		368	<b>382</b>	3.80%
<b>3G</b>	270	<b>318</b>	17.78%		345	<b>435</b>	26.09%		365	<b>380</b>	4.11%
<b>4G1</b>	268	<b>315</b>	17.54%		340	<b>430</b>	26.47%		360	<b>375</b>	4.17%
<b>4G</b>	265	<b>310</b>	16.98%		330	<b>430</b>	30.30%		355	<b>370</b>	4.23%
<b>waste</b>	35	<b>35</b>	0.00%		35	<b>35</b>	0.00%		35	<b>35</b>	0.00%
<b>accret</b>											

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Custer County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	2 part-time listers
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The assessor makes the final determination of value.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The part-time listers.
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Yes
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural - A parcel of land used exclusively for the production of agricultural products.</li> <li>• Rural Acreages – A parcel of land under 40 acres that has no influence of adjoining agricultural parcels under the same ownership.</li> <li>• Suburban – An area outside the limits of an incorporated city of village but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city of village. An area of residential expansion shall be valued as suburban; Broken Bow shall be within 3 miles of the city and all other towns and villages shall be within 1 mile.</li> <li>• Urban – A parcel of real property located within the limits of an incorporated city of village.</li> </ul>
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>
	Not applicable
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	Not applicable
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1982
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	The office procedure is to handle this on an annual basis from all forms of discovery, including but not limited to, while doing pickup work, re-appraisal work, requested inspections, property protests and so on. The GIS will be a real asset in this work when it is fully implemented.

a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	Through discovery by, including but not limited to, physical inspection, NRD and FSA maps, well registrations, taxpayers, real estate agents, personal property listings, and so forth.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Office staff and the part-time listers.
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	Monitored on an annual basis and anxiously awaiting the implementation of the new GIS system.
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	6
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	<p>Market Area 1 – this is the predominant market area and is considered the better farm ground. It is made up of harder soils and has the best irrigation potential.</p> <p>Market Area 2 – is the Sandhills and best suited for pasture only. The bulk of this land consists of a soil type known as valentine sand.</p> <p>Market Area 3 – is considered a buffer zone between the better farmland and the Sandhills. This ground is still sandy but the loamier soils are starting to show up to start farming. The sales will start to show that a higher amount will be paid in this area than in area two, but still less than what would be paid in area one.</p> <p>Market Area 4 – this area has a carryover market influence from Lincoln County. It is farm ground with deep wells.</p> <p>Market Area 5 – this area is primarily canyons with some farming done on the plateaus. The bulk of the sales will be for grass. This area lies south of the South Loup River in the southern part of the county.</p> <p>Market Area 6 – this area is north of the Middle Loup River in the northern part of the county and will show a slight variance from market area one because of being north of the river.</p>
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>
	Not applicable
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	Not applicable
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	No

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	80.79	95% Median C.I.:	66.99 to 73.77	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,240,267	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	60.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.58 to 86.83	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	29,240,267	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.13	95% Mean C.I.:	64.43 to 85.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,405,103							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	235,808	COD:	25.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,621	PRD:	102.60	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	70.13	70.98	70.26	14.31	101.02	59.44	85.70	59.44 to 85.70		75,709	53,192
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	85.97	76.78	82.13	13.34	93.48	47.62	89.77	47.62 to 89.77		181,589	149,140
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	11	73.68	69.02	62.66	19.06	110.15	37.68	100.04	47.18 to 87.45		175,847	110,182
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	13	86.37	132.27	148.29	67.15	89.20	56.13	719.13	70.74 to 101.85		216,835	321,550
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	70.72	73.64	84.65	15.52	86.99	62.46	90.65	N/A		109,937	93,067
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	73.21	73.26	75.84	11.23	96.60	46.74	88.04	46.74 to 88.04		270,234	204,944
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	75.68	75.59	72.54	10.49	104.20	54.72	89.98	54.72 to 89.98		265,913	192,896
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	14	64.07	64.69	63.12	20.92	102.48	30.21	108.70	42.52 to 77.04		210,130	132,639
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	76.42	85.09	62.03	28.99	137.17	47.98	141.90	N/A		121,886	75,608
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	60.26	61.00	56.94	23.88	107.12	33.71	83.22	48.02 to 77.72		303,242	172,680
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	23	66.98	66.42	64.13	11.00	103.57	47.00	82.65	62.42 to 73.28		316,650	203,069
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	9	54.07	60.84	60.86	18.42	99.96	47.31	79.99	50.29 to 78.27		270,592	164,680
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	38	79.83	92.60	103.67	36.90	89.32	37.68	719.13	70.74 to 86.37		175,266	181,695
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	33	71.26	70.23	70.36	16.50	99.82	30.21	108.70	63.75 to 76.15		224,258	157,787
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	53	66.93	65.60	61.22	18.26	107.14	33.71	141.90	57.69 to 72.00		286,407	175,352
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	35	76.54	93.89	101.62	39.82	92.40	37.68	719.13	71.26 to 85.49		202,416	205,686
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	43	69.45	67.72	62.12	21.43	109.02	30.21	141.90	61.77 to 75.62		244,894	152,117
____ALL____												
	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77		235,808	172,621

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	80.79	95% Median C.I.:	66.99 to 73.77	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,240,267	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	60.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.58 to 86.83	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	29,240,267	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.13	95% Mean C.I.:	64.43 to 85.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,405,103							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	235,808	COD:	25.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,621	PRD:	102.60	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2017	1	47.00	47.00	47.00			47.00	47.00	N/A	635,350	298,617
2023	2	53.00	53.00	53.94	5.37	98.25	50.15	55.84	N/A	450,000	242,733
2025	2	79.13	79.13	80.05	5.16	98.86	75.05	83.22	N/A	424,696	339,972
2027	2	70.10	70.10	52.48	25.53	133.58	52.20	88.00	N/A	422,671	221,813
2029	1	71.72	71.72	71.72			71.72	71.72	N/A	215,000	154,197
2031	2	64.41	64.41	61.97	36.69	103.94	40.78	88.04	N/A	362,500	224,627
2033	2	75.89	75.89	73.62	6.68	103.08	70.82	80.96	N/A	184,057	135,506
2153	3	69.87	70.69	70.58	3.92	100.15	66.99	75.21	N/A	351,059	247,788
2155	2	78.10	78.10	75.63	5.83	103.27	73.54	82.65	N/A	196,630	148,701
2159	1	71.62	71.62	71.62			71.62	71.62	N/A	360,000	257,836
2161	1	47.18	47.18	47.18			47.18	47.18	N/A	186,500	88,000
2163	1	48.30	48.30	48.30			48.30	48.30	N/A	464,460	224,332
2303	1	82.19	82.19	82.19			82.19	82.19	N/A	83,500	68,631
2307	2	75.29	75.29	73.70	4.37	102.15	72.00	78.58	N/A	196,824	145,066
2309	2	93.49	93.49	82.30	16.28	113.59	78.27	108.70	N/A	414,885	341,463
2311	2	94.30	94.30	93.40	8.41	100.97	86.37	102.23	N/A	293,430	274,059
2313	1	73.65	73.65	73.65			73.65	73.65	N/A	143,000	105,320
2317	2	41.51	41.51	34.98	27.21	118.65	30.21	52.80	N/A	118,420	41,423
2443	3	63.54	63.02	66.18	10.96	95.23	52.31	73.21	N/A	192,936	127,682
2445	1	75.62	75.62	75.62			75.62	75.62	N/A	18,522	14,007
2447	2	58.36	58.36	70.84	29.69	82.38	41.03	75.69	N/A	42,900	30,390
2451	1	60.96	60.96	60.96			60.96	60.96	N/A	310,000	188,964
2453	2	56.18	56.18	56.53	2.69	99.38	54.67	57.69	N/A	485,250	274,317
2455	3	47.62	52.86	52.28	24.92	101.10	37.68	73.28	N/A	262,723	137,363
2591	1	59.44	59.44	59.44			59.44	59.44	N/A	106,400	63,242
2593	2	67.94	67.94	62.60	27.77	108.55	49.08	86.81	N/A	111,671	69,900
2595	4	60.67	221.80	270.68	280.94	81.94	46.74	719.13	N/A	236,536	640,254
2599	2	66.80	66.80	69.83	6.50	95.66	62.46	71.14	N/A	162,075	113,174
2601	4	77.55	76.94	77.25	7.92	99.59	64.55	88.09	N/A	74,579	57,612
2605	3	78.48	77.43	79.71	9.01	97.14	66.29	87.51	N/A	371,316	295,969
2607	4	85.99	82.90	78.66	6.20	105.39	70.74	88.89	N/A	271,622	213,649
2733	4	62.66	65.56	65.86	15.78	99.54	54.72	82.19	N/A	217,456	143,216
2735	2	74.90	74.90	74.82	3.44	100.10	72.32	77.48	N/A	49,674	37,168
2737	1	54.07	54.07	54.07			54.07	54.07	N/A	320,000	173,038
2739	4	77.66	76.97	75.66	2.12	101.73	73.03	79.51	N/A	363,296	274,875
2741	3	61.77	62.06	56.11	15.35	110.60	47.98	76.42	N/A	200,448	112,471
2743	1	42.52	42.52	42.52			42.52	42.52	N/A	336,000	142,863
2745	3	85.13	84.53	87.53	8.20	96.58	73.77	94.70	N/A	115,024	100,682

