

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

24 Dawson

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	526	COD	10.12
Total Sales Price	\$46,309,328	PRD	102.44
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$46,579,328	COV	16.76
Total Assessed Value	\$43,848,750	STD	16.16
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$88,554	Avg. Absolute Deviation	9.88
Avg. Assessed Value	\$83,363	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$66,982
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	96	Max	186
Min	9.00		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.11 to 98.13
95% Mean C.I	95.05 to 97.81
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.53 to 95.74

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	42.15
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.73
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.13

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	652	98	9.73	101.04
2007	743	98	12.22	101.11
2006	762	98	13.8	103.76
2005	785	98	13.37	103.54

2009 Commission Summary

24 Dawson

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	82	COD	18.22
Total Sales Price	\$13,828,154	PRD	127.98
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,864,954	COV	26.51
Total Assessed Value	\$10,099,723	STD	24.72
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$169,085	Avg. Absolute Deviation	17.33
Avg. Assessed Value	\$123,167	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$153,577
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	93	Max	168
Min	22		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.00 to 98.68
95% Mean C.I	87.88 to 98.58
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	55.37 to 90.31

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 12.23

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.06

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 5.66

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	94	97	16.42	124.94
2007	95	99	15.14	105.44
2006	101	99	13.71	101.47
2005	95	97	23.07	104.67

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Dawson 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 Dawson County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Dawson 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 Dawson County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Dawson 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 Dawson County is 73.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Dawson County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales: 524 **MEDIAN: 95** COV: 20.20 95% Median C.I.: 94.28 to 97.06
 TOTAL Sales Price: 46,149,428 WGT. MEAN: 91 STD: 18.85 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 89.15 to 92.68
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 46,419,428 MEAN: 93 AVG.ABS.DEV: 13.01 95% Mean C.I.: 91.68 to 94.91
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 42,203,776
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 88,586 COD: 13.63 MAX Sales Ratio: 186.35
 AVG. Assessed Value: 80,541 PRD: 102.62 MIN Sales Ratio: 9.00

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:35:47

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	92	97.58	93.69	93.49	9.60	100.21	35.70	150.32	95.37 to 98.54		86,931	81,274
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	62	98.81	96.58	94.96	10.19	101.70	12.14	145.45	97.40 to 99.66		94,441	89,685
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	45	95.24	97.87	92.87	15.73	105.38	67.39	186.35	87.98 to 98.22		67,800	62,968
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	92	97.75	94.30	91.81	10.69	102.71	9.00	134.45	96.42 to 98.98		94,655	86,901
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	81	88.92	90.21	87.16	18.01	103.50	29.41	138.53	85.60 to 93.41		88,091	76,780
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	46	89.47	90.34	87.06	15.69	103.76	52.27	137.82	83.39 to 95.39		100,734	87,703
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	43	95.86	95.25	90.78	15.78	104.93	63.46	154.86	87.70 to 101.35		91,220	82,806
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	63	91.53	89.57	88.43	14.22	101.30	12.74	129.49	87.14 to 94.61		81,195	71,798
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	291	97.81	95.14	93.18	11.03	102.11	9.00	186.35	97.01 to 98.40		88,015	82,014
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	233	90.54	90.99	88.13	16.31	103.25	12.74	154.86	88.39 to 93.33		89,300	78,701
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	264	94.27	92.96	89.60	15.03	103.75	9.00	186.35	91.32 to 96.67		89,123	79,856
____ALL____												
	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06		88,586	80,541
ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
COZAD	112	90.07	91.81	88.35	15.92	103.92	52.27	172.81	85.21 to 93.27		81,083	71,634
COZAD RURAL	5	101.25	101.48	100.41	5.91	101.06	89.35	116.31	N/A		145,012	145,610
EDDYVILLE	3	71.57	85.01	72.86	22.67	116.67	67.40	116.07	N/A		32,750	23,863
FARNAM	10	92.40	99.51	86.14	31.55	115.52	54.29	186.35	62.48 to 131.53		31,947	27,519
GOTHENBURG	108	93.90	91.96	90.03	13.21	102.14	12.74	138.53	89.96 to 97.59		95,852	86,298
GOTHENBURG RURAL	6	95.18	99.12	96.36	12.72	102.86	82.46	122.56	82.46 to 122.56		78,460	75,607
JOHNSON LAKE	68	94.19	93.19	89.95	12.54	103.61	37.49	129.49	91.45 to 97.23		123,893	111,439
LEXINGTON	177	98.25	96.44	95.32	9.68	101.18	9.00	154.86	97.46 to 98.87		78,645	74,965
LEXINGTON RURAL	9	87.98	86.72	85.54	8.93	101.38	61.58	100.00	75.64 to 99.64		162,611	139,094
MIDWAY LAKE	6	54.71	53.03	52.95	17.63	100.16	35.70	74.50	35.70 to 74.50		44,908	23,777
OVERTON	6	93.32	91.17	90.86	11.15	100.34	67.88	108.64	67.88 to 108.64		71,833	65,267
OVERTON RURAL	3	98.22	110.16	103.53	12.40	106.40	97.85	134.40	N/A		55,333	57,284
PLUM CREEK LAKE	3	62.26	62.36	60.12	26.13	103.73	38.00	86.81	N/A		107,666	64,725
SUMNER	7	97.92	96.94	96.65	11.13	100.29	75.21	125.49	75.21 to 125.49		36,357	35,139
SUMNER RURAL	1	72.59	72.59	72.59			72.59	72.59	N/A		120,000	87,108
____ALL____												
	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06		88,586	80,541

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	524	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	20.20	95% Median C.I.:	94.28 to 97.06
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,149,428	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.15 to 92.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,419,428	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	91.68 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	42,203,776						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,586	COD:	13.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	80,541	PRD:	102.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:35:47

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	411	96.80	94.11	91.62	13.01	102.72	9.00	186.35	94.96 to 97.62	81,324	74,506
2	12	93.14	90.03	94.36	16.59	95.41	58.80	119.79	61.64 to 106.67	86,041	81,191
3	101	93.29	90.38	88.67	15.08	101.92	35.70	134.40	88.67 to 95.39	118,440	105,022
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

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	450	96.03	94.10	91.53	12.88	102.82	12.14	186.35	94.55 to 97.44	87,248	79,856
2	25	100.00	87.07	61.34	20.31	141.93	9.00	125.32	77.81 to 100.48	31,776	19,492
3	49	91.81	89.08	90.85	16.02	98.05	35.70	129.49	86.11 to 95.65	129,861	117,979
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	523	95.45	93.28	90.92	13.65	102.60	9.00	186.35	94.26 to 97.06	88,744	80,684
06	1	100.48	100.48	100.48			100.48	100.48	N/A	6,000	6,029
07											
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0009											
21-0180											
24-0001	188	98.13	95.58	94.20	10.14	101.46	9.00	154.86	97.40 to 98.77	82,259	77,491
24-0004	11	96.91	96.56	93.97	10.66	102.76	67.88	134.40	83.45 to 108.64	65,263	61,331
24-0011	123	90.06	90.63	88.47	16.76	102.44	35.70	172.81	85.49 to 93.27	81,595	72,188
24-0020	111	94.28	92.40	90.31	13.38	102.31	12.74	138.53	90.58 to 97.70	96,148	86,830
24-0101	10	96.66	93.46	85.97	15.55	108.72	67.40	125.49	72.59 to 116.07	46,075	39,608
32-0095	18	92.10	90.19	73.32	28.39	123.00	37.49	186.35	62.48 to 108.00	71,092	52,125
37-0030	63	93.91	93.59	91.29	12.10	102.52	62.70	129.49	90.19 to 97.25	123,611	112,841
NonValid School											
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

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:	524	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	20.20	95% Median C.I.:	94.28 to 97.06
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,149,428	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.15 to 92.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,419,428	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	91.68 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	42,203,776						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,586	COD:	13.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	80,541	PRD:	102.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:35:47

YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	40	100.00	87.78	72.80	20.41	120.58	9.00	125.32	82.67 to 100.84	43,472	31,647
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	7	90.38	90.09	83.38	17.43	108.05	58.80	134.40	58.80 to 134.40	65,194	54,362
1900 TO 1919	76	94.63	93.01	91.98	16.76	101.12	53.04	155.49	87.98 to 98.69	52,533	48,322
1920 TO 1939	78	95.48	94.07	89.50	15.83	105.10	12.74	172.81	88.85 to 98.00	68,303	61,132
1940 TO 1949	43	94.96	90.34	85.22	14.32	106.00	35.70	186.35	85.71 to 97.40	75,681	64,498
1950 TO 1959	52	95.46	95.22	94.05	11.59	101.25	52.27	154.86	93.96 to 99.12	91,158	85,731
1960 TO 1969	54	96.76	95.06	93.02	12.18	102.19	61.65	130.29	90.07 to 99.00	100,530	93,511
1970 TO 1979	96	97.54	95.08	93.17	10.60	102.04	62.70	125.49	93.36 to 98.87	106,449	99,181
1980 TO 1989	25	93.36	89.30	88.44	10.79	100.97	52.05	108.00	82.13 to 98.13	106,780	94,439
1990 TO 1994	7	98.53	96.98	95.61	5.35	101.44	79.27	107.71	79.27 to 107.71	170,928	163,419
1995 TO 1999	21	92.72	94.21	92.08	7.79	102.32	78.14	116.38	87.08 to 99.07	158,776	146,198
2000 TO Present	25	93.73	94.18	92.06	9.50	102.30	75.64	118.60	84.54 to 100.00	162,448	149,553
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

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	96.66	96.66	96.67	3.45	100.00	93.33	100.00	N/A	1,500	1,450
5000 TO 9999	13	100.00	98.51	100.49	13.83	98.03	65.43	124.82	77.20 to 116.67	6,723	6,756
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	100.00	98.27	100.37	12.43	97.91	65.43	124.82	84.00 to 113.33	6,026	6,048
10000 TO 29999	50	101.10	102.56	100.68	20.44	101.86	29.41	186.35	94.12 to 108.62	20,288	20,426
30000 TO 59999	101	95.48	93.67	93.26	18.22	100.44	35.70	155.49	90.96 to 98.18	45,440	42,379
60000 TO 99999	178	97.47	93.67	93.60	9.89	100.08	41.42	121.95	95.39 to 98.13	77,427	72,470
100000 TO 149999	112	93.51	92.14	91.96	10.91	100.19	12.74	129.49	90.75 to 97.17	122,375	112,536
150000 TO 249999	61	91.43	86.58	86.87	12.73	99.67	9.00	115.61	87.31 to 93.73	179,758	156,152
250000 TO 499999	6	80.41	78.93	78.55	16.68	100.49	37.49	98.75	37.49 to 98.75	293,200	230,302
500000 +	1	78.14	78.14	78.14			78.14	78.14	N/A	512,500	400,450
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

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:	524	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	20.20	95% Median C.I.:	94.28 to 97.06
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,149,428	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.15 to 92.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,419,428	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	91.68 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	42,203,776						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,586	COD:	13.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	80,541	PRD:	102.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:35:47

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	77.20	81.95	75.25	14.02	108.91	65.43	100.00	N/A	4,200	3,160
5000 TO 9999	10	100.00	92.37	82.80	15.38	111.56	29.41	123.24	71.57 to 113.33	7,990	6,616
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	100.00	88.90	81.23	16.27	109.44	29.41	123.24	73.80 to 100.48	6,726	5,464
10000 TO 29999	65	87.95	87.61	65.21	28.17	134.36	9.00	186.35	78.99 to 96.05	31,319	20,422
30000 TO 59999	113	94.77	92.95	87.96	17.10	105.67	38.00	172.81	88.85 to 97.40	51,993	45,733
60000 TO 99999	179	97.49	94.96	92.71	9.88	102.43	61.65	154.86	95.24 to 98.20	84,297	78,150
100000 TO 149999	107	95.37	93.69	91.84	9.40	102.01	37.49	118.73	91.53 to 98.00	131,967	121,205
150000 TO 249999	41	95.20	97.06	95.75	8.87	101.38	75.64	129.49	92.72 to 98.74	189,394	181,336
250000 TO 499999	4	88.52	88.48	86.13	10.75	102.73	78.14	98.75	N/A	358,125	308,443
ALL											
	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	34	100.00	86.06	65.78	21.04	130.83	9.00	125.32	77.81 to 100.84	39,379	25,903
10	21	95.68	91.20	90.62	16.76	100.64	35.70	125.39	81.56 to 100.34	46,726	42,342
20	168	95.08	93.37	90.09	16.89	103.64	12.74	186.35	91.86 to 97.06	64,369	57,988
25	1	98.56	98.56	98.56			98.56	98.56	N/A	95,000	93,629
30	274	96.54	94.49	92.73	10.67	101.90	37.49	155.49	94.31 to 97.81	101,847	94,443
40	26	91.01	91.23	89.34	9.08	102.12	69.18	109.88	84.27 to 98.47	203,230	181,567
ALL											
	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	34	100.00	86.06	65.78	21.04	130.83	9.00	125.32	77.81 to 100.84	39,379	25,903
100	2	99.91	99.91	99.90	0.44	100.00	99.47	100.34	N/A	57,750	57,695
101	331	96.01	93.65	91.17	13.96	102.72	12.74	186.35	93.91 to 97.44	83,270	75,920
102	14	87.85	87.93	86.77	11.23	101.34	71.91	115.61	73.36 to 99.06	150,503	130,591
103	21	95.39	92.19	91.81	9.75	100.41	66.47	110.00	84.00 to 99.20	120,815	110,918
104	100	95.17	94.32	92.86	11.06	101.58	62.21	138.53	91.81 to 97.21	104,502	97,039
106	2	113.19	113.19	89.60	37.37	126.33	70.89	155.49	N/A	80,250	71,904
111	15	97.46	96.33	96.46	7.93	99.87	74.18	112.58	92.11 to 101.91	108,273	104,439
301	5	98.14	98.54	96.68	3.87	101.93	93.73	108.27	N/A	104,680	101,200
ALL											
	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

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:	524	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	20.20	95% Median C.I.:	94.28 to 97.06
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,149,428	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.15 to 92.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,419,428	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	91.68 to 94.91
TOTAL Assessed Value:	42,203,776						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,586	COD:	13.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	80,541	PRD:	102.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:35:47

CONDITION										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)	34	100.00	86.06	65.78	21.04	130.83	9.00	125.32	77.81 to 100.84	39,379	25,903
10	1	123.24	123.24	123.24			123.24	123.24	N/A	7,500	9,243
20	22	89.07	89.11	78.46	24.74	113.58	12.74	134.45	67.39 to 116.07	36,272	28,458
30	423	95.47	93.64	91.55	12.80	102.29	35.70	186.35	94.07 to 97.06	91,781	84,026
40	40	97.19	95.95	93.58	8.78	102.54	62.70	122.76	92.20 to 99.45	125,338	117,286
50	4	109.42	107.39	103.48	7.77	103.78	90.06	120.66	N/A	109,500	113,310
ALL	524	95.46	93.30	90.92	13.63	102.62	9.00	186.35	94.28 to 97.06	88,586	80,541

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

Residential

As scheduled within the three-year plan of assessment, residential updates were done for the City of Cozad, and the village of Farnam, along with these Plum Creek Canyon and Midway Lake were done as well.

The canyon and Midway amounted to about 50 properties each. There were less than 10 sales in the file for each of them, but given the size of the “market” or neighborhood and the anticipation of newer sales coming into the file the determination was made to address these two areas for 2009.

The assessor defines update as, “Examination of sold properties on-site in each instance and the development of a model to be used for a particular market area or neighborhood for both sold and unsold properties, following a statistical analysis and thorough market study of the level of value. This normally does not include a complete *new* record, but a check of the current record for accuracy, and may or may not warrant physical measurement and complete inspection of the property. The updates generally are limited to particular locations, and may be as limited as one property in the case of an increase in the square footage of a dwelling, or the addition of some other structure, such as a new garage. But the term “update” is used most often in relation to the change of numerous sold and unsold properties within a given area. It is most likely to involve a group of properties contained in no less than a residential subdivision. It generally would not involve a group as large as the entire county because that could shift it into a definition of a full appraisal.”

Nothing other than routine maintenance occurred in Lexington, Eddyville, Gothenburg, Overton, Sumner, or the remainder of the county.

There is not language specifically addressing a six-year plan of physical inspection and review, however with the three-year plan of assessment the assessor states on page 2 (below the chart), second paragraph, “It is the intention of the assessor, relative to the amount of change annually in the market, to look at updating each class of property in a three-year cycle starting with residential, then continuing with agriculture production ground, and then commercial. In practice, market forces often times disrupt this cycle, and any plan of this scope requires considerable flexibility.”