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

	NUMBER of Sales:		124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>		<b>71</b>	COV:	80.79	95% Median C.I.:		66.99 to 73.77	(!: Derived)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:		29,240,267	WGT. MEAN:		73	STD:	60.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:		59.58 to 86.83	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:		29,240,267	MEAN:		75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.13	95% Mean C.I.:		64.43 to 85.79	(!: ag_denom=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value:		21,405,103										
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		235,808	COD:		25.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13					
	AVG. Assessed Value:		172,621	PRD:		102.60	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21					
Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52													
2747	3	71.26	67.85	67.38	9.36	100.69	56.13	76.15	N/A	253,696	170,946		
2749	2	56.24	56.24	55.70	10.58	100.98	50.29	62.19	N/A	117,303	65,332		
2887	2	66.90	66.90	66.73	0.67	100.24	66.45	67.34	N/A	328,000	218,880		
2889	2	78.63	78.63	77.66	11.21	101.26	69.82	87.45	N/A	167,625	130,169		
2891	3	66.98	76.14	66.08	19.23	115.22	61.39	100.04	N/A	239,203	158,062		
2893	2	87.24	87.24	84.84	3.15	102.82	84.49	89.98	N/A	320,750	272,132		
2895	3	68.88	67.57	67.52	2.45	100.08	64.39	69.45	N/A	193,936	130,941		
2897	1	61.21	61.21	61.21			61.21	61.21	N/A	27,000	16,528		
2901	2	59.42	59.42	61.58	5.05	96.49	56.42	62.42	N/A	65,074	40,073		
2903	1	52.01	52.01	52.01			52.01	52.01	N/A	130,000	67,615		
3029	2	68.27	68.27	73.58	7.92	92.78	62.86	73.68	N/A	46,910	34,518		
3031	3	63.75	66.93	69.84	14.94	95.83	54.24	82.81	N/A	234,875	164,043		
3033	1	85.49	85.49	85.49			85.49	85.49	N/A	78,957	67,501		
3035	4	67.09	61.97	57.40	17.36	107.95	33.71	79.99	N/A	294,456	169,032		
3037	5	89.77	83.51	54.90	35.59	152.10	35.99	141.90	N/A	273,232	150,005		
3039	1	90.65	90.65	90.65			90.65	90.65	N/A	287,955	261,035		
3041	2	75.16	75.16	74.85	1.84	100.41	73.77	76.54	N/A	147,500	110,400		
3043	1	47.31	47.31	47.31			47.31	47.31	N/A	604,800	286,160		
3045	4	82.78	82.63	81.44	3.39	101.46	79.27	85.70	N/A	67,881	55,285		

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52

ALL	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621
-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	60	73.12	81.78	86.70	29.54	94.32	30.21	719.13	65.37 to 77.61	215,668	186,992
2	3	48.30	48.48	48.11	2.17	100.78	47.00	50.15	N/A	466,603	224,466
3	6	63.78	64.20	63.02	19.54	101.88	47.18	83.22	47.18 to 83.22	448,286	282,508
4	17	69.82	70.83	63.52	18.35	111.51	47.31	100.04	56.13 to 85.70	171,016	108,626
5	29	69.45	70.28	63.02	23.73	111.52	33.71	141.90	61.39 to 76.54	244,845	154,300
6	9	70.82	70.39	67.90	15.97	103.66	40.78	88.04	52.80 to 88.00	244,756	166,196

ALL	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621
-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621
ALL	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621



# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	80.79	95% Median C.I.:	66.99 to 73.77	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,240,267	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	60.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.58 to 86.83	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	29,240,267	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.13	95% Mean C.I.:	64.43 to 85.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,405,103							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	235,808	COD:	25.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,621	PRD:	102.60	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	47.00	47.00	47.00			47.00	47.00	N/A	635,350	298,617
21-0015	14	66.29	66.33	66.23	22.23	100.16	41.03	108.70	48.30 to 78.58	350,269	231,966
21-0025	21	73.65	72.33	72.60	9.44	99.64	52.31	88.09	63.75 to 77.72	196,967	142,991
21-0044	16	74.90	72.30	74.26	15.18	97.35	54.07	88.89	56.62 to 84.39	213,686	158,687
21-0084	13	71.72	70.17	65.87	19.18	106.53	30.21	102.23	52.20 to 88.00	303,464	199,905
21-0089	11	59.44	59.55	57.08	17.88	104.32	37.68	82.19	47.62 to 73.28	186,683	106,561
21-0180	25	73.77	100.61	107.16	54.35	93.89	42.52	719.13	65.37 to 85.13	208,003	222,898
24-0011											
24-0020	8	79.83	75.20	64.20	11.88	117.13	47.31	87.45	47.31 to 87.45	207,821	133,418
24-0101	8	60.59	64.50	53.22	35.50	121.20	33.71	101.85	33.71 to 101.85	281,291	149,691
58-0025	1	80.96	80.96	80.96			80.96	80.96	N/A	101,700	82,341
82-0015	4	65.78	64.31	63.80	10.45	100.80	52.01	73.68	N/A	87,361	55,736
88-0005	1	52.80	52.80	52.80			52.80	52.80	N/A	50,000	26,398
88-0021	1	70.74	70.74	70.74			70.74	70.74	N/A	533,146	377,151
NonValid School											
ALL											
	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	2	51.95	51.95	42.41	21.01	122.50	41.03	62.86	N/A	6,402	2,715
10.01 TO 30.00	3	75.62	73.35	69.42	13.92	105.65	56.42	88.00	N/A	14,396	9,994
30.01 TO 50.00	7	78.06	81.13	72.82	27.28	111.41	46.74	141.90	46.74 to 141.90	31,115	22,659
50.01 TO 100.00	12	78.74	79.86	83.25	10.44	95.92	52.80	108.70	73.77 to 85.17	64,519	53,714
100.01 TO 180.00	36	60.82	61.03	55.85	21.04	109.27	30.21	100.04	52.31 to 67.34	184,723	103,173
180.01 TO 330.00	25	70.74	70.85	64.83	14.76	109.29	35.99	101.85	66.93 to 78.58	234,503	152,017
330.01 TO 650.00	21	77.61	107.21	106.93	50.23	100.26	50.15	719.13	70.82 to 84.39	298,015	318,672
650.01 +	18	70.14	69.07	67.50	17.51	102.32	47.00	88.04	55.84 to 83.22	523,404	353,316
ALL											
	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	80.79	95% Median C.I.:	66.99 to 73.77	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,240,267	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	60.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.58 to 86.83	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	29,240,267	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.13	95% Mean C.I.:	64.43 to 85.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,405,103							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	235,808	COD:	25.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,621	PRD:	102.60	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	3	62.19	84.79	59.27	49.10	143.05	50.29	141.90	N/A	81,588	48,360
DRY-N/A	10	70.72	70.04	66.80	13.40	104.85	49.08	100.04	59.44 to 76.54	147,836	98,757
GRASS	70	73.25	80.74	80.88	27.17	99.83	46.74	719.13	67.25 to 77.04	239,580	193,780
GRASS-N/A	16	77.98	72.11	73.79	15.71	97.73	30.21	87.45	55.97 to 85.17	215,013	158,648
IRRGTD	8	75.00	73.20	68.32	24.55	107.15	41.03	108.70	41.03 to 108.70	161,884	110,601
IRRGTD-N/A	17	56.62	56.88	54.64	23.95	104.10	33.71	86.81	40.78 to 71.14	353,602	193,214
ALL	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621

**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	5	62.19	78.38	63.02	34.47	124.37	50.29	141.90	N/A	133,953	84,413
DRY-N/A	8	70.72	70.37	67.46	13.99	104.31	49.08	100.04	49.08 to 100.04	131,671	88,824
GRASS	78	73.67	80.74	81.02	25.29	99.65	46.74	719.13	69.45 to 77.72	234,687	190,145
GRASS-N/A	8	61.21	63.51	66.75	27.39	95.15	30.21	87.45	30.21 to 87.45	238,154	158,959
IRRGTD	17	56.13	62.67	57.02	30.92	109.92	33.71	108.70	41.03 to 82.65	237,640	135,497
IRRGTD-N/A	8	62.34	60.90	57.13	20.37	106.61	35.99	86.81	35.99 to 86.81	408,303	233,249
ALL	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	12	66.68	73.60	64.18	24.02	114.68	49.08	141.90	59.44 to 76.54	113,594	72,901
DRY-N/A	1	71.62	71.62	71.62			71.62	71.62	N/A	360,000	257,836
GRASS	86	73.60	79.14	79.68	25.30	99.32	30.21	719.13	68.88 to 77.61	235,009	187,244
IRRGTD	25	57.69	62.11	57.07	27.61	108.83	33.71	108.70	48.02 to 71.14	292,252	166,778
ALL	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	235,808	172,621

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	124	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	80.79	95% Median C.I.:	66.99 to 73.77	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	29,240,267	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	60.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.58 to 86.83	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	29,240,267	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.13	95% Mean C.I.:	64.43 to 85.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,405,103							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	235,808	COD:	25.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	172,621	PRD:	102.60	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:41:52

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	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A		805	506
5000 TO 9999	1	88.00	88.00	88.00			88.00	88.00	N/A		6,517	5,735
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	75.43	75.43	85.24	16.66	88.50	62.86	88.00	N/A		3,661	3,120
10000 TO 29999	7	75.62	78.42	75.77	29.47	103.49	41.03	141.90	41.03 to 141.90		19,015	14,408
30000 TO 59999	13	77.04	74.83	75.01	12.65	99.76	46.74	100.04	62.46 to 85.70		44,241	33,185
60000 TO 99999	7	82.19	80.99	80.92	4.38	100.08	73.68	86.81	73.68 to 86.81		79,896	64,654
100000 TO 149999	24	66.62	70.54	70.47	20.42	100.10	47.62	108.70	59.44 to 79.27		123,518	87,041
150000 TO 249999	18	69.16	68.82	68.98	13.47	99.77	30.21	89.77	66.93 to 75.21		201,577	139,049
250000 TO 499999	39	70.82	82.86	80.87	41.65	102.46	33.71	719.13	56.13 to 75.05		324,599	262,518
500000 +	14	68.56	65.03	64.09	19.15	101.47	35.99	87.51	47.31 to 83.22		622,373	398,850
ALL												
	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77		235,808	172,621

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	2	51.95	51.95	42.41	21.01	122.50	41.03	62.86	N/A		6,402	2,715
5000 TO 9999	1	88.00	88.00	88.00			88.00	88.00	N/A		6,517	5,735
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	62.86	63.96	57.78	24.91	110.69	41.03	88.00	N/A		6,440	3,721
10000 TO 29999	11	76.42	76.27	70.12	21.05	108.77	46.74	141.90	52.80 to 87.58		28,253	19,810
30000 TO 59999	11	77.48	75.28	66.56	14.27	113.09	30.21	100.04	62.46 to 89.98		64,190	42,725
60000 TO 99999	23	63.75	65.97	63.81	17.01	103.38	47.18	86.81	55.97 to 76.54		115,061	73,419
100000 TO 149999	25	68.88	68.86	62.73	21.50	109.77	33.71	108.70	56.62 to 79.27		206,923	129,794
150000 TO 249999	24	70.98	66.28	63.04	15.08	105.14	35.99	89.77	56.13 to 73.54		310,170	195,523
250000 TO 499999	23	71.62	72.62	69.12	16.78	105.05	47.00	102.23	65.37 to 83.22		462,171	319,472
500000 +	4	81.38	238.73	161.53	200.39	147.80	73.03	719.13	N/A		577,629	933,024
ALL												
	124	71.44	75.11	73.20	25.38	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77		235,808	172,621

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	141	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	76.05	95% Median C.I.:	67.34 to 75.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,471,876	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	57.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.89 to 85.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,471,876	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.26	95% Mean C.I.:	66.23 to 85.25	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,360,449							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,481	COD:	25.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,861	PRD:	102.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:42:08

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	70.13	70.98	70.26	14.31	101.02	59.44	85.70	59.44 to 85.70		75,709	53,192
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	87.16	78.38	82.78	11.80	94.69	47.62	89.77	47.62 to 89.77		181,427	150,178
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	73.72	72.03	67.69	21.01	106.41	37.68	105.10	54.24 to 87.45		182,859	123,772
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	13	86.37	132.27	148.29	67.15	89.20	56.13	719.13	70.74 to 101.85		216,835	321,550
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	78.58	76.41	86.18	13.45	88.67	62.46	90.65	N/A		187,949	161,977
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	74.13	77.19	78.21	15.01	98.69	46.74	104.70	46.74 to 104.70		257,646	201,513
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	76.83	83.25	80.53	17.32	103.38	54.72	150.33	70.10 to 89.98		249,461	200,897
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	16	65.87	65.59	63.95	19.23	102.57	30.21	108.70	56.42 to 76.49		205,451	131,382
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	76.42	85.09	62.03	28.99	137.17	47.98	141.90	N/A		121,886	75,608
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	60.26	60.69	57.20	22.54	106.09	33.71	83.22	50.15 to 75.62		322,604	184,530
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	26	66.96	65.39	63.42	12.50	103.10	33.91	82.65	61.69 to 73.28		327,722	207,839
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	57.52	61.06	61.17	17.15	99.82	47.31	79.99	50.29 to 78.27		283,533	173,435
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	39	80.96	93.25	103.86	36.33	89.78	37.68	719.13	70.74 to 87.45		177,406	184,256
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	43	73.21	74.76	75.01	18.23	99.66	30.21	150.33	69.45 to 77.50		227,455	170,620
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	59	66.29	64.89	60.98	18.30	106.41	33.71	141.90	60.96 to 71.62		301,227	183,690
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	38	79.49	94.30	100.92	37.42	93.45	37.68	719.13	73.03 to 87.45		210,897	212,826
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	53	70.10	70.43	65.28	21.92	107.89	30.21	150.33	64.39 to 76.15		248,981	162,533
____ALL____												
	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05		244,481	179,861

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	141	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	76.05	95% Median C.I.:	67.34 to 75.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,471,876	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	57.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.89 to 85.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,471,876	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.26	95% Mean C.I.:	66.23 to 85.25	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,360,449							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,481	COD:	25.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,861	PRD:	102.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:42:08

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2017	1	47.00	47.00	47.00			47.00	47.00	N/A	635,350	298,617
2023	2	53.00	53.00	53.94	5.37	98.25	50.15	55.84	N/A	450,000	242,733
2025	2	79.13	79.13	80.05	5.16	98.86	75.05	83.22	N/A	424,696	339,972
2027	3	61.69	67.30	54.77	19.34	122.87	52.20	88.00	N/A	375,114	205,448
2029	1	71.72	71.72	71.72			71.72	71.72	N/A	215,000	154,197
2031	2	64.41	64.41	61.97	36.69	103.94	40.78	88.04	N/A	362,500	224,627
2033	3	80.96	100.70	95.74	32.74	105.18	70.82	150.33	N/A	172,421	165,076
2153	3	69.87	70.69	70.58	3.92	100.15	66.99	75.21	N/A	351,059	247,788
2155	2	78.10	78.10	75.63	5.83	103.27	73.54	82.65	N/A	196,630	148,701
2157	1	70.10	70.10	70.10			70.10	70.10	N/A	336,000	235,535
2159	1	71.62	71.62	71.62			71.62	71.62	N/A	360,000	257,836
2161	1	47.18	47.18	47.18			47.18	47.18	N/A	186,500	88,000
2163	1	48.30	48.30	48.30			48.30	48.30	N/A	464,460	224,332
2303	1	82.19	82.19	82.19			82.19	82.19	N/A	83,500	68,631
2307	2	75.29	75.29	73.70	4.37	102.15	72.00	78.58	N/A	196,824	145,066
2309	2	93.49	93.49	82.30	16.28	113.59	78.27	108.70	N/A	414,885	341,463
2311	2	94.30	94.30	93.40	8.41	100.97	86.37	102.23	N/A	293,430	274,059
2313	1	73.65	73.65	73.65			73.65	73.65	N/A	143,000	105,320
2317	3	52.80	49.44	55.56	22.16	88.98	30.21	65.31	N/A	245,613	136,465
2443	3	63.54	63.02	66.18	10.96	95.23	52.31	73.21	N/A	192,936	127,682
2445	1	75.62	75.62	75.62			75.62	75.62	N/A	18,522	14,007
2447	2	46.02	46.02	50.76	10.84	90.67	41.03	51.01	N/A	233,500	118,515
2451	1	60.96	60.96	60.96			60.96	60.96	N/A	310,000	188,964
2453	2	56.18	56.18	56.53	2.69	99.38	54.67	57.69	N/A	485,250	274,317
2455	6	55.34	60.51	61.95	37.53	97.66	33.91	107.48	33.91 to 107.48	334,166	207,031
2591	1	59.44	59.44	59.44			59.44	59.44	N/A	106,400	63,242
2593	2	67.94	67.94	62.60	27.77	108.55	49.08	86.81	N/A	111,671	69,900
2595	4	60.67	221.80	270.68	280.94	81.94	46.74	719.13	N/A	236,536	640,254
2597	2	90.74	90.74	83.35	15.39	108.86	76.77	104.70	N/A	359,765	299,863
2599	2	66.80	66.80	69.83	6.50	95.66	62.46	71.14	N/A	162,075	113,174
2601	4	77.55	76.94	77.25	7.92	99.59	64.55	88.09	N/A	74,579	57,612
2605	3	78.48	77.43	79.71	9.01	97.14	66.29	87.51	N/A	371,316	295,969
2607	4	85.99	82.90	78.66	6.20	105.39	70.74	88.89	N/A	271,622	213,649
2733	6	68.02	68.70	68.51	13.44	100.27	54.72	82.63	54.72 to 82.63	209,804	143,747
2735	2	74.90	74.90	74.82	3.44	100.10	72.32	77.48	N/A	49,674	37,168
2737	1	54.07	54.07	54.07			54.07	54.07	N/A	320,000	173,038
2739	4	77.66	76.97	75.66	2.12	101.73	73.03	79.51	N/A	363,296	274,875
2741	3	61.77	62.06	56.11	15.35	110.60	47.98	76.42	N/A	200,448	112,471