Within the third paragraph there is a statement, “Much of the work tends to be ongoing, albeit, within smaller segments of each class. In actual practice, updates have been conducted every year in one or more localities for residential property, and changes have been required for

commercial property to a degree at least every two years. Agricultural ground also tends to receive annual attention.”

Also the fourth paragraph states, “The fact that there are three major groups of property in the statistical analysis naturally suggested looking at a cycle in three-year increments....”

2009 Assessment Survey for Dawson County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	The office appraiser, assessor, and contracted appraisal service.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The office appraiser or contracted appraisal service will establish an initial value, however ultimately the assessor will be responsible for setting the final estimate of value.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The pickup work is done by the office appraiser.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	Approximately ninety-five percent of the residential class is valued based on costing tables currently loaded in the MicroSolve CAMA System from June of 2005. The system does not have the capability of handling more than one set of costing tables; in other words there are still some residential values based on previous tables.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Depending upon when a particular portion of the county was re-priced, the depreciation schedule will vary with the costing tables in use at the time. Currently the Marshall-Swift depreciation tables within the CAMA program that coincide with the June of 2005 costing tables will be used. The MicroSolve CAMA System does not have the capability of handling more than one set of depreciation tables at a time.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach and supported by a market approach based on cost per square foot that was developed by the contracted appraiser. The sales comparison approach can be done in the MicroSolve CAMA System – pulling comparables from the sales file. It is a good tool but the reliability is dependent upon the sales file and if comparables actually exist. In order to use one must know the correct parameter settings, it cannot be general in setup.

7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	There are six towns or villages, Johnson Lake, Midway Lake and the rural area. There are also five neighborhoods within the City of Lexington, four each within the cities of Cozad and Gothenburg, and from one up to as many as three in the small villages.
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	<p>These areas are first 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.</p> <p>These areas may then additionally be sub-stratified into groupings of like properties, for example by subdivision, in order to further analyze the market effects of each. The neighborhoods reflect to a great extent improvements within a similar age group, and therefore similar marketability characteristics within the styles of structures. They also follow the general growth areas of the communities in terms of history of development. The streets and other city amenities would reflect some of the differences; sanitary sewer, storm sewer and electric hookups and would be more modernized, for example.</p> <p>Market sales also help but they tend to parallel the building date of the dwelling, and the point in time when a subdivision was developed. There are of course exceptions within older neighborhoods where considerable remodeling or refurbishing has taken place, or a new improvement has been added to a longtime vacant lot or larger parcel. Effective age and economic or location factors are more of a consideration than perhaps actual age in these instances.</p> <p>There has also of late been development on the basis of tax increment financing and those parcels with a project often reflect lot sale prices influenced by limitations set forth by the city. These sale prices are below normal market sales purposefully to provide the incentive for building homes. Lots cannot be resold for profit, and dwellings must meet certain size and style restrictions, and time limits for when they are completed. Three of these projects have been instituted in Lexington. They create an equalization conflict with normal market sales.</p>
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Most would be with the exception of the rural residential. The coding for the rural residential properties is tied to the main high schools within the county. For example, those with codes associated with the Lexington high school would be placed in the assessor location of Lexington Rural. This coding process would make it difficult to do an overall adjustment to all rural residential properties.

10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	The suburban location, as defined in regulation, does not have its own valuation grouping in the county.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, they are valued in the same manner and at the same statutory level of value.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
483	0	0	483

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	526	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	16.76	95% Median C.I.:	97.11 to 98.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,309,328	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	16.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 95.74
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,579,328	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.88	95% Mean C.I.:	95.05 to 97.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	43,848,750						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,553	COD:	10.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,362	PRD:	102.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:23:53

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	92	98.21	97.18	96.22	6.71	101.00	58.80	150.32	97.06 to 98.84		86,931	83,647
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	62	98.83	99.55	97.70	9.54	101.89	12.14	147.76	98.07 to 99.66		94,441	92,271
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	44	97.33	98.76	95.91	11.75	102.97	67.39	186.35	94.92 to 99.41		68,886	66,065
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	92	98.03	97.25	94.68	7.90	102.71	9.00	134.45	97.21 to 99.32		94,655	89,620
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	82	95.19	94.35	91.27	12.73	103.37	29.41	138.53	92.15 to 98.51		87,846	80,178
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	47	96.64	95.75	93.20	8.38	102.73	61.55	137.82	93.09 to 99.07		99,260	92,510
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	43	98.09	98.18	93.19	13.72	105.36	63.46	154.86	90.54 to 103.54		91,220	85,006
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	64	94.29	91.57	90.51	12.55	101.18	12.74	129.49	90.74 to 97.47		81,182	73,476
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	290	98.21	97.95	96.00	8.49	102.03	9.00	186.35	97.67 to 98.75		88,249	84,718
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	236	95.57	94.57	91.87	12.09	102.94	12.74	154.86	94.12 to 97.23		88,927	81,696
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	265	97.25	96.33	93.50	10.13	103.03	9.00	186.35	96.67 to 97.97		89,087	83,300
____ALL____												
	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13		88,553	83,362
ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
COZAD	111	97.98	100.13	98.55	8.35	101.59	62.21	155.49	96.74 to 98.79		81,633	80,453
COZAD RURAL	5	101.25	101.48	100.41	5.91	101.06	89.35	116.31	N/A		145,012	145,610
EDDYVILLE	3	71.57	85.01	72.86	22.67	116.67	67.40	116.07	N/A		32,750	23,863
FARNAM	10	94.99	109.18	101.44	21.21	107.63	77.20	186.35	90.75 to 131.53		31,947	32,406
GOTHENBURG	111	94.96	92.56	90.91	12.51	101.81	12.74	138.53	91.53 to 97.88		94,882	86,257
GOTHENBURG RURAL	6	95.18	99.12	96.36	12.72	102.86	82.46	122.56	82.46 to 122.56		78,460	75,607
JOHNSON LAKE	68	94.54	93.88	91.02	10.91	103.14	57.06	129.49	91.81 to 97.25		123,893	112,770
LEXINGTON	177	98.50	97.64	96.59	8.10	101.09	9.00	154.86	97.82 to 99.00		78,645	75,963
LEXINGTON RURAL	9	87.98	87.79	86.36	10.14	101.65	61.58	109.24	75.64 to 100.00		162,611	140,438
MIDWAY LAKE	6	99.35	103.23	102.68	4.32	100.54	98.90	116.36	98.90 to 116.36		44,908	46,113
OVERTON	6	93.32	91.17	90.86	11.15	100.34	67.88	108.64	67.88 to 108.64		71,833	65,267
OVERTON RURAL	3	97.85	92.44	95.52	5.78	96.78	81.26	98.22	N/A		55,333	52,856
PLUM CREEK LAKE	3	97.64	78.19	70.42	20.80	111.03	38.00	98.93	N/A		107,666	75,820
SUMNER	7	97.92	96.94	96.65	11.13	100.29	75.21	125.49	75.21 to 125.49		36,357	35,139
SUMNER RURAL	1	73.57	73.57	73.57			73.57	73.57	N/A		120,000	88,280
____ALL____												
	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13		88,553	83,362

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	526	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	16.76	95% Median C.I.:	97.11 to 98.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,309,328	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	16.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 95.74
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,579,328	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.88	95% Mean C.I.:	95.05 to 97.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	43,848,750						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,553	COD:	10.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,362	PRD:	102.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:23:53

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	413	97.92	97.24	95.31	9.65	102.03	9.00	186.35	97.36 to 98.28	81,317	77,504
2	12	93.14	90.03	94.36	16.59	95.41	58.80	119.79	61.64 to 106.67	86,041	81,191
3	101	95.10	93.87	90.83	11.20	103.35	38.00	129.49	92.72 to 97.85	118,440	107,574
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

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	452	97.65	96.97	94.89	9.63	102.19	12.14	186.35	97.11 to 98.14	87,216	82,756
2	25	100.00	87.07	61.34	20.31	141.93	9.00	125.32	77.81 to 100.48	31,776	19,492
3	49	97.23	96.28	93.59	9.06	102.87	68.48	129.49	93.56 to 98.99	129,861	121,537
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	525	97.62	96.42	94.14	10.13	102.43	9.00	186.35	97.06 to 98.13	88,711	83,509
06	1	100.48	100.48	100.48			100.48	100.48	N/A	6,000	6,029
07											
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0009											
21-0180											
24-0001	188	98.37	96.89	95.49	8.59	101.47	9.00	154.86	97.62 to 98.87	82,259	78,547
24-0004	11	95.68	91.73	92.12	8.61	99.58	67.88	108.64	81.26 to 100.38	65,263	60,123
24-0011	122	98.13	100.55	98.97	7.90	101.59	62.21	155.49	97.25 to 98.94	82,100	81,253
24-0020	114	95.08	92.87	91.14	12.76	101.90	12.74	138.53	91.86 to 97.88	95,196	86,756
24-0101	10	96.66	93.56	86.22	15.45	108.51	67.40	125.49	73.57 to 116.07	46,075	39,725
32-0095	18	95.82	98.15	82.14	18.03	119.50	38.00	186.35	91.47 to 98.93	71,092	58,393
37-0030	63	94.46	94.34	92.06	11.01	102.49	63.49	129.49	91.81 to 97.63	123,611	113,791
NonValid School											
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	526	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	16.76	95% Median C.I.:	97.11 to 98.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,309,328	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	16.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 95.74
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,579,328	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.88	95% Mean C.I.:	95.05 to 97.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	43,848,750						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,553	COD:	10.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,362	PRD:	102.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:23:54

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	40	100.00	88.28	73.71	19.91	119.76	9.00	125.32	84.00 to 100.84	43,472	32,044
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	7	83.61	82.89	81.02	11.85	102.31	58.80	95.48	58.80 to 95.48	65,194	52,822
1900 TO 1919	76	96.05	96.69	95.26	14.15	101.50	60.00	155.49	93.14 to 98.77	52,533	50,044
1920 TO 1939	78	97.42	96.29	92.17	10.00	104.47	12.74	150.32	95.93 to 98.18	68,451	63,088
1940 TO 1949	44	96.89	96.19	90.45	9.41	106.34	57.06	186.35	93.87 to 98.50	75,507	68,299
1950 TO 1959	52	98.41	99.35	97.23	7.35	102.18	68.48	154.86	95.24 to 99.87	91,158	88,629
1960 TO 1969	54	98.58	100.36	97.84	8.30	102.58	75.93	130.29	96.72 to 99.45	100,530	98,356
1970 TO 1979	97	98.25	98.03	96.59	7.52	101.49	67.32	125.49	97.44 to 98.98	106,181	102,561
1980 TO 1989	25	94.26	91.86	91.67	8.48	100.21	52.05	108.00	90.74 to 98.74	106,780	97,883
1990 TO 1994	7	98.53	97.64	96.28	6.02	101.41	79.27	112.34	79.27 to 112.34	170,928	164,577
1995 TO 1999	21	97.25	96.91	94.79	5.72	102.23	78.14	116.38	92.20 to 101.91	158,776	150,509
2000 TO Present	25	97.50	96.42	94.54	7.09	101.99	75.64	118.60	93.73 to 100.00	162,448	153,575
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	96.66	96.66	96.67	3.45	100.00	93.33	100.00	N/A	1,500	1,450
5000 TO 9999	13	100.00	98.51	100.49	13.83	98.03	65.43	124.82	77.20 to 116.67	6,723	6,756
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	100.00	98.27	100.37	12.43	97.91	65.43	124.82	84.00 to 113.33	6,026	6,048
10000 TO 29999	49	99.76	101.23	99.23	18.16	102.02	29.41	186.35	95.24 to 106.67	20,294	20,138
30000 TO 59999	102	97.80	100.34	100.25	11.84	100.09	58.80	155.49	96.58 to 98.94	45,303	45,417
60000 TO 99999	180	98.13	96.61	96.56	7.07	100.06	52.05	124.97	97.62 to 98.75	77,392	74,726
100000 TO 149999	112	97.21	94.71	94.63	8.10	100.09	12.74	129.49	93.96 to 98.22	122,375	115,799
150000 TO 249999	61	94.46	89.81	89.86	11.13	99.94	9.00	115.61	91.81 to 96.92	179,758	161,534
250000 TO 499999	6	83.80	83.32	83.24	12.97	100.10	57.06	98.75	57.06 to 98.75	293,200	244,054
500000 +	1	78.14	78.14	78.14			78.14	78.14	N/A	512,500	400,450
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	526	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	16.76	95% Median C.I.:	97.11 to 98.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,309,328	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	16.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 95.74
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,579,328	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.88	95% Mean C.I.:	95.05 to 97.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	43,848,750						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,553	COD:	10.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,362	PRD:	102.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:23:54

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	77.20	81.95	75.25	14.02	108.91	65.43	100.00	N/A	4,200	3,160
5000 TO 9999	10	100.00	92.37	82.80	15.38	111.56	29.41	123.24	71.57 to 113.33	7,990	6,616
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	100.00	88.90	81.23	16.27	109.44	29.41	123.24	73.80 to 100.48	6,726	5,464
10000 TO 29999	58	95.77	94.15	69.58	21.86	135.31	9.00	186.35	92.44 to 100.84	29,360	20,429
30000 TO 59999	108	96.96	96.66	93.01	11.76	103.93	38.00	155.49	94.96 to 98.40	49,894	46,407
60000 TO 99999	181	98.25	98.10	96.72	7.22	101.43	67.94	154.86	97.82 to 98.79	80,258	77,623
100000 TO 149999	111	97.29	96.05	95.17	7.31	100.92	61.58	124.97	94.61 to 98.93	127,538	121,373
150000 TO 249999	49	96.91	96.16	94.80	7.75	101.43	57.06	129.49	94.07 to 98.47	189,201	179,357
250000 TO 499999	4	91.91	90.18	87.90	8.51	102.59	78.14	98.75	N/A	358,125	314,797
ALL											
	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	35	100.00	86.35	66.48	20.55	129.89	9.00	125.32	80.65 to 100.84	39,154	26,028
10	21	98.99	99.67	97.62	10.18	102.10	60.00	125.39	95.00 to 101.54	46,726	45,614
20	169	97.23	96.99	93.86	11.35	103.34	12.74	186.35	95.86 to 98.22	64,748	60,770
25	1	98.56	98.56	98.56			98.56	98.56	N/A	95,000	93,629
30	274	97.85	97.36	95.92	8.17	101.50	57.06	155.49	97.17 to 98.22	101,847	97,691
40	26	97.17	93.91	91.76	7.94	102.34	69.18	112.34	89.69 to 99.04	203,230	186,482
ALL											
	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	35	100.00	86.35	66.48	20.55	129.89	9.00	125.32	80.65 to 100.84	39,154	26,028
100	2	99.91	99.91	99.90	0.44	100.00	99.47	100.34	N/A	57,750	57,695
101	332	97.92	97.40	94.98	9.54	102.55	12.74	186.35	97.29 to 98.53	83,406	79,219
102	14	91.18	91.38	90.92	9.87	100.50	71.91	115.61	79.27 to 99.83	150,503	136,843
103	21	97.67	98.02	97.57	5.19	100.46	79.64	124.97	95.39 to 99.20	120,815	117,881
104	100	95.83	96.32	94.57	9.49	101.85	62.21	147.76	94.79 to 97.88	104,502	98,832
106	2	115.97	115.97	93.92	34.08	123.47	76.44	155.49	N/A	80,250	75,372
111	15	98.05	98.04	97.90	6.43	100.13	74.18	112.58	92.20 to 101.91	108,273	106,004
301	5	98.14	98.54	96.68	3.87	101.93	93.73	108.27	N/A	104,680	101,200
ALL											
	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	526	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	16.76	95% Median C.I.:	97.11 to 98.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	46,309,328	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	16.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 95.74
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	46,579,328	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.88	95% Mean C.I.:	95.05 to 97.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	43,848,750						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	88,553	COD:	10.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	186.35		
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,362	PRD:	102.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.00		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:23:54

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	35	100.00	86.35	66.48	20.55	129.89	9.00	125.32	80.65 to 100.84	39,154	26,028
10	1	123.24	123.24	123.24			123.24	123.24	N/A	7,500	9,243
20	22	89.07	88.00	78.00	21.96	112.82	12.74	134.45	71.57 to 97.23	36,272	28,291
30	424	97.69	97.45	95.19	8.76	102.37	52.05	186.35	97.17 to 98.18	91,867	87,449
40	40	97.80	97.03	94.76	7.71	102.40	69.18	122.76	93.45 to 100.00	125,338	118,766
50	4	111.74	110.97	108.88	4.95	101.93	99.76	120.66	N/A	109,500	119,219
ALL	526	97.63	96.43	94.14	10.12	102.44	9.00	186.35	97.11 to 98.13	88,553	83,362

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 98% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio and 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 and the qualitative measures are indicating 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 in-house and with the assistance of the contracted appraiser (Stanard Appraisal Service). The assessor has made comment that the intention is, relative to the amount of change annually in the market, to update each class of property in a three-year cycle, this would work with the six-year plan of review and physical inspection. The assessor tries to stay on track with purposed goals. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the residential class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	926	526	56.80
2008	1,026	652	63.55
2007	1,111	743	66.88
2006	1,080	762	70.56
2005	1,087	785	72.22

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County

RESIDENTIAL: The table indicates that residential transactions are still declining, as is the percent of usable sales. The greatest percent of non-usable sales occurs with transactions involving foreclosures and sheriff sales (approximately 38%) due largely to economic factors in and around Lexington that deal with a fluid and transitory work force at a large industrial facility. Then followed by estate settlements (16%), family transactions (10%), and the remainder of the disqualified sales which is a mixture of partial interests, land exchanges, divorce, re-location, mobile homes, economic development involving the City of Lexington, substantially changed, gifts, corrective deeds, and splits. As noted by the Dawson County Assessor the sales are reviewed in the following manner. For sales that are part of an active update planned for a particular market (city or rural) the information is compiled and copies are placed in a review file. Stanard Appraisal Company has been under contract to the Dawson County Assessor for many years. This staff of professional appraisers will attempt to speak with both the buyer and seller involved in a transfer. The new owner most often is spoken to on site as the appraiser inspects the property. Interior inspection occurs when possible. The appraiser has a standard form that is filled out. He or she is also expected to measure the exterior of a dwelling to ensure details on the record match what was sold. Any changes are noted and the record updated. Market sales models are derived from this work. For properties that are not part of an on-going update, the appraisers generally drive to the location and take a photograph of the home if a current one is not on file. The record card is checked against what is seen on site to ensure that details such as square feet, condition, and other aspects match up. There is also a dependency on an exchange of information with local professional appraisers, and others such as attorneys, realtors, banks, and agricultural related businessmen. Government officials are part of the information trail as well, particularly in city and county venues. Public records are also gleaned for pertinent information.