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 6

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	141	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	76.05	95% Median C.I.:	67.34 to 75.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,471,876	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	57.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.89 to 85.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,471,876	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.26	95% Mean C.I.:	66.23 to 85.25	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,360,449							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,481	COD:	25.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,861	PRD:	102.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:42:08

2743	2	59.51	59.51	52.38	28.54	113.61	42.52	76.49	N/A	236,700	123,980
2745	4	86.82	85.52	87.70	7.00	97.52	73.77	94.70	N/A	104,393	91,551
2747	3	71.26	67.85	67.38	9.36	100.69	56.13	76.15	N/A	253,696	170,946
2749	2	56.24	56.24	55.70	10.58	100.98	50.29	62.19	N/A	117,303	65,332
2887	2	66.90	66.90	66.73	0.67	100.24	66.45	67.34	N/A	328,000	218,880
2889	3	72.77	76.68	76.62	8.08	100.08	69.82	87.45	N/A	141,750	108,609
2891	3	66.98	76.14	66.08	19.23	115.22	61.39	100.04	N/A	239,203	158,062
2893	3	87.52	87.33	86.02	2.09	101.53	84.49	89.98	N/A	380,500	327,294
2895	3	68.88	67.57	67.52	2.45	100.08	64.39	69.45	N/A	193,936	130,941
2897	1	61.21	61.21	61.21			61.21	61.21	N/A	27,000	16,528
2901	2	59.42	59.42	61.58	5.05	96.49	56.42	62.42	N/A	65,074	40,073
2903	1	52.01	52.01	52.01			52.01	52.01	N/A	130,000	67,615
3029	2	68.27	68.27	73.58	7.92	92.78	62.86	73.68	N/A	46,910	34,518
3031	4	70.63	69.58	71.54	14.98	97.26	54.24	82.81	N/A	226,156	161,783
3033	1	85.49	85.49	85.49			85.49	85.49	N/A	78,957	67,501
3035	4	67.09	61.97	57.40	17.36	107.95	33.71	79.99	N/A	294,456	169,032
3037	5	89.77	83.51	54.90	35.59	152.10	35.99	141.90	N/A	273,232	150,005
3039	2	97.88	97.88	97.51	7.38	100.38	90.65	105.10	N/A	273,977	267,150
3041	2	75.16	75.16	74.85	1.84	100.41	73.77	76.54	N/A	147,500	110,400
3043	1	47.31	47.31	47.31			47.31	47.31	N/A	604,800	286,160
3045	4	82.78	82.63	81.44	3.39	101.46	79.27	85.70	N/A	67,881	55,285
ALL											
	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	70	73.12	81.22	84.16	28.16	96.51	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 77.50	233,533	196,545
2	3	48.30	48.48	48.11	2.17	100.78	47.00	50.15	N/A	466,603	224,466
3	6	63.78	64.20	63.02	19.54	101.88	47.18	83.22	47.18 to 83.22	448,286	282,508
4	18	70.54	70.94	63.80	17.39	111.20	47.31	100.04	59.44 to 85.17	166,515	106,229
5	33	73.28	70.94	64.59	23.59	109.84	33.71	141.90	64.39 to 76.54	254,719	164,514
6	11	70.82	76.86	71.91	24.44	106.88	40.78	150.33	52.80 to 88.04	239,269	172,063
ALL											
	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## 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	18	76.63	80.12	75.61	23.12	105.97	33.91	150.33	65.31 to 88.50	294,744	222,844
2	123	71.26	75.10	73.20	25.60	102.60	30.21	719.13	66.99 to 73.77	237,125	173,571
ALL											
	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	141	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	76.05	95% Median C.I.:	67.34 to 75.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,471,876	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	57.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.89 to 85.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,471,876	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.26	95% Mean C.I.:	66.23 to 85.25	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,360,449							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,481	COD:	25.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,861	PRD:	102.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:42:09

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	47.00	47.00	47.00			47.00	47.00	N/A	635,350	298,617
21-0015	15	71.62	67.02	67.29	19.68	99.61	41.03	108.70	50.15 to 78.27	363,584	244,650
21-0025	22	73.43	72.70	72.26	12.26	100.61	51.01	105.10	63.54 to 78.06	217,159	156,924
21-0044	16	74.90	72.30	74.26	15.18	97.35	54.07	88.89	56.62 to 84.39	213,686	158,687
21-0084	17	70.82	74.10	68.29	22.81	108.51	30.21	150.33	61.69 to 88.00	306,481	209,281
21-0089	14	60.82	61.39	61.23	22.80	100.27	33.91	107.48	47.62 to 73.28	233,596	143,019
21-0180	28	76.29	99.43	104.76	48.92	94.91	42.52	719.13	66.98 to 86.81	214,536	224,738
24-0011											
24-0020	9	79.27	74.93	64.64	11.54	115.91	47.31	87.45	66.45 to 85.70	194,730	125,870
24-0101	9	66.93	65.94	55.20	30.32	119.47	33.71	101.85	35.99 to 89.77	272,259	150,281
58-0025	1	80.96	80.96	80.96			80.96	80.96	N/A	101,700	82,341
82-0015	6	68.02	67.87	69.41	10.49	97.78	52.01	82.63	52.01 to 82.63	123,074	85,427
88-0005	1	52.80	52.80	52.80			52.80	52.80	N/A	50,000	26,398
88-0021	2	79.62	79.62	72.87	11.15	109.27	70.74	88.50	N/A	302,823	220,655
NonValid School											
ALL	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	2	51.95	51.95	42.41	21.01	122.50	41.03	62.86	N/A	6,402	2,715
10.01 TO 30.00	3	75.62	73.35	69.42	13.92	105.65	56.42	88.00	N/A	14,396	9,994
30.01 TO 50.00	8	82.82	82.05	76.74	24.07	106.93	46.74	141.90	46.74 to 141.90	36,288	27,846
50.01 TO 100.00	12	78.74	79.86	83.25	10.44	95.92	52.80	108.70	73.77 to 85.17	64,519	53,714
100.01 TO 180.00	45	62.42	63.58	58.49	22.94	108.69	30.21	150.33	54.67 to 70.10	204,725	119,746
180.01 TO 330.00	28	71.00	73.15	67.56	16.73	108.29	35.99	105.10	67.34 to 79.27	232,146	156,831
330.01 TO 650.00	22	77.66	107.23	106.97	49.66	100.24	50.15	719.13	70.82 to 88.89	303,060	324,169
650.01 +	21	73.03	70.14	68.78	16.10	101.97	47.00	88.04	61.39 to 83.22	522,441	359,337
ALL	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	141	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	76.05	95% Median C.I.:	67.34 to 75.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,471,876	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	57.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.89 to 85.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,471,876	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.26	95% Mean C.I.:	66.23 to 85.25	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,360,449							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,481	COD:	25.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,861	PRD:	102.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:42:09

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	6	74.63	84.79	80.44	30.87	105.41	50.29	141.90	50.29 to 141.90	122,027	98,155
DRY-N/A	11	70.10	70.05	67.41	12.29	103.91	49.08	100.04	59.44 to 76.54	164,942	111,191
GRASS	71	73.21	80.53	80.43	26.95	100.12	46.74	719.13	66.98 to 77.04	243,247	195,650
GRASS-N/A	22	80.65	79.53	80.67	19.34	98.59	30.21	150.33	67.34 to 86.37	252,368	203,579
IRRGTD	11	67.34	72.63	67.10	24.08	108.24	41.03	108.70	54.67 to 89.98	186,143	124,901
IRRGTD-N/A	20	55.35	56.73	53.93	25.73	105.19	33.71	86.81	42.52 to 70.74	352,753	190,229
ALL	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	74.63	80.78	74.83	25.76	107.95	50.29	141.90	50.29 to 141.90	144,645	108,239
DRY-N/A	9	70.10	70.34	68.10	12.55	103.29	49.08	100.04	59.44 to 75.62	154,374	105,125
GRASS	80	73.67	80.86	80.72	25.34	100.17	46.74	719.13	69.45 to 77.72	243,141	196,271
GRASS-N/A	13	77.50	76.79	79.14	27.72	97.02	30.21	150.33	52.80 to 87.52	259,337	205,243
IRRGTD	23	61.69	62.88	56.76	27.36	110.79	33.71	108.70	48.02 to 75.21	253,748	144,021
IRRGTD-N/A	8	62.34	60.90	57.13	20.37	106.61	35.99	86.81	35.99 to 86.81	408,303	233,249
ALL	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	16	71.44	75.48	71.08	20.72	106.19	49.08	141.90	60.96 to 76.54	136,658	97,138
DRY-N/A	1	71.62	71.62	71.62			71.62	71.62	N/A	360,000	257,836
GRASS	93	73.68	80.29	80.49	25.93	99.75	30.21	719.13	69.45 to 77.72	245,405	197,525
IRRGTD	31	61.69	62.37	56.89	25.61	109.63	33.71	108.70	51.01 to 71.14	293,633	167,048
ALL	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	141	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	76.05	95% Median C.I.:	67.34 to 75.05	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,471,876	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	57.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.89 to 85.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,471,876	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.26	95% Mean C.I.:	66.23 to 85.25	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	25,360,449							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,481	COD:	25.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	719.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,861	PRD:	102.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.21			

Printed: 04/01/2009 12:42:09

## 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	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	805	506
5000 TO 9999	1	88.00	88.00	88.00			88.00	88.00	N/A	6,517	5,735
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	75.43	75.43	85.24	16.66	88.50	62.86	88.00	N/A	3,661	3,120
10000 TO 29999	7	75.62	78.42	75.77	29.47	103.49	41.03	141.90	41.03 to 141.90	19,015	14,408
30000 TO 59999	13	77.04	74.83	75.01	12.65	99.76	46.74	100.04	62.46 to 85.70	44,241	33,185
60000 TO 99999	8	82.42	81.56	81.23	5.22	100.40	72.77	88.50	72.77 to 88.50	80,996	65,797
100000 TO 149999	26	69.97	73.84	74.39	22.87	99.26	47.62	150.33	62.19 to 79.27	125,038	93,011
150000 TO 249999	22	69.63	71.41	71.23	14.77	100.24	30.21	104.70	66.98 to 79.51	199,405	142,045
250000 TO 499999	46	68.28	80.96	78.79	41.21	102.75	33.71	719.13	60.96 to 73.54	330,591	260,477
500000 +	17	69.87	67.06	65.97	17.93	101.66	35.99	87.52	52.20 to 83.22	603,719	398,252
ALL											
	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	51.95	51.95	42.41	21.01	122.50	41.03	62.86	N/A	6,402	2,715
5000 TO 9999	1	88.00	88.00	88.00			88.00	88.00	N/A	6,517	5,735
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	62.86	63.96	57.78	24.91	110.69	41.03	88.00	N/A	6,440	3,721
10000 TO 29999	11	76.42	76.27	70.12	21.05	108.77	46.74	141.90	52.80 to 87.58	28,253	19,810
30000 TO 59999	10	78.74	75.23	65.49	15.22	114.87	30.21	100.04	62.46 to 89.98	63,229	41,412
60000 TO 99999	25	64.55	67.14	64.73	17.49	103.72	47.18	88.50	59.44 to 76.54	112,356	72,731
100000 TO 149999	28	68.11	67.83	61.22	21.73	110.79	33.71	108.70	56.62 to 76.49	211,654	129,582
150000 TO 249999	32	71.43	90.87	86.15	46.64	105.48	35.99	719.13	61.69 to 75.21	297,336	256,143
250000 TO 499999	29	76.15	75.01	71.70	17.08	104.62	47.00	107.48	65.37 to 84.39	456,860	327,563
500000 +	3	78.27	78.60	78.32	4.88	100.35	73.03	84.49	N/A	670,172	524,904
ALL											
	141	71.72	75.74	73.57	25.46	102.96	30.21	719.13	67.34 to 75.05	244,481	179,861

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 71%. The assessor also considered the inclusion of fifteen minimally improved agricultural sales in the analysis of the agricultural market. The statistical profile for the minimally improved agricultural also indicates an acceptable level of value has been met. Even though the price related differential is within the acceptable range, the coefficient of dispersion is indicating issues with assessment uniformity. However it would not only be affected by the various subclasses (6 market areas) but also by the diversity of the land classes within each. It is believed, from a review of the sales file, that the agricultural properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the verification process. The assessor tries to stay on task with purposed goals in the three-year plan of assessment and six-year review and physical inspection.

Within the sub-stratus Majority Land Use >50% strata Dry is showing a median of 66.68 with 12 sales, and strata Irrigated is showing a median of 57.69 with 25 sales, and within the sub-stratus Majority Land Use >80% strata Irrigated is showing a median of 56.13 with 17 sales. These sub-strata's are not valid valuation groupings as they are a culmination of sales involving six different market areas that would be affected by the diversity of the land classes within each and the values applied to each of the land classification groupings within each.

There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Custer County.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>294</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>42.18</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>42.20</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>51.85</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>62.88</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>57.09</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The table is indicating that the percent of sales used is somewhat consistent with 2008. The largest percent of non-qualified sales goes to family transactions (approximately 29%). The remainder of those disqualified are a culmination of; centrally assessed (in particular the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad) approximately 12%, partial interests approximately 11%, land use changes (primarily land going to irrigation) approximately 12%, and the rest such things as; deeds involving legal action, corrective deeds, splits, land exchanges, coding errors and substantially changed (new construction). The assessor states the review process in Custer County is done by mailing a survey document to the new owner, possibly sending the lister out to determine if the data on the property record card is accurate, and occasionally making phone calls to other parties involved in the sale, such as the seller, the title company, the attorney, or perhaps a surveyor if the sale involves splitting parcels or an accountant to determine amount of personal property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer 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>64</b>	<b>6.26</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>10.03</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>68.76</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>13.11</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>74</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is an approximate three point (2.99) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, the statistics are barely similar and offer weak support of each other. However, the R&O Ratio is reflective of the assessment actions to the base and there is no other information available to suggest that the R&O Ratio is not the best indicator of the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property within Custer County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer 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)
10.91	2009	6.26
11.68	2008	5.54
1.35	2007	1.75
7.55	2006	13.11
3.08	2005	0.35

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is a 4.65 point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth). The percent change in the sales file is a reflection of six markets areas with a varying degree of change based on the number of sales and the differing land classification groups and values within. Fifty-percent or 27 of the sales are in market area one, six-percent or 3 are in market area two, eight-percent or 4 are in market area three, ten-percent or 5 are in market area four, seventeen and a half percent or 14 are in market area five, and two-percent or 1 sale is in market area six.

The assessment actions were done from an analysis of each market area and as a result of the changing market conditions the values were adjusted accordingly in each area. The percent of change would not be an equal amount for each market area and would be dependent upon the amount of the various land classifications within each.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Custer 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 Custer 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>71</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>75</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and somewhat supportive of one another. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the agricultural class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>25.38</b>	<b>102.60</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>5.38</b>	<b>0.00</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Of the two qualitative measures only the coefficient of dispersion is above the acceptable standard. For assessment year 2009 the assessor reacted to inflationary market conditions after an analysis of the sales and adjusted the land classification groups within each market area as indicated by the study. The COD is not only affected by the diversity of the market areas but by the land classes within each. It is believed because of the action taken by the assessor the agricultural unimproved properties have been treated in a uniform and proportionate manner within Custer County.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Custer 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>129</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>-5</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>23.91</b>	<b>25.38</b>	<b>1.47</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>107.12</b>	<b>102.60</b>	<b>-4.52</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>30.21</b>	<b>30.21</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>338.08</b>	<b>719.13</b>	<b>381.05</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is a difference of five sales between the Preliminary Statistics and the R&O Statistics, four of these sales were removed since they were substantially changed from time of sale and one removed that had been coded unimproved (2) when it should have been coded improved (1). The R&O Statistics are a reflection of the assessment actions taken for 2009 in that after an analysis of the market conditions the values changed within each of the six market areas as deemed necessary from the study.