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 Dawson County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	2.37	97	98
2008	96.82	1.57	98	98.31
2007	91	5.22	96	98
2006	96	1.87	98	98
2005	97	1.71	99	98

RESIDENTIAL: There is less than a one point (.75) difference in the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, the two statistics are similar and strongly support each other and indicate that an acceptable level of value has been accomplished.

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 Dawson 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)
4.55	2009	2.37
2.96	2008	1.57
13.75	2007	5.22
6.62	2006	1.87
4.04	2005	1.71

RESIDENTIAL: A comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change in the residential base (excluding growth) reveals an approximate two point (2.18) difference and is not unreasonable. In the analysis of the residential class the assessor will focus on those subclasses needing attention. For 2009 scheduled residential updates were done for the City of Cozad and the Village of Farnam, along with these the areas known as Plum Creek Canyon and Midway Lake were also updated.

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 Dawson County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	94	96

RESIDENTIAL: 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 residential class and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	10.12	102.44
Difference	0.00	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: Both of the qualitative measures, the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential, have met the acceptable standards. Indicating the residential property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner within Dawson County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	524	526	2
Median	95	98	3
Wgt. Mean	91	94	3
Mean	93	96	3
COD	13.63	10.12	-3.51
PRD	102.62	102.44	-0.18
Minimum	9.00	9.00	0.00
Maximum	186.35	186.35	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: Two sales were added to the R&O Statistics that had not previously been coded correctly. After reviewing the three-year plan of assessment, the preliminary statistics, the reported assessment actions and the 2009 R&O Statistics, it appears that all statistical measures are an accurate reflection of the assessment actions taken in Dawson County for the residential class of property for assessment year 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

In order to be meaningful, statistical inferences must be based on a representative and proportionate sample of the population. If the sales are representative of the population and the sales have been appraised in a similar manner to the unsold properties, statistical inferences should be substantially the same as statistics developed from actual assessed value. This comparison is to provide additional information to the analyst in determining the reliability of the statistical inference.

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	526	241	285
Median	98	93	5
Wgt. Mean	94	91	3
Mean	96	94	2
COD	10.12	16.87	-6.75
PRD	102.44	103.54	-1.10
Minimum	9.00	5.74	3.26
Maximum	186.35	169.54	16.81

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 Dawson County the measures of central tendency are somewhat similar and suggest that the sales file is representative of the population. Further, even though the trended qualitative measures are only slightly outside of the parameters there is still indication that the sold and unsold properties are treated in a similar manner and there is no bias in the assignment of residential assessments.

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:	83	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.15	95% Median C.I.:	89.36 to 98.48
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,428,154	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	25.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.18 to 92.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,464,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.12	95% Mean C.I.:	87.27 to 98.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,719,908						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	174,276	COD:	19.15	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,155	PRD:	125.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:35:59

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	9	100.00	101.54	96.38	12.77	105.36	65.83	153.60	89.36 to 105.16	58,428	56,314
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	98.95	92.60	95.01	7.23	97.46	74.50	100.00	N/A	65,400	62,135
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	102.35	106.13	105.46	11.34	100.64	93.46	130.00	93.46 to 130.00	74,833	78,915
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	98.11	111.02	76.42	37.58	145.28	44.22	167.50	44.22 to 167.50	59,400	45,395
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	10	91.93	91.79	96.80	11.31	94.82	66.44	107.20	77.93 to 107.20	99,890	96,698
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	87.85	78.02	56.44	23.58	138.23	22.16	111.94	49.98 to 98.68	526,166	296,961
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	72.43	77.49	69.05	14.00	112.23	65.10	100.00	N/A	193,125	133,350
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	80.30	89.97	81.04	13.45	111.01	78.60	111.00	N/A	582,600	472,150
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	92.65	90.99	89.12	17.66	102.10	62.86	115.83	N/A	62,500	55,699
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	87.62	95.18	86.36	22.36	110.21	66.38	131.11	N/A	67,200	58,034
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	72.87	89.72	65.15	36.00	137.72	57.54	155.61	N/A	126,250	82,249
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	14	94.75	90.65	98.12	14.75	92.39	54.24	118.97	73.28 to 108.33	130,221	127,771
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	98.95	103.36	93.66	17.98	110.36	44.22	167.50	93.46 to 105.16	63,617	59,584
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	29	87.48	83.93	65.90	18.36	127.35	22.16	111.94	75.26 to 98.68	339,075	223,461
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	27	90.51	91.40	90.28	20.50	101.25	54.24	155.61	76.29 to 103.73	107,929	97,435
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	35	94.62	93.37	65.08	21.13	143.48	22.16	167.50	87.48 to 99.85	233,648	152,051
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	83.35	88.73	79.28	19.94	111.92	62.86	131.11	69.60 to 111.00	194,143	153,926
____ALL____											
	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
COZAD	15	95.50	92.99	89.20	12.71	104.25	54.24	115.83	82.86 to 104.86	80,553	71,855
COZAD RURAL	1	167.50	167.50	167.50			167.50	167.50	N/A	10,000	16,750
EDDYVILLE	1	66.44	66.44	66.44			66.44	66.44	N/A	900	598
GOTHENBURG	27	92.62	91.04	87.73	16.65	103.77	44.22	155.61	85.71 to 99.90	76,609	67,211
GOTHENBURG RURAL	2	89.61	89.61	87.27	16.54	102.68	74.79	104.43	N/A	184,000	160,583
LEXINGTON	34	94.65	90.41	69.18	21.62	130.70	22.16	153.60	76.29 to 100.00	317,038	219,312
OVERTON	2	130.23	130.23	115.12	23.21	113.13	100.00	160.46	N/A	10,000	11,511
OVERTON RURAL	1	92.09	92.09	92.09			92.09	92.09	N/A	10,000	9,209
____ALL____											
	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.15	95% Median C.I.:	89.36 to 98.48
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,428,154	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	25.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.18 to 92.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,464,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.12	95% Mean C.I.:	87.27 to 98.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,719,908						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	174,276	COD:	19.15	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,155	PRD:	125.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:36:00

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	78	94.68	92.19	73.74	18.51	125.02	22.16	160.46	87.62 to 98.68	179,576	132,420
2	1	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	70,000	43,999
3	4	98.26	109.70	89.47	26.73	122.62	74.79	167.50	N/A	97,000	86,781
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

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	71	93.46	92.57	73.80	19.80	125.43	22.16	167.50	86.40 to 98.95	200,600	148,046
2	11	95.50	93.10	93.71	17.80	99.35	49.98	155.61	62.50 to 105.16	19,118	17,916
3	1	95.83	95.83	95.83			95.83	95.83	N/A	12,000	11,500
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0009											
21-0180											
24-0001	33	93.46	90.16	69.09	22.39	130.51	22.16	153.60	76.29 to 100.00	325,645	224,973
24-0004	4	99.24	112.76	102.75	17.61	109.74	92.09	160.46	N/A	15,750	16,183
24-0011	16	95.83	97.65	89.85	16.57	108.69	54.24	167.50	82.86 to 108.33	76,143	68,411
24-0020	29	92.62	90.94	87.66	16.61	103.74	44.22	155.61	85.71 to 99.90	84,015	73,650
24-0101	1	66.44	66.44	66.44			66.44	66.44	N/A	900	598
32-0095											
37-0030											
NonValid School											
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.15	95% Median C.I.:	89.36 to 98.48
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,428,154	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	25.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.18 to 92.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,464,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.12	95% Mean C.I.:	87.27 to 98.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,719,908						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	174,276	COD:	19.15	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,155	PRD:	125.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:36:00

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	14	95.83	98.18	95.39	20.58	102.93	49.98	167.50	74.50 to 105.16	19,307	18,416
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	12	99.43	101.55	99.57	18.89	101.99	66.44	160.46	78.60 to 111.00	48,766	48,555
1920 TO 1939	9	87.62	92.03	80.79	23.96	113.91	61.50	153.60	65.83 to 114.00	46,611	37,658
1940 TO 1949	3	98.11	99.60	100.25	3.07	99.36	95.83	104.86	N/A	33,667	33,750
1950 TO 1959	7	98.48	99.63	101.07	13.13	98.57	69.44	130.00	69.44 to 130.00	56,000	56,600
1960 TO 1969	7	100.78	99.42	97.62	16.29	101.85	69.60	131.11	69.60 to 131.11	196,865	192,173
1970 TO 1979	11	93.46	92.45	92.05	9.17	100.43	66.38	107.20	74.79 to 107.20	130,145	119,799
1980 TO 1989	7	85.71	77.95	87.79	26.61	88.79	22.16	118.97	22.16 to 118.97	232,142	203,791
1990 TO 1994	5	80.30	80.26	58.98	15.96	136.09	49.68	109.20	N/A	1,427,600	841,964
1995 TO 1999	4	77.11	76.69	67.59	21.32	113.47	44.22	108.33	N/A	141,575	95,685
2000 TO Present	4	77.78	77.12	64.68	27.29	119.23	54.24	98.68	N/A	139,500	90,227
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	96.15	103.08	107.67	19.84	95.74	66.44	153.60	N/A	2,680	2,885
5000 TO 9999	3	155.61	130.19	135.54	18.41	96.05	74.50	160.46	N/A	6,333	8,584
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	99.94	113.25	124.02	30.12	91.32	66.44	160.46	66.44 to 160.46	4,050	5,022
10000 TO 29999	10	93.96	93.88	91.13	25.10	103.02	49.98	167.50	62.50 to 114.00	17,450	15,902
30000 TO 59999	22	98.30	95.74	96.11	9.89	99.62	69.44	131.11	87.48 to 100.00	41,072	39,474
60000 TO 99999	17	97.16	96.02	95.87	15.02	100.16	61.50	140.62	86.40 to 108.33	68,294	65,471
100000 TO 149999	8	75.78	70.79	71.02	20.43	99.68	22.16	93.46	22.16 to 93.46	122,812	87,222
150000 TO 249999	9	83.33	86.08	85.25	21.96	100.97	44.22	109.20	66.38 to 107.20	177,366	151,208
250000 TO 499999	4	97.06	90.90	90.65	15.93	100.28	57.54	111.94	N/A	306,163	277,527
500000 +	5	80.30	80.91	64.01	23.59	126.40	49.68	118.97	N/A	1,678,000	1,074,095
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.15	95% Median C.I.:	89.36 to 98.48
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,428,154	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	25.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.18 to 92.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,464,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.12	95% Mean C.I.:	87.27 to 98.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,719,908						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	174,276	COD:	19.15	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,155	PRD:	125.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:36:00

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	7	95.50	91.41	81.52	24.32	112.14	49.98	153.60	49.98 to 153.60	4,057	3,307
5000 TO 9999	2	126.28	126.28	114.88	27.07	109.92	92.09	160.46	N/A	7,500	8,616
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	95.50	99.16	93.05	26.87	106.57	49.98	160.46	66.44 to 153.60	4,822	4,487
10000 TO 29999	13	82.86	92.74	68.49	33.71	135.40	22.16	167.50	69.44 to 114.00	29,807	20,416
30000 TO 59999	24	97.66	93.46	91.50	11.66	102.15	61.50	131.11	87.62 to 100.00	46,483	42,530
60000 TO 99999	18	95.95	92.22	83.62	18.39	110.28	44.22	140.62	75.26 to 100.00	93,266	77,991
100000 TO 149999	5	83.33	84.13	83.91	6.93	100.26	76.29	93.46	N/A	140,000	117,478
150000 TO 249999	6	105.82	93.39	88.68	13.68	105.31	57.54	109.20	57.54 to 109.20	208,333	184,758
250000 TO 499999	5	93.34	92.33	89.55	12.24	103.11	65.10	111.94	N/A	379,930	340,230
500000 +	3	80.30	82.98	62.14	28.76	133.53	49.68	118.97	N/A	2,463,333	1,530,811
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

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	93.80	97.44	93.22	21.13	104.53	49.98	167.50	74.50 to 105.16	27,878	25,987
10	8	87.85	90.33	89.19	11.25	101.27	74.79	109.20	74.79 to 109.20	129,625	115,617
20	61	94.74	91.90	72.34	19.69	127.04	22.16	160.46	87.48 to 99.85	213,732	154,608
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	27.15	95% Median C.I.:	89.36 to 98.48
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,428,154	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	25.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.18 to 92.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,464,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.12	95% Mean C.I.:	87.27 to 98.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,719,908						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	174,276	COD:	19.15	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,155	PRD:	125.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:36:00

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	19	95.50	101.89	108.13	23.01	94.23	49.98	167.50	82.86 to 118.97	58,857	63,643
140	1	98.68	98.68	98.68			98.68	98.68	N/A	38,000	37,500
325	7	95.83	87.69	78.38	15.94	111.88	62.86	114.00	62.86 to 114.00	70,000	54,865
326	2	68.78	68.78	71.72	35.71	95.90	44.22	93.34	N/A	251,447	180,344
336	1	104.86	104.86	104.86			104.86	104.86	N/A	36,000	37,750
339	1	90.00	90.00	90.00			90.00	90.00	N/A	63,000	56,700
341	2	112.31	112.31	111.60	15.75	100.64	94.62	130.00	N/A	62,500	69,750
343	5	90.51	91.76	87.59	12.63	104.76	75.26	111.94	N/A	575,111	503,743
344	8	92.42	84.77	84.36	16.89	100.49	54.24	104.43	54.24 to 104.43	71,125	59,998
347	1	98.01	98.01	98.01			98.01	98.01	N/A	70,000	68,610
349	3	83.33	91.09	84.72	13.63	107.51	77.93	112.00	N/A	115,000	97,433
350	3	99.90	96.97	97.07	10.34	99.89	80.00	111.00	N/A	46,666	45,300
352	4	100.33	89.38	54.67	17.76	163.50	49.68	107.20	N/A	1,415,500	773,838
353	12	98.92	97.67	96.57	14.93	101.14	65.83	140.62	78.60 to 110.00	71,483	69,031
355	1	69.44	69.44	69.44			69.44	69.44	N/A	36,000	25,000
384	1	73.64	73.64	73.64			73.64	73.64	N/A	27,500	20,250
406	8	93.68	91.53	73.30	26.00	124.88	22.16	160.46	22.16 to 160.46	45,737	33,523
407	1	85.71	85.71	85.71			85.71	85.71	N/A	105,000	90,000
410	1	74.79	74.79	74.79			74.79	74.79	N/A	213,000	159,300
419	1	65.10	65.10	65.10			65.10	65.10	N/A	500,000	325,500
471	1	57.54	57.54	57.54			57.54	57.54	N/A	325,000	187,000
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155
04											
ALL	83	94.62	92.68	74.11	19.15	125.06	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.48	174,276	129,155

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

Commercial

For 2009 within the commercial class the work occurred in the two areas stated within the three-year plan of assessment; fast food franchises and mobile home courts.