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

Records : 14,231

Value : 1,261,588,846

Growth 11,731,687

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>	638	1,149,905	154	1,168,875	80	844,434	872	3,163,214	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	3,190	11,476,976	310	5,439,114	261	5,033,235	3,761	21,949,325	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	3,235	125,678,010	312	25,682,515	298	23,109,392	3,845	174,469,917	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,873	138,304,891	466	32,290,504	378	28,987,061	4,717	199,582,456	1,794,526
<b>% of Res Total</b>	82.11	69.30	9.88	16.18	8.01	14.52	33.15	15.82	15.30
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	114	567,999	16	120,333	8	89,877	138	778,209	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	542	6,431,555	52	704,469	9	208,722	603	7,344,746	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	565	36,546,447	56	6,320,345	17	5,414,571	638	48,281,363	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	679	43,546,001	72	7,145,147	25	5,713,170	776	56,404,318	3,648,947
<b>% of Com Total</b>	87.50	77.20	9.28	12.67	3.22	10.13	5.45	4.47	31.10
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	2	84,813	2	260,225	0	0	4	345,038	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	2	241,395	2	5,059,441	0	0	4	5,300,836	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	2	326,208	2	5,319,666	0	0	4	5,645,874	149,111
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	50.00	5.78	50.00	94.22	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.45	1.27
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	1	5,636	1	5,636	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	5,636	1	5,636	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,873	138,304,891	466	32,290,504	379	28,992,697	4,718	199,588,092	1,794,526
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	82.09	69.30	9.88	16.18	8.03	14.53	33.15	15.82	15.30
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	681	43,872,209	74	12,464,813	25	5,713,170	780	62,050,192	3,798,058
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	87.31	70.70	9.49	20.09	3.21	9.21	5.48	4.92	32.37
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	4,554	182,177,100	540	44,755,317	404	34,705,867	5,498	261,638,284	5,592,584
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	82.83	69.63	9.82	17.11	7.35	13.26	38.63	20.74	47.67

## 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	7	245,158	2,691,480		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		7	245,158	2,691,480
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					7	245,158	2,691,480

## 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	505	41	536	1,082

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	45	392,207	15	357,854	6,559	603,702,222	6,619	604,452,283
28. Ag-Improved Land	5	36,386	12	306,173	2,038	285,710,095	2,055	286,052,654
29. Ag Improvements	8	261,071	13	544,020	2,093	108,640,534	2,114	109,445,625
30. Ag Total							8,733	999,950,562

## 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	4	3.26	17,246	7	8.00	54,850	
33. HomeSite Improvements	5	3.26	168,357	7	8.00	425,297	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	12	20.19	37,105	6	29.88	33,317	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	11	28.30	42,513	
37. FarmSite Improvements	7	0.00	92,714	13	0.00	118,723	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	9.17	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	15	15.00	93,000	15	15.00	93,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,322	1,394.89	8,585,678	1,333	1,406.15	8,657,774	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,349	1,353.78	69,278,058	1,361	1,365.04	69,871,712	6,139,103
34. HomeSite Total				1,376	1,421.15	78,622,486	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	28	81.40	91,510	46	131.47	161,932	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,658	2,703.79	4,291,872	1,669	2,732.09	4,334,385	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,989	0.00	39,362,476	2,009	0.00	39,573,913	0
38. FarmSite Total				2,055	2,863.56	44,070,230	
39. Road & Ditches	0	15,998.33	0	0	16,007.50	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				3,431	20,292.21	122,692,716	6,139,103



## 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	13	2,353.07	226,115	13	2,353.07	226,115

## Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	68,356.62	39.82%	117,908,517	48.54%	1,724.90
47. 2A1	13,559.83	7.90%	20,549,347	8.46%	1,515.46
48. 2A	18,926.77	11.03%	26,095,957	10.74%	1,378.79
49. 3A1	14,057.07	8.19%	18,026,756	7.42%	1,282.40
50. 3A	3,495.29	2.04%	4,003,219	1.65%	1,145.32
51. 4A1	24,309.58	14.16%	27,237,997	11.21%	1,120.46
52. 4A	28,939.06	16.86%	29,099,945	11.98%	1,005.56
53. Total	171,644.22	100.00%	242,921,738	100.00%	1,415.26
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	26,599.82	26.74%	19,154,166	36.17%	720.09
56. 2D1	8,775.74	8.82%	5,800,798	10.95%	661.00
57. 2D	8,735.53	8.78%	5,608,194	10.59%	642.00
58. 3D1	15,213.28	15.30%	8,962,058	16.92%	589.09
59. 3D	882.24	0.89%	430,533	0.81%	488.00
60. 4D1	20,289.67	20.40%	7,182,535	13.56%	354.00
61. 4D	18,965.71	19.07%	5,822,635	10.99%	307.01
62. Total	99,461.99	100.00%	52,960,919	100.00%	532.47
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	17,755.98	3.04%	8,305,826	3.30%	467.78
65. 2G1	15,442.06	2.64%	7,108,660	2.82%	460.34
66. 2G	14,108.18	2.41%	6,427,108	2.55%	455.56
67. 3G1	8,174.65	1.40%	3,700,151	1.47%	452.64
68. 3G	3,893.17	0.67%	1,735,099	0.69%	445.68
69. 4G1	46,728.73	7.99%	20,499,007	8.14%	438.68
70. 4G	478,718.46	81.86%	203,903,435	81.02%	425.94
71. Total	584,821.23	100.00%	251,679,286	100.00%	430.35
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	171,644.22	20.02%	242,921,738	44.36%	1,415.26
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	99,461.99	11.60%	52,960,919	9.67%	532.47
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	584,821.23	68.21%	251,679,286	45.96%	430.35
<b>Waste</b>					
<b>Waste</b>	1,405.87	0.16%	49,237	0.01%	35.02
<b>Other</b>					
<b>Other</b>	19.20	0.00%	5,920	0.00%	308.33
<b>Exempt</b>					
<b>Exempt</b>	4,041.27	0.47%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Market Area Total</b>					
<b>Market Area Total</b>	857,352.51	100.00%	547,617,100	100.00%	638.73

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	31.90	1.49%	25,071	3.02%	785.92
47. 2A1	44.50	2.09%	26,290	3.17%	590.79
48. 2A	103.40	4.85%	51,842	6.25%	501.37
49. 3A1	2.10	0.10%	1,050	0.13%	500.00
50. 3A	376.10	17.63%	156,474	18.85%	416.04
51. 4A1	717.30	33.61%	272,001	32.77%	379.20
52. 4A	858.60	40.24%	297,387	35.82%	346.36
53. Total	2,133.90	100.00%	830,115	100.00%	389.01
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	80.80	11.31%	36,360	17.72%	450.00
56. 2D1	43.90	6.15%	19,316	9.41%	440.00
57. 2D	78.30	10.96%	31,320	15.26%	400.00
58. 3D1	41.20	5.77%	12,567	6.12%	305.02
59. 3D	87.80	12.29%	25,024	12.20%	285.01
60. 4D1	213.35	29.87%	54,409	26.52%	255.02
61. 4D	168.88	23.65%	26,182	12.76%	155.03
62. Total	714.23	100.00%	205,178	100.00%	287.27
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	140.93	0.08%	33,127	0.08%	235.06
65. 2G1	192.64	0.11%	45,271	0.11%	235.00
66. 2G	1,521.11	0.86%	357,489	0.86%	235.02
67. 3G1	296.20	0.17%	69,614	0.17%	235.02
68. 3G	3,126.32	1.78%	734,710	1.78%	235.01
69. 4G1	14,076.41	7.99%	3,308,033	7.99%	235.01
70. 4G	156,757.08	89.01%	36,828,498	89.01%	234.94
71. Total	176,110.69	100.00%	41,376,742	100.00%	234.95
Irrigated Total	2,133.90	1.19%	830,115	1.96%	389.01
Dry Total	714.23	0.40%	205,178	0.48%	287.27
Grass Total	176,110.69	98.32%	41,376,742	97.55%	234.95
Waste	155.00	0.09%	3,877	0.01%	25.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	161.89	0.09%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	179,113.82	100.00%	42,415,912	100.00%	236.81

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	2,366.64	15.63%	2,222,066	20.24%	938.91
47. 2A1	809.40	5.34%	744,049	6.78%	919.26
48. 2A	3,483.60	23.00%	2,979,513	27.14%	855.30
49. 3A1	659.18	4.35%	531,047	4.84%	805.62
50. 3A	1,485.86	9.81%	1,162,304	10.59%	782.24
51. 4A1	3,207.05	21.18%	1,763,666	16.06%	549.93
52. 4A	3,133.58	20.69%	1,577,467	14.37%	503.41
53. Total	15,145.31	100.00%	10,980,112	100.00%	724.98
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,217.74	14.69%	572,338	18.47%	470.00
56. 2D1	160.50	1.94%	74,641	2.41%	465.05
57. 2D	2,541.96	30.67%	1,169,299	37.74%	460.00
58. 3D1	532.31	6.42%	178,333	5.76%	335.02
59. 3D	578.79	6.98%	191,001	6.16%	330.00
60. 4D1	1,791.05	21.61%	546,310	17.63%	305.02
61. 4D	1,464.93	17.68%	366,234	11.82%	250.00
62. Total	8,287.28	100.00%	3,098,156	100.00%	373.84
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,382.87	1.91%	497,834	2.13%	360.00
65. 2G1	589.59	0.81%	209,315	0.90%	355.02
66. 2G	4,832.09	6.66%	1,691,233	7.23%	350.00
67. 3G1	1,664.14	2.29%	579,123	2.48%	348.00
68. 3G	2,239.14	3.09%	772,541	3.30%	345.02
69. 4G1	9,925.12	13.68%	3,400,496	14.54%	342.62
70. 4G	51,924.89	71.56%	16,233,070	69.42%	312.63
71. Total	72,557.84	100.00%	23,383,612	100.00%	322.28
<hr/>					
Irrigated Total	15,145.31	15.75%	10,980,112	29.31%	724.98
Dry Total	8,287.28	8.62%	3,098,156	8.27%	373.84
Grass Total	72,557.84	75.47%	23,383,612	62.41%	322.28
Waste	152.12	0.16%	5,331	0.01%	35.04
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	218.20	0.23%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	96,142.55	100.00%	37,467,211	100.00%	389.70

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	11,686.15	37.41%	16,448,032	47.97%	1,407.48
47. 2A1	2,393.01	7.66%	3,020,363	8.81%	1,262.16
48. 2A	3,353.42	10.73%	3,509,105	10.23%	1,046.43
49. 3A1	4,735.69	15.16%	4,255,569	12.41%	898.62
50. 3A	407.10	1.30%	334,015	0.97%	820.47
51. 4A1	6,611.05	21.16%	5,503,470	16.05%	832.47
52. 4A	2,053.69	6.57%	1,219,386	3.56%	593.75
53. Total	31,240.11	100.00%	34,289,940	100.00%	1,097.63
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	8,398.97	29.19%	4,706,818	37.12%	560.40
56. 2D1	2,025.80	7.04%	851,458	6.72%	420.31
57. 2D	2,659.43	9.24%	1,103,725	8.70%	415.02
58. 3D1	7,243.60	25.18%	2,969,878	23.42%	410.00
59. 3D	139.73	0.49%	56,595	0.45%	405.03
60. 4D1	6,562.38	22.81%	2,362,457	18.63%	360.00
61. 4D	1,740.13	6.05%	628,699	4.96%	361.29
62. Total	28,770.04	100.00%	12,679,630	100.00%	440.72
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,579.09	5.84%	2,036,515	6.97%	365.03
65. 2G1	2,553.47	2.67%	829,956	2.84%	325.03
66. 2G	3,545.30	3.71%	1,141,583	3.91%	322.00
67. 3G1	3,308.06	3.46%	1,058,577	3.63%	320.00
68. 3G	622.11	0.65%	197,831	0.68%	318.00
69. 4G1	10,931.68	11.44%	3,429,794	11.75%	313.75
70. 4G	69,045.53	72.23%	20,504,974	70.22%	296.98
71. Total	95,585.24	100.00%	29,199,230	100.00%	305.48
Irrigated Total	31,240.11	20.06%	34,289,940	45.02%	1,097.63
Dry Total	28,770.04	18.48%	12,679,630	16.65%	440.72
Grass Total	95,585.24	61.39%	29,199,230	38.33%	305.48
Waste	101.90	0.07%	3,569	0.00%	35.02
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	643.25	0.41%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	155,697.29	100.00%	76,172,369	100.00%	489.23

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

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	14,432.36	43.09%	16,506,463	49.42%	1,143.71
47. 2A1	3,783.44	11.30%	4,272,599	12.79%	1,129.29
48. 2A	4,745.72	14.17%	4,315,529	12.92%	909.35
49. 3A1	2,363.33	7.06%	2,135,154	6.39%	903.45
50. 3A	1,293.07	3.86%	1,020,145	3.05%	788.93
51. 4A1	4,037.16	12.05%	3,149,900	9.43%	780.23
52. 4A	2,836.42	8.47%	2,003,832	6.00%	706.47
53. Total	33,491.50	100.00%	33,403,622	100.00%	997.38
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	5,794.83	30.28%	3,883,711	37.83%	670.20
56. 2D1	2,184.93	11.42%	1,398,356	13.62%	640.00
57. 2D	1,918.21	10.02%	1,208,609	11.77%	630.07
58. 3D1	2,746.18	14.35%	1,620,246	15.78%	590.00
59. 3D	469.50	2.45%	223,033	2.17%	475.04
60. 4D1	3,264.61	17.06%	1,046,991	10.20%	320.71
61. 4D	2,757.24	14.41%	884,801	8.62%	320.90
62. Total	19,135.50	100.00%	10,265,747	100.00%	536.48
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,436.51	3.05%	2,419,457	3.21%	445.04
65. 2G1	5,461.38	3.06%	2,403,007	3.19%	440.00
66. 2G	3,775.65	2.12%	1,661,287	2.20%	440.00
67. 3G1	2,820.79	1.58%	1,227,122	1.63%	435.03
68. 3G	1,643.97	0.92%	716,483	0.95%	435.82
69. 4G1	11,908.72	6.68%	5,115,638	6.79%	429.57
70. 4G	147,194.31	82.58%	61,808,310	82.03%	419.91
71. Total	178,241.33	100.00%	75,351,304	100.00%	422.75
Irrigated Total	33,491.50	14.47%	33,403,622	28.06%	997.38
Dry Total	19,135.50	8.27%	10,265,747	8.62%	536.48
Grass Total	178,241.33	76.99%	75,351,304	63.30%	422.75
Waste	636.20	0.27%	22,295	0.02%	35.04
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	686.64	0.30%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	231,504.53	100.00%	119,042,968	100.00%	514.21

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

Market Area 6

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	11,533.01	47.97%	16,779,732	55.46%	1,454.93
47. 2A1	554.32	2.31%	678,351	2.24%	1,223.75
48. 2A	5,493.46	22.85%	6,650,313	21.98%	1,210.59
49. 3A1	476.18	1.98%	511,447	1.69%	1,074.06
50. 3A	2,788.62	11.60%	2,936,455	9.71%	1,053.01
51. 4A1	1,910.03	7.94%	1,669,308	5.52%	873.97
52. 4A	1,285.72	5.35%	1,028,470	3.40%	799.92
53. Total	24,041.34	100.00%	30,254,076	100.00%	1,258.42
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,168.46	19.25%	765,366	26.18%	655.02
56. 2D1	96.20	1.58%	60,606	2.07%	630.00
57. 2D	980.07	16.14%	607,644	20.78%	620.00
58. 3D1	1,071.43	17.65%	610,715	20.89%	570.00
59. 3D	120.00	1.98%	56,400	1.93%	470.00
60. 4D1	1,699.55	27.99%	560,852	19.18%	330.00
61. 4D	935.63	15.41%	261,977	8.96%	280.00
62. Total	6,071.34	100.00%	2,923,560	100.00%	481.53
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,504.18	2.50%	594,187	2.78%	395.02
65. 2G1	416.19	0.69%	162,314	0.76%	390.00
66. 2G	2,095.97	3.48%	807,084	3.78%	385.06
67. 3G1	1,092.21	1.82%	417,224	1.96%	382.00
68. 3G	5,961.68	9.91%	2,272,428	10.65%	381.17
69. 4G1	6,901.60	11.47%	2,506,261	11.74%	363.14
70. 4G	42,175.06	70.12%	14,579,615	68.32%	345.69
71. Total	60,146.89	100.00%	21,339,113	100.00%	354.78
Irrigated Total	24,041.34	26.42%	30,254,076	55.47%	1,258.42
Dry Total	6,071.34	6.67%	2,923,560	5.36%	481.53
Grass Total	60,146.89	66.10%	21,339,113	39.12%	354.78
Waste	729.41	0.80%	25,537	0.05%	35.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	1,192.70	1.31%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	90,988.98	100.00%	54,542,286	100.00%	599.44

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	231.69	313,285	239.93	336,740	277,224.76	352,029,578	277,696.38	352,679,603
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	14.39	8,072	121.51	76,663	162,304.48	82,048,455	162,440.38	82,133,190
<b>78. Grass</b>	103.15	52,885	272.64	119,613	1,167,087.43	442,156,789	1,167,463.22	442,329,287
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	9.46	331	3,171.04	109,515	3,180.50	109,846
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	19.20	5,920	19.20	5,920
<b>81. Exempt</b>	62.76	0	195.61	0	6,685.58	0	6,943.95	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>349.23</b>	<b>374,242</b>	<b>643.54</b>	<b>533,347</b>	<b>1,609,806.91</b>	<b>876,350,257</b>	<b>1,610,799.68</b>	<b>877,257,846</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	277,696.38	17.24%	352,679,603	40.20%	1,270.02
<b>Dry Land</b>	162,440.38	10.08%	82,133,190	9.36%	505.62
<b>Grass</b>	1,167,463.22	72.48%	442,329,287	50.42%	378.88
<b>Waste</b>	3,180.50	0.20%	109,846	0.01%	34.54
<b>Other</b>	19.20	0.00%	5,920	0.00%	308.33
<b>Exempt</b>	6,943.95	0.43%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,610,799.68</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>877,257,846</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>544.61</b>



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

21	Custer	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	195,114,153	199,582,456	4,468,303	2.29%	1,794,526	1.37%
02. Recreational	0	5,636	5,636		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	73,840,363	78,622,486	4,782,123	6.48%	6,139,103	-1.84%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>268,954,516</b>	<b>278,210,578</b>	<b>9,256,062</b>	<b>3.44%</b>	<b>7,933,629</b>	<b>0.49%</b>
05. Commercial	51,354,050	56,404,318	5,050,268	9.83%	3,648,947	2.73%
06. Industrial	5,496,763	5,645,874	149,111	2.71%	149,111	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	37,219,388	44,070,230	6,850,842	18.41%	0	18.41%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>94,070,201</b>	<b>106,120,422</b>	<b>12,050,221</b>	<b>12.81%</b>	<b>3,798,058</b>	<b>8.77%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>363,024,717</b>	<b>384,331,000</b>	<b>21,306,283</b>	<b>5.87%</b>	<b>11,731,687</b>	<b>2.64%</b>
11. Irrigated	361,614,077	352,679,603	-8,934,474	-2.47%		
12. Dryland	76,616,848	82,133,190	5,516,342	7.20%		
13. Grassland	387,059,355	442,329,287	55,269,932	14.28%		
14. Wasteland	245,858	109,846	-136,012	-55.32%		
15. Other Agland	5,920	5,920	0	0.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>825,542,058</b>	<b>877,257,846</b>	<b>51,715,788</b>	<b>6.26%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,188,566,775</b>	<b>1,261,588,846</b>	<b>73,022,071</b>	<b>6.14%</b>	<b>11,731,687</b>	<b>5.16%</b>

# **CUSTER COUNTY PLAN OF ASSESSMENT ASSESSMENT YEARS 2009, 2010, AND 2011**

## **Introduction**

Pursuant to LB 263, Section 9 the assessor shall submit a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter to the county board of equalization on or before July 31, 2007. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. After the budget is approved by the county board a copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31 each year.