The fast food work was left over from a year ago and after an analysis of several sales the data indicated a need to review this type of commercial property.

The mobile home court project was mostly in the Lexington area, although all courts were reviewed all through the county.

There is not language specifically addressing a six-year plan of physical inspection and review, however with the three-year plan of assessment the assessor states on page 2 (below the chart), second paragraph, “It is the intention of the assessor, relative to the amount of change annually in the market, to look at updating each class of property in a three-year cycle starting with residential, then continuing with agriculture production ground, and then commercial. In practice, market forces often times disrupt this cycle, and any plan of this scope requires considerable flexibility.”

Within the third paragraph there is a statement, “Much of the work tends to be ongoing, albeit, within smaller segments of each class. In actual practice, updates have been conducted every year in one or more localities for residential property, and changes have been required for commercial property to a degree at least every two years. Agricultural ground also tends to receive annual attention.”

Also the fourth paragraph states, “The fact that there are three major groups of property in the statistical analysis naturally suggested looking at a cycle in three-year increments....”

2009 Assessment Survey for Dawson County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	The office appraiser, assessor, and contracted appraisal service.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The office appraiser or contracted appraisal service will establish an initial value, however ultimately the assessor is responsible for setting the final estimate of value.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The office appraiser will do all pickup work unless it involves a special industrial type property, in which case the contracted appraisal service will assist.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	All commercial property has been priced with the Marshall-Swift June of 2005 costing tables in the MicroSolve CAMA System.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	The county uses the Marshall-Swift depreciation tables that coincide with the June of 2005 costing tables within the CAMA program.
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The income approach is utilized for all properties where rents and income and expense data can be obtained from the market.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The sales comparison approach is used for properties of the same occupancy code if enough sales are available. With commercial properties the availability of sales for all occupancy codes does not happen. As well many commercial property sales entail mixed occupancy codes, in which case finding comparables is difficult.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	Often reviews and updates are conducted in terms of occupancy code, such as all fast food franchise businesses or motels. Reviews may be conducted in neighborhoods, like highway strips to Interstate 80 or main business districts within the larger communities of Dawson County. In the smaller less populated towns and villages there are not enough sales of a particular occupancy code to determine if there are common value characteristics.

9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	They are defined by location and type of business, commercial or industrial and occupancy codes.
10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	This is difficult within the commercial class of property. More emphasis is put on occupancy codes, and possibly location like main street or the interstate corridor, in the valuation process. Models are built for neighborhoods with similar properties, that is to say a neighborhood with like retail or office businesses, but there are still various areas with mixed occupancy and the diversity of these sales makes it difficult.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	They can have, as previously explained more emphasis is put on occupancy codes, and possibly location like main street or the interstate corridor, in the valuation process. Models are built for neighborhoods with similar properties, that is to say a neighborhood with like retail or office businesses, but there are still various areas with mixed occupancy.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	The suburban location, as defined in regulation, does not have its own valuation grouping in the county.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
36	0	0	36

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	82	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	26.51	95% Median C.I.:	90.00 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,828,154	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	24.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.37 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,864,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.33	95% Mean C.I.:	87.88 to 98.58
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,099,723						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	169,084	COD:	18.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,167	PRD:	127.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:24:09

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	9	100.00	101.54	96.38	12.77	105.36	65.83	153.60	89.36 to 105.16	58,428	56,314
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	98.95	92.60	95.01	7.23	97.46	74.50	100.00	N/A	65,400	62,135
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	104.06	106.85	106.08	10.46	100.72	93.46	130.00	93.46 to 130.00	74,833	79,382
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	98.11	111.02	76.42	37.58	145.28	44.22	167.50	44.22 to 167.50	59,400	45,395
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	10	95.67	94.80	101.32	8.68	93.56	66.44	107.20	87.48 to 107.20	99,890	101,208
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	87.85	78.02	56.44	23.58	138.23	22.16	111.94	49.98 to 98.68	526,166	296,961
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	72.43	77.49	69.05	14.00	112.23	65.10	100.00	N/A	193,125	133,350
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	80.30	89.97	81.04	13.45	111.01	78.60	111.00	N/A	582,600	472,150
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	92.65	90.99	89.12	17.66	102.10	62.86	115.83	N/A	62,500	55,699
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	87.62	95.18	86.36	22.36	110.21	66.38	131.11	N/A	67,200	58,034
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	72.87	89.72	65.15	36.00	137.72	57.54	155.61	N/A	126,250	82,249
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	13	93.34	91.29	91.63	11.00	99.63	62.50	110.00	80.00 to 103.73	94,084	86,208
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	98.95	103.52	93.82	17.82	110.34	44.22	167.50	93.46 to 105.16	63,617	59,687
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	29	91.77	84.97	66.36	17.25	128.03	22.16	111.94	75.26 to 98.68	339,075	225,016
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	26	90.66	91.75	84.81	18.52	108.18	57.54	155.61	78.79 to 98.89	89,003	75,487
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	35	95.50	94.35	65.66	20.25	143.70	22.16	167.50	91.77 to 99.85	233,648	153,419
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	83.35	88.73	79.28	19.94	111.92	62.86	131.11	69.60 to 111.00	194,143	153,926
____ALL____											
	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

ASSESSOR LOCATION

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
COZAD	15	96.67	96.61	94.87	9.28	101.83	74.50	115.83	90.51 to 104.86	80,553	76,422
COZAD RURAL	1	167.50	167.50	167.50			167.50	167.50	N/A	10,000	16,750
EDDYVILLE	1	66.44	66.44	66.44			66.44	66.44	N/A	900	598
GOTHENBURG	27	92.62	91.04	87.73	16.65	103.77	44.22	155.61	85.71 to 99.90	76,609	67,211
GOTHENBURG RURAL	2	89.61	89.61	87.27	16.54	102.68	74.79	104.43	N/A	184,000	160,583
LEXINGTON	33	94.67	90.05	66.49	20.95	135.44	22.16	153.60	76.29 to 98.95	308,463	205,088
OVERTON	2	130.23	130.23	115.12	23.21	113.13	100.00	160.46	N/A	10,000	11,511
OVERTON RURAL	1	92.09	92.09	92.09			92.09	92.09	N/A	10,000	9,209
____ALL____											
	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 82 **MEDIAN: 95** COV: 26.51 95% Median C.I.: 90.00 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price: 13,828,154 WGT. MEAN: 73 STD: 24.72 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 55.37 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 13,864,954 MEAN: 93 AVG.ABS.DEV: 17.33 95% Mean C.I.: 87.88 to 98.58
TOTAL Assessed Value: 10,099,723
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 169,084 COD: 18.22 MAX Sales Ratio: 167.50
AVG. Assessed Value: 123,167 PRD: 127.98 MIN Sales Ratio: 22.16

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:24:09

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	77	95.50	92.77	72.41	17.45	128.10	22.16	160.46	90.00 to 98.68	174,116	126,085
2	1	62.86	62.86	62.86			62.86	62.86	N/A	70,000	43,999
3	4	98.26	109.70	89.47	26.73	122.62	74.79	167.50	N/A	97,000	86,781
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

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	70	94.71	93.21	72.50	18.59	128.56	22.16	167.50	89.36 to 98.92	194,895	141,302
2	11	95.50	93.10	93.71	17.80	99.35	49.98	155.61	62.50 to 105.16	19,118	17,916
3	1	95.83	95.83	95.83			95.83	95.83	N/A	12,000	11,500
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0009											
21-0180											
24-0001	32	94.07	89.79	66.38	21.62	135.26	22.16	153.60	75.26 to 100.00	317,071	210,482
24-0004	4	99.24	112.76	102.75	17.61	109.74	92.09	160.46	N/A	15,750	16,183
24-0011	16	97.80	101.04	95.47	13.13	105.83	74.50	167.50	90.51 to 108.33	76,143	72,693
24-0020	29	92.62	90.94	87.66	16.61	103.74	44.22	155.61	85.71 to 99.90	84,015	73,650
24-0101	1	66.44	66.44	66.44			66.44	66.44	N/A	900	598
32-0095											
37-0030											
NonValid School											
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	82	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	26.51	95% Median C.I.:	90.00 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,828,154	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	24.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.37 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,864,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.33	95% Mean C.I.:	87.88 to 98.58
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,099,723						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	169,084	COD:	18.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,167	PRD:	127.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:24:09

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	14	95.83	98.18	95.39	20.58	102.93	49.98	167.50	74.50 to 105.16	19,307	18,416
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	12	99.43	101.55	99.57	18.89	101.99	66.44	160.46	78.60 to 111.00	48,766	48,555
1920 TO 1939	9	87.62	92.03	80.79	23.96	113.91	61.50	153.60	65.83 to 114.00	46,611	37,658
1940 TO 1949	3	98.11	99.60	100.25	3.07	99.36	95.83	104.86	N/A	33,667	33,750
1950 TO 1959	7	98.48	99.63	101.07	13.13	98.57	69.44	130.00	69.44 to 130.00	56,000	56,600
1960 TO 1969	7	100.78	99.42	97.62	16.29	101.85	69.60	131.11	69.60 to 131.11	196,865	192,173
1970 TO 1979	11	93.46	92.84	92.25	9.59	100.64	66.38	107.20	74.79 to 107.20	130,145	120,054
1980 TO 1989	6	75.41	71.11	69.54	27.94	102.26	22.16	104.43	22.16 to 104.43	170,833	118,792
1990 TO 1994	5	80.30	82.93	59.26	19.28	139.94	49.68	109.20	N/A	1,427,600	845,964
1995 TO 1999	4	85.48	80.88	72.02	24.13	112.30	44.22	108.33	N/A	141,575	101,962
2000 TO Present	4	94.41	86.26	72.87	12.80	118.37	57.54	98.68	N/A	139,500	101,652
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	96.15	103.08	107.67	19.84	95.74	66.44	153.60	N/A	2,680	2,885
5000 TO 9999	3	155.61	130.19	135.54	18.41	96.05	74.50	160.46	N/A	6,333	8,584
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	99.94	113.25	124.02	30.12	91.32	66.44	160.46	66.44 to 160.46	4,050	5,022
10000 TO 29999	10	93.96	93.88	91.13	25.10	103.02	49.98	167.50	62.50 to 114.00	17,450	15,902
30000 TO 59999	22	98.30	95.74	96.11	9.89	99.62	69.44	131.11	87.48 to 100.00	41,072	39,474
60000 TO 99999	17	98.01	96.27	96.11	14.79	100.17	61.50	140.62	86.40 to 108.33	68,294	65,636
100000 TO 149999	8	81.00	75.36	75.67	17.95	99.59	22.16	93.46	22.16 to 93.46	122,812	92,934
150000 TO 249999	9	96.67	89.42	88.08	17.01	101.52	44.22	109.20	66.38 to 107.20	177,366	156,219
250000 TO 499999	4	97.06	90.90	90.65	15.93	100.28	57.54	111.94	N/A	306,163	277,527
500000 +	4	72.70	71.40	59.78	19.27	119.44	49.68	90.51	N/A	1,947,500	1,164,171
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

PAD 2009 R&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:	82	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	26.51	95% Median C.I.:	90.00 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,828,154	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	24.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.37 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,864,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.33	95% Mean C.I.:	87.88 to 98.58
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,099,723						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	169,084	COD:	18.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,167	PRD:	127.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:24:09

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	7	95.50	91.41	81.52	24.32	112.14	49.98	153.60	49.98 to 153.60	4,057	3,307
5000 TO 9999	2	126.28	126.28	114.88	27.07	109.92	92.09	160.46	N/A	7,500	8,616
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	95.50	99.16	93.05	26.87	106.57	49.98	160.46	66.44 to 153.60	4,822	4,487
10000 TO 29999	13	82.86	92.74	68.49	33.71	135.40	22.16	167.50	69.44 to 114.00	29,807	20,416
30000 TO 59999	24	97.66	93.46	91.50	11.66	102.15	61.50	131.11	87.62 to 100.00	46,483	42,530
60000 TO 99999	17	98.01	94.70	86.17	16.39	109.91	44.22	140.62	75.26 to 108.33	91,400	78,755
100000 TO 149999	6	92.13	90.25	90.42	5.08	99.81	76.29	96.67	76.29 to 96.67	137,500	124,332
150000 TO 249999	6	105.82	93.39	88.68	13.68	105.31	57.54	109.20	57.54 to 109.20	208,333	184,758
250000 TO 499999	5	93.34	92.33	89.55	12.24	103.11	65.10	111.94	N/A	379,930	340,230
500000 +	2	64.99	64.99	57.12	23.56	113.77	49.68	80.30	N/A	3,395,000	1,939,322
ALL											
	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

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	93.80	97.44	93.22	21.13	104.53	49.98	167.50	74.50 to 105.16	27,878	25,987
10	8	95.67	94.09	93.54	8.15	100.58	74.79	109.20	74.79 to 109.20	129,625	121,255
20	60	95.29	92.13	70.48	18.91	130.72	22.16	160.46	87.48 to 99.85	207,294	146,097
ALL											
	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	82	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	26.51	95% Median C.I.:	90.00 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,828,154	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	24.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.37 to 90.31
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,864,954	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.33	95% Mean C.I.:	87.88 to 98.58
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,099,723						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	169,084	COD:	18.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,167	PRD:	127.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.16		

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

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:24:09

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	18	93.80	100.94	95.59	23.34	105.60	49.98	167.50	82.86 to 105.16	28,794	27,524
140	1	98.68	98.68	98.68			98.68	98.68	N/A	38,000	37,500
325	7	95.83	87.69	78.38	15.94	111.88	62.86	114.00	62.86 to 114.00	70,000	54,865
326	2	68.78	68.78	71.72	35.71	95.90	44.22	93.34	N/A	251,447	180,344
336	1	104.86	104.86	104.86			104.86	104.86	N/A	36,000	37,750
339	1	90.00	90.00	90.00			90.00	90.00	N/A	63,000	56,700
341	2	114.46	114.46	113.84	13.58	100.54	98.92	130.00	N/A	62,500	71,150
343	5	90.51	91.76	87.59	12.63	104.76	75.26	111.94	N/A	575,111	503,743
344	8	94.01	89.34	92.39	11.74	96.70	61.50	104.43	61.50 to 104.43	71,125	65,710
347	1	98.01	98.01	98.01			98.01	98.01	N/A	70,000	68,610
349	3	96.67	101.11	97.80	5.98	103.39	94.67	112.00	N/A	115,000	112,468
350	3	99.90	96.97	97.07	10.34	99.89	80.00	111.00	N/A	46,666	45,300
352	4	100.33	89.38	54.67	17.76	163.50	49.68	107.20	N/A	1,415,500	773,838
353	12	98.92	97.67	96.57	14.93	101.14	65.83	140.62	78.60 to 110.00	71,483	69,031
355	1	69.44	69.44	69.44			69.44	69.44	N/A	36,000	25,000
384	1	73.64	73.64	73.64			73.64	73.64	N/A	27,500	20,250
406	8	93.68	91.53	73.30	26.00	124.88	22.16	160.46	22.16 to 160.46	45,737	33,523
407	1	85.71	85.71	85.71			85.71	85.71	N/A	105,000	90,000
410	1	74.79	74.79	74.79			74.79	74.79	N/A	213,000	159,300
419	1	65.10	65.10	65.10			65.10	65.10	N/A	500,000	325,500
471	1	57.54	57.54	57.54			57.54	57.54	N/A	325,000	187,000
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167
04											
ALL	82	95.12	93.23	72.84	18.22	127.98	22.16	167.50	90.00 to 98.68	169,084	123,167

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 supported by the trended preliminary ratio. The sample is representative of the population and when the effects of high dollar sales are mitigated it is believed the qualitative measures are indicating that the commercial 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 in-house and with the assistance of the contracted appraiser (Stanard Appraisal Service). The assessor has made comment that the intention is, relative to the amount of change annually in the market, to update each class of property in a three-year cycle, this would work with the six-year plan of review and physical inspection. The assessor tries to stay on track with purposed goals. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	187	82	43.85
2008	173	94	54.34
2007	175	95	54.29
2006	187	101	54.01
2005	176	95	53.98

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County

COMMERCIAL:For the last four years the utilization grid is indicating that the percent of sales used in the measurement of the commercial class has hovered around the 54% mark. For 2009 this percent spirals downward. In reviewing the disqualified sales approximately 20% of them involve some type of legal action (foreclosures and sheriff's sales), followed by partial interests at 19%, and substantially changed (new construction) 13%, sales were personal property could not be verified (10%) and the remainder where such things as, family, centrally assessed (Source Gas Distribution, LLC and Cozad Telephone), liquidations, use change, corrective deeds, and splits. As noted by the Dawson County Assessor the sales are reviewed in the following manner. For sales that are part of an active update planned for a particular market (city or rural) the information is compiled and copies are placed in a review file. Stanard Appraisal Company has been under contract to the Dawson County Assessor for many years. This staff of professional appraisers will attempt to speak with both the buyer and seller involved in a transfer. He or she is also expected to measure the improvements of a commercial establishment to ensure details on the record match what was sold. Any changes are noted and the record updated. Market sales models are derived from this work. Appraisers also ask for market rents, and when possible, income and expense statements for the prior three-year period. It generally takes an official letter on assessor stationery to encourage the submission of income and expense statements. A letter is also issued to a property owner who files a case with the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. A complete inspection of the property is insisted upon, along with the gathering of any information that will help with the income approach. For properties that are not part of an on-going update, the appraisers generally drive to the location and take a photograph of the business if a current one is not on file. The record card is checked against what is seen on site to ensure that details such as square feet, condition, and other aspects match up. There is also an exchange of information with local professional appraisers, and others such as attorneys, realtors, banks, and agricultural related businessmen. Government officials are part of the information trail as well, particularly in city and county venues. Public records are also gleaned for pertinent information.

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 Dawson County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	-1.27	94	95
2008	96.91	2.47	99	96.91
2007	99	3.27	102	99
2006	90	5.90	96	99
2005	97	-0.16	97	97

COMMERCIAL: The is an approximate a one point (1.21) difference in the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, the two statistics are similar and tend to support each other and indicate that an acceptable level of value has been accomplished.

2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 Dawson 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)
-5.56	2009	-1.27
0.00	2008	2.47
0.75	2007	3.27
27.09	2006	5.90
4.80	2005	-0.16

COMMERCIAL: A comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change in commercial base (excluding growth) reveals an approximate four point (4.29) difference and appears to be more pronounced in the sales file. The percent change in the sales file is reflecting the removal of one sale (book 2008 page 1921 sale date 04/11/08) with a value of \$ 713,790 that is now exempt and owned by the City of Lexington. The percent change in the base would also be reflective of this loss in value to the population along with the review of the fast food franchises and mobile home courts, and the annual routine maintenance.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson 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 Dawson County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	95	73	93

COMMERCIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency the median and arithmetic mean are within the prescribed parameter, the weighted mean is well below. However, the weighted mean is being impacted by two high dollar sales, book 2007 page 1718 sale date 05/15/07 in the amount of \$1,650,000 and the other book 2007 page 0052 sale date 12/31/06 in the amount of \$5,140,000. When these two sales are hypothetically removed from the "mix" their effects are mitigated and the weighted mean, still below the acceptable standard is improved to 87.93, the median is 95.67, and the mean is 93.93. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to best describe the level of value for the commercial class of property in Dawson County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	18.22	127.98
Difference	0.00	24.98

COMMERCIAL:Of the qualitative measures the coefficient of dispersion has met the standard. However the price related differential is excessively high but is being impacted by two high dollar sales book 2007 page 1718 sale date 05/15/07 and book 2007 page 0052 sale date 12/31/06. When these two sales are hypothetically removed from the "mix" their effects are mitigated, the COD moves to 17.77% and the PRD to 106.83, still 3.83 points above the standard but considerably improved. Considering the dispersion among the assessor locations, and the diversity of the commercial properties this would not be uncommon.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Dawson County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	83	82	-1
Median	95	95	0
Wgt. Mean	74	73	-1
Mean	93	93	0
COD	19.15	18.22	-0.93
PRD	125.06	127.98	2.92
Minimum	22.16	22.16	0.00
Maximum	167.50	167.50	0.00

COMMERCIAL:After reviewing the three-year plan of assessment, the preliminary statistics, the reported assessment actions and the 2009 R&O Statistics, it appears that all statistical measures are an accurate reflection of the assessment actions taken in Dawson County for the commercial class of property for assessment year 2009.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

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

Agricultural

A county surveyor has been hired and is working to get a GIS system up and running for the county. This is going to be most useful in assisting the assessor in getting the 2008 soil conversion implemented for 2010.

An analysis of the market was done; all changes in value will be displayed as follows for the three market areas.

	area - 1			area - 2			area - 3		
	2008	2009	% Chg	2008	2009	% Chg	2008	2009	% Chg
1A1									
1A	1600	1700	6.25%	1260	1260	0.00%	1455	1600	9.97%
2A1	1525	1650	8.20%	1220	1220	0.00%	1360	1525	12.13%
2A	1415	1525	7.77%	1050	1050	0.00%	1240	1415	14.11%
3A1	1200	1375	14.58%	735	735	0.00%	1050	1300	23.81%
3A	1000	1175	17.50%	590	590	0.00%	850	1120	31.76%
4A1	900	1175	30.56%	545	545	0.00%	775	1000	29.03%
4A	875	1100	25.71%	545	545	0.00%	730	1000	36.99%
1D1									
1D	735	860	17.01%	600	600	0.00%	650	700	7.69%
2D1	610	800	31.15%	560	560	0.00%	560	600	7.14%
2D	565	755	33.63%	465	465	0.00%	475	525	10.53%
3D1	550	700	27.27%	430	430	0.00%	450	500	11.11%
3D	455	600	31.87%	385	385	0.00%	435	460	5.75%
4D1	425	500	17.65%	345	345	0.00%	380	425	11.84%
4D	400	500	25.00%	275	275	0.00%	365	425	16.44%
1G1									
1G	575	575	0.00%	500	500	0.00%	520	575	10.58%
2G1	495	510	3.03%	440	440	0.00%	490	490	0.00%
2G	440	475	7.95%	375	375	0.00%	425	475	11.76%
3G1	430	450	4.65%	375	375	0.00%	415	415	0.00%
3G	415	415	0.00%	330	330	0.00%	410	415	1.22%
4G1	395	395	0.00%	280	280	0.00%	400	415	3.75%
4G	355	385	8.45%	250	250	0.00%	360	415	15.28%
waste	35	35	0.00%	35	35	0.00%	35	35	0.00%
accret	300	300	0.00%						

2009 Assessment Survey for Dawson County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Agricultural buildings are taken care of by the office appraiser and assessor. The land use is done by the assessor and deputy assessor; the appraiser will assist upon request.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The office appraiser will assist in setting initial values, however ultimately the assessor is responsible for setting the final estimate of value.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The pickup work is done by the appraiser and assessor.
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	<p>Dawson County Policy Defining Agricultural and Horticultural Land Use:</p> <p>Background –</p> <p>The change in dealing with agricultural and horticultural parcel definition was initiated in LB 407 in 2005, which came out of the Nebraska Legislature’s Revenue Committee and was eventually amended into LB 808 in the 2006 session.</p> <p>Shaping the criteria of “use” as it relates to the definition of parcel for the entire state became problematic. What terms may work well in an Eastern Nebraska county could be totally unsuitable to Dawson County.</p> <p>The discussion between the Dawson County Board of Commissioners and the County Assessor on this matter included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Consideration on the basis of size of the parcel and its vicinity to currently active commercial agricultural business, 2) Whether the owner is directly involved in agricultural or horticultural ongoing business concerns, 3) The sale price and motivation behind the sale, and 4) The degree of what may be considered an agricultural use. <p>To be constructive, the guidelines within Dawson County offer flexibility. A routine review process is included as part of the policy. Annual examination of the use of all the</p>

agricultural property within the county would be impractical, but examination of perhaps a third of the county each year may be feasible. Certainly, any unusual market activity that would prompt a full review is possible.

The Use Test -

- Is the applicable income generated directly from commercial agricultural production, as opposed to income incidental to the use of the parcel?
- What are zoning regulations as they pertain to parcel size?
 - The number of acres most often used to define nonagricultural status within Dawson County zoning regulations is 20 or less.
 - Dawson County's policy is to review all sales of 20 acres or less. If the parcel's owner has no other interest in a going agricultural concern that is contiguous to the smaller parcel, the question arises whether commercial agriculture is the primary purpose, or highest and best use of the land.
 - If in the assessor's opinion the parcel, in line with generally accepted appraisal practices, is more likely to appear on the market as residential development or was purchased for that reason, the parcel is then defined as rural residential site.
- Practices that constitute commercial farming or ranching are determined under a county survey form entitled: "Status of Land Conforming to an Agricultural or Horticultural Use." Many of the entries on this survey help define what use the parcel conforms to.

Final determination of whether a parcel conforms to a commercial agricultural use will follow inspection of the property, and completion of the county's survey form. Appeal of this decision would occur through the normal course of valuation protests administered within the authority of the county board of equalization.

Statutory references: Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359 and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Directive 08-04.

In DAWSON COUNTY
STATUS OF LAND CONFORMING TO AN
AGRICULTURAL OR HORTICULTURAL USE

Owner: _____

Legal Description: _____

Date of inquiry: _____ Assessor's verification: _____

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> The property is primarily used for the production of agricultural or horticultural product(s).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are growing crops.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Type of crop (s) _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of acres _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Length and time of year of growing season _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is grazing, feeding, or breeding of livestock.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Type of livestock _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of head _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Length and time of year of grazing season _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Horticultural use _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Type of product produced _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Length of season and time of year for the product _____</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> The market sale of the parcel indicates it is derived from <u>non-</u>agricultural influence.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Intended highest and best use _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The market sale of the parcel indicates it is derived from <u>agricultural</u> influence.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The land is enrolled in a state or federal government program that pays the landowner.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Reserve Program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands Reserve Program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of acres in the parcel _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The majority of income generated on the parcel comes from the sale of crops or livestock or a horticultural product.</p> |
|---|---|

If the property meets the definition as an agricultural or horticultural parcel it will be assessed at up to 75% of the uninfluenced

agricultural market value, except land classified as building site will not be assessed as an agricultural or horticultural parcel.

If the owner believes the property qualifies for special valuation he or she must apply for that designation on forms prescribed by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. That valuation level is up to 75% of the agricultural market value as determined by uninfluenced agricultural sales.

5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The assessor stated that, "Several years ago models were established in terms of the income approach. Various resources were utilized, particularly the University of Nebraska and the local Extension Service since they conduct annual surveys of land rents. Capitalization rates were derived from market sales and interviews with local banking and farm investment firms. Separate capitalization rates were employed in connection with specific uses: irrigation, dry or grass." The model has not been updated.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1978
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	The office procedure is to handle this on a continuing 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.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Through discovery by, including but not limited to, physical inspection, FSA maps, well registrations, taxpayers, real estate agents, personal property listings, and so forth.
b.	By whom?
	By the assessor, deputy assessor, and with the assistance of the office appraiser when needed.
c.	What proportion is complete/implemented at this time?
	Again, all land use within the county is monitored on a continual basis.
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	Three agricultural market areas have been established within Dawson County.
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	<p>If one were to look at a soil map of Dawson County it would be very noticeable that the three market areas follow the topography and geography of the county. The largest area consists of the Platte Valley for the most part. Other areas are the Sumner school district to the northeast, and the Farnam-Eustis school district to the southwest.</p> <p>Keeping the property owners within the same school districts was a consideration when the areas were first established. Among other characteristics, the accessibility to water would most likely be another major factor in the farming methods within these market areas. Area 1 historically has utilized the benefits of the Platte River both for surface and sub-surface irrigation. Very little of the soil potential in terms of acre count falls below</p>

	the 1A category. In contract, similar use in both Area 2 and Area 3 involves more of a mix of subclass soils and 3A and 4A acre counts may be higher. Wells must be sunk much deeper in Areas 2 and 3 as well. The same can be said for the grass/pasture uses in Areas 2 and 3. The vast majority of the subclass would be 4G1 and 4G.
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	Not applicable
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Not applicable
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	Special value has partially been implemented. There are additional boundaries established for special valuation along the south side of the Platte River, and Highway 283 from Interstate 80 north into Lexington.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
39	0	0	39

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6764

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:58:21

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	5	73.66	65.92	61.40	32.66	107.36	30.89	98.56	N/A		290,570	178,410
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	77.44	81.61	77.67	12.36	105.06	68.02	121.51	70.91 to 88.88		243,178	188,881
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	80.34	83.23	84.84	11.13	98.10	68.54	101.48	74.72 to 96.49		184,316	156,378
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	20	76.01	83.16	78.17	26.68	106.38	33.61	219.24	70.73 to 86.21		223,416	174,655
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	76.22	71.50	79.51	15.97	89.92	30.85	90.21	30.85 to 90.21		222,060	176,567
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	84.81	75.07	66.17	20.73	113.44	17.32	100.50	45.03 to 97.52		182,402	120,698
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	76.22	75.94	64.27	26.62	118.16	25.07	141.95	59.62 to 88.77		302,939	194,692
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	20	77.69	76.07	75.20	11.81	101.15	57.52	94.46	68.35 to 82.92		216,449	162,775
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	66.61	66.61	68.69	3.98	96.98	63.96	69.26	N/A		185,000	127,072
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	59.36	63.39	60.01	15.86	105.64	44.55	87.74	44.55 to 87.74		269,552	161,750
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	25	59.42	65.74	61.02	22.84	107.73	42.60	134.01	53.74 to 70.21		269,254	164,310
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	16	55.29	54.99	49.87	24.02	110.27	31.28	87.34	42.16 to 64.49		264,939	132,116
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	54	78.06	81.24	77.76	19.06	104.47	30.89	219.24	73.75 to 82.71		221,716	172,410
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	57	77.48	75.35	69.47	19.58	108.46	17.32	141.95	72.53 to 82.96		240,816	167,306
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	51	59.24	62.03	57.57	21.49	107.76	31.28	134.01	55.90 to 64.49		264,643	152,348
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	54	78.30	80.24	78.05	19.81	102.81	17.32	219.24	74.59 to 84.39		202,601	158,123
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	50	73.58	73.61	67.35	19.90	109.30	25.07	141.95	63.96 to 79.72		258,283	173,950
____ALL____												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6764

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:58:22

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
3183	4	57.08	64.63	64.07	15.49	100.86	54.81	89.55	N/A		316,275	202,647
3185	8	73.36	73.80	69.67	15.76	105.92	43.62	92.42	43.62 to 92.42		353,712	246,432
3187	4	70.16	69.96	69.79	9.83	100.24	56.70	82.80	N/A		273,500	190,876
3189	2	84.22	84.22	96.74	20.49	87.06	66.97	101.48	N/A		21,153	20,464
3191	3	97.52	86.44	104.04	24.52	83.08	45.03	116.77	N/A		140,333	146,009
3193	4	70.19	75.03	72.13	18.43	104.02	61.18	98.56	N/A		134,767	97,212
3195	5	48.38	59.04	54.18	29.94	108.97	42.60	89.41	N/A		239,918	129,986
3329	3	75.91	76.21	70.56	9.64	108.01	65.38	87.34	N/A		158,833	112,069
3331	4	48.81	54.54	51.88	19.65	105.13	44.55	76.00	N/A		532,167	276,084
3333	3	79.54	77.42	78.78	5.53	98.28	69.76	82.96	N/A		416,645	328,223
3335	4	74.47	78.11	65.03	28.50	120.12	54.15	109.36	N/A		287,400	186,890
3337	19	75.75	75.60	75.16	20.14	100.59	31.28	118.04	69.26 to 88.42		168,436	126,588
3339	17	74.59	78.19	70.28	24.68	111.25	38.35	141.95	59.54 to 94.39		193,716	136,149
3341	4	57.28	69.99	39.57	57.99	176.86	31.39	134.01	N/A		301,037	119,134
3407	6	85.79	81.82	82.58	12.70	99.08	59.81	96.49	59.81 to 96.49		346,112	285,807
3409	4	69.39	73.00	74.18	9.54	98.41	64.22	89.00	N/A		178,781	132,613
3411	3	61.74	60.69	62.55	21.94	97.02	39.84	80.48	N/A		195,166	122,078
3413	9	59.42	62.17	58.32	22.09	106.60	30.89	83.46	50.44 to 75.60		313,455	182,814
3415	11	73.66	72.64	70.79	15.86	102.62	51.42	97.09	53.20 to 88.65		290,327	205,513
3417	4	65.30	68.95	67.80	12.31	101.70	57.33	87.87	N/A		337,331	228,708
3419	4	54.04	55.84	66.07	51.59	84.51	25.07	90.21	N/A		232,514	153,632
3553	8	79.81	81.84	78.09	12.89	104.80	55.90	100.81	55.90 to 100.81		204,434	159,638
3555	8	83.76	84.79	84.66	7.31	100.16	76.59	95.56	76.59 to 95.56		174,244	147,511
3557	5	70.71	64.72	65.92	12.37	98.18	45.33	74.63	N/A		144,720	95,393
3559	5	78.99	77.21	77.70	7.70	99.37	65.80	86.92	N/A		248,360	192,975
3561	3	63.96	56.31	48.06	16.19	117.16	36.95	68.02	N/A		205,100	98,577
3563	5	62.45	65.68	61.06	13.91	107.56	50.16	78.73	N/A		211,000	128,835
3645	3	57.26	97.94	38.91	117.55	251.71	17.32	219.24	N/A		255,500	99,414
ALL												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	139	73.68	74.09	69.32	21.54	106.87	17.32	219.24	70.71 to 77.23		240,940	167,026
2	4	63.06	60.45	51.51	26.79	117.36	36.95	78.73	N/A		255,000	131,346
3	19	69.76	68.73	61.35	25.81	112.03	42.60	116.77	45.35 to 87.34		246,598	151,280
ALL												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6764