## **Real Property Assessment Requirements**

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land that meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 755 of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

## **General Description of Real Property in Custer County**

Per the 2008 county Abstract, Custer County consists of the following real property types;

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value</u>
Residential	4764	33.45%	16.48%
Commercial	777	5.45%	4.32%
Industrial	4	.03%	.46%
Recreational	0	.00%	.00%
Agricultural	8699	61.07%	78.74%
Special Value	0	.00%	.00%

Agricultural land-taxable acres were 1,611,031.92 Acres.

Other pertinent facts: Custer County is predominately agricultural and 73% is grassland.

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

## **Current Resources**

### **A. Staff/Budget/Training:**

Assessor/\$41,282.50/I hold the assessor's certificate when I passed the test in the early 1980's. I have attended many of the IAAO courses and classes of the PA&T. I have all the hours needed at this time to keep the certificate current.

Deputy Assessor/\$30,961.88/She also holds the assessor's certificate, passing the test in 2004. She has completed all her hours needed at this time to keep the certificate current.

3 full time clerks-One clerk has 7 years experience in the assessor's office and one has 2 years experience and the third has 7 months experience.

3 part-time listers. One lister was hired in the fall of 2004, the second lister was hired in August 2007 and the third lister was hired in June 2008 for the summer.

B. The Cadastral Maps were flown in the 1970's but are in good condition. They are kept current with monthly land sales. The county board agreed to hire Great Plains GIS Consulting to help the county get started with a GIS program and we are using [agridatainc.com](http://agridatainc.com) to measure land by soil types and land use.

C. The Property Record cards list all information required by statute with current photos and sketches.

D. The county uses the TERASCAN software package. There are 5 terminals and 1 public-use terminal.

E. The county has a Web-site with all parcels listed.

## **Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

A. Discovery: The County now has zoning and has a zoning administrator. Before any construction is allowed, the property owner must file a permit with the zoning administrator and in turn the assessor is notified. At the beginning of the year each property is reviewed for % of completion and valued accordingly. In Real Estate Transfers the name is changed within the month the deed is filed, cadastral maps updated, and a sales review is mailed to the new owner.

B. Data Collection: The 3 part-time lister's travel throughout the different areas each year, measuring each home, and outbuilding, taking new pictures, and interviewing each property owner as to the interior work. In new construction & remodeling the property is inspected inside and out. As sales occur, the sale is used for 3 years to set property values.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions: The area Field Liaison works very hard with the assessor and staff and with the help of an excel program we enter sales data to be able to adjust the problem areas.

**D. Approaches to Value:**

1. Market Approach; sales comparison: Using the sales of the various styles, conditions, and ages, I use the information to adjust the depreciation.
2. Cost Approach: The RCN (replacement cost new) is figured with the July 2007 Marshall and Swift values from the TerraScan software system.
3. Income Approach: income and expense data collection/analysis from the market is done by the Commercial Appraiser that is hired to value commercial and industrial properties.
4. Sales of agricultural land is mapped out and when a trend in sales indicate a market area change is required will be the only time areas will change. One market area is set with soil type boundaries and two with natural boundaries such as rivers.

After assessment action, a review of the sales ratio is a top priority.

Notices of valuation changes are mailed to all property owners that have a change of value and notices are also published in the local newspaper.

**Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity of Assessment Year 2007**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>
Residential	98%
Commercial	97%
Agricultural Land	70%
Special Value Ag-land	00%

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2008 Reports and Opinions.

**2008 ACTION TAKEN:**

The villages of Callaway and Oconto and the rural improvements in Delight, Woodriver and Custer Townships were viewed and assessed using the 2007 Marshall & Swift RCN and depreciation set from a 3 year history of sales.

**RESIDENTIAL PLAN:**

**2009**

The villages of Arnold, and Anselmo will be physically viewed and revalued. Also the improvements in the townships of Grant, Wayne, Elim, Arnold, Hayes, Triumph and Cliff will be physically viewed and revalued.

**2010**

The villages of Merna and Broken Bow City and the improvements in the townships of Kilfoil, Ryno, Victoria and Broken Bow will be physically viewed and revalued.

**2011**

The villages of Ansley, Mason City, and Berwyn and the improvements in the townships of East Custer, Loup, Elk Creek, Algernon, Ansley, and Berwyn will be viewed and revalued.

**COMMERCIAL PLAN:**

**2009**

Only new construction or new commercial properties will need to be revalued by Stanard Appraisal Service unless sales indicate a need for further action.

**2010**

Only new construction or new commercial properties will need to be revalued by Stanard Appraisal Service unless sales indicate a need for further action.

**2011**

Only new construction of new commercial properties will need to be revalued by Stanard Appraisal Service unless sales indicate a need for further action.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND :**

**2009**

The soils will be measured with the program agridata.com and numeric codes used for the soil types.

The land values will be figured at 75% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area.

**2010**

Land values will be figured at 75% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area.

**2011**

Land values will be figured at 75% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area.

**Other functions preformed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:**

I will continue to maintain the parcel records on each property owner making changes monthly of ownership and maintain accurate cadastral maps with ownership changes.

I will continually perform the duties required of me by law to serve the property owners of Custer County and to maintain equality in assessment for all. I will file all the administrative reports required by law/regulations such as abstracts, both real and personal property, the assessor's survey, the sales information to PA&T rosters & annual assessed value updates, school district taxable value report, homestead exemption tax loss report, and certificate of taxes levied report. I will certify the value to political subdivisions, and report the current values to the Board of Education Lands & Funds of properties they own and report the exempt property and taxable property owned by governmental subdivisions. I will also report to the county board the annual plan of assessment.

I will continually administer the annual filing of all personal property schedules and notify the taxpayer of incomplete filings, failure to file and penalties applied.

I will send the applications for annual filings for permissive exemptions, review and make recommendations to the county board.

I will send notices of intent to tax to the governmental owned property not used for public purpose.

I will administer approximately 650 annual filings of applications for homestead exemptions and assist where necessary and continue to monitor approval/denial process and send out denial notification.

I will continue to review the centrally assessed valuation certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, and establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

I will continue to manage the record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment project (TIFF) and administer the reports and allocate the ad valorem tax.

I will continue to manage the tax entity boundaries making changes only when legal changes dictate and review the tax rates used for the tax billing process.

I will continue to prepare tax lists and certify these to the county treasurer for real estate, personal, and centrally assessed.

I will continue to attend the county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests and assemble and provide necessary information.

I will prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC (tax equalization and review commission) to defend county valuations.

I will continue to attend hearing if applicable to the county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

I will continue to attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education for maintaining my assessor's certificate.

**CONCLUSION:**

The assessor maintains two budgets; the assessor's functions budget and the reappraisal budget. The assessor's office budget will remain almost the same reflecting cost of living raises at \$149,182.38. The reappraisal budget will be almost the same at 29,400.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Custer County Assessor

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Custer County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	3
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	2 part-time listers
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	1 employee shared with the Register of Deeds
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$148,682
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	The clerk controls a budget for the computer system of the entire courthouse.
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	Not applicable
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$ - 0 -
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$ 500
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$29,400 is levied separately from the assessor budget. The listers are funded through this budget.
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	\$ - 0 -



13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$178,082
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Nothing was left in the assessor's budget; \$24,000 went unused in the appraisal budget.

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	These maps are not digitized; the maintenance is shared between the Assessors Office and the Register of Deeds. The maps were flown in the 1970's.
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes – but not fully implemented yet.
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Custer County is in the preliminary stages of getting GIS underway. They have a signed contract with GIS Workshop, Inc. to accomplish this goal.
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

## **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes

3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Broken Bow only.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2005

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

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	The commercial class of real property is contracted through a private appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Service) and the remainder of the appraisal work is done in-house.
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	There are none.



## Certification

---

This is to certify that the 2009 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

One copy to the Custer 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