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:58:22

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
2	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298
____ALL____											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0009	3	57.26	97.94	38.91	117.55	251.71	17.32	219.24	N/A	255,500	99,414
21-0180											
24-0001	43	73.66	70.83	67.91	17.08	104.30	30.89	109.36	65.80 to 77.48	269,825	183,239
24-0004	17	79.28	75.07	75.19	17.48	99.84	25.07	100.81	65.38 to 90.21	215,267	161,855
24-0011	54	75.52	76.84	74.66	18.45	102.92	31.28	141.95	70.91 to 82.96	203,175	151,692
24-0020	23	68.35	69.23	62.13	26.69	111.42	31.39	134.01	56.70 to 74.17	298,318	185,352
24-0101	17	69.76	69.64	62.77	26.09	110.95	42.60	116.77	45.35 to 89.41	239,692	150,446
32-0095	5	62.45	60.85	53.59	21.64	113.54	36.95	78.73	N/A	252,000	135,054
37-0030											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	7	45.33	65.33	58.44	60.81	111.78	30.85	134.01	30.85 to 134.01	28,881	16,878
30.01 TO 50.00	9	75.28	75.12	65.36	19.03	114.92	31.28	121.51	61.40 to 84.81	75,684	49,469
50.01 TO 100.00	56	74.14	76.60	70.00	21.53	109.43	39.84	219.24	70.24 to 79.28	159,154	111,411
100.01 TO 180.00	70	71.15	70.48	66.60	21.15	105.83	25.07	118.04	65.80 to 77.23	305,302	203,326
180.01 TO 330.00	13	73.66	68.65	64.31	17.85	106.74	17.32	96.63	59.42 to 78.73	337,507	217,049
330.01 TO 650.00	2	93.27	93.27	93.03	25.20	100.26	69.76	116.77	N/A	202,021	187,932
650.01 +	5	87.19	81.99	73.63	13.57	111.35	52.27	96.49	N/A	647,453	476,719
____ALL____											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6764

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:58:22

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	39.84	68.38	39.69	85.95	172.30	31.28	134.01	N/A	91,666	36,378
DRY-N/A	5	73.68	71.10	75.48	19.73	94.20	45.03	94.35	N/A	112,412	84,851
GRASS	18	75.60	72.38	74.30	22.97	97.42	25.07	141.95	63.01 to 79.54	162,128	120,461
GRASS-N/A	13	64.49	66.81	59.43	36.70	112.42	17.32	116.77	38.35 to 89.32	327,821	194,816
IRRGTD	68	68.91	70.21	65.87	18.36	106.59	31.39	121.51	64.22 to 73.04	255,977	168,617
IRRGTD-N/A	55	77.23	78.89	72.00	20.16	109.57	36.95	219.24	73.66 to 83.46	250,410	180,293
ALL	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

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	4	61.38	72.01	47.11	59.39	152.85	31.28	134.01	N/A	83,015	39,112
DRY-N/A	4	66.61	68.15	74.64	23.82	91.30	45.03	94.35	N/A	126,250	94,235
GRASS	20	75.60	72.73	75.69	22.18	96.09	25.07	141.95	64.49 to 79.54	188,749	142,867
GRASS-N/A	11	63.96	65.16	54.14	40.44	120.36	17.32	116.77	30.89 to 100.50	309,546	167,596
IRRGTD	103	70.91	71.17	66.65	19.20	106.79	31.39	121.51	66.11 to 74.59	263,362	175,524
IRRGTD-N/A	20	81.00	89.13	81.50	19.38	109.36	61.74	219.24	76.00 to 89.00	202,636	165,152
ALL	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

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	8	66.61	70.08	63.72	39.27	109.98	31.28	134.01	31.28 to 134.01	104,632	66,673
GRASS	29	75.91	72.01	69.86	25.58	103.08	17.32	141.95	63.96 to 82.80	196,065	136,970
GRASS-N/A	2	41.58	41.58	48.78	25.71	85.25	30.89	52.27	N/A	747,050	364,380
IRRGTD	123	73.04	74.09	68.58	19.85	108.04	31.39	219.24	70.24 to 76.59	253,488	173,838
ALL	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6764

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:58:22

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	66.97	66.97	66.97			66.97	66.97	N/A		5,807	3,889
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	66.97	66.97	66.97			66.97	66.97	N/A		5,807	3,889
10000 TO 29999	5	75.28	85.98	78.39	52.42	109.68	33.61	141.95	N/A		19,300	15,129
30000 TO 59999	9	87.34	99.18	96.64	35.64	102.63	30.85	219.24	63.96 to 121.51		43,302	41,845
60000 TO 99999	9	73.68	72.78	73.62	20.38	98.86	39.84	109.36	45.33 to 98.56		82,194	60,512
100000 TO 149999	22	84.78	82.83	83.29	10.04	99.44	61.40	118.04	75.96 to 88.42		126,387	105,269
150000 TO 249999	49	73.04	72.49	72.09	18.83	100.56	30.89	116.77	68.57 to 77.48		196,786	141,857
250000 TO 499999	59	66.04	66.98	65.70	20.84	101.96	17.32	97.09	61.74 to 73.66		335,559	220,455
500000 +	8	55.85	59.37	58.19	26.68	102.03	31.39	87.19	31.39 to 87.19		717,908	417,729
ALL												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

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	66.97	66.97	66.97			66.97	66.97	N/A		5,807	3,889
5000 TO 9999	2	39.32	39.32	38.56	14.52	101.98	33.61	45.03	N/A		24,250	9,350
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	45.03	48.54	41.60	24.69	116.69	33.61	66.97	N/A		18,102	7,529
10000 TO 29999	6	69.62	81.90	65.60	50.54	124.84	30.85	141.95	30.85 to 141.95		30,727	20,158
30000 TO 59999	11	82.92	79.43	68.62	21.98	115.75	31.28	121.51	39.84 to 101.48		69,714	47,838
60000 TO 99999	22	70.58	71.27	55.26	34.16	128.96	17.32	219.24	48.38 to 78.73		152,687	84,378
100000 TO 149999	47	71.45	71.08	67.20	17.04	105.78	36.95	94.39	64.22 to 77.38		189,848	127,575
150000 TO 249999	47	72.54	74.05	68.96	19.51	107.38	31.39	118.04	65.83 to 79.28		301,966	208,224
250000 TO 499999	23	74.17	75.08	71.69	17.82	104.74	43.62	97.09	62.04 to 88.64		396,689	284,379
500000 +	3	79.54	73.00	68.16	14.63	107.09	52.27	87.19	N/A		864,089	588,999
ALL												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6764

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:59:11

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	5	73.66	65.92	61.40	32.66	107.36	30.89	98.56	N/A		290,570	178,410
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	12	77.44	81.61	77.67	12.36	105.06	68.02	121.51	70.91 to 88.88		243,178	188,881
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	17	80.34	83.23	84.84	11.13	98.10	68.54	101.48	74.72 to 96.49		184,316	156,378
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	20	76.01	83.16	78.17	26.68	106.38	33.61	219.24	70.73 to 86.21		223,416	174,655
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	76.22	71.50	79.51	15.97	89.92	30.85	90.21	30.85 to 90.21		222,060	176,567
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	84.81	75.07	66.17	20.73	113.44	17.32	100.50	45.03 to 97.52		182,402	120,698
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	76.22	75.94	64.27	26.62	118.16	25.07	141.95	59.62 to 88.77		302,939	194,692
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	20	77.69	76.07	75.20	11.81	101.15	57.52	94.46	68.35 to 82.92		216,449	162,775
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	66.61	66.61	68.69	3.98	96.98	63.96	69.26	N/A		185,000	127,072
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	59.36	63.39	60.01	15.86	105.64	44.55	87.74	44.55 to 87.74		269,552	161,750
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	25	59.42	65.74	61.02	22.84	107.73	42.60	134.01	53.74 to 70.21		269,254	164,310
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	16	55.29	54.99	49.87	24.02	110.27	31.28	87.34	42.16 to 64.49		264,939	132,116
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	54	78.06	81.24	77.76	19.06	104.47	30.89	219.24	73.75 to 82.71		221,716	172,410
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	57	77.48	75.35	69.47	19.58	108.46	17.32	141.95	72.53 to 82.96		240,816	167,306
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	51	59.24	62.03	57.57	21.49	107.76	31.28	134.01	55.90 to 64.49		264,643	152,348
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	54	78.30	80.24	78.05	19.81	102.81	17.32	219.24	74.59 to 84.39		202,601	158,123
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	50	73.58	73.61	67.35	19.90	109.30	25.07	141.95	63.96 to 79.72		258,283	173,950
____ALL____												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6764

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:59:11

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3183	4	57.08	64.63	64.07	15.49	100.86	54.81	89.55	N/A	316,275	202,647
3185	8	73.36	73.80	69.67	15.76	105.92	43.62	92.42	43.62 to 92.42	353,712	246,432
3187	4	70.16	69.96	69.79	9.83	100.24	56.70	82.80	N/A	273,500	190,876
3189	2	84.22	84.22	96.74	20.49	87.06	66.97	101.48	N/A	21,153	20,464
3191	3	97.52	86.44	104.04	24.52	83.08	45.03	116.77	N/A	140,333	146,009
3193	4	70.19	75.03	72.13	18.43	104.02	61.18	98.56	N/A	134,767	97,212
3195	5	48.38	59.04	54.18	29.94	108.97	42.60	89.41	N/A	239,918	129,986
3329	3	75.91	76.21	70.56	9.64	108.01	65.38	87.34	N/A	158,833	112,069
3331	4	48.81	54.54	51.88	19.65	105.13	44.55	76.00	N/A	532,167	276,084
3333	3	79.54	77.42	78.78	5.53	98.28	69.76	82.96	N/A	416,645	328,223
3335	4	74.47	78.11	65.03	28.50	120.12	54.15	109.36	N/A	287,400	186,890
3337	19	75.75	75.60	75.16	20.14	100.59	31.28	118.04	69.26 to 88.42	168,436	126,588
3339	17	74.59	78.19	70.28	24.68	111.25	38.35	141.95	59.54 to 94.39	193,716	136,149
3341	4	57.28	69.99	39.57	57.99	176.86	31.39	134.01	N/A	301,037	119,134
3407	6	85.79	81.82	82.58	12.70	99.08	59.81	96.49	59.81 to 96.49	346,112	285,807
3409	4	69.39	73.00	74.18	9.54	98.41	64.22	89.00	N/A	178,781	132,613
3411	3	61.74	60.69	62.55	21.94	97.02	39.84	80.48	N/A	195,166	122,078
3413	9	59.42	62.17	58.32	22.09	106.60	30.89	83.46	50.44 to 75.60	313,455	182,814
3415	11	73.66	72.64	70.79	15.86	102.62	51.42	97.09	53.20 to 88.65	290,327	205,513
3417	4	65.30	68.95	67.80	12.31	101.70	57.33	87.87	N/A	337,331	228,708
3419	4	54.04	55.84	66.07	51.59	84.51	25.07	90.21	N/A	232,514	153,632
3553	8	79.81	81.84	78.09	12.89	104.80	55.90	100.81	55.90 to 100.81	204,434	159,638
3555	8	83.76	84.79	84.66	7.31	100.16	76.59	95.56	76.59 to 95.56	174,244	147,511
3557	5	70.71	64.72	65.92	12.37	98.18	45.33	74.63	N/A	144,720	95,393
3559	5	78.99	77.21	77.70	7.70	99.37	65.80	86.92	N/A	248,360	192,975
3561	3	63.96	56.31	48.06	16.19	117.16	36.95	68.02	N/A	205,100	98,577
3563	5	62.45	65.68	61.06	13.91	107.56	50.16	78.73	N/A	211,000	128,835
3645	3	57.26	97.94	38.91	117.55	251.71	17.32	219.24	N/A	255,500	99,414
ALL											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	139	73.68	74.09	69.32	21.54	106.87	17.32	219.24	70.71 to 77.23	240,940	167,026
2	4	63.06	60.45	51.51	26.79	117.36	36.95	78.73	N/A	255,000	131,346
3	19	69.76	68.73	61.35	25.81	112.03	42.60	116.77	45.35 to 87.34	246,598	151,280
ALL											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6764

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:59:12

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
2	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298
____ALL____											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0009	3	57.26	97.94	38.91	117.55	251.71	17.32	219.24	N/A	255,500	99,414
21-0180											
24-0001	43	73.66	70.83	67.91	17.08	104.30	30.89	109.36	65.80 to 77.48	269,825	183,239
24-0004	17	79.28	75.07	75.19	17.48	99.84	25.07	100.81	65.38 to 90.21	215,267	161,855
24-0011	54	75.52	76.84	74.66	18.45	102.92	31.28	141.95	70.91 to 82.96	203,175	151,692
24-0020	23	68.35	69.23	62.13	26.69	111.42	31.39	134.01	56.70 to 74.17	298,318	185,352
24-0101	17	69.76	69.64	62.77	26.09	110.95	42.60	116.77	45.35 to 89.41	239,692	150,446
32-0095	5	62.45	60.85	53.59	21.64	113.54	36.95	78.73	N/A	252,000	135,054
37-0030											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	7	45.33	65.33	58.44	60.81	111.78	30.85	134.01	30.85 to 134.01	28,881	16,878
30.01 TO 50.00	9	75.28	75.12	65.36	19.03	114.92	31.28	121.51	61.40 to 84.81	75,684	49,469
50.01 TO 100.00	56	74.14	76.60	70.00	21.53	109.43	39.84	219.24	70.24 to 79.28	159,154	111,411
100.01 TO 180.00	70	71.15	70.48	66.60	21.15	105.83	25.07	118.04	65.80 to 77.23	305,302	203,326
180.01 TO 330.00	13	73.66	68.65	64.31	17.85	106.74	17.32	96.63	59.42 to 78.73	337,507	217,049
330.01 TO 650.00	2	93.27	93.27	93.03	25.20	100.26	69.76	116.77	N/A	202,021	187,932
650.01 +	5	87.19	81.99	73.63	13.57	111.35	52.27	96.49	N/A	647,453	476,719
____ALL____											
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6764

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:59:12

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
DRY	3	39.84	68.38	39.69	85.95	172.30	31.28	134.01	N/A	91,666	36,378
DRY-N/A	5	73.68	71.10	75.48	19.73	94.20	45.03	94.35	N/A	112,412	84,851
GRASS	18	75.60	72.38	74.30	22.97	97.42	25.07	141.95	63.01 to 79.54	162,128	120,461
GRASS-N/A	13	64.49	66.81	59.43	36.70	112.42	17.32	116.77	38.35 to 89.32	327,821	194,816
IRRGTD	68	68.91	70.21	65.87	18.36	106.59	31.39	121.51	64.22 to 73.04	255,977	168,617
IRRGTD-N/A	55	77.23	78.89	72.00	20.16	109.57	36.95	219.24	73.66 to 83.46	250,410	180,293
ALL	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
DRY	4	61.38	72.01	47.11	59.39	152.85	31.28	134.01	N/A	83,015	39,112
DRY-N/A	4	66.61	68.15	74.64	23.82	91.30	45.03	94.35	N/A	126,250	94,235
GRASS	20	75.60	72.73	75.69	22.18	96.09	25.07	141.95	64.49 to 79.54	188,749	142,867
GRASS-N/A	11	63.96	65.16	54.14	40.44	120.36	17.32	116.77	30.89 to 100.50	309,546	167,596
IRRGTD	103	70.91	71.17	66.65	19.20	106.79	31.39	121.51	66.11 to 74.59	263,362	175,524
IRRGTD-N/A	20	81.00	89.13	81.50	19.38	109.36	61.74	219.24	76.00 to 89.00	202,636	165,152
ALL	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
DRY	8	66.61	70.08	63.72	39.27	109.98	31.28	134.01	31.28 to 134.01	104,632	66,673
GRASS	29	75.91	72.01	69.86	25.58	103.08	17.32	141.95	63.96 to 82.80	196,065	136,970
GRASS-N/A	2	41.58	41.58	48.78	25.71	85.25	30.89	52.27	N/A	747,050	364,380
IRRGTD	123	73.04	74.09	68.58	19.85	108.04	31.39	219.24	70.24 to 76.59	253,488	173,838
ALL	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96	241,951	164,298

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6764

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

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	31.73	95% Median C.I.:	70.21 to 75.96	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	38,957,104	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	23.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.41 to 71.40	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	39,196,104	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.69	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	26,616,412							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,951	COD:	22.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	219.24			
AVG. Assessed Value:	164,298	PRD:	107.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.32			

Printed: 04/01/2009 13:59:12

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	66.97	66.97	66.97			66.97	66.97	N/A		5,807	3,889
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	66.97	66.97	66.97			66.97	66.97	N/A		5,807	3,889
10000 TO 29999	5	75.28	85.98	78.39	52.42	109.68	33.61	141.95	N/A		19,300	15,129
30000 TO 59999	9	87.34	99.18	96.64	35.64	102.63	30.85	219.24	63.96 to 121.51		43,302	41,845
60000 TO 99999	9	73.68	72.78	73.62	20.38	98.86	39.84	109.36	45.33 to 98.56		82,194	60,512
100000 TO 149999	22	84.78	82.83	83.29	10.04	99.44	61.40	118.04	75.96 to 88.42		126,387	105,269
150000 TO 249999	49	73.04	72.49	72.09	18.83	100.56	30.89	116.77	68.57 to 77.48		196,786	141,857
250000 TO 499999	59	66.04	66.98	65.70	20.84	101.96	17.32	97.09	61.74 to 73.66		335,559	220,455
500000 +	8	55.85	59.37	58.19	26.68	102.03	31.39	87.19	31.39 to 87.19		717,908	417,729
ALL												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

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	66.97	66.97	66.97			66.97	66.97	N/A		5,807	3,889
5000 TO 9999	2	39.32	39.32	38.56	14.52	101.98	33.61	45.03	N/A		24,250	9,350
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	45.03	48.54	41.60	24.69	116.69	33.61	66.97	N/A		18,102	7,529
10000 TO 29999	6	69.62	81.90	65.60	50.54	124.84	30.85	141.95	30.85 to 141.95		30,727	20,158
30000 TO 59999	11	82.92	79.43	68.62	21.98	115.75	31.28	121.51	39.84 to 101.48		69,714	47,838
60000 TO 99999	22	70.58	71.27	55.26	34.16	128.96	17.32	219.24	48.38 to 78.73		152,687	84,378
100000 TO 149999	47	71.45	71.08	67.20	17.04	105.78	36.95	94.39	64.22 to 77.38		189,848	127,575
150000 TO 249999	47	72.54	74.05	68.96	19.51	107.38	31.39	118.04	65.83 to 79.28		301,966	208,224
250000 TO 499999	23	74.17	75.08	71.69	17.82	104.74	43.62	97.09	62.04 to 88.64		396,689	284,379
500000 +	3	79.54	73.00	68.16	14.63	107.09	52.27	87.19	N/A		864,089	588,999
ALL												
	162	73.35	73.12	67.91	22.10	107.68	17.32	219.24	70.21 to 75.96		241,951	164,298

2009 CORRELATION SECTION for Dawson County

Agricultural or Special Valuation

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL LAND: In Dawson County there are 162 qualified unimproved agricultural sales that are valued as having non-influenced value. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the prescribed parameter, median (73.35) and arithmetic mean (73.12), the weighted mean is below by approximately one point (1.09) at 67.91. Outlier(s) do not appear to be affecting these measures. In examining the agricultural minimally improved sales, which adds eleven more sales to the file, all measures seem to coordinate with agricultural unimproved profile, they are: median 72.54, mean, 72.84, and weighted mean 67.55. It is the opinion that all seem to be indicating that an acceptable level of value has been attained. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used in determining the overall level of value. Both of the qualitative measures, coefficient of dispersion (22.10) and price related differential (107.68) are slightly above the acceptable standards, but because of the known assessment practices it is believed the assessment of the agricultural unimproved class has been done in a uniform and proportionate manner. This same inference has been made from the agricultural minimally improved profile which exhibits a COD of 22.19 and a PRD of 107.83. A review of all available statistical data and administrative reports indicates that Dawson County has achieved an acceptable level of value and that the quality of assessment has been met.

Within the sub-stratus Majority Land Use >50%, >80%, and >95% strata Grass in all three sub-stratus is showing a median of 76% (rounded). These sub-strata's are not valid valuation groupings as they are a culmination of sales involving three 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.

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

SPECIAL VALUATION: Only a small portion of Dawson County is affected by special value, for purposes of valuation the value has been established from like uninfluenced agricultural sales that have occurred in the surrounding area and valued the same as other agricultural property in this market area.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 14,747

Value : 1,459,733,517

Growth 18,736,279

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	690	3,156,277	60	619,684	120	1,390,598	870	5,166,559	
02. Res Improve Land	5,708	43,984,439	169	1,868,972	1,023	17,561,766	6,900	63,415,177	
03. Res Improvements	6,485	371,430,976	173	14,960,525	1,075	100,188,597	7,733	486,580,098	
04. Res Total	7,175	418,571,692	233	17,449,181	1,195	119,140,961	8,603	555,161,834	9,084,195
% of Res Total	83.40	75.40	2.71	3.14	13.89	21.46	58.34	38.03	48.48
05. Com UnImp Land	141	2,642,722	5	205,329	22	282,116	168	3,130,167	
06. Com Improve Land	831	18,232,278	37	1,012,942	106	1,630,196	974	20,875,416	
07. Com Improvements	832	98,291,523	37	6,751,408	106	12,416,468	975	117,459,399	
08. Com Total	973	119,166,523	42	7,969,679	128	14,328,780	1,143	141,464,982	3,903,990
% of Com Total	85.13	84.24	3.67	5.63	11.20	10.13	7.75	9.69	20.84
09. Ind UnImp Land	4	185,085	1	254,196	0	0	5	439,281	
10. Ind Improve Land	8	372,422	5	1,118,616	1	57,486	14	1,548,524	
11. Ind Improvements	8	10,706,008	5	23,432,698	1	864,874	14	35,003,580	
12. Ind Total	12	11,263,515	6	24,805,510	1	922,360	19	36,991,385	0
% of Ind Total	63.16	30.45	31.58	67.06	5.26	2.49	0.13	2.53	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	58	1,004,964	58	1,004,964	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	525	18,037,060	525	18,037,060	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	525	41,091,051	525	41,091,051	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	583	60,133,075	583	60,133,075	284,927
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	3.95	4.12	1.52
Res & Rec Total	7,175	418,571,692	233	17,449,181	1,778	179,274,036	9,186	615,294,909	9,369,122
% of Res & Rec Total	78.11	68.03	2.54	2.84	19.36	29.14	62.29	42.15	50.01
Com & Ind Total	985	130,430,038	48	32,775,189	129	15,251,140	1,162	178,456,367	3,903,990
% of Com & Ind Total	84.77	73.09	4.13	18.37	11.10	8.55	7.88	12.23	20.84
17. Taxable Total	8,160	549,001,730	281	50,224,370	1,907	194,525,176	10,348	793,751,276	13,273,112
% of Taxable Total	78.86	69.17	2.72	6.33	18.43	24.51	70.17	54.38	70.84

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	112	2,853,321	4,514,876		0	0	0
19. Commercial	90	6,729,605	35,634,870		0	0	0
20. Industrial	2	147,205	31,046,222		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		112	2,853,321	4,514,876
19. Commercial	1	58,263	1,965,924		91	6,787,868	37,600,794
20. Industrial	0	0	0		2	147,205	31,046,222
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					205	9,788,394	73,161,892

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing									
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	1	4,257	1	4,257	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	1	4,257	1	4,257	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	1,413	5	22	1,440

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	3,248	408,605,951	3,248	408,605,951
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,150	173,238,844	1,150	173,238,844
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,150	84,133,189	1,150	84,133,189
30. Ag Total							4,398	665,977,984

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	143	506.17	888,447	143	506.17	888,447	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	707	3,329.32	10,689,422	707	3,329.32	10,689,422	
33. HomeSite Improvements	736	0.00	56,706,280	736	0.00	56,706,280	1,692,830
34. HomeSite Total				879	3,835.49	68,284,149	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	52	219.76	282,442	52	219.76	282,442	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	244	361.37	784,114	244	361.37	784,114	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,111	0.00	27,426,909	1,111	0.00	27,426,909	3,770,337
38. FarmSite Total				1,163	581.13	28,493,465	
39. Road & Ditches	3,321	8,793.78	0	3,321	8,793.78	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI				2,042	13,210.40	96,777,614	5,463,167

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	2	212.43	101,267	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	2	212.43	101,267

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	227	33,810.47	20,383,610	227	33,810.47	20,383,610
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%	
46. 1A	166,643.04	67.62%	282,387,207	72.31%	1,694.56
47. 2A1	13,551.76	5.50%	22,024,804	5.64%	1,625.24
48. 2A	25,860.90	10.49%	39,134,624	10.02%	1,513.27
49. 3A1	2,665.24	1.08%	3,652,829	0.94%	1,370.54
50. 3A	6,716.80	2.73%	7,744,722	1.98%	1,153.04
51. 4A1	24,695.18	10.02%	28,661,897	7.34%	1,160.63
52. 4A	6,292.47	2.55%	6,895,657	1.77%	1,095.86
53. Total	246,425.39	100.00%	390,501,740	100.00%	1,584.67
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	8,127.70	39.16%	6,989,822	47.67%	860.00
56. 2D1	1,519.44	7.32%	1,215,552	8.29%	800.00
57. 2D	2,468.98	11.89%	1,864,517	12.72%	755.18
58. 3D1	755.58	3.64%	528,906	3.61%	700.00
59. 3D	1,217.86	5.87%	730,716	4.98%	600.00
60. 4D1	5,190.63	25.01%	2,595,315	17.70%	500.00
61. 4D	1,477.17	7.12%	738,585	5.04%	500.00
62. Total	20,757.36	100.00%	14,663,413	100.00%	706.42
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	6,046.41	4.03%	3,476,706	5.77%	575.00
65. 2G1	3,728.65	2.48%	1,901,611	3.16%	510.00
66. 2G	4,454.35	2.97%	2,115,829	3.51%	475.00
67. 3G1	1,017.39	0.68%	457,828	0.76%	450.00
68. 3G	3,571.00	2.38%	1,483,233	2.46%	415.36
69. 4G1	16,065.63	10.70%	6,369,213	10.57%	396.45
70. 4G	115,328.55	76.78%	44,446,787	73.77%	385.39
71. Total	150,211.98	100.00%	60,251,207	100.00%	401.11
Irrigated Total	246,425.39	55.72%	390,501,740	82.73%	1,584.67
Dry Total	20,757.36	4.69%	14,663,413	3.11%	706.42
Grass Total	150,211.98	33.97%	60,251,207	12.77%	401.11
Waste	5,266.06	1.19%	183,834	0.04%	34.91
Other	19,587.04	4.43%	6,395,792	1.36%	326.53
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	778,492	0.16%	0.00
Market Area Total	442,247.83	100.00%	471,995,986	100.00%	1,067.27

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%	
46. 1A	11,303.93	80.19%	14,242,952	87.44%	1,260.00
47. 2A1	230.82	1.64%	281,600	1.73%	1,220.00
48. 2A	114.00	0.81%	119,700	0.73%	1,050.00
49. 3A1	1,619.99	11.49%	1,194,103	7.33%	737.11
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	545.82	3.87%	297,472	1.83%	545.00
52. 4A	281.33	2.00%	153,326	0.94%	545.00
53. Total	14,095.89	100.00%	16,289,153	100.00%	1,155.60
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	3,788.59	44.99%	2,273,154	55.35%	600.00
56. 2D1	371.50	4.41%	208,040	5.07%	560.00
57. 2D	174.48	2.07%	81,133	1.98%	465.00
58. 3D1	2,074.74	24.64%	892,138	21.72%	430.00
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	1,415.65	16.81%	488,400	11.89%	345.00
61. 4D	595.52	7.07%	163,768	3.99%	275.00
62. Total	8,420.48	100.00%	4,106,633	100.00%	487.70
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	1,817.80	6.63%	908,900	11.67%	500.00
65. 2G1	620.54	2.26%	273,038	3.51%	440.00
66. 2G	678.46	2.47%	254,423	3.27%	375.00
67. 3G1	1,458.61	5.32%	546,982	7.02%	375.00
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	3,000.90	10.94%	840,254	10.79%	280.00
70. 4G	19,860.42	72.39%	4,965,127	63.75%	250.00
71. Total	27,436.73	100.00%	7,788,724	100.00%	283.88
Irrigated Total	14,095.89	28.03%	16,289,153	57.77%	1,155.60
Dry Total	8,420.48	16.75%	4,106,633	14.56%	487.70
Grass Total	27,436.73	54.56%	7,788,724	27.62%	283.88
Waste	332.42	0.66%	11,636	0.04%	35.00
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	50,285.52	100.00%	28,196,146	100.00%	560.72

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%	
46. 1A	10,497.41	54.85%	16,795,856	63.01%	1,600.00
47. 2A1	1,553.13	8.11%	2,368,527	8.89%	1,525.00
48. 2A	747.54	3.91%	1,040,830	3.90%	1,392.34
49. 3A1	347.00	1.81%	451,100	1.69%	1,300.00
50. 3A	53.97	0.28%	60,446	0.23%	1,119.99
51. 4A1	2,589.25	13.53%	2,589,250	9.71%	1,000.00
52. 4A	3,350.91	17.51%	3,350,910	12.57%	1,000.00
53. Total	19,139.21	100.00%	26,656,919	100.00%	1,392.79
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	2,129.77	33.25%	1,490,839	42.62%	700.00
56. 2D1	727.26	11.35%	436,356	12.47%	600.00
57. 2D	544.94	8.51%	286,093	8.18%	525.00
58. 3D1	111.98	1.75%	55,990	1.60%	500.00
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	1,370.73	21.40%	582,562	16.65%	425.00
61. 4D	1,520.81	23.74%	646,346	18.48%	425.00
62. Total	6,405.49	100.00%	3,498,186	100.00%	546.12
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	3,674.18	4.01%	2,112,659	5.44%	575.00
65. 2G1	1,655.61	1.81%	811,250	2.09%	490.00
66. 2G	1,293.45	1.41%	614,389	1.58%	475.00
67. 3G1	624.26	0.68%	259,069	0.67%	415.00
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	13,619.24	14.85%	5,651,987	14.55%	415.00
70. 4G	70,823.62	77.24%	29,391,816	75.67%	415.00
71. Total	91,690.36	100.00%	38,841,170	100.00%	423.61
Irrigated Total	19,139.21	16.28%	26,656,919	38.63%	1,392.79
Dry Total	6,405.49	5.45%	3,498,186	5.07%	546.12
Grass Total	91,690.36	77.98%	38,841,170	56.28%	423.61
Waste	341.78	0.29%	11,963	0.02%	35.00
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	117,576.84	100.00%	69,008,238	100.00%	586.92

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	279,660.49	433,447,812	279,660.49	433,447,812
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	35,583.33	22,268,232	35,583.33	22,268,232
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	269,339.07	106,881,101	269,339.07	106,881,101
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,940.26	207,433	5,940.26	207,433
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	19,587.04	6,395,792	19,587.04	6,395,792
81. Exempt	0.00	778,492	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	778,492
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	610,110.19	569,200,370	610,110.19	569,200,370

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	279,660.49	45.84%	433,447,812	76.15%	1,549.91
Dry Land	35,583.33	5.83%	22,268,232	3.91%	625.81
Grass	269,339.07	44.15%	106,881,101	18.78%	396.83
Waste	5,940.26	0.97%	207,433	0.04%	34.92
Other	19,587.04	3.21%	6,395,792	1.12%	326.53
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	778,492	0.14%	0.00
Total	610,110.19	100.00%	569,200,370	100.00%	932.95

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

24 Dawson

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	534,491,841	555,161,834	20,669,993	3.87%	9,084,195	2.17%
02. Recreational	57,433,725	60,133,075	2,699,350	4.70%	284,927	4.20%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	67,199,871	68,284,149	1,084,278	1.61%	1,692,830	-0.91%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	659,125,437	683,579,058	24,453,621	3.71%	11,061,952	2.03%
05. Commercial	139,907,908	141,464,982	1,557,074	1.11%	3,903,990	-1.68%
06. Industrial	36,893,925	36,991,385	97,460	0.26%	0	0.26%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	25,836,174	28,493,465	2,657,291	10.29%	3,770,337	-4.31%
08. Minerals	4,257	4,257	0	0.00%		
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	202,642,264	206,954,089	4,311,825	2.13%		
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	861,767,701	890,533,147	28,765,446	3.34%		
11. Irrigated	398,072,967	433,447,812	35,374,845	8.89%		
12. Dryland	19,795,884	22,268,232	2,472,348	12.49%		
13. Grassland	99,231,405	106,881,101	7,649,696	7.71%		
14. Wasteland	209,017	207,433	-1,584	-0.76%		
15. Other Agland	6,395,792	6,395,792	0	0.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	523,705,065	569,200,370	45,495,305	8.69%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,385,472,766	1,459,733,517	74,260,751	5.36%		

Dawson County Assessor's Office

John Phillip Moore, Assessor

Joyce Reil, Deputy

July 25, 2008

To: Dawson County Board of Commissioners

[Ruth Sorensen, *Property Tax Administrator, amended copy*]

Subject: Three-Year Plan of Assessment

From: John Phillip Moore, Dawson County Assessor

[Dear Ruth: The following is the report submitted to the Dawson County Commissioners earlier this year. I have put any amended information in italics.]

Dear County Board of Commissioners:

This report attempts to bring you as county commissioners into a discussion about the process of setting valuations each year, and develops a plan for a three-year period. The responsibility of establishing valuations remains with the assessor. However, it is helpful to draw on our collective knowledge and opinions concerning the situation in the real estate markets.

Introduction

An assessor works within the framework established by State law. A real property assessment system requires that procedures be accomplished in a complete and uniform manner each time they are repeated. Accurate and efficient assessment practices represent prudent expenditure of tax dollars. They establish taxpayer confidence in local government while allowing that government to serve its citizens effectively. Therefore, the important role assessment practices play is significant.

This report covers three large classes of property: 1) residential, 2) commercial/industrial, and 3) agricultural. The expectation for 2009 is that the statistics for all categories will fall within parameters set by State Property Assessment officials within annual directives. The primary factor used for measurement is the assessment sales ratio (92-100%). Agricultural ground as a whole is to be proportionate to the other classes (69-75%)[changed with legislative action in 2006]. It is difficult to avoid some imbalance for the three main agricultural categories—irrigated, dry, and grass—as well as the additional subclasses within each of those groupings. This occurs because of a lack of sales for some market areas.

The qualifying statistical measurements of coefficient of dispersion (COD), and price related differential (PRD) receive considerable study as well. Attempts are made utilizing computer modeling of the sales file, and subsequent application to all properties to meet generally accepted guidelines.

Statistical Information

Here are the statistics for Dawson County as reported for 2008 based on the median:

	Residential Property	Commercial Property	Agricultural Property
No. Of Sales:	652	94	156
AS%:	98.31	96.91	73.43
COD:	9.73	16.42	19.90
PRD:	101.04	124.94	105.94

The unusual change in the PRD for 2008 in the commercial class resulted from the sale of land purchased by the city of Lexington through its Community Redevelopment Authority at a rate far exceeding the assessment due to the change in use of the property. It had been assessed as agricultural ground and is now in the commercial file.

This report outlines time frames for reappraising or updating of property values. It is the intention of the assessor, relative to the amount of change annually in the market, to look at updating each class of property in a three-year cycle starting with residential, then continuing with agriculture production ground, and then commercial. In practice, market forces often times disrupt this cycle, and any plan of this scope requires considerable flexibility. Review and analysis of the situation in more detail is conducted as required by statute for possible changes in this plan. The utilization of a Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA) system helps determine the need for an on-site physical inspection that could lead to a large-scale reappraisal.

Despite my serious intentions, it is difficult to anticipate abrupt changes within each larger market class, given that the sales studies are at least a year behind current trends. Much of the work tends to be ongoing, albeit, within smaller segments of each class. In actual practice, updates have been conducted every year in one or more localities for residential property, and changes have been required for commercial property to a degree at least every two years. Agricultural ground also tends to receive annual attention.

The fact that there are three major groups of property in the statistical analysis naturally suggested looking at a cycle in three-year increments. But the markets, much like a meandering river, have currents of their own. To stay with those “currents” has required the assessor to react in timely fashion to what *is* happening as much as it has to anticipating what *might* occur. Therefore, expectations often have reflected more the need to “keep up”.

Pursuant to section 77-1311.02, assessors are to submit a three-year plan of assessment annually to the county board of equalization by July 31, and a copy of that report to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue by October 31 with amendments if necessary. Included in the plan is the examination of the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county.

Definitions

To help draw boundaries in terms of methods, these definitions are offered:

Updating: Examination of sold properties on-site in each instance and the development of a model to be used for a particular market area or neighborhood for both sold and unsold properties. This occurs following a statistical analysis and thorough market study of the level of value. It normally does not include a complete *new* record, but a check of the current record for accuracy, and may or may not warrant physical measurement and complete inspection of the property. The updates generally are limited to particular locations, and may be as restricted as one property in the case of an increase in the square footage of a dwelling, or the addition of some other structure, such as a new garage. But the term “update” is used most often in relation to the change of numerous sold and unsold properties within a given area. It is most likely to involve a group of properties contained in no less than a residential subdivision. It generally would not involve a group as large as the entire county because that could shift it into a definition of a full reappraisal.

Reappraisal: The complete new measurement of all *sold and unsold* properties within the entire county in a given classification. The appraisers and listers would be looking at the property, initially, absent in-depth knowledge of its history. The outcome would be the creation of all new property record cards. This most likely would include either commercial or residential classifications but seldom both at the same time, due to the cost involved to prepare and complete the reappraisal in a timely manner. A reappraisal would be prompted most likely only if there was an unusual upward or downward surge in every economic sector of the county at once, and that surge results in a classification falling well out of mandated ranges of level of value, and then particularly as it pertains to quality statistics of PRD and COD.

[It would also be difficult to include agricultural production ground under this definition because that tends to receive annual ongoing attention due to the differences inherent in the property type. A complete new measurement of all acres within the agriculture sector would be prohibitive for many reasons, though recent popularity of pivot irrigation systems has resulted in some acre count work. The county board of commissioners has determined that a certified copy of an individual’s contract with federal farm programs, showing the amount of acres involved in a particular use is the best evidence of the number of acres that should be on record in accordance with their use. For irrigated acres we depend on the certification filed with Central Platte NRD.]

Review: This is the initial stage of checking real estate transfer statements, changes on properties, and preliminary statistical studies to determine the need to proceed toward an update or reappraisal. Unless there is additional credible information from

other resources, reviews only serve to provide cursive support of the level of value, but may encourage further action.

Residential Information

The 2007 preliminary statistical report for urban residential sales indicated assessment-sales ratios were within accepted levels on a countywide basis for residential and agricultural and commercial classes. The CODs and PRDs prompted considerably closer looks at specific areas. Transfers within the last six months limited to the sales file under consideration indicated ratios were slipping at the Lakeview Acres subdivision near Johnson Lake, and areas remaining in Lexington that had not been updated in 2007. Statistical market studies are now underway for use in determining 2009 valuations.

At this time, given activity from sales, and following the routine set up to regularly review property, it is anticipated that the following will be on a list for 2009 initial review:

- ❑ The city of Cozad. Ratios have started to fade after several years of little change and the community has not been reviewed at a whole in some time.
- ❑ The village of Farnam. The community appears to be in a downward trend and more study is needed.
- ❑ *A review of the preliminary statistics used to set 2009 valuations have shown the need to review rural residential property around Lexington, Cozad and Gothenburg, so that has been added to our "to do" list.*

As a result of the increases of valuation in 2008, the ratio countywide is well within the necessary range overall for the residential class. The qualitative statistics in 2008 revealed relatively good results in higher population areas where abundant sales were helpful in determining market valuation levels. The models developed and applied contributed substantially to the acceptable assessment level. Though minor changes will be applied if needed, these models are expected to continue to achieve uniformity within their given market.

Commercial/Industrial Properties

The countywide ratio for this property classification came within standards in preliminary calculations for 2008.

The results of that analysis show that a full update conducted in 2006 for commercial properties continues to show values within an acceptable range. Appraisers conduct a thorough review on an ongoing basis in anticipation of at least refining various occupation codes.

For 2009 it appears further review will be needed for the following:

- ❑ Mobile home parks. A substantial sale exceeding \$1 million in Lexington has created unusual ratios and a review of all of that subclass will be conducted.
- ❑ Fast food franchises. Three sales created considerable changes in the ratio for this occupation code.
- ❑ *Preliminary statistics indicate a need to review commercial markets in Cozad as well, so we will be developing a model for that situation as well.*

Results of statistical readings of qualitative figures on commercial property can be quite misleading given the diverse nature of the property class. A good COD for retail stores does not necessarily mean the same holds true for office buildings, as an example.

Sales reviews on this class of property have been conducted with professional appraisers for the last several years and that practice will continue. The materials used when a reappraisal was completed for 2000 are still available, and this office has geared up to make the process more formal at that level. Budget constraints have for many years been a limiting factor in this process. Updated values were in place for 2006.

A specialist appraiser reviews industrial properties with staff help. This is done annually, and any activity that is prompted is done in a timely manner in accordance with the assessment calendar. The number of industrial properties within Dawson County is relatively small, but the valuation involved has a significant impact on the overall file. An ethanol plant that began production two years ago is a prime example.

Again, due to the diversity of the within variety of commercial property, very often review and update of values are conducted in terms of categories, such as all fast food franchise businesses, or motels. Reviews within neighborhoods, like highway strips to Interstate 80, are also conducted regularly. And depending on the activity within the market, main business districts within the larger communities of Dawson County undergo some review as well.

Ag Ground

The mixture that typifies any description of agricultural production ground gives a strong indication of why these numbers can be ambiguous. The overall ratio in 2008 preliminary studies began to indicate the unprecedented upward trend in agricultural sales.

It appears that 2009 values could increase to historic highs given sales of the last two years.

The top of the range for irrigated ground appears to be nearing \$4,500 to \$5,000 an acre. Some obvious influence of this has been seen in both dry and grass subclasses.

Added to the stress of reacting to the unusual valuation increases is the directive to review and recount all soils within the county by 2009, a process that has not occurred since 1978 in Dawson County.

To accomplish this, and with cooperation from the county board and surveyor, it is expected that a new tool will be available through a GIS system in the preliminary stages of set up beginning in July 2008. The goal is to have the system operational in time to complete the recount of soils for 2009 records. Coupled with this will be the updating of valuations in response to the market sales.

Sales analysis has been ongoing for more than two years of this major class of property. Models have been established that are very useful in cooperation with State liaison Pat Albro.

Models have also been established in terms of the income approach. Various resources have been utilized, particularly from the University of Nebraska and the local Extension Service that conducts an annual survey of land rents. Capitalization rates are derived from market sales and interviews with local banking and farm investment firms. Separate capitalization rates are employed in connection with specific uses: irrigation, dry or grass.

This work at this time is an enormous task, unlike any taken on for more than two decades. Even with the assistance of a GIS computer format, this office will put almost all of its energy for the next several months to updating these records.

Other Information

Dawson County has more than 22,000 total parcels in the files. Of that number about 58 percent represents residential and recreational properties, 7-8 percent commercial/industrial, 28 percent agricultural parcels, and the remainder is accounted for in exempt property. Nearly 50 percent of the county's valuation, on the other hand, rests in agricultural land, and that percentage could climb quite significantly with the 2009 valuations.

Currently the office staff includes the assessor, the deputy, chief appraiser, two full-time, and one part-time clerical employees. Some professional appraisers are also utilized on a contract basis. All but one full-time employee hold assessor certificates. They each attend educational classes on a regular basis, including IAAO courses pertaining to their positions.

The budget for the office in 2007-2008 was \$300,000. Of that figure, \$78,500 was stipulated for appraisal contracts. The actual amount spent, however, was \$89,499. The assessor had requested \$90,000 for this work. The budget is not conducted by line item, so expenditures from other areas had to be utilized. The total budget calculates to approximately \$18.75 per parcel rounded. The 2008-2009 fiscal budget is expected to increase. Reasons for this include the introduction of the new GIS system, and the need to replace the appraiser who will be retiring during the fiscal year. Additional money was added for his replacement in anticipation of having two employees for a short time.

The county board approved the requested amount for appraisal contracts. It also provided expenditures for the surveyor and I to establish a GIS system.

Due to an impending retirement, and the need for data entry help, there is also a \$15,000 line item new to the budget for part-time help. I anticipate this amount will also help in the transition as I realign the staff when my current appraiser retires. Total budget adopted for the office is \$331,850. Of that \$165,107 can be directly attributable to appraisal activity.

Additional expenditures of some \$5,000 are contained within the assessor's budget for use on a specialty property—particularly a larger commercial or industrial property that require a higher degree of appraisal expertise.

Office Procedures, Materials

This office has written policies and procedures concerning appraisal/assessment practices, and personnel guidelines that basically incorporate county policies and job descriptions. Cadastral maps were reviewed and resketched over several years concluding about 1995. They are updated almost daily as the surveyor provides the needed information. Black and white aerial photos of the rural sections were taken in 1982. Rural home site aerial photos were taken in December 1995 for use in a 1997 update. Record cards were redesigned with the reappraisal process that began about 1993. New photographs are taken upon each inspection of a property. Digital photographs were added to the CAMA system as the properties underwent review the last several years.

The introduction of a GIS system will enable the office to place cadastral and other statistical information in electronic form on computers. It is expected that there will eventually be a web site to help expedite inquiries and keep information current and concise.

Reviews are conducted regularly on the sales file. Data entry occurs as the transfer statements are examined and sent through a routine that begins with the deputy assessor who completes needed changes on the properties. She then sends the information on to staff. They add the pertinent facts to the CAMA and administrative systems. The assessor reviews all sales and makes the final judgment as to qualifying them for use in statistical measurements.

Often the properties that come up for review on the sales file are physically inspected in the field, particularly if they appear to be an outlier within the statistics. Attempts are made to inspect all properties that are protested to the county board of equalization. Review of entire neighborhoods, and in the case of commercial properties with all similar types of structures, are conducted as well whenever there are wholesale updates of values to be entered on the record for a given year. For example, many residential properties are checked before establishing the model that changes values. Within the first few months of a year, on-site inspections are conducted on all dwellings before a value is entered for the record, if those parcels are part of a market update.

This same procedure follows for the other classes of property as the cycle continues throughout the three years. An outside appraisal firm helps with this work. The sales files are matched up with state property assessment division records. Confirmation of sales may be conducted at various levels including personal interviews and on-site inspections. More formal methods were incorporated beginning in 2005.

Time and expense are major factors in the percentage of the number of sales that can be reviewed, particularly in the residential sales. Due to many home owners working outside the home, and the cultural diversity of Dawson County, personal interviews are sometimes difficult to obtain. There have also been numerous foreclosure procedures in recent years and those sales tend to increase the time schedule despite their limited use in the sales file.

Conclusion

The Dawson County Assessor's Office attempts to review and maintain market value updates on all classes of property on an annual basis, but follows three-year cycles for each class depending on the amount of sales activity. A CAMA system helps in maintaining the proper level of values as required by statute. A new GIS system is expected to be a useful tool that will be in place hopefully in 2009.

A countywide reappraisal process that included a new measurement of all structures, and therefore a completely new record of each parcel, was started about 1993 and had been completed as of 2000. Updates prompted by market changes are considered annually; however, a more thorough review is planned at three-year increments to determine if another comprehensive reappraisal would be desirable.

Respectfully submitted,

John Phillip Moore
Dawson County Assessor

Cc: Property Assessment Division,
Ruth Sorensen Administrator;
Pat Albro, Measurement Supervisor

2009 Assessment Survey for Dawson County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	1
3.	Other full-time employees
	2
4.	Other part-time employees
	1
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$331,850
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$25,000 – computer bills are split and allocated to the appropriate budgets within the county.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$137,607
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$5,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	None
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None

13.	Total budget
	\$331,850
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software
	MicroSolve license is held by MIPS
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	The maps (1995) are maintained in house with the assistance of the county surveyor.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Dawson County has hired a county surveyor who is implementing a GIS system, it is anticipated that it will be in use by July of 2009.
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	County Surveyor
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Lexington, Cozad, and Gothenburg

4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1991

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Stanard Appraisal Services
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

One copy to the Dawson County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts