

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

30 Fillmore

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	185	COD	21.55
Total Sales Price	\$9,429,862	PRD	106.18
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,429,862	COV	33.02
Total Assessed Value	\$9,209,262	STD	34.24
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$50,972	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.35
Avg. Assessed Value	\$49,780	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$52,479
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	98
Mean	104	Max	265
Min	15.07		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.46 to 99.96
95% Mean C.I	98.76 to 108.63
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.18 to 101.14

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	14.87
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.27
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.90

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	199	99	8.64	102.35
2007	188	99	4.99	101.32
2006	162	99	16.73	104.39
2005	176	99	21.75	110.78

2009 Commission Summary

30 Fillmore

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	28	COD	5.30
Total Sales Price	\$1,734,940	PRD	101.58
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,707,440	COV	10.91
Total Assessed Value	\$1,624,490	STD	10.55
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$60,980	Avg. Absolute Deviation	5.26
Avg. Assessed Value	\$58,018	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$84,429
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	95
Mean	97	Max	111
Min	51		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.80 to 99.66
95% Mean C.I	92.56 to 100.74
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.14 to 100.14

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 5.12

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 5.14

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 3.53

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	35	98	18.76	106.14
2007	28	98	12.16	101.25
2006	24	98	12.82	101.63
2005	19	100	9.32	101.79

2009 Commission Summary

30 Fillmore

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	61	COD	23.94
Total Sales Price	\$18,894,483	PRD	109.28
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$19,294,069	COV	33.10
Total Assessed Value	\$13,692,715	STD	25.67
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$316,296	Avg. Absolute Deviation	17.19
Avg. Assessed Value	\$224,471	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$212,614
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	71
Mean	78	Max	205.59
Min	43.65		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.55 to 77.63
95% Mean C.I	71.11 to 84.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	65.13 to 76.81

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	80.01
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.81
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.12

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	46	74	16.96	104.76
2007	52	74	14.72	108.03
2006	75	76	13.05	104.61
2005	105	77	11.75	103.15

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Fillmore 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 Fillmore County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Fillmore County is not 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 Fillmore County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Fillmore County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	186	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.07	95% Median C.I.:	98.71 to 101.40
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,434,862	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	40.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.70 to 103.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,434,862	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.86	95% Mean C.I.:	102.48 to 114.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,456,522						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,725	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	326.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,841	PRD:	108.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:08

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	22	98.75	97.88	99.43	6.06	98.45	77.00	123.69	95.60 to 99.90	55,900	55,579
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	98.79	100.19	98.23	12.94	101.99	62.04	195.40	94.80 to 101.40	51,767	50,853
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	21	99.83	111.93	99.63	17.74	112.34	81.61	326.30	98.50 to 106.33	63,309	63,076
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	29	100.33	97.33	94.52	16.39	102.97	43.80	134.50	87.44 to 109.27	51,036	48,238
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	26	99.29	106.98	97.76	25.88	109.43	46.00	198.67	87.16 to 121.30	62,282	60,887
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	103.54	121.84	99.48	39.53	122.48	47.13	265.00	86.62 to 130.71	38,079	37,880
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	117.98	130.85	116.44	38.03	112.37	61.40	218.60	92.37 to 209.29	40,017	46,597
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	27	106.68	107.41	107.16	26.21	100.23	15.07	200.90	93.33 to 125.52	42,681	45,739
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	92	99.35	101.42	97.81	13.58	103.69	43.80	326.30	98.38 to 99.93	55,159	53,949
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	94	103.90	114.93	103.05	32.47	111.52	15.07	265.00	96.52 to 115.96	46,384	47,799
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	103	100.33	109.17	97.66	25.42	111.78	43.80	326.30	98.18 to 103.54	52,981	51,741
____ALL____											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
EXETER	29	99.26	102.69	99.69	19.24	103.01	15.07	218.60	98.28 to 104.22	32,787	32,686
FAIRMONT	28	99.83	104.68	97.94	19.42	106.89	62.04	213.70	94.83 to 103.57	48,927	47,917
GENEVA	77	102.73	117.91	101.54	27.74	116.12	61.40	326.30	99.86 to 110.82	60,948	61,887
GRAFTON	6	96.36	101.41	88.14	30.53	115.06	63.74	157.69	63.74 to 157.69	39,883	35,152
MILLIGAN	11	99.50	113.94	113.06	24.02	100.78	55.23	173.85	96.89 to 172.20	19,454	21,995
OHIOWA	9	74.97	74.61	78.38	25.76	95.19	46.00	117.50	46.00 to 96.52	10,805	8,469
RURAL	10	96.91	107.38	105.48	24.26	101.80	65.00	209.29	71.49 to 116.78	103,600	109,275
SHICKLEY	13	96.40	97.84	94.16	11.35	103.91	73.44	133.56	84.98 to 106.68	49,615	46,718
STRANG	2	87.29	87.29	84.42	5.68	103.40	82.33	92.25	N/A	4,750	4,010
SUB GENEVA	1	91.32	91.32	91.32			91.32	91.32	N/A	180,000	164,375
____ALL____											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

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	175	99.86	108.39	99.76	23.98	108.65	15.07	326.30	99.01 to 101.52	46,964	46,853
2	2	94.75	94.75	94.20	3.62	100.59	91.32	98.18	N/A	155,000	146,007
3	9	95.64	108.40	106.52	27.02	101.76	65.00	209.29	71.49 to 116.78	100,666	107,235
____ALL____											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

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

NUMBER of Sales:	186	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.07	95% Median C.I.:	98.71 to 101.40
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,434,862	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	40.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.70 to 103.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,434,862	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.86	95% Mean C.I.:	102.48 to 114.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,456,522						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,725	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	326.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,841	PRD:	108.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:08

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	177	99.86	108.56	100.30	22.94	108.24	46.00	326.30	98.86 to 101.67	53,028	53,185
2	9	95.38	102.09	87.40	43.82	116.81	15.07	265.00	43.80 to 134.50	5,422	4,738
____ALL____											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	182	99.63	107.54	100.07	23.57	107.47	15.07	326.30	98.59 to 100.59	51,631	51,665
06											
07	4	136.66	140.34	140.72	20.80	99.72	106.33	181.69	N/A	9,500	13,368
____ALL____											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	5	116.55	112.56	110.85	6.58	101.54	94.68	125.52	N/A	57,160	63,362
30-0001	41	99.43	105.98	102.95	20.39	102.95	15.07	218.60	98.38 to 104.79	30,532	31,432
30-0025	120	100.09	111.50	100.49	26.82	110.95	46.00	326.30	99.01 to 103.54	57,205	57,488
30-0054	15	96.40	97.72	94.97	10.01	102.90	73.44	133.56	88.53 to 101.76	61,666	58,562
48-0303											
76-0068											
85-0047											
85-0094	5	72.22	76.01	68.77	23.14	110.53	47.13	117.50	N/A	21,500	14,785
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	186	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.07	95% Median C.I.:	98.71 to 101.40
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,434,862	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	40.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.70 to 103.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,434,862	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.86	95% Mean C.I.:	102.48 to 114.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,456,522						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,725	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	326.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,841	PRD:	108.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:08

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	20	98.76	106.91	106.54	29.70	100.35	15.07	265.00	92.25 to 116.78	29,177	31,085
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	12	99.36	105.47	112.35	34.54	93.88	46.00	248.90	62.04 to 115.96	22,766	25,577
1900 TO 1919	43	100.54	111.63	98.02	25.60	113.89	60.36	326.30	98.59 to 111.25	26,448	25,924
1920 TO 1939	32	98.62	115.91	102.62	33.62	112.96	47.13	259.54	92.10 to 125.52	36,328	37,279
1940 TO 1949	7	105.87	107.92	106.13	12.67	101.69	84.98	135.20	84.98 to 135.20	35,500	37,675
1950 TO 1959	11	98.18	111.50	105.73	19.76	105.46	82.99	198.67	87.82 to 128.60	57,553	60,851
1960 TO 1969	18	100.05	99.16	96.99	15.37	102.24	66.30	132.37	83.25 to 109.32	60,138	58,326
1970 TO 1979	26	99.71	102.02	93.77	16.62	108.80	65.00	181.69	91.32 to 102.73	85,669	80,330
1980 TO 1989	8	95.63	94.98	93.69	5.85	101.38	83.46	104.22	83.46 to 104.22	90,962	85,218
1990 TO 1994	5	103.01	101.44	99.07	10.68	102.40	87.16	114.80	N/A	165,621	164,074
1995 TO 1999	2	112.43	112.43	112.86	3.67	99.61	108.30	116.55	N/A	117,500	132,610
2000 TO Present	2	154.41	154.41	128.82	35.55	119.86	99.52	209.29	N/A	148,000	190,652
ALL	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	92.25	99.35	81.24	45.61	122.29	46.00	265.00	46.00 to 117.50	2,233	1,814
5000 TO 9999	19	123.00	134.20	129.86	43.23	103.34	15.07	326.30	89.30 to 181.69	7,429	9,647
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	28	105.53	123.00	123.80	48.91	99.35	15.07	326.30	89.30 to 127.31	5,759	7,130
10000 TO 29999	54	102.04	117.63	117.68	25.77	99.96	55.23	248.90	99.75 to 121.30	18,177	21,390
30000 TO 59999	39	99.14	100.21	98.07	19.88	102.18	60.36	198.67	92.99 to 106.94	41,881	41,073
60000 TO 99999	38	99.04	101.59	101.46	13.52	100.13	68.78	209.29	93.33 to 104.22	73,271	74,343
100000 TO 149999	18	99.83	96.69	96.67	10.94	100.03	66.57	116.55	84.82 to 108.30	122,288	118,211
150000 TO 249999	9	92.55	92.03	92.47	7.27	99.53	71.65	103.01	87.16 to 99.96	185,900	171,894
ALL	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	186	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.07	95% Median C.I.:	98.71 to 101.40
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,434,862	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	40.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.70 to 103.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,434,862	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.86	95% Mean C.I.:	102.48 to 114.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,456,522						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,725	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	326.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,841	PRD:	108.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:08

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	11	72.50	84.82	58.19	58.25	145.77	15.07	265.00	43.80 to 117.50	2,936	1,708
5000 TO 9999	12	98.29	98.60	95.21	17.75	103.56	55.23	127.31	82.33 to 123.00	8,538	8,130
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	23	92.25	92.01	86.34	33.28	106.57	15.07	265.00	72.50 to 109.27	5,859	5,058
10000 TO 29999	55	100.54	115.23	100.15	28.22	115.07	60.36	326.30	98.43 to 105.87	18,647	18,674
30000 TO 59999	48	101.58	116.08	103.98	29.41	111.64	63.74	248.90	95.96 to 124.00	41,372	43,017
60000 TO 99999	34	99.16	101.67	99.67	10.95	102.00	66.57	137.98	94.68 to 106.68	75,552	75,304
100000 TO 149999	17	99.90	97.86	96.94	9.12	100.95	71.65	114.80	84.82 to 108.30	126,335	122,473
150000 TO 249999	9	99.52	109.64	102.14	19.02	107.34	87.16	209.29	87.44 to 116.55	174,678	178,423
ALL											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	20	98.76	106.91	106.54	29.70	100.35	15.07	265.00	92.25 to 116.78	29,177	31,085
10	2	128.60	128.60	135.52	22.63	94.89	99.50	157.69	N/A	21,000	28,460
20	91	100.17	112.61	104.11	27.74	108.16	46.00	326.30	99.06 to 105.40	30,930	32,201
30	69	99.52	103.28	98.32	17.86	105.05	61.40	200.90	94.83 to 104.22	76,326	75,044
40	4	90.00	91.08	91.94	5.50	99.07	84.82	99.52	N/A	182,026	167,358
ALL											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	24	99.80	114.54	109.93	33.80	104.19	15.07	265.00	94.83 to 129.87	28,147	30,942
100	4	136.66	140.34	140.72	20.80	99.72	106.33	181.69	N/A	9,500	13,368
101	106	99.51	102.35	99.03	17.48	103.35	47.13	209.29	97.72 to 100.33	59,959	59,378
102	6	99.08	99.37	98.38	27.35	101.01	63.74	137.98	63.74 to 137.98	73,250	72,063
103	2	86.06	86.06	84.83	16.74	101.44	71.65	100.46	N/A	147,500	125,125
104	41	102.55	120.11	105.83	33.32	113.50	46.00	326.30	97.46 to 115.96	32,587	34,486
111	2	91.30	91.30	89.19	9.45	102.37	82.67	99.93	N/A	112,500	100,337
301	1	98.71	98.71	98.71			98.71	98.71	N/A	70,000	69,095
ALL											
	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

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:	186	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.07	95% Median C.I.:	98.71 to 101.40
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,434,862	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	40.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.70 to 103.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,434,862	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.86	95% Mean C.I.:	102.48 to 114.01
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,456,522						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,725	COD:	23.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	326.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,841	PRD:	108.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:08

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	20	98.76	106.91	106.54	29.70	100.35	15.07	265.00	92.25 to 116.78	29,177	31,085
10	3	46.00	46.38	46.56	0.82	99.60	46.00	47.13	N/A	2,666	1,241
15	3	133.14	150.74	153.59	17.95	98.15	123.69	195.40	N/A	8,916	13,695
20	40	101.46	123.30	103.95	36.26	118.62	55.23	326.30	97.72 to 117.63	23,358	24,280
30	113	99.50	104.05	99.08	17.72	105.02	60.36	209.29	98.28 to 100.54	59,633	59,087
35	1	107.23	107.23	107.23			107.23	107.23	N/A	98,500	105,620
40	5	103.01	103.91	101.78	8.28	102.10	87.44	114.80	N/A	171,621	174,669
50	1	87.16	87.16	87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	187,000	162,990
ALL	186	99.80	108.24	100.23	23.91	108.00	15.07	326.30	98.71 to 101.40	50,725	50,841

Fillmore County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the Residential property class/subclasses:

For 2009 the county conducted a market study of the residential property class. The preliminary statistics indicated the level of value was within the acceptable range; however the town of Geneva appeared to be valued above the acceptable range.

Further analysis of this subclass class indicated houses of average and below condition and quality built before 1950 were overvalued. Approximately 462 parcels existed in this subclass. A reduction of 20% was applied to the previous year's assessed value of the house resulting in statistics that suggest all properties are valued uniformly and proportionately.

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

2009 Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contract Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract Appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2004
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006 in Geneva and Rural, and 2007 for the small towns
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	N/A
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	9
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Areas are defined by town and all parcels outside the city limits are included in the rural.
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
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 of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	No
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. Both areas are valued using the same costing and depreciation schedule.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
53	4	21	78

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	185	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	33.02	95% Median C.I.:	97.46 to 99.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,429,862	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	34.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.18 to 101.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,429,862	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.35	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 108.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,209,262						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,972	COD:	21.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	265.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,779	PRD:	106.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:13

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	22	98.41	95.43	96.84	6.09	98.55	65.27	114.80	92.94 to 99.76		55,900	54,133
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	98.79	98.47	97.90	11.20	100.58	62.04	160.95	94.80 to 101.40		51,767	50,681
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	20	99.63	98.41	96.34	7.77	102.15	66.45	114.80	98.18 to 102.73		66,225	63,800
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	29	90.12	93.73	92.65	17.23	101.17	43.80	134.50	84.98 to 101.84		51,036	47,285
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	26	95.75	102.68	93.54	26.25	109.77	46.00	198.67	87.16 to 108.30		62,282	58,257
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	100.54	115.51	95.27	36.62	121.24	47.13	265.00	83.46 to 123.00		38,079	36,279
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	117.98	128.95	114.54	39.64	112.58	51.42	218.60	76.39 to 209.29		40,017	45,835
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	27	106.68	104.99	106.00	21.00	99.05	15.07	172.20	95.38 to 121.28		42,681	45,240
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	91	98.59	96.21	95.70	11.04	100.53	43.80	160.95	96.89 to 99.52		55,711	53,316
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	94	100.23	110.94	99.94	31.32	111.01	15.07	265.00	94.83 to 109.30		46,384	46,355
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	102	98.34	102.69	94.30	22.85	108.90	43.80	265.00	91.42 to 100.54		53,451	50,407
_____ALL_____												
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96		50,972	49,779

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
EXETER	29	99.26	102.69	99.69	19.24	103.01	15.07	218.60	98.28 to 104.22		32,787	32,686
FAIRMONT	28	99.83	104.68	97.94	19.42	106.89	62.04	213.70	94.83 to 103.57		48,927	47,917
GENEVA	76	99.69	106.53	95.97	23.36	111.00	51.42	265.00	91.42 to 103.01		61,684	59,198
GRAFTON	6	96.36	101.41	88.14	30.53	115.06	63.74	157.69	63.74 to 157.69		39,883	35,152
MILLIGAN	11	99.50	113.94	113.06	24.02	100.78	55.23	173.85	96.89 to 172.20		19,454	21,995
OHIOWA	9	74.97	74.61	78.38	25.76	95.19	46.00	117.50	46.00 to 96.52		10,805	8,469
RURAL	10	98.27	110.72	107.31	20.56	103.17	71.49	209.29	92.55 to 116.78		103,600	111,177
SHICKLEY	13	96.40	97.84	94.16	11.35	103.91	73.44	133.56	84.98 to 106.68		49,615	46,718
STRANG	2	87.29	87.29	84.42	5.68	103.40	82.33	92.25	N/A		4,750	4,010
SUB GENEVA	1	91.32	91.32	91.32			91.32	91.32	N/A		180,000	164,375
_____ALL_____												
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96		50,972	49,779

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	174	99.19	103.36	96.58	21.66	107.02	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.97		47,206	45,592
2	2	94.75	94.75	94.20	3.62	100.59	91.32	98.18	N/A		155,000	146,007
3	9	98.36	112.11	108.62	22.81	103.21	71.49	209.29	92.55 to 116.78		100,666	109,347
_____ALL_____												
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96		50,972	49,779

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	185	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	33.02	95% Median C.I.:	97.46 to 99.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,429,862	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	34.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.18 to 101.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,429,862	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.35	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 108.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,209,262						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,972	COD:	21.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	265.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,779	PRD:	106.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

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

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:13

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	176	99.19	103.78	97.71	20.44	106.20	46.00	218.60	97.54 to 99.97	53,301	52,083
2	9	95.38	102.09	87.40	43.82	116.81	15.07	265.00	43.80 to 134.50	5,422	4,738
____ALL____											
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	181	98.71	102.88	97.49	21.17	105.54	15.07	265.00	96.89 to 99.90	51,888	50,584
06											
07	4	136.66	140.34	140.72	20.80	99.72	106.33	181.69	N/A	9,500	13,368
____ALL____											
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	5	116.55	112.56	110.85	6.58	101.54	94.68	125.52	N/A	57,160	63,362
30-0001	41	99.43	105.98	102.95	20.39	102.95	15.07	218.60	98.38 to 104.79	30,532	31,432
30-0025	119	99.14	104.17	96.69	23.50	107.74	46.00	265.00	92.94 to 100.17	57,644	55,734
30-0054	15	96.40	97.72	94.97	10.01	102.90	73.44	133.56	88.53 to 101.76	61,666	58,562
48-0303											
76-0068											
85-0047											
85-0094	5	78.19	82.68	86.46	24.69	95.63	47.13	117.50	N/A	21,500	18,588
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	185	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	33.02	95% Median C.I.:	97.46 to 99.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,429,862	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	34.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.18 to 101.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,429,862	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.35	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 108.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,209,262						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,972	COD:	21.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	265.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,779	PRD:	106.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:13

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	20	96.02	103.26	100.20	29.26	103.06	15.07	265.00	88.82 to 109.30	29,177	29,234
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	12	90.55	98.14	101.68	34.97	96.52	46.00	213.93	62.04 to 104.79	22,766	23,149
1900 TO 1919	42	99.86	102.33	92.36	18.92	110.80	51.42	218.60	96.20 to 103.54	26,959	24,898
1920 TO 1939	32	97.87	107.71	92.94	30.52	115.88	47.13	213.70	86.53 to 121.28	36,328	33,765
1940 TO 1949	7	96.89	99.71	98.61	14.16	101.12	78.42	135.20	78.42 to 135.20	35,500	35,005
1950 TO 1959	11	98.18	111.50	105.73	19.76	105.46	82.99	198.67	87.82 to 128.60	57,553	60,851
1960 TO 1969	18	100.05	99.16	96.99	15.37	102.24	66.30	132.37	83.25 to 109.32	60,138	58,326
1970 TO 1979	26	99.71	103.30	94.62	15.34	109.18	66.57	181.69	92.37 to 102.73	85,669	81,061
1980 TO 1989	8	95.63	94.98	93.69	5.85	101.38	83.46	104.22	83.46 to 104.22	90,962	85,218
1990 TO 1994	5	103.01	101.44	99.07	10.68	102.40	87.16	114.80	N/A	165,621	164,074
1995 TO 1999	2	112.43	112.43	112.86	3.67	99.61	108.30	116.55	N/A	117,500	132,610
2000 TO Present	2	154.41	154.41	128.82	35.55	119.86	99.52	209.29	N/A	148,000	190,652
ALL	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	92.25	99.35	81.24	45.61	122.29	46.00	265.00	46.00 to 117.50	2,233	1,814
5000 TO 9999	18	108.41	119.93	118.58	38.62	101.13	15.07	218.60	89.30 to 134.50	7,564	8,970
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	27	101.79	113.07	113.78	42.06	99.38	15.07	265.00	82.33 to 127.31	5,787	6,585
10000 TO 29999	54	100.17	112.40	112.69	23.28	99.74	55.23	213.93	98.38 to 106.33	18,177	20,484
30000 TO 59999	39	98.51	97.96	96.49	18.68	101.52	51.42	198.67	84.98 to 104.79	41,881	40,412
60000 TO 99999	38	96.00	97.45	97.41	13.59	100.04	65.27	209.29	91.42 to 99.52	73,271	71,372
100000 TO 149999	18	99.83	94.98	94.95	12.66	100.03	66.45	116.55	82.67 to 108.30	122,288	116,112
150000 TO 249999	9	92.55	92.03	92.47	7.27	99.53	71.65	103.01	87.16 to 99.96	185,900	171,894
ALL	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	185	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	33.02	95% Median C.I.:	97.46 to 99.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,429,862	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	34.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.18 to 101.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,429,862	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.35	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 108.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,209,262						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,972	COD:	21.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	265.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,779	PRD:	106.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:13

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	11	72.50	84.82	58.19	58.25	145.77	15.07	265.00	43.80 to 117.50	2,936	1,708
5000 TO 9999	13	94.78	96.30	93.12	16.17	103.42	55.23	127.31	82.33 to 111.25	8,728	8,127
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	24	90.78	91.04	85.38	31.82	106.63	15.07	265.00	72.50 to 105.56	6,073	5,185
10000 TO 29999	56	99.37	107.83	96.14	24.25	112.17	51.42	218.60	97.13 to 101.84	19,412	18,662
30000 TO 59999	48	99.47	109.74	99.11	25.53	110.73	63.74	213.93	94.80 to 113.57	44,247	43,851
60000 TO 99999	34	98.71	97.52	94.80	10.78	102.88	66.45	130.40	92.95 to 104.22	79,302	75,175
100000 TO 149999	14	100.18	99.29	98.25	8.14	101.06	71.65	114.80	90.12 to 109.32	128,907	126,645
150000 TO 249999	9	99.52	109.64	102.14	19.02	107.34	87.16	209.29	87.44 to 116.55	174,678	178,423
ALL											
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	20	96.02	103.26	100.20	29.26	103.06	15.07	265.00	88.82 to 109.30	29,177	29,234
10	2	128.60	128.60	135.52	22.63	94.89	99.50	157.69	N/A	21,000	28,460
20	90	99.76	107.05	102.41	23.31	104.53	46.00	218.60	98.36 to 102.73	31,218	31,970
30	69	98.59	99.69	95.69	17.26	104.17	51.42	198.67	92.88 to 100.46	76,326	73,040
40	4	90.00	87.15	89.35	9.88	97.54	69.07	99.52	N/A	182,026	162,635
ALL											
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	24	97.45	110.53	103.25	32.79	107.05	15.07	265.00	89.30 to 113.57	28,147	29,062
100	4	136.66	140.34	140.72	20.80	99.72	106.33	181.69	N/A	9,500	13,368
101	106	99.20	100.79	98.58	16.71	102.24	47.13	209.29	97.13 to 100.00	59,959	59,105
102	6	86.66	88.58	89.41	24.66	99.08	63.74	116.55	63.74 to 116.55	73,250	65,490
103	2	86.06	86.06	84.83	16.74	101.44	71.65	100.46	N/A	147,500	125,125
104	40	98.33	107.53	96.17	27.50	111.81	46.00	218.60	92.94 to 103.57	33,277	32,002
111	2	91.30	91.30	89.19	9.45	102.37	82.67	99.93	N/A	112,500	100,337
301	1	98.71	98.71	98.71			98.71	98.71	N/A	70,000	69,095
ALL											
	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

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:	185	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	33.02	95% Median C.I.:	97.46 to 99.96
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,429,862	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	34.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.18 to 101.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,429,862	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.35	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 108.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,209,262						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	50,972	COD:	21.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	265.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,779	PRD:	106.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.07		

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

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:13

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	20	96.02	103.26	100.20	29.26	103.06	15.07	265.00	88.82 to 109.30	29,177	29,234
10	3	46.00	46.38	46.56	0.82	99.60	46.00	47.13	N/A	2,666	1,241
15	3	133.14	133.22	135.29	13.87	98.47	105.56	160.95	N/A	8,916	12,063
20	39	99.75	113.43	100.71	28.00	112.63	51.42	218.60	95.60 to 109.27	23,829	23,999
30	113	99.14	101.44	96.86	17.47	104.72	60.36	209.29	96.89 to 100.00	59,633	57,762
35	1	86.53	86.53	86.53			86.53	86.53	N/A	98,500	85,235
40	5	103.01	103.91	101.78	8.28	102.10	87.44	114.80	N/A	171,621	174,669
50	1	87.16	87.16	87.16			87.16	87.16	N/A	187,000	162,990
ALL	185	99.06	103.69	97.66	21.55	106.18	15.07	265.00	97.46 to 99.96	50,972	49,779

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	274	185	67.52
2008	268	199	74.25
2007	283	188	66.43
2006	266	162	60.90
2005	233	176	75.54

RESIDENTIAL: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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	100	-1.83	98	99
2008	99.19	-0.87	98	99.25
2007	99	4.22	103	99
2006	95	8.63	103	99
2005	99	0.17	99	99

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

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
-2.91	2009	-1.83
0.37	2008	-0.87
8.36	2007	4.22
9.76	2006	8.63
0.49	2005	0.17

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

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	98	104

RESIDENTIAL: The median ratio and weighted mean ratio are within the acceptable range. The mean is above the acceptable range. While this may suggest regressivity in assessment, it does not disprove the median as the best measure of central tendency.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	21.55	106.18
Difference	6.55	3.18

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. This tends to indicate a lack of uniformity and regressivity in residential assessments. However, given the erratic market in many of the small subclasses in Fillmore County, it is not only expected but allowable to have CODs and PRDs above the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	186	185	-1
Median	100	99	-1
Wgt. Mean	100	98	-2
Mean	108	104	-4
COD	23.91	21.55	-2.36
PRD	108.00	106.18	-1.82
Minimum	15.07	15.07	0.00
Maximum	326.30	265.00	-61.30

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. The primary actions were a reduction to the town of Geneva for 2009 and the results are displayed accurately in this table.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	185	192	-7
Median	99	101	-2
Wgt. Mean	98	101	-3
Mean	104	119	-15
COD	21.55	39.18	-17.63
PRD	106.18	116.79	-10.61
Minimum	15.07	14.67	0.40
Maximum	265.00	350.59	-85.59

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

In Fillmore County the measures of central tendency are similar suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. This analysis suggests sold properties are treated similarly to the unsold properties in the residential class and the assessor has no bias in the assignment of residential assessments. The quality statistics however are significantly different than one another. This could indicate assessment practice issues or could be attributable to sampling error in the data gathering process.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	36.23	95% Median C.I.:	78.92 to 104.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,737,440	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	36.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.31 to 98.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,709,940	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.79	95% Mean C.I.:	86.40 to 114.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,501,160						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	58,963	COD:	25.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	203.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,764	PRD:	114.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:17

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	87.91	85.05	81.81	13.80	103.96	56.64	100.67	56.64 to 100.67		77,166	63,131
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	101.08	99.73	97.62	5.02	102.16	91.44	106.67	N/A		19,166	18,710
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	64.73	64.73	64.73			64.73	64.73	N/A		90,000	58,255
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	179.67	179.67	179.67			179.67	179.67	N/A		3,000	5,390
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	93.97	111.96	79.75	47.34	140.38	56.01	203.86	N/A		83,500	66,591
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	102.40	100.60	107.44	14.68	93.63	70.63	126.96	N/A		44,000	47,272
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	79.69	84.76	89.28	10.98	94.93	75.80	103.84	N/A		106,125	94,748
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	181.00	181.00	181.00			181.00	181.00	N/A		2,500	4,525
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	103.06	103.06	87.36	17.41	117.97	85.12	121.00	N/A		16,000	13,977
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	51.20	51.20	51.20			51.20	51.20	N/A		30,000	15,360
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	112.34	112.34	123.47	10.98	90.98	100.00	124.67	N/A		48,720	60,152
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	10	91.84	87.42	80.78	13.54	108.22	56.64	106.67	64.73 to 101.08		61,050	49,317
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	13	100.50	105.30	89.58	29.61	117.55	56.01	203.86	75.80 to 126.96		72,115	64,603
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	110.50	110.50	103.83	28.71	106.42	51.20	181.00	51.20 to 181.00		26,990	28,024
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	93.97	115.37	77.29	51.95	149.28	56.01	203.86	56.01 to 203.86		71,166	55,001
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	100.50	102.59	94.58	22.27	108.48	70.63	181.00	75.80 to 126.96		57,727	54,596
____ALL____												
	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30		58,963	51,764

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
EXETER	2	104.52	104.52	106.86	4.32	97.80	100.00	109.03	N/A		9,870	10,547
FAIRMONT	1	83.17	83.17	83.17			83.17	83.17	N/A		32,000	26,615
GENEVA	15	91.44	95.24	86.44	23.64	110.19	51.20	181.00	76.22 to 104.30		72,880	62,996
MILLIGAN	2	143.17	143.17	127.52	25.49	112.27	106.67	179.67	N/A		5,250	6,695
OHIOWA	2	95.82	95.82	74.91	26.29	127.90	70.63	121.00	N/A		11,750	8,802
RURAL	2	91.38	91.38	93.01	13.64	98.25	78.92	103.84	N/A		172,500	160,435
SHICKLEY	1	64.73	64.73	64.73			64.73	64.73	N/A		90,000	58,255
STRANG	1	100.67	100.67	100.67			100.67	100.67	N/A		3,000	3,020
SUB GENEVA	2	151.25	151.25	166.09	34.78	91.07	98.64	203.86	N/A		19,500	32,387
SUB SHICKLEY	1	56.64	56.64	56.64			56.64	56.64	N/A		54,000	30,585
____ALL____												
	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30		58,963	51,764

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	36.23	95% Median C.I.:	78.92 to 104.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,737,440	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	36.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.31 to 98.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,709,940	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.79	95% Mean C.I.:	86.40 to 114.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,501,160						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	58,963	COD:	25.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	203.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,764	PRD:	114.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:17

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	23	100.00	99.09	85.30	23.13	116.17	51.20	181.00	78.52 to 106.67	53,997	46,060
2	4	91.88	111.07	98.29	43.74	113.00	56.64	203.86	N/A	30,750	30,223
3	2	91.38	91.38	93.01	13.64	98.25	78.92	103.84	N/A	172,500	160,435
ALL	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

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	27	100.00	102.08	88.36	24.82	115.54	56.01	203.86	78.92 to 106.67	61,701	54,518
2	2	74.92	74.92	66.30	31.66	113.01	51.20	98.64	N/A	22,000	14,585
ALL	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	1	103.84	103.84	103.84			103.84	103.84	N/A	195,000	202,485
30-0001	4	107.85	123.84	114.04	19.01	108.60	100.00	179.67	N/A	7,560	8,621
30-0025	22	91.84	99.34	87.67	25.95	113.32	51.20	203.86	78.52 to 104.30	60,940	53,425
30-0054	2	60.69	60.69	61.69	6.67	98.36	56.64	64.73	N/A	72,000	44,420
48-0303											
76-0068											
85-0047											
85-0094											
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

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:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	36.23	95% Median C.I.:	78.92 to 104.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,737,440	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	36.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.31 to 98.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,709,940	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.79	95% Mean C.I.:	86.40 to 114.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,501,160						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	58,963	COD:	25.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	203.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,764	PRD:	114.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:17

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	2	74.92	74.92	66.30	31.66	113.01	51.20	98.64	N/A	22,000	14,585
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	91.44	91.44	91.44			91.44	91.44	N/A	25,000	22,860
1900 TO 1919	4	110.50	119.22	85.59	28.16	139.30	76.22	179.67	N/A	13,685	11,712
1920 TO 1939	6	103.67	111.42	96.61	20.08	115.32	70.63	181.00	70.63 to 181.00	11,416	11,030
1940 TO 1949	3	101.08	127.82	127.82	41.33	100.00	78.52	203.86	N/A	25,000	31,955
1950 TO 1959	4	84.36	94.71	89.66	13.43	105.64	83.17	126.96	N/A	107,875	96,716
1960 TO 1969	2	98.27	98.27	99.13	6.14	99.13	92.23	104.30	N/A	66,500	65,920
1970 TO 1979	2	94.70	94.70	95.14	31.65	99.54	64.73	124.67	N/A	91,350	86,910
1980 TO 1989	3	75.80	70.45	74.21	9.80	94.94	56.64	78.92	N/A	118,833	88,188
1990 TO 1994	1	56.01	56.01	56.01			56.01	56.01	N/A	144,000	80,660
1995 TO 1999	1	103.84	103.84	103.84			103.84	103.84	N/A	195,000	202,485
2000 TO Present											
ALL	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

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	121.00	136.47	131.86	26.45	103.50	100.00	181.00	N/A	3,048	4,019
5000 TO 9999	1	106.67	106.67	106.67			106.67	106.67	N/A	7,500	8,000
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	113.84	131.50	123.55	25.52	106.44	100.00	181.00	100.00 to 181.00	3,790	4,682
10000 TO 29999	8	99.57	106.71	108.06	22.00	98.75	70.63	203.86	70.63 to 203.86	21,187	22,896
30000 TO 59999	7	83.17	81.65	84.72	20.65	96.38	51.20	126.96	51.20 to 126.96	43,928	37,215
60000 TO 99999	3	104.30	97.90	97.83	19.16	100.07	64.73	124.67	N/A	86,233	84,363
100000 TO 149999	1	56.01	56.01	56.01			56.01	56.01	N/A	144,000	80,660
150000 TO 249999	3	78.92	86.19	87.73	11.84	98.24	75.80	103.84	N/A	165,833	145,488
250000 TO 499999	1	83.60	83.60	83.60			83.60	83.60	N/A	310,000	259,175
ALL	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

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:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	36.23	95% Median C.I.:	78.92 to 104.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,737,440	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	36.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.31 to 98.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,709,940	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.79	95% Mean C.I.:	86.40 to 114.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,501,160						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	58,963	COD:	25.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	203.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,764	PRD:	114.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:17

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	110.84	125.67	120.14	22.86	104.60	100.00	181.00	N/A	3,060	3,676
5000 TO 9999	2	143.17	143.17	127.52	25.49	112.27	106.67	179.67	N/A	5,250	6,695
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	113.84	131.50	123.55	25.52	106.44	100.00	181.00	100.00 to 181.00	3,790	4,682
10000 TO 29999	10	88.28	86.93	84.45	14.96	102.94	51.20	109.03	70.63 to 101.08	23,650	19,971
30000 TO 59999	5	76.22	98.74	83.64	45.85	118.04	56.64	203.86	N/A	54,200	45,335
60000 TO 99999	3	104.30	95.76	84.25	22.67	113.66	56.01	126.96	N/A	93,166	78,490
100000 TO 149999	3	78.92	93.13	88.45	20.64	105.29	75.80	124.67	N/A	131,733	116,515
150000 TO 249999	1	103.84	103.84	103.84			103.84	103.84	N/A	195,000	202,485
250000 TO 499999	1	83.60	83.60	83.60			83.60	83.60	N/A	310,000	259,175
ALL											
	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	74.92	74.92	66.30	31.66	113.01	51.20	98.64	N/A	22,000	14,585
10	11	100.67	111.40	102.70	27.58	108.47	70.63	203.86	78.52 to 179.67	36,454	37,437
20	16	95.72	95.68	83.81	23.78	114.16	56.01	181.00	75.80 to 109.03	79,058	66,260
ALL											
	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	91.88	88.99	75.16	22.67	118.39	51.20	121.00	N/A	19,000	14,281
170	2	91.80	91.80	93.50	38.30	98.18	56.64	126.96	N/A	56,750	53,062
203	1	56.01	56.01	56.01			56.01	56.01	N/A	144,000	80,660
353	1	76.22	76.22	76.22			76.22	76.22	N/A	45,000	34,300
406	2	80.85	80.85	81.13	2.88	99.65	78.52	83.17	N/A	28,500	23,122
41	1	83.60	83.60	83.60			83.60	83.60	N/A	310,000	259,175
42	3	103.84	102.88	103.74	1.22	99.17	100.50	104.30	N/A	96,666	100,283
47	2	108.45	108.45	112.31	14.96	96.56	92.23	124.67	N/A	74,850	84,067
48	1	203.86	203.86	203.86			203.86	203.86	N/A	25,000	50,965
49	1	75.80	75.80	75.80			75.80	75.80	N/A	152,500	115,595
50	5	106.67	117.58	103.15	18.03	113.99	91.44	179.67	N/A	15,100	15,575
61	1	70.63	70.63	70.63			70.63	70.63	N/A	21,500	15,185
98	5	100.00	105.06	75.50	27.60	139.16	64.73	181.00	N/A	50,048	37,785
ALL											
	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	36.23	95% Median C.I.:	78.92 to 104.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,737,440	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	36.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.31 to 98.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,709,940	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.79	95% Mean C.I.:	86.40 to 114.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,501,160						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	58,963	COD:	25.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	203.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,764	PRD:	114.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:17

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764
04											
ALL	29	98.64	100.21	87.79	25.14	114.15	51.20	203.86	78.92 to 104.30	58,963	51,764

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

Commercial

Fillmore County conducted a physical review of all commercial properties for the 2009 assessment year. As part of this process, they added new Marshall & Swift cost tables. After implementing the cost updates the county adjusted depreciation on several unique parcels to arrive at an assessed value similar to the selling price. These parcels included a truck wash, car wash, and an old school building.

In addition to this revaluation, the county completed all pick-up work of new and omitted construction.

2009 Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contract Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract Appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2008
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2009
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?
	N/A
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Sales and Market Approach
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	11
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Areas are defined by location and include all towns. Any parcels outside the city limits are included in the rural except for parcels that are within one mile of the city limits. Commercial properties with both Highway and rail road access are in a separate market area.
10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes, the land has a common characteristic
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>)
	Only in the town of Geneva.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
10	5	6	21

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.91	95% Median C.I.:	96.80 to 99.66
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,734,940	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	10.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.14 to 100.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,707,440	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.26	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.74
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,624,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,980	COD:	5.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.83		
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,017	PRD:	101.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:26

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	98.93	98.05	88.74	5.27	110.49	83.63	110.83	83.63 to 110.83		77,166	68,475
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	104.64	102.00	100.38	4.23	101.61	94.04	107.33	N/A		19,166	19,240
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	99.16	99.16	99.16			99.16	99.16	N/A		90,000	89,245
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	90.50	90.50	90.50			90.50	90.50	N/A		3,000	2,715
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	99.53	99.79	99.62	0.58	100.18	99.03	101.08	N/A		83,500	83,178
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	100.97	101.37	101.88	1.91	99.50	99.26	104.28	N/A		44,000	44,826
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	96.51	96.29	96.73	2.02	99.54	93.81	98.33	N/A		106,125	102,655
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	92.13	92.13	98.38	7.74	93.66	85.00	99.27	N/A		16,000	15,740
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	51.20	51.20	51.20			51.20	51.20	N/A		30,000	15,360
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	98.46	98.46	96.96	1.68	101.54	96.80	100.11	N/A		48,720	47,237
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	10	99.19	99.35	91.37	5.04	108.73	83.63	110.83	94.04 to 107.33		61,050	55,782
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	13	99.26	98.48	98.70	2.45	99.78	90.50	104.28	94.88 to 101.08		72,115	71,181
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	96.80	86.48	88.63	13.05	97.57	51.20	100.11	N/A		31,888	28,263
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	99.28	98.14	99.46	1.92	98.67	90.50	101.08	90.50 to 101.08		71,166	70,779
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	98.80	97.49	98.25	3.50	99.23	85.00	104.28	93.81 to 102.32		63,250	62,140
____ALL____												
	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66		60,980	58,017

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
EXETER	2	99.57	99.57	99.29	0.54	100.28	99.03	100.11	N/A		9,870	9,800
FAIRMONT	1	93.81	93.81	93.81			93.81	93.81	N/A		32,000	30,020
GENEVA	14	98.68	94.57	93.04	6.81	101.65	51.20	104.64	94.04 to 102.32		77,907	72,481
MILLIGAN	2	98.91	98.91	102.52	8.51	96.48	90.50	107.33	N/A		5,250	5,382
OHIOWA	2	92.13	92.13	98.04	7.74	93.97	85.00	99.26	N/A		11,750	11,520
RURAL	2	98.86	98.86	98.79	0.54	100.07	98.33	99.39	N/A		172,500	170,412
SHICKLEY	1	99.16	99.16	99.16			99.16	99.16	N/A		90,000	89,245
STRANG	1	110.83	110.83	110.83			110.83	110.83	N/A		3,000	3,325
SUB GENEVA	2	99.86	99.86	100.21	1.22	99.66	98.64	101.08	N/A		19,500	19,540
SUB SHICKLEY	1	99.72	99.72	99.72			99.72	99.72	N/A		54,000	53,850
____ALL____												
	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66		60,980	58,017

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.91	95% Median C.I.:	96.80 to 99.66
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,734,940	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	10.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.14 to 100.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,707,440	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.26	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.74
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,624,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,980	COD:	5.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.83		
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,017	PRD:	101.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:26

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	22	99.10	95.89	93.67	6.57	102.38	51.20	110.83	94.04 to 100.11	56,338	52,770
2	4	99.50	99.68	99.76	0.73	99.91	98.64	101.08	N/A	30,750	30,677
3	2	98.86	98.86	98.79	0.54	100.07	98.33	99.39	N/A	172,500	170,412
____ALL____	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

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	26	99.24	98.32	95.90	3.83	102.52	83.63	110.83	96.80 to 99.72	63,978	61,358
2	2	74.92	74.92	66.30	31.66	113.01	51.20	98.64	N/A	22,000	14,585
____ALL____	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	1	98.33	98.33	98.33			98.33	98.33	N/A	195,000	191,740
30-0001	4	99.57	99.24	100.41	4.50	98.83	90.50	107.33	N/A	7,560	7,591
30-0025	21	99.22	95.81	94.10	6.14	101.81	51.20	110.83	94.88 to 99.66	63,723	59,966
30-0054	2	99.44	99.44	99.37	0.28	100.07	99.16	99.72	N/A	72,000	71,547
48-0303											
76-0068											
85-0047											
85-0094											
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.91	95% Median C.I.:	96.80 to 99.66
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,734,940	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	10.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.14 to 100.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,707,440	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.26	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.74
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,624,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,980	COD:	5.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.83		
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,017	PRD:	101.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:26

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	2	74.92	74.92	66.30	31.66	113.01	51.20	98.64	N/A	22,000	14,585
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	94.04	94.04	94.04			94.04	94.04	N/A	25,000	23,510
1900 TO 1919	4	94.32	93.44	97.42	6.03	95.92	85.00	100.11	N/A	13,685	13,331
1920 TO 1939	5	102.32	103.75	101.53	3.88	102.19	99.03	110.83	N/A	13,200	13,402
1940 TO 1949	3	101.08	100.65	100.65	2.77	100.00	96.24	104.64	N/A	25,000	25,163
1950 TO 1959	4	96.54	94.08	87.68	5.55	107.30	83.63	99.61	N/A	107,875	94,581
1960 TO 1969	2	101.75	101.75	102.11	2.49	99.64	99.22	104.28	N/A	66,500	67,905
1970 TO 1979	2	97.98	97.98	97.96	1.20	100.02	96.80	99.16	N/A	91,350	89,487
1980 TO 1989	3	99.39	98.00	97.51	1.62	100.50	94.88	99.72	N/A	118,833	115,876
1990 TO 1994	1	99.66	99.66	99.66			99.66	99.66	N/A	144,000	143,505
1995 TO 1999	1	98.33	98.33	98.33			98.33	98.33	N/A	195,000	191,740
2000 TO Present											
ALL	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	95.31	96.61	98.00	9.30	98.58	85.00	110.83	N/A	3,185	3,121
5000 TO 9999	1	107.33	107.33	107.33			107.33	107.33	N/A	7,500	8,050
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	100.11	98.75	101.46	8.52	97.34	85.00	110.83	N/A	4,048	4,107
10000 TO 29999	8	99.15	99.41	99.38	2.44	100.03	94.04	104.64	94.04 to 104.64	21,187	21,055
30000 TO 59999	7	99.22	91.57	93.98	7.98	97.43	51.20	99.72	51.20 to 99.72	43,928	41,285
60000 TO 99999	3	99.16	100.08	99.82	2.51	100.26	96.80	104.28	N/A	86,233	86,076
100000 TO 149999	1	99.66	99.66	99.66			99.66	99.66	N/A	144,000	143,505
150000 TO 249999	3	98.33	97.53	97.59	1.53	99.94	94.88	99.39	N/A	165,833	161,840
250000 TO 499999	1	83.63	83.63	83.63			83.63	83.63	N/A	310,000	259,255
ALL	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 28 **MEDIAN: 99** COV: 10.91 95% Median C.I.: 96.80 to 99.66
TOTAL Sales Price: 1,734,940 WGT. MEAN: 95 STD: 10.55 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 90.14 to 100.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 1,707,440 MEAN: 97 AVG.ABS.DEV: 5.26 95% Mean C.I.: 92.56 to 100.74
TOTAL Assessed Value: 1,624,490
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 60,980 COD: 5.30 MAX Sales Ratio: 110.83
AVG. Assessed Value: 58,017 PRD: 101.58 MIN Sales Ratio: 51.20

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:26

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	95.31	96.61	98.00	9.30	98.58	85.00	110.83	N/A	3,185	3,121
5000 TO 9999	1	107.33	107.33	107.33			107.33	107.33	N/A	7,500	8,050
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	100.11	98.75	101.46	8.52	97.34	85.00	110.83	N/A	4,048	4,107
10000 TO 29999	10	99.15	94.57	93.07	6.80	101.62	51.20	104.64	94.04 to 102.32	22,950	21,358
30000 TO 59999	5	99.22	98.10	98.53	1.49	99.56	93.81	99.72	N/A	49,500	48,772
60000 TO 99999	3	99.16	100.08	99.82	2.51	100.26	96.80	104.28	N/A	86,233	86,076
100000 TO 149999	3	99.39	97.98	97.94	1.60	100.04	94.88	99.66	N/A	148,833	145,761
150000 TO 249999	1	98.33	98.33	98.33			98.33	98.33	N/A	195,000	191,740
250000 TO 499999	1	83.63	83.63	83.63			83.63	83.63	N/A	310,000	259,255
ALL											
	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	74.92	74.92	66.30	31.66	113.01	51.20	98.64	N/A	22,000	14,585
10	11	99.22	98.26	98.39	4.94	99.87	85.00	110.83	90.50 to 107.33	36,454	35,868
20	15	99.39	98.36	95.11	3.00	103.41	83.63	104.64	96.80 to 100.11	84,162	80,051
ALL											
	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	91.82	83.53	79.80	16.80	104.67	51.20	99.27	N/A	19,000	15,162
170	2	99.66	99.66	99.67	0.06	100.00	99.61	99.72	N/A	56,750	56,560
203	1	99.66	99.66	99.66			99.66	99.66	N/A	144,000	143,505
353	1	98.14	98.14	98.14			98.14	98.14	N/A	45,000	44,165
406	2	95.03	95.03	94.88	1.28	100.16	93.81	96.24	N/A	28,500	27,040
41	1	83.63	83.63	83.63			83.63	83.63	N/A	310,000	259,255
42	3	102.32	101.64	100.15	1.94	101.49	98.33	104.28	N/A	96,666	96,811
47	2	98.01	98.01	97.72	1.23	100.30	96.80	99.22	N/A	74,850	73,142
48	1	101.08	101.08	101.08			101.08	101.08	N/A	25,000	25,270
49	1	94.88	94.88	94.88			94.88	94.88	N/A	152,500	144,695
50	5	99.03	99.11	99.72	5.54	99.38	90.50	107.33	N/A	15,100	15,058
61	1	99.26	99.26	99.26			99.26	99.26	N/A	21,500	21,340
98	4	99.75	102.37	99.46	3.11	102.93	99.16	110.83	N/A	61,935	61,600
ALL											
	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.91	95% Median C.I.:	96.80 to 99.66
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,734,940	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	10.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.14 to 100.14
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,707,440	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.26	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.74
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,624,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,980	COD:	5.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	110.83		
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,017	PRD:	101.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.20		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:25:26

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	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017
04											
ALL	28	99.19	96.65	95.14	5.30	101.58	51.20	110.83	96.80 to 99.66	60,980	58,017

2009 Correlation Section for Fillmore County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:In reviewing the statistics for the commercial class of property, the percent change in the sales file is dissimilar from percent change in the overall county. Disparity in this table generally suggests that sales are reviewed and revalued on a different standard than other commercial properties.

Fillmore County conducted a physical review of all commercial properties for the 2009 assessment year. As part of this process, they added new Marshall & Swift cost tables to the entire commercial class. After implementing the cost updates, the county adjusted depreciation on several unique parcels to arrive at an assessed value similar to the selling price. These parcels included a truck wash, car wash, and an old school building. Using the specific selling prices of these parcels to arrive at assessed values will undoubtedly produce more noticeable change in the sales file than in the change in the assessed base.

To determine a representative level of value for the commercial properties in the county, statistics were calculated using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. The comparison confirmed the median measure to be similar to that of the sales file, but displayed quality statistics much higher than the 5.30% coefficient of dispersion and the 101.58% price related differential. The particularly low COD in the sales file suggests that either the market is stable and relatively predictable in the commercial class or that the selling prices had a strong influence on the assessments of the sample.

Based on this analysis the level of value is determined to be within the acceptable range at 99 percent of market value. However the quality of assessment is determined to not be in compliance with professionally accepted mass appraisal practices. While several unique commercial properties may exist in Fillmore County, the assessments of sold parcels must be based on the same standard as parcels without recent selling prices to be considered in compliance. While the updating of commercial parcel information and cost tables by the county is commendable, in those situations where limited sale information exists in the county the assessor must consider the use of additional information such as comparable sales from the same geographic area, expanding the period from which sales are drawn, or relying on previously rejected sales.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	81	28	34.57
2008	66	35	53.03
2007	47	28	59.57
2006	48	24	50.00
2005	55	19	34.55

COMMERCIAL: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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	99	4.38	103	99
2008	98.31	0.83	99	98.31
2007	98	4.57	103	98
2006	98	2.22	100	98
2005	100	0.64	100	100

COMMERCIAL: Table III displays roughly a four percentage point difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio. This kind of disparity tends to indicate that sold parcels are reviewed and valued differently than the unsold parcels.

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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)
-14.42	2009	4.38
2.55	2008	0.83
0.70	2007	4.57
4.81	2006	2.22
0.00	2005	0.64

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in the sales file is dissimilar from percent change in the overall county. Disparity in this table suggests that sales are reviewed and revalued on a different standard than other commercial properties. Fillmore County conducted a physical review of all commercial properties for the 2009 assessment year. As part of this process, they added new Marshall & Swift cost tables. After implementing the cost updates the county adjusted depreciation on several unique parcels to arrive at an assessed value similar to the selling price. These parcels included a truck wash, car wash, and an old school building. Using the specific selling prices of these parcels to arrive at assessed values will undoubtedly produce more noticeable change in the sales file than in the change in the assessed base.

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	95	97

COMMERCIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range suggesting the level of value is best measured by the median measure of central tendency.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	5.30	101.58
Difference	0.00	0.00

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price differential are both well within the acceptable range. The extremely low COD suggests that either the market is stable and relatively predictable in the commercial class or that the selling prices influenced the assessments of the sample.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	29	28	-1
Median	99	99	0
Wgt. Mean	88	95	7
Mean	100	97	-3
COD	25.14	5.30	-19.84
PRD	114.15	101.58	-12.57
Minimum	51.20	51.20	0.00
Maximum	203.86	110.83	-93.03

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. While the median for the class did not change, a significant change resulted in the quality statistics

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	35.47	95% Median C.I.:	56.60 to 66.89	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	23.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.35 to 66.52	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.80	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 71.79	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,853,665							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	25.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,322	PRD:	107.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:39

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	99.75	99.75	99.75			99.75	99.75	N/A	221,000	220,440	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	88.67	78.85	73.15	15.17	107.80	58.56	96.13	58.56 to 96.13	348,642	255,034	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	87.73	87.73	87.73			87.73	87.73	N/A	61,000	53,515	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	82.04	82.04	82.04			82.04	82.04	N/A	183,000	150,135	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	73.57	77.37	78.15	9.43	99.01	68.87	89.68	N/A	347,458	271,528	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	67.35	67.04	64.24	11.28	104.36	48.63	91.60	56.60 to 71.84	356,247	228,853	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	7	56.53	60.78	59.62	12.28	101.96	49.57	77.97	49.57 to 77.97	260,339	155,207	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	54.03	64.15	72.45	35.09	88.54	34.18	113.23	34.18 to 113.23	185,298	134,255	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	61.41	71.19	61.17	31.96	116.38	43.94	182.42	45.94 to 82.07	276,940	169,404	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	52.55	55.54	48.76	21.97	113.91	38.12	90.89	38.12 to 90.89	482,300	235,153	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	40.83	43.25	46.51	19.82	92.98	31.43	55.27	31.43 to 55.27	324,133	150,759	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	88.67	82.16	75.64	13.31	108.63	58.56	99.75	59.11 to 96.13	302,500	228,799	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	66.15	67.14	65.65	13.44	102.27	48.63	91.60	56.60 to 71.84	314,772	206,652	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	31	55.27	60.38	54.76	29.60	110.27	31.43	182.42	48.20 to 61.41	321,333	175,960	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	84.89	79.49	75.22	13.33	105.67	58.56	96.13	66.89 to 89.68	310,572	233,622	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	34	62.82	66.58	63.33	22.59	105.13	34.18	182.42	56.53 to 68.58	280,676	177,763	
____ALL____	_____											
	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322	

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	35.47	95% Median C.I.:	56.60 to 66.89	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	23.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.35 to 66.52	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.80	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 71.79	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,853,665							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	25.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,322	PRD:	107.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:39

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3675	7	60.53	54.82	59.52	18.98	92.11	34.18	74.19	34.18 to 74.19	137,285	81,707
3677	1	77.97	77.97	77.97			77.97	77.97	N/A	195,000	152,050
3679	3	59.11	68.78	64.95	16.98	105.90	58.56	88.67	N/A	433,833	281,770
3681	4	54.76	67.95	63.59	29.36	106.84	49.04	113.23	N/A	412,000	262,007
3749	3	49.57	52.93	50.48	22.17	104.85	38.12	71.09	N/A	446,000	225,133
3751	3	61.74	56.01	59.74	16.66	93.76	37.72	68.58	N/A	229,825	137,305
3753	3	82.07	80.17	79.76	8.40	100.52	68.87	89.56	N/A	264,666	211,085
3755	9	66.89	68.42	55.37	24.43	123.57	39.99	96.13	48.20 to 90.89	387,317	214,461
3909	7	57.16	63.84	60.90	20.11	104.82	43.93	89.68	43.93 to 89.68	380,088	231,482
3911	2	121.96	121.96	91.63	49.58	133.09	61.49	182.42	N/A	333,000	305,140
3913	3	66.15	67.71	60.17	24.75	112.54	43.94	93.05	N/A	412,000	247,898
3915	2	61.52	61.52	58.87	48.91	104.50	31.43	91.60	N/A	186,400	109,725
3985	4	56.63	55.05	54.29	3.43	101.39	49.67	57.25	N/A	205,583	111,607
3987	4	61.02	63.93	56.19	21.31	113.76	45.94	87.73	N/A	336,062	188,845
3989	5	64.66	70.99	67.98	15.26	104.43	56.60	99.75	N/A	333,448	226,688
3991	1	50.49	50.49	50.49			50.49	50.49	N/A	112,000	56,550
____ALL____											
	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	46	64.00	68.29	62.36	24.34	109.50	37.72	182.42	57.16 to 68.87	357,150	222,715
2	15	56.53	58.68	56.15	25.82	104.51	31.43	96.13	43.94 to 73.57	191,008	107,250
____ALL____											
	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322
____ALL____											
	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	35.47	95% Median C.I.:	56.60 to 66.89	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	23.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.35 to 66.52	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.80	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 71.79	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,853,665							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	25.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,322	PRD:	107.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:39

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	10	60.97	58.24	56.40	22.72	103.25	34.18	82.04	36.32 to 78.94	214,342	120,898
30-0001	8	52.14	58.22	56.63	31.03	102.81	31.43	113.23	31.43 to 113.23	383,100	216,935
30-0025	27	66.89	73.68	66.23	26.85	111.26	37.72	182.42	57.25 to 88.67	304,629	201,745
30-0054	10	60.25	62.36	61.51	16.62	101.38	43.93	89.68	50.49 to 73.57	367,149	225,825
48-0303											
76-0068	1	54.81	54.81	54.81			54.81	54.81	N/A	558,000	305,840
85-0047											
85-0094	5	55.91	61.08	55.04	20.84	110.96	45.94	87.73	N/A	326,270	179,594
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	7	60.53	64.13	63.75	27.67	100.60	34.18	90.89	34.18 to 90.89	83,000	52,910
50.01 TO 100.00	22	64.00	64.04	63.46	19.50	100.92	31.43	96.13	55.91 to 77.97	182,729	115,957
100.01 TO 180.00	28	57.86	67.60	60.57	31.10	111.62	38.12	182.42	54.70 to 68.87	444,954	269,486
180.01 TO 330.00	4	66.34	67.64	62.06	21.08	108.99	48.20	89.68	N/A	558,575	346,650
ALL	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	57.25	64.66	63.38	17.70	102.01	49.57	87.73	49.57 to 87.73	165,585	104,955
DRY-N/A	5	49.04	44.88	46.13	15.11	97.29	31.43	56.53	N/A	239,006	110,245
GRASS	1	36.32	36.32	36.32			36.32	36.32	N/A	75,000	27,240
GRASS-N/A	4	56.32	60.74	63.28	32.31	95.98	34.18	96.13	N/A	68,618	43,425
IRRGTD	10	65.01	63.01	64.04	6.81	98.39	50.49	70.07	56.60 to 68.58	318,700	204,093
IRRGTD-N/A	34	65.78	71.62	62.12	28.92	115.29	38.12	182.42	55.43 to 82.04	394,219	244,878
ALL	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	35.47	95% Median C.I.:	56.60 to 66.89	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	23.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.35 to 66.52	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.80	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 71.79	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,853,665							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	25.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,322	PRD:	107.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:39

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	57.25	64.66	63.38	17.70	102.01	49.57	87.73	49.57 to 87.73	165,585	104,955
DRY-N/A	5	49.04	44.88	46.13	15.11	97.29	31.43	56.53	N/A	239,006	110,245
GRASS	1	36.32	36.32	36.32			36.32	36.32	N/A	75,000	27,240
GRASS-N/A	4	56.32	60.74	63.28	32.31	95.98	34.18	96.13	N/A	68,618	43,425
IRRGTD	36	64.38	69.40	62.50	24.83	111.04	38.12	182.42	58.56 to 70.07	382,483	239,059
IRRGTD-N/A	8	71.53	70.81	62.41	18.73	113.46	48.20	90.89	48.20 to 90.89	352,630	220,082
ALL	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	12	56.22	56.42	54.62	19.32	103.28	31.43	87.73	49.04 to 71.84	196,177	107,159
GRASS	5	50.90	55.85	57.50	34.33	97.14	34.18	96.13	N/A	69,895	40,188
IRRGTD	44	65.40	69.66	62.49	24.02	111.48	38.12	182.42	58.56 to 71.09	377,055	235,609
ALL	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	50.90	50.90	50.90			50.90	50.90	N/A	52,000	26,470
60000 TO 99999	7	74.19	68.74	69.44	27.44	98.99	34.18	96.13	34.18 to 96.13	74,067	51,435
100000 TO 149999	6	58.89	63.15	63.25	14.14	99.84	50.49	82.07	50.49 to 82.07	129,183	81,708
150000 TO 249999	14	65.41	74.73	73.31	34.03	101.93	31.43	182.42	49.57 to 91.60	200,319	146,860
250000 TO 499999	21	66.89	69.94	69.46	17.86	100.69	49.04	113.23	57.16 to 73.57	352,373	244,746
500000 +	12	48.42	49.62	48.83	12.95	101.63	38.12	61.49	43.93 to 56.60	645,347	315,096
ALL	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	61	COV:	35.47	95% Median C.I.:	56.60 to 66.89	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	23.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.35 to 66.52	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.80	95% Mean C.I.:	60.05 to 71.79	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,853,665							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	25.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	194,322	PRD:	107.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:39

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	36.32	40.47	39.57	15.35	102.26	34.18	50.90	N/A	63,666	25,195
30000 TO 59999	4	67.97	68.54	65.73	18.28	104.28	50.49	87.73	N/A	82,868	54,467
60000 TO 99999	10	56.99	60.80	55.54	25.49	109.48	31.43	96.13	37.72 to 90.89	145,290	80,688
100000 TO 149999	6	60.60	63.49	60.44	19.37	105.05	49.04	82.07	49.04 to 82.07	221,983	134,157
150000 TO 249999	14	67.55	72.62	70.84	15.68	102.52	55.27	99.75	61.41 to 88.67	261,526	185,256
250000 TO 499999	24	58.84	67.51	59.67	31.33	113.13	38.12	182.42	48.63 to 70.07	513,559	306,449
ALL _____	_____										
	61	61.49	65.92	61.44	25.69	107.30	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 66.89	316,296	194,322

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	34.27	95% Median C.I.:	56.73 to 67.01	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,881,158	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	22.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.45 to 65.57	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,255,744	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.08	95% Mean C.I.:	60.07 to 70.64	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,188,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	337,039	COD:	24.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,623	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:51

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	73.05	73.05	75.48			73.05	73.05	N/A	255,500	192,855	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	79.98	79.98	72.61	24.72	110.15	60.21	99.75	N/A	361,165	262,242	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	88.67	78.85	73.15	15.17	107.80	58.56	96.13	58.56 to 96.13	348,642	255,034	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	87.73	87.73	87.73			87.73	87.73	N/A	61,000	53,515	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	82.04	82.04	82.04			82.04	82.04	N/A	183,000	150,135	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	73.57	77.37	78.15	9.43	99.01	68.87	89.68	N/A	347,458	271,528	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	67.80	67.25	65.91	9.28	102.03	48.63	91.60	61.74 to 71.84	383,127	252,532	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	8	56.22	58.72	55.71	13.53	105.41	44.27	77.97	44.27 to 77.97	309,337	172,326	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	54.03	64.15	72.45	35.09	88.54	34.18	113.23	34.18 to 113.23	185,298	134,255	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	59.33	68.55	56.93	33.41	120.42	39.46	182.42	45.94 to 74.19	316,462	180,149	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	52.55	55.54	48.76	21.97	113.91	38.12	90.89	38.12 to 90.89	482,300	235,153	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	40.83	43.25	46.51	19.82	92.98	31.43	55.27	31.43 to 55.27	324,133	150,759	
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	11	87.73	79.34	73.47	15.48	107.99	58.56	99.75	59.11 to 96.13	316,302	232,372	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	26	66.58	66.36	64.86	12.85	102.32	44.27	91.60	61.74 to 71.09	348,610	226,107	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	32	55.04	59.73	53.70	29.69	111.21	31.43	182.42	45.94 to 61.41	334,767	179,784	
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	84.89	79.49	75.22	13.33	105.67	58.56	96.13	66.89 to 89.68	310,572	233,622	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	40	63.19	65.47	61.83	21.56	105.89	34.18	182.42	56.60 to 67.01	318,695	197,035	
_____ALL_____												
	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623	

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	34.27	95% Median C.I.:	56.73 to 67.01	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,881,158	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	22.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.45 to 65.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,255,744	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.08	95% Mean C.I.:	60.07 to 70.64	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,188,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	337,039	COD:	24.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,623	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:51

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3675	7	60.53	54.82	59.52	18.98	92.11	34.18	74.19	34.18 to 74.19	137,285	81,707
3677	1	77.97	77.97	77.97			77.97	77.97	N/A	195,000	152,050
3679	3	59.11	68.78	64.95	16.98	105.90	58.56	88.67	N/A	433,833	281,770
3681	4	54.76	67.95	63.59	29.36	106.84	49.04	113.23	N/A	412,000	262,007
3749	6	68.27	61.23	60.97	14.16	100.43	38.12	72.10	38.12 to 72.10	440,081	268,320
3751	3	61.74	56.01	59.74	16.66	93.76	37.72	68.58	N/A	229,825	137,305
3753	3	82.07	80.17	79.76	8.40	100.52	68.87	89.56	N/A	264,666	211,085
3755	9	66.89	68.42	55.37	24.43	123.57	39.99	96.13	48.20 to 90.89	387,317	214,461
3909	8	64.50	64.99	62.18	18.67	104.52	43.93	89.68	43.93 to 89.68	364,514	226,653
3911	2	121.96	121.96	91.63	49.58	133.09	61.49	182.42	N/A	333,000	305,140
3913	4	55.05	60.65	52.44	34.43	115.66	39.46	93.05	N/A	496,800	260,511
3915	2	61.52	61.52	58.87	48.91	104.50	31.43	91.60	N/A	186,400	109,725
3985	4	56.63	55.05	54.29	3.43	101.39	49.67	57.25	N/A	205,583	111,607
3987	5	60.21	63.18	57.40	17.28	110.07	45.94	87.73	N/A	369,116	211,885
3989	6	64.28	66.54	61.46	18.08	108.27	44.27	99.75	44.27 to 99.75	386,595	237,600
3991	2	56.49	56.49	60.40	10.61	93.52	50.49	62.48	N/A	305,412	184,475
____ALL____											
	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	53	63.89	67.10	61.52	23.11	109.07	37.72	182.42	58.56 to 68.58	379,907	233,705
2	16	56.63	59.58	57.73	25.99	103.20	31.43	96.13	43.94 to 73.57	195,039	112,600
____ALL____											
	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	7	62.48	59.29	57.78	14.79	102.62	39.46	72.10	39.46 to 72.10	529,453	305,925
2	62	61.62	66.04	61.62	25.53	107.17	31.43	182.42	56.60 to 68.58	315,315	194,298
____ALL____											
	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	34.27	95% Median C.I.:	56.73 to 67.01	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,881,158	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	22.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.45 to 65.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,255,744	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.08	95% Mean C.I.:	60.07 to 70.64	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,188,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	337,039	COD:	24.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,623	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:51

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	11	61.41	59.58	58.44	22.23	101.97	34.18	82.04	36.32 to 78.94	218,084	127,440
30-0001	11	58.56	61.31	61.14	26.40	100.28	31.43	113.23	38.12 to 72.10	397,026	242,727
30-0025	28	66.52	72.46	64.01	27.51	113.20	37.72	182.42	57.25 to 82.07	320,578	205,195
30-0054	12	59.54	60.86	59.36	16.57	102.53	43.93	89.68	50.49 to 70.07	401,887	238,567
48-0303	1	60.21	60.21	60.65			60.21	60.21	N/A	501,330	304,045
76-0068	1	54.81	54.81	54.81			54.81	54.81	N/A	558,000	305,840
85-0047											
85-0094	5	55.91	61.08	55.04	20.84	110.96	45.94	87.73	N/A	326,270	179,594
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	7	60.53	64.13	63.75	27.67	100.60	34.18	90.89	34.18 to 90.89	83,000	52,910
50.01 TO 100.00	22	64.00	64.04	63.46	19.50	100.92	31.43	96.13	55.91 to 77.97	182,729	115,957
100.01 TO 180.00	36	60.85	66.14	60.17	26.79	109.92	38.12	182.42	54.81 to 68.87	456,122	274,443
180.01 TO 330.00	4	66.34	67.64	62.06	21.08	108.99	48.20	89.68	N/A	558,575	346,650
ALL	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

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	8	64.55	65.71	65.57	16.80	100.21	49.57	87.73	49.57 to 87.73	176,825	115,942
DRY-N/A	5	49.04	44.88	46.13	15.11	97.29	31.43	56.53	N/A	239,006	110,245
GRASS	1	36.32	36.32	36.32			36.32	36.32	N/A	75,000	27,240
GRASS-N/A	4	56.32	60.74	63.28	32.31	95.98	34.18	96.13	N/A	68,618	43,425
IRRGTD	10	65.01	63.01	64.04	6.81	98.39	50.49	70.07	56.60 to 68.58	318,700	204,093
IRRGTD-N/A	41	64.66	69.51	61.18	26.92	113.62	38.12	182.42	57.16 to 74.19	417,308	255,301
ALL	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	34.27	95% Median C.I.:	56.73 to 67.01	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,881,158	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	22.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.45 to 65.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,255,744	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.08	95% Mean C.I.:	60.07 to 70.64	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,188,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	337,039	COD:	24.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,623	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:51

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	8	64.55	65.71	65.57	16.80	100.21	49.57	87.73	49.57 to 87.73	176,825	115,942
DRY-N/A	5	49.04	44.88	46.13	15.11	97.29	31.43	56.53	N/A	239,006	110,245
GRASS	1	36.32	36.32	36.32			36.32	36.32	N/A	75,000	27,240
GRASS-N/A	4	56.32	60.74	63.28	32.31	95.98	34.18	96.13	N/A	68,618	43,425
IRRGTD	43	64.11	67.76	61.50	23.28	110.17	38.12	182.42	59.11 to 68.58	406,409	249,945
IRRGTD-N/A	8	71.53	70.81	62.41	18.73	113.46	48.20	90.89	48.20 to 90.89	352,630	220,082
ALL	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

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	13	56.53	57.70	56.67	19.98	101.82	31.43	87.73	49.04 to 73.05	200,741	113,751
GRASS	5	50.90	55.85	57.50	34.33	97.14	34.18	96.13	N/A	69,895	40,188
IRRGTD	51	64.66	68.24	61.63	22.99	110.73	38.12	182.42	60.21 to 68.87	397,973	245,260
ALL	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	50.90	50.90	50.90			50.90	50.90	N/A	52,000	26,470
60000 TO 99999	7	74.19	68.74	69.44	27.44	98.99	34.18	96.13	34.18 to 96.13	74,067	51,435
100000 TO 149999	6	58.89	63.15	63.25	14.14	99.84	50.49	82.07	50.49 to 82.07	129,183	81,708
150000 TO 249999	14	65.41	74.73	73.31	34.03	101.93	31.43	182.42	49.57 to 91.60	200,319	146,860
250000 TO 499999	25	68.58	70.01	69.96	15.35	100.08	49.04	113.23	61.41 to 72.10	358,313	250,682
500000 +	16	48.42	50.12	49.15	14.74	101.96	38.12	62.48	43.93 to 59.11	634,241	311,757
ALL	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	34.27	95% Median C.I.:	56.73 to 67.01	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,881,158	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	22.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.45 to 65.57	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,255,744	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.08	95% Mean C.I.:	60.07 to 70.64	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,188,000							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	337,039	COD:	24.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,623	PRD:	107.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:45:51

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	36.32	40.47	39.57	15.35	102.26	34.18	50.90	N/A	63,666	25,195
30000 TO 59999	2	74.74	74.74	73.11	17.39	102.23	61.74	87.73	N/A	69,737	50,982
60000 TO 99999	12	56.99	61.06	56.10	24.71	108.84	31.43	96.13	49.57 to 74.19	137,075	76,899
100000 TO 149999	6	60.60	63.49	60.44	19.37	105.05	49.04	82.07	49.04 to 82.07	221,983	134,157
150000 TO 249999	15	68.87	72.65	71.14	14.76	102.12	55.27	99.75	63.89 to 82.04	261,124	185,763
250000 TO 499999	31	60.21	65.65	59.23	27.41	110.83	38.12	182.42	54.70 to 68.58	517,148	306,331
_____ALL_____	_____										
	69	61.74	65.35	61.01	24.43	107.12	31.43	182.42	56.73 to 67.01	337,039	205,623

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

Agricultural

For the 2009 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using unimproved agricultural sales and sales with minimal nonagricultural components, the market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be below the statutory range at 62%. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the two market areas.

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

- The Irrigated land in Market Areas One and Two increased 250 dollars per acre in all classification groupings.
- The Dry land in Market Areas One and Two increased 250 dollars per acre in all classification groupings.
- The Grass land in Market Areas One and Two increased 200 dollars per acre in all classification groupings.

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

Other notable changes to the class included changes in classification in the GIS and Administrative programs when pivots were added or other farming changes were reported.

2009 Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contract Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract Appraiser
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes, the county zoning has a policy
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Agricultural land is defined by statute, and has various acreage requirements for zoning.
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?
	N/A
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	2008
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	FSA and GIS imagery
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and Staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	2
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	By water availability and similar soil types
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.

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

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
34	92	10	136

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.10	95% Median C.I.:	67.55 to 77.63	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	25.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.13 to 76.81	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	71.11 to 84.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,692,715							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	23.94	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	224,470	PRD:	109.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:02

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	112.25	112.25	112.25			112.25	112.25	N/A	221,000	248,065	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	101.16	90.91	83.71	15.85	108.61	67.55	116.68	67.55 to 116.68	348,642	291,833	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	103.70	103.70	103.70			103.70	103.70	N/A	61,000	63,260	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	92.56	92.56	92.56			92.56	92.56	N/A	183,000	169,390	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	88.88	90.04	90.79	8.85	99.17	78.82	102.41	N/A	347,458	315,451	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	78.19	77.33	72.89	11.22	106.09	55.03	103.29	63.64 to 86.89	356,247	259,658	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	7	70.82	70.70	69.06	9.44	102.36	59.45	87.97	59.45 to 87.97	260,339	179,801	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	70.55	82.42	88.31	28.88	93.33	53.35	127.60	53.35 to 127.60	185,298	163,640	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	70.62	83.42	70.52	31.32	118.30	49.53	205.59	51.79 to 98.76	276,940	195,299	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	64.40	64.08	56.22	19.32	113.96	43.65	102.61	43.65 to 102.61	482,300	271,170	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	51.13	53.83	54.92	9.84	98.01	48.20	62.33	48.20 to 62.33	324,133	178,020	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	102.06	94.71	86.47	13.61	109.52	67.55	116.68	67.98 to 112.25	302,500	261,573	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	77.63	77.66	75.20	12.83	103.27	55.03	103.29	70.82 to 86.89	314,772	236,711	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	31	66.15	72.51	63.92	27.10	113.43	43.65	205.59	55.22 to 70.62	321,333	205,407	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	96.86	91.90	86.45	13.70	106.30	67.55	116.68	75.97 to 103.70	310,572	268,486	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	34	72.56	78.83	73.20	21.05	107.70	49.53	205.59	67.41 to 78.74	280,676	205,450	
____ALL____	_____											
	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470	

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.10	95% Median C.I.:	67.55 to 77.63	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	25.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.13 to 76.81	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	71.11 to 84.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,692,715							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	23.94	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	224,470	PRD:	109.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:03

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3675	7	68.01	68.93	70.56	14.68	97.69	52.31	98.76	52.31 to 98.76	137,285	96,871
3677	1	87.97	87.97	87.97			87.97	87.97	N/A	195,000	171,540
3679	3	67.98	79.20	74.78	16.92	105.91	67.55	102.06	N/A	433,833	324,405
3681	4	62.32	78.50	72.96	26.71	107.59	61.76	127.60	N/A	412,000	300,586
3749	3	59.45	61.11	57.82	20.51	105.69	43.65	80.23	N/A	446,000	257,876
3751	3	77.63	69.06	70.37	14.23	98.14	48.20	81.35	N/A	229,825	161,726
3753	3	94.74	91.57	90.84	7.86	100.81	78.82	101.16	N/A	264,666	240,428
3755	9	75.97	80.17	63.87	27.92	125.50	45.03	116.68	55.03 to 106.36	387,317	247,397
3909	7	66.15	74.67	70.87	21.55	105.37	49.94	102.41	49.94 to 102.41	380,088	269,357
3911	2	137.44	137.44	103.26	49.59	133.10	69.29	205.59	N/A	333,000	343,870
3913	3	74.38	76.30	67.82	24.86	112.51	49.53	105.00	N/A	412,000	279,410
3915	2	75.78	75.78	73.35	36.31	103.30	48.26	103.29	N/A	186,400	136,730
3985	4	69.66	68.20	67.59	3.62	100.90	62.64	70.82	N/A	205,583	138,947
3987	4	70.92	74.33	64.10	20.77	115.97	51.79	103.70	N/A	336,062	215,406
3989	5	73.08	79.90	76.48	15.20	104.47	63.64	112.25	N/A	333,448	255,026
3991	1	74.43	74.43	74.43			74.43	74.43	N/A	112,000	83,360
____ALL____											
	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	46	73.69	78.83	71.37	23.67	110.46	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 78.82	357,150	254,885
2	15	68.71	73.65	68.69	22.88	107.23	48.26	116.68	53.35 to 88.88	191,008	131,197
____ALL____											
	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470
____ALL____											
	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.10	95% Median C.I.:	67.55 to 77.63	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	25.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.13 to 76.81	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	71.11 to 84.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,692,715							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	23.94	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	224,470	PRD:	109.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:03

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	10	68.58	71.46	66.45	20.98	107.54	45.03	106.36	52.31 to 92.56	214,342	142,433
30-0001	8	62.22	68.90	65.95	25.10	104.46	43.65	127.60	43.65 to 127.60	383,100	252,668
30-0025	27	77.63	85.62	76.02	26.07	112.63	48.20	205.59	69.29 to 101.16	304,629	231,573
30-0054	10	72.44	73.14	71.02	14.31	102.99	49.94	102.41	62.33 to 88.88	367,149	260,741
48-0303											
76-0068	1	61.95	61.95	61.95			61.95	61.95	N/A	558,000	345,660
85-0047											
85-0094	5	67.41	71.99	63.84	18.90	112.77	51.79	103.70	N/A	326,270	208,295
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	7	74.43	81.08	80.26	22.46	101.02	53.35	103.70	53.35 to 103.70	83,000	66,615
50.01 TO 100.00	22	72.56	76.45	74.81	18.88	102.19	48.20	116.68	67.41 to 87.97	182,729	136,699
100.01 TO 180.00	28	68.42	77.39	69.15	28.82	111.92	43.65	205.59	62.64 to 78.74	444,954	307,694
180.01 TO 330.00	4	78.43	78.62	71.77	21.70	109.55	55.22	102.41	N/A	558,575	400,891
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	70.62	77.95	76.57	16.97	101.81	59.45	103.70	59.45 to 103.70	165,585	126,781
DRY-N/A	5	62.64	58.52	59.82	11.83	97.83	48.20	70.82	N/A	239,006	142,963
GRASS	1	52.31	52.31	52.31			52.31	52.31	N/A	75,000	39,230
GRASS-N/A	4	74.01	79.51	82.34	26.35	96.57	53.35	116.68	N/A	68,618	56,498
IRRGTD	10	74.34	72.65	72.69	4.40	99.95	63.64	78.74	68.01 to 77.63	318,700	231,657
IRRGTD-N/A	34	74.53	82.23	70.94	29.95	115.91	43.65	205.59	66.12 to 98.76	394,219	279,665
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

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:	61	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.10	95% Median C.I.:	67.55 to 77.63	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	25.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.13 to 76.81	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	71.11 to 84.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,692,715							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	23.94	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	224,470	PRD:	109.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:03

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	70.62	77.95	76.57	16.97	101.81	59.45	103.70	59.45 to 103.70	165,585	126,781
DRY-N/A	5	62.64	58.52	59.82	11.83	97.83	48.20	70.82	N/A	239,006	142,963
GRASS	1	52.31	52.31	52.31			52.31	52.31	N/A	75,000	39,230
GRASS-N/A	4	74.01	79.51	82.34	26.35	96.57	53.35	116.68	N/A	68,618	56,498
IRRGTD	36	73.69	79.37	71.05	24.52	111.71	43.65	205.59	67.98 to 78.74	382,483	271,770
IRRGTD-N/A	8	86.78	83.10	72.37	19.04	114.84	55.22	102.61	55.22 to 102.61	352,630	255,183
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	12	68.06	69.86	68.06	17.26	102.63	48.20	103.70	59.45 to 86.89	196,177	133,523
GRASS	5	66.67	74.07	75.89	27.71	97.60	52.31	116.68	N/A	69,895	53,045
IRRGTD	44	74.34	80.05	71.28	24.20	112.31	43.65	205.59	67.98 to 80.23	377,055	268,754
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	66.67	66.67	66.67			66.67	66.67	N/A	52,000	34,670
60000 TO 99999	7	98.76	86.97	87.74	19.67	99.12	52.31	116.68	52.31 to 116.68	74,067	64,987
100000 TO 149999	6	72.53	77.23	77.06	11.20	100.22	68.01	94.74	68.01 to 94.74	129,183	99,555
150000 TO 249999	14	73.73	87.33	85.59	33.15	102.03	48.20	205.59	59.45 to 106.36	200,319	171,452
250000 TO 499999	21	75.97	80.70	79.97	16.70	100.91	62.33	127.60	67.55 to 88.88	352,373	281,804
500000 +	12	55.13	56.23	55.37	12.83	101.57	43.65	69.29	49.53 to 63.64	645,347	357,297
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	61	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	33.10	95% Median C.I.:	67.55 to 77.63	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,894,483	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	25.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.13 to 76.81	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,294,069	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.19	95% Mean C.I.:	71.11 to 84.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,692,715							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	316,296	COD:	23.94	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	224,470	PRD:	109.28	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:03

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	3	53.35	57.44	56.57	8.97	101.55	52.31	66.67	N/A	63,666	36,015
60000 TO 99999	11	74.43	80.12	72.66	24.34	110.27	48.20	116.68	48.26 to 103.70	116,488	84,638
100000 TO 149999	5	73.08	76.31	74.07	14.99	103.04	59.45	94.74	N/A	166,648	123,428
150000 TO 249999	14	73.16	80.18	77.98	17.54	102.82	62.33	112.25	62.68 to 103.29	237,761	185,409
250000 TO 499999	27	69.29	78.44	70.12	29.31	111.87	43.65	205.59	61.95 to 80.23	471,865	330,853
500000 +	1	55.22	55.22	55.22			55.22	55.22	N/A	919,425	507,725
ALL	61	71.81	77.56	70.97	23.94	109.28	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 77.63	316,296	224,470

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	32.28	95% Median C.I.:	67.90 to 77.63	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,949,483	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.84 to 75.24	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,324,069	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.50	95% Mean C.I.:	70.78 to 82.45	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,336,915							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	338,029	COD:	22.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	236,766	PRD:	109.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:21

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	1	87.85	87.85	87.85			87.85	87.85	N/A		264,000	231,930
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	90.08	90.08	81.40	24.62	110.66	67.90	112.25	N/A		363,000	295,482
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	101.16	90.91	83.71	15.85	108.61	67.55	116.68	67.55 to 116.68		348,642	291,833
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	103.70	103.70	103.70			103.70	103.70	N/A		61,000	63,260
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	92.56	92.56	92.56			92.56	92.56	N/A		183,000	169,390
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	88.88	90.04	90.79	8.85	99.17	78.82	102.41	N/A		347,458	315,451
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	77.90	77.01	73.95	9.29	104.14	55.03	103.29	70.28 to 81.35		386,248	285,615
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	8	69.11	68.11	64.00	12.23	106.42	50.02	87.97	50.02 to 87.97		310,296	198,590
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	70.55	82.42	88.31	28.88	93.33	53.35	127.60	53.35 to 127.60		185,298	163,640
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	69.89	80.19	65.37	32.12	122.67	44.61	205.59	51.79 to 94.74		316,862	207,126
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	64.40	64.08	56.22	19.32	113.96	43.65	102.61	43.65 to 102.61		482,300	271,170
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	51.13	53.83	54.92	9.84	98.01	48.20	62.33	48.20 to 62.33		324,133	178,020
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	11	101.16	91.65	83.89	15.50	109.25	67.55	116.68	67.90 to 112.25		317,409	266,271
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	26	76.47	76.37	73.54	12.59	103.85	50.02	103.29	70.82 to 81.06		350,585	257,810
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	32	66.14	71.64	62.56	27.27	114.51	43.65	205.59	53.35 to 70.62		334,917	209,526
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	96.86	91.90	86.45	13.70	106.30	67.55	116.68	75.97 to 103.70		310,572	268,486
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	40	72.56	76.99	70.72	20.29	108.88	44.61	205.59	68.71 to 77.63		320,099	226,367
____ALL____												
	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63		338,029	236,766

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	32.28	95% Median C.I.:	67.90 to 77.63	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,949,483	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.84 to 75.24	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,324,069	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.50	95% Mean C.I.:	70.78 to 82.45	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,336,915							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	338,029	COD:	22.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	236,766	PRD:	109.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:21

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3675	7	68.01	68.93	70.56	14.68	97.69	52.31	98.76	52.31 to 98.76	137,285	96,871
3677	1	87.97	87.97	87.97			87.97	87.97	N/A	195,000	171,540
3679	3	67.98	79.20	74.78	16.92	105.91	67.55	102.06	N/A	433,833	324,405
3681	4	62.32	78.50	72.96	26.71	107.59	61.76	127.60	N/A	412,000	300,586
3749	6	76.75	69.65	67.99	13.26	102.43	43.65	81.06	43.65 to 81.06	447,166	304,041
3751	3	77.63	69.06	70.37	14.23	98.14	48.20	81.35	N/A	229,825	161,726
3753	3	94.74	91.57	90.84	7.86	100.81	78.82	101.16	N/A	264,666	240,428
3755	9	75.97	80.17	63.87	27.92	125.50	45.03	116.68	55.03 to 106.36	387,317	247,397
3909	8	76.52	76.32	72.40	19.85	105.42	49.94	102.41	49.94 to 102.41	365,577	264,679
3911	2	137.44	137.44	103.26	49.59	133.10	69.29	205.59	N/A	333,000	343,870
3913	4	61.96	68.38	59.01	34.40	115.88	44.61	105.00	N/A	498,000	293,863
3915	2	75.78	75.78	73.35	36.31	103.30	48.26	103.29	N/A	186,400	136,730
3985	4	69.66	68.20	67.59	3.62	100.90	62.64	70.82	N/A	205,583	138,947
3987	5	67.90	73.05	65.14	17.36	112.14	51.79	103.70	N/A	369,850	240,905
3989	6	72.44	74.92	68.98	18.08	108.62	50.02	112.25	50.02 to 112.25	387,873	267,540
3991	2	72.36	72.36	71.04	2.87	101.85	70.28	74.43	N/A	306,000	217,385
____ALL____											
	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	53	73.08	77.24	70.00	22.65	110.33	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 78.17	381,036	266,736
2	16	69.66	74.54	70.30	22.87	106.03	48.26	116.68	53.35 to 88.88	195,570	137,493
____ALL____											
	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	7	70.28	66.77	64.05	14.64	104.23	44.61	81.06	44.61 to 81.06	538,000	344,610
2	62	71.92	77.72	71.20	23.88	109.17	43.65	205.59	67.55 to 78.74	315,452	224,591
____ALL____											
	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	32.28	95% Median C.I.:	67.90 to 77.63	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,949,483	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.84 to 75.24	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,324,069	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.50	95% Mean C.I.:	70.78 to 82.45	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,336,915							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	338,029	COD:	22.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	236,766	PRD:	109.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:21

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	11	69.15	72.95	68.80	21.37	106.04	45.03	106.36	52.31 to 92.56	218,857	150,569
30-0001	11	67.55	71.43	69.66	22.42	102.54	43.65	127.60	48.26 to 81.06	400,890	279,269
30-0025	28	76.80	84.16	73.37	26.94	114.70	44.61	205.59	69.29 to 98.76	320,749	235,346
30-0054	12	71.05	70.98	68.07	14.90	104.26	49.94	102.41	62.33 to 78.74	402,624	274,078
48-0303	1	67.90	67.90	67.90			67.90	67.90	N/A	505,000	342,900
76-0068	1	61.95	61.95	61.95			61.95	61.95	N/A	558,000	345,660
85-0047											
85-0094	5	67.41	71.99	63.84	18.90	112.77	51.79	103.70	N/A	326,270	208,295
93-0083											
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	7	74.43	81.08	80.26	22.46	101.02	53.35	103.70	53.35 to 103.70	83,000	66,615
50.01 TO 100.00	22	72.56	76.45	74.81	18.88	102.19	48.20	116.68	67.41 to 87.97	182,729	136,699
100.01 TO 180.00	36	69.79	75.62	68.29	25.62	110.74	43.65	205.59	62.68 to 78.17	458,020	312,768
180.01 TO 330.00	4	78.43	78.62	71.77	21.70	109.55	55.22	102.41	N/A	558,575	400,891
ALL	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

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	8	78.76	79.19	78.66	16.05	100.67	59.45	103.70	59.45 to 103.70	177,887	139,925
DRY-N/A	5	62.64	58.52	59.82	11.83	97.83	48.20	70.82	N/A	239,006	142,963
GRASS	1	52.31	52.31	52.31			52.31	52.31	N/A	75,000	39,230
GRASS-N/A	4	74.01	79.51	82.34	26.35	96.57	53.35	116.68	N/A	68,618	56,498
IRRGTD	10	74.34	72.65	72.69	4.40	99.95	63.64	78.74	68.01 to 77.63	318,700	231,657
IRRGTD-N/A	41	73.08	79.59	69.43	27.83	114.63	43.65	205.59	66.15 to 87.97	418,767	290,753
ALL	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	32.28	95% Median C.I.:	67.90 to 77.63	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,949,483	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.84 to 75.24	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,324,069	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.50	95% Mean C.I.:	70.78 to 82.45	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,336,915							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	338,029	COD:	22.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	236,766	PRD:	109.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:21

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	8	78.76	79.19	78.66	16.05	100.67	59.45	103.70	59.45 to 103.70	177,887	139,925
DRY-N/A	5	62.64	58.52	59.82	11.83	97.83	48.20	70.82	N/A	239,006	142,963
GRASS	1	52.31	52.31	52.31			52.31	52.31	N/A	75,000	39,230
GRASS-N/A	4	74.01	79.51	82.34	26.35	96.57	53.35	116.68	N/A	68,618	56,498
IRRGTD	43	73.08	77.32	69.55	23.08	111.17	43.65	205.59	67.98 to 77.63	407,800	283,628
IRRGTD-N/A	8	86.78	83.10	72.37	19.04	114.84	55.22	102.61	55.22 to 102.61	352,630	255,183
ALL	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

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	13	68.71	71.24	70.06	17.93	101.69	48.20	103.70	59.45 to 87.85	201,394	141,093
GRASS	5	66.67	74.07	75.89	27.71	97.60	52.31	116.68	N/A	69,895	53,045
IRRGTD	51	74.29	78.23	69.94	22.90	111.85	43.65	205.59	68.01 to 78.17	399,146	279,166
ALL	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	66.67	66.67	66.67			66.67	66.67	N/A	52,000	34,670
60000 TO 99999	7	98.76	86.97	87.74	19.67	99.12	52.31	116.68	52.31 to 116.68	74,067	64,987
100000 TO 149999	6	72.53	77.23	77.06	11.20	100.22	68.01	94.74	68.01 to 94.74	129,183	99,555
150000 TO 249999	14	73.73	87.33	85.59	33.15	102.03	48.20	205.59	59.45 to 106.36	200,319	171,452
250000 TO 499999	25	77.63	80.68	79.93	14.66	100.95	62.33	127.60	70.82 to 81.06	360,354	288,017
500000 +	16	55.13	56.73	55.57	14.56	102.07	43.65	70.28	49.53 to 67.90	635,323	353,076
ALL	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	69	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	32.28	95% Median C.I.:	67.90 to 77.63	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,949,483	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.84 to 75.24	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,324,069	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.50	95% Mean C.I.:	70.78 to 82.45	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,336,915							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	338,029	COD:	22.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	236,766	PRD:	109.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.65			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:26:21

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	3	53.35	57.44	56.57	8.97	101.55	52.31	66.67	N/A	63,666	36,015
60000 TO 99999	11	74.43	80.12	72.66	24.34	110.27	48.20	116.68	48.26 to 103.70	116,488	84,638
100000 TO 149999	5	73.08	76.31	74.07	14.99	103.04	59.45	94.74	N/A	166,648	123,428
150000 TO 249999	15	74.29	80.69	78.71	17.34	102.52	62.33	112.25	69.15 to 92.56	239,510	188,511
250000 TO 499999	34	69.79	76.04	68.73	26.19	110.63	43.65	205.59	63.64 to 78.74	485,481	333,685
500000 +	1	55.22	55.22	55.22			55.22	55.22	N/A	919,425	507,725
_____ALL_____	_____										
	69	71.81	76.61	70.04	22.97	109.38	43.65	205.59	67.90 to 77.63	338,029	236,766

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

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

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

The agricultural market in Fillmore County has been determined by the assessor to have two distinct market areas. The difference in value however, only exists in the dryland grouping. Irrigated and grass land is valued with the same value schedule in the entire county. The systematic valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics confirm that the major land use categories are valued within the acceptable range indicating uniformity and proportionality in the class exists. The assessment practices are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	220	61	27.73
2008	227	46	20.26
2007	222	52	23.42
2006	216	75	34.72
2005	246	105	42.68

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the percentage of sales used for 2009 indicates that a relatively small percentage of available sales were used compared to other counties in the area. A further analysis indicates that 40 of the disqualified sales were substantially changed after the sale occurred and required to be removed by the Division. Had those sales been used in the qualified sales file, the usability percentage would have been 45.90 percent and considered acceptable compared to the utilization for previous years. Based on this analysis, one can reasonably assume that the County has not trimmed the sample and has used all available arm's length sales for valuation purposes.

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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	61	14.91	70	72
2008	62.73	23.24	77	73.88
2007	74	0.85	75	74
2006	75	1.56	76	76
2005	75	2.31	77	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary median ratio and the Reports and Opinions median ratio are considered to be similar, especially given the large increase in assessed value this year. This analysis suggests the sold parcels and the unsold parcels are treated similarly for assessment purposes.

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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)
16.36	2009	14.91
22.05	2008	23.24
-1.23	2007	0.85
0.80	2006	1.56
2.56	2005	2.31

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

2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	72	71	78

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median ratio and weighted mean ratio are within the acceptable range. The mean is above the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	23.94	109.28
Difference	3.94	6.28

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county in their uniform application and development of a schedule of agricultural land values, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Fillmore 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	61	61	0
Median	61	72	11
Wgt. Mean	61	71	10
Mean	66	78	12
COD	25.69	23.94	-1.75
PRD	107.30	109.28	1.98
Minimum	31.43	43.65	12.22
Maximum	182.42	205.59	23.17

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

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 6,468

Value : 897,943,830

Growth 3,984,920

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	264	461,235	13	206,930	2	64,830	279	732,995	
02. Res Improve Land	2,007	5,548,765	63	996,170	183	2,910,625	2,253	9,455,560	
03. Res Improvements	2,018	98,581,622	63	6,502,175	183	18,194,315	2,264	123,278,112	
04. Res Total	2,282	104,591,622	76	7,705,275	185	21,169,770	2,543	133,466,667	1,803,545
% of Res Total	89.74	78.37	2.99	5.77	7.27	15.86	39.32	14.86	45.26
05. Com UnImp Land	70	263,780	9	121,800	1	4,000	80	389,580	
06. Com Improve Land	396	1,503,155	51	1,008,010	16	313,925	463	2,825,090	
07. Com Improvements	396	28,861,127	44	4,467,765	12	1,347,105	452	34,675,997	
08. Com Total	466	30,628,062	53	5,597,575	13	1,665,030	532	37,890,667	378,770
% of Com Total	87.59	80.83	9.96	14.77	2.44	4.39	8.23	4.22	9.51
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	328,000	2	206,670	0	0	3	534,670	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	7,200	8	448,775	1	42,240	10	498,215	
11. Ind Improvements	1	210,100	8	6,561,265	1	318,870	10	7,090,235	
12. Ind Total	2	545,300	10	7,216,710	1	361,110	13	8,123,120	0
% of Ind Total	15.38	6.71	76.92	88.84	7.69	4.45	0.20	0.90	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land									
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	4,425	1	4,425	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	34,740	1	34,740	
16. Rec Total							1	39,165	0
% of Rec Total							0.02	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total							2,544	133,505,832	1,803,545
% of Res & Rec Total							39.33	14.87	45.26
Com & Ind Total	468	31,173,362	63	12,814,285	14	2,026,140	545	46,013,787	378,770
% of Com & Ind Total	85.87	67.75	11.56	27.85	2.57	4.40	8.43	5.12	9.51
17. Taxable Total							3,089	179,519,619	2,182,315
% of Taxable Total							47.76	19.99	54.76

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial	1	13,100	2,762,085		0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	328,000	50,798,325		0	0	0
21. Other							
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial	0	0	0		1	13,100	2,762,085
20. Industrial	0	0	0		1	328,000	50,798,325
21. Other							
22. Total Sch II					2	341,100	53,560,410

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									
25. Total									

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	273	35	9	317

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	50	283,810	285	46,320,400	2,019	408,579,295	2,354	455,183,505
28. Ag-Improved Land	7	59,080	129	22,812,585	892	186,240,650	1,028	209,112,315
29. Ag Improvements	7	154,175	126	6,537,467	892	47,436,749	1,025	54,128,391
30. Ag Total							3,379	718,424,211

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	7,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2	2.00	15,000	54	54.00	405,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	0.00	55,810	57	0.00	3,363,180	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	0.47	1,175	17	32.95	68,790	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	5	5.02	12,550	89	326.02	703,015	
37. FarmSite Improvements	6	0.00	98,365	120	0.00	3,174,287	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	286	686.15	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	15	15.00	112,500	16	16.00	120,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	436	438.02	3,285,150	492	494.02	3,705,150	
33. HomeSite Improvements	456	0.00	25,771,790	515	0.00	29,190,780	187,560
34. HomeSite Total				531	510.02	33,015,930	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	111	286.04	494,230	129	319.46	564,195	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	683	2,363.74	5,033,200	777	2,694.78	5,748,765	
37. FarmSite Improvements	855	0.00	21,664,959	981	0.00	24,937,611	1,615,045
38. FarmSite Total				1,110	3,014.24	31,250,571	
39. Road & Ditches	2,615	7,222.19	0	2,901	7,908.34	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI				1,641	11,432.60	64,266,501	1,802,605

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	2	253.30	170,835
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	3	439.36	438,050	5	692.66	608,885

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value						
44. Recapture Value N/A						
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value						
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	5,598.15	2.63%	13,827,440	2.89%	2,470.00
46. 1A	120,814.40	56.77%	286,330,350	59.87%	2,370.00
47. 2A1	43,021.69	20.21%	97,229,070	20.33%	2,260.00
48. 2A	13,726.03	6.45%	29,648,295	6.20%	2,160.01
49. 3A1	20,764.91	9.76%	38,519,005	8.05%	1,855.00
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	6,846.83	3.22%	9,996,360	2.09%	1,460.00
52. 4A	2,050.12	0.96%	2,685,665	0.56%	1,310.00
53. Total	212,822.13	100.00%	478,236,185	100.00%	2,247.12
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,251.23	4.35%	3,782,055	4.79%	1,679.99
55. 1D	27,921.36	54.00%	45,791,095	57.95%	1,640.00
56. 2D1	7,064.10	13.66%	10,878,655	13.77%	1,539.99
57. 2D	3,596.00	6.95%	5,358,080	6.78%	1,490.01
58. 3D1	7,012.47	13.56%	9,256,445	11.71%	1,320.00
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	2,693.50	5.21%	2,814,690	3.56%	1,044.99
61. 4D	1,165.30	2.25%	1,142,000	1.45%	980.01
62. Total	51,703.96	100.00%	79,023,020	100.00%	1,528.37
Grass					
63. 1G1	563.40	0.00%	470,465	4.23%	835.05
64. 1G	2,774.18	16.51%	2,261,000	20.32%	815.02
65. 2G1	1,642.97	9.78%	1,240,430	11.15%	754.99
66. 2G	1,528.09	9.10%	1,062,000	9.54%	694.99
67. 3G1	1,753.82	10.44%	1,183,855	10.64%	675.02
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	2,411.60	14.36%	1,386,730	12.46%	575.02
70. 4G	6,125.42	36.46%	3,522,115	31.65%	575.00
71. Total	16,799.48	100.00%	11,126,595	100.00%	662.32
Irrigated Total	212,822.13	74.90%	478,236,185	84.07%	2,247.12
Dry Total	51,703.96	18.20%	79,023,020	13.89%	1,528.37
Grass Total	16,799.48	5.91%	11,126,595	1.96%	662.32
Waste	2,411.84	0.85%	152,370	0.03%	63.18
Other	402.11	0.14%	300,080	0.05%	746.26
Exempt	4,919.97	1.73%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	284,139.52	100.00%	568,838,250	100.00%	2,001.97

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,233.46	12.22%	3,046,645	13.45%	2,470.00
46. 1A	5,017.76	49.69%	11,892,110	52.48%	2,370.00
47. 2A1	1,572.36	15.57%	3,553,550	15.68%	2,260.01
48. 2A	746.27	7.39%	1,611,945	7.11%	2,160.00
49. 3A1	898.98	8.90%	1,667,595	7.36%	1,854.99
50. 3A	8.19	0.08%	13,555	0.06%	1,655.07
51. 4A1	406.41	4.02%	593,350	2.62%	1,459.98
52. 4A	214.41	2.12%	280,880	1.24%	1,310.01
53. Total	10,097.84	100.00%	22,659,630	100.00%	2,244.01
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,155.62	5.53%	3,405,875	6.13%	1,580.00
55. 1D	20,403.59	52.36%	31,217,590	56.18%	1,530.00
56. 2D1	5,677.50	14.57%	8,118,860	14.61%	1,430.01
57. 2D	3,434.34	8.81%	4,636,425	8.34%	1,350.02
58. 3D1	4,952.40	12.71%	6,017,215	10.83%	1,215.01
59. 3D	27.86	0.07%	29,955	0.05%	1,075.20
60. 4D1	1,746.18	4.48%	1,641,435	2.95%	940.01
61. 4D	567.83	1.46%	499,720	0.90%	880.05
62. Total	38,965.32	100.00%	55,567,075	100.00%	1,426.06
Grass					
63. 1G1	376.43	0.00%	314,320	4.51%	835.00
64. 1G	1,863.72	17.80%	1,518,955	21.79%	815.01
65. 2G1	875.73	8.37%	661,155	9.48%	754.98
66. 2G	1,082.65	10.34%	752,430	10.79%	694.99
67. 3G1	1,157.08	11.05%	781,060	11.20%	675.03
68. 3G	173.94	1.66%	103,490	1.48%	594.98
69. 4G1	1,460.36	13.95%	839,715	12.05%	575.01
70. 4G	3,477.80	33.22%	1,999,765	28.69%	575.01
71. Total	10,467.71	100.00%	6,970,890	100.00%	665.94
Irrigated Total	10,097.84	16.87%	22,659,630	26.56%	2,244.01
Dry Total	38,965.32	65.08%	55,567,075	65.13%	1,426.06
Grass Total	10,467.71	17.48%	6,970,890	8.17%	665.94
Waste	195.20	0.33%	9,755	0.01%	49.97
Other	146.24	0.24%	112,110	0.13%	766.62
Exempt	870.04	1.45%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	59,872.31	100.00%	85,319,460	100.00%	1,425.02

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	68.16	158,790	22,043.15	50,016,430	200,808.66	450,720,595	222,919.97	500,895,815
77. Dry Land	87.27	140,110	10,983.57	16,255,890	79,598.44	118,194,095	90,669.28	134,590,095
78. Grass	19.12	15,240	2,239.34	1,539,640	25,008.73	16,542,605	27,267.19	18,097,485
79. Waste	0.48	25	216.54	10,830	2,390.02	151,270	2,607.04	162,125
80. Other	0.00	0	178.87	125,890	369.48	286,300	548.35	412,190
81. Exempt	4,787.30	0	245.16	0	757.55	0	5,790.01	0
82. Total	175.03	314,165	35,661.47	67,948,680	308,175.33	585,894,865	344,011.83	654,157,710

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	222,919.97	64.80%	500,895,815	76.57%	2,246.98
Dry Land	90,669.28	26.36%	134,590,095	20.57%	1,484.41
Grass	27,267.19	7.93%	18,097,485	2.77%	663.71
Waste	2,607.04	0.76%	162,125	0.02%	62.19
Other	548.35	0.16%	412,190	0.06%	751.69
Exempt	5,790.01	1.68%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	344,011.83	100.00%	654,157,710	100.00%	1,901.56

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

30 Fillmore

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	134,114,216	133,466,667	-647,549	-0.48%	1,803,545	-1.83%
02. Recreational	39,165	39,165	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	33,191,030	33,015,930	-175,100	-0.53%	187,560	-1.09%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	167,344,411	166,521,762	-822,649	-0.49%	1,991,105	-1.68%
05. Commercial	35,771,205	37,890,667	2,119,462	5.93%	378,770	4.87%
06. Industrial	7,949,155	8,123,120	173,965	2.19%	0	2.19%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	30,129,025	31,250,571	1,121,546	3.72%	1,615,045	-1.64%
08. Minerals	0					
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	73,849,385					
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	241,193,796					
11. Irrigated	442,436,585	500,895,815	58,459,230	13.21%		
12. Dryland	113,565,600	134,590,095	21,024,495	18.51%		
13. Grassland	12,735,205	18,097,485	5,362,280	42.11%		
14. Wasteland	78,735	162,125	83,390	105.91%		
15. Other Agland	478,505	412,190	-66,315	-13.86%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	569,294,630	654,157,710	84,863,080	14.91%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	810,488,426	897,943,830	87,455,404	10.79%		

FILLMORE COUNTY

Plan of Assessment – 2008 Update

State law establishes the framework within which the assessor must operate. However, a real property assessment system requires that an operation or procedure be done completely and in a uniform manner each time it is repeated. Accurate and efficient assessment practices represent prudent expenditure of tax monies, establishes taxpayer confidence in local government, and enables the local government to serve its citizens more effectively. The important role the assessment practices play in local government cannot be overstated. Pursuant to Nebraska Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9 the assessor shall submit a Plan of Assessment to the county board of equalization before July 31st and the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31st. The plan and update shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county.

The responsibilities of assessment include record maintenance. Ownership is updated in the cadastrals and on our record cards using 521 RETS (Real Estate Transfer Statements) and the miscellaneous book to check for death certificates, etc. Our mapping procedures include updating the cadastrals and GIS. We use the GIS to draw out any new tracts.

Reports are systematically filed as required by law. Real estate abstract is filed by March 19, personal property abstract is filed by June 15, certification of values for levy setting is mailed to all entities in the county by August 20, and copies of the school valuations are also mailed to the Department of Education. The school district taxable value report is mailed to the state by August 25, tax list of real and personal property is delivered to the treasurer by November 22, and the CTL (Certificate of Taxes Levied) is filed with the state by December 1. Tax list corrections are made only if necessary. Homestead exemption applications are mailed by February 1 and must be filled out, signed and returned to our office by June 30. Personal property forms are mailed by February 15th and must be filled out, signed and returned by May 1. Notices of valuation change are mailed by June 1. Exempt property applications are mailed in November and must be filled out, signed and returned by December 31.

The assessor is responsible for valuing at market value all real property in the county except railroads and public service entities as of January 1 of each year. Assessors use professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques, including but not limited to: comparison with sales of property of known or recognized value, taking into account location, zoning, and current functional use; income approach, and cost approach. By statute all real property is assessed at 100% of actual value, except for agricultural land and horticultural land which is assessed at 75% of actual value. Fillmore County currently contracts with Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC to assist with the review of sales and do the pick-up work.

Our current aerial photos were taken in 2006 for all rural parcels. This helps identify buildings in the rural area. County-wide zoning was implemented January 1, 2000. Any new buildings or additions need to be approved prior to construction. This has been very beneficial for our office.

Pick-up work is scheduled based on our permits. We try to schedule pick-up work and sales review in the same area.

After sales are reviewed, we decide whether we need to look at a certain class or sub-class of property. We try to have a systematic review of all property in the county.

The qualification process involves a careful review of the information on the 521 RETS and utilizes the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff to make a decision about the usability of the sales. Some are later modified based on information discovered during the verification and inspection processes. The verification process is primarily accomplished during the on-site inspection, which is done by the contract appraiser. Most of the interviews conducted outside the inspection process are for clarification or when another party to the sale is contacted, and for unimproved parcels that are not inspected. The county attempts to inspect all improved sales in the qualified roster, and many of the others in the total roster that are not obviously non-sales.

The assessor and staff do most of the sale qualification with further verification and inspection contracted to Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC. The qualification decisions are sometimes modified after the verification or inspection processes are done. Sale inspection is contracted to

Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC. Most of the verification process is done during the inspection and most interviews are done at that time. The phone is used for verification with persons who are unavailable during the inspection process or if additional clarification is needed. In Fillmore County the order of preference for verification is buyer, buyer's representative, seller and then real estate agent. The county verifies a larger percentage of the transfers to enhance the input to the county CAMA system that is used to calculate building valuation.

When conducting a physical inspection, the county looks for the same thing we look for when listing property. We check for the accuracy of the listing. We also believe the sale file review serves as a semi-random sampling of the assessed property. The review enables us to plan for reappraisal priorities, and prepare for future changes of classes and sub-classes. The county attempts to inspect all qualified improved sales as well as others that are possibly good sales. We estimate this is 85% of the residential sales, 75% of the commercial sales, 20% of the unimproved agland sales and 60% of the improved agland sales that are in the total roster. We occasionally inspect some unimproved sales to verify land use. Unreported pick-up work and alterations are listed and errors that are discovered are corrected on the records accordingly. Omissions are usually parcels of unreported pick-up work, which are listed, valued and added to the tax rolls. We continue to work with the NRD. Looking at possible regulation in the future, owners want to make sure our records are correct. For 2008 we measured and recorded the land use in the rest of the county in our GIS system and applied the new numeric codes. Our administrative package has a permit tab and all pick-up work is entered on corresponding property records. We are able to run a list of permits out of this system.

The information gathered during the sale review process is kept in the county sales books. We are starting to notice some influences due to the development of the four-lane highway through our county. An example would be ABE Fairmont LLC, which is the new Ethanol Plant at Fairmont which became operational in November of '07.

Fillmore County Assessor's office personnel includes the assessor, deputy and clerk. The assessor and deputy have completed their continuing education to keep up their certificates and are certified through 2010. I have included money in the budget for education. Our appraisal

work is contracted with Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC and Mr. Knoche helps with the sales review and pick-up work.

Fillmore County Assessor's office acquired all new computers and printers (July 2005).

Fillmore County utilizes the computerized administrative system County Solutions, provided and supported by NACO. The Marshall & Swift costing tables are used for estimating replacement costs for the residential parcels and ag buildings. The county administrative system includes the Microsolve CAMA 2000 package. The assessment records are kept in the hard copy format with updates made in the form of inserts. The valuation history on the face of the hard copy is updated to reflect all valuation changes that are made annually.

According to the 2008 amended abstract, the real property within Fillmore County is comprised of the following: 2,541 residential parcels of which 275 are unimproved, 535 commercial parcels of which 79 are unimproved, 12 industrial parcels, 1 recreational parcels, and 3,374 agricultural parcels of which 2,349 are unimproved. Among the improved agricultural parcels are 525 with residential improvements. The percentage breakdown of the three primary classes of real estate is as follows: residential 40%, commercial/industrial 8%, agricultural 52% and 0.00% comprising any other classes. There are two other groups to mention; the administrative parcels (including Game and Parks and exempt parcels), numbering 288 and there are two parcels that have additional valuation responsibility (TIF Projects). These groups are mentioned because they represent additional assessment responsibility but will not be included in the parcel count in this report. The total number of parcels that are associated with the total real property value from the total records on the front page of the abstract in Fillmore County is estimated at 6,463 and contain no parcels with mineral interests valued. The total including exempt, Game and Parks and TIF parcels is 6,792.

The total valuation as certified on the abstract of assessment for real property 2008 to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division is 807,187,188. The breakdown of valuation is as follows:

	<u>Valuation</u>	<u>Total Parcels</u>
Real Estate	807,187,188	6,463
Personal Property	103,421,759	1,291
Railroad & Public Service Utilities	<u>15,681,985</u>	
(Certified by PA&T in 2007)		
TOTAL	926,290,932	

Homestead Exemption applications for 2008 were 305

Charitable exemption applications were 36 excluding cemeteries.

Cadastrals are maps showing the boundaries of subdivisions of land usually with the bearings and lengths thereof and the areas of individual tracts for the purpose of describing and recording ownership. Our current set of cadastrals was made in 1989. The ownership names and property lines are routinely updated, and we consider them current.

Our property record cards serve as a reference to and inventory of all portions of the property. It contains a summary of the general data relevant to the parcel it represents. Our most recent record cards (for all classes of property) were prepared in 1993 during our county-wide reappraisal. Our 2008 records are currently up-to-date along with the 2008 values. We also updated all photos for ALL our town/village record cards for 2007. The Geneva and rural photos were updated for 2006.

When a parcel of real property in the State of Nebraska transfers and a deed is recorded a Real Estate Transfer Statement, form 521, is required. A copy of Form 521 is provided to the assessor. The assessor is responsible for maintaining the changes of ownership on the property

record cards of the county. The assessor completes supplemental worksheets on these sales and submits this information to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division within 45 days or sooner.

Our office has developed a formal manual of office and assessment procedures, which includes a job description. It is our practice to follow all rules, regs, and directives that govern the assessment process.

We qualify all sales, review most of them, prepare in-depth analysis on most property classes or subclasses and identify the projects that need to be done.

Our level of value, quality and uniformity for assessment year 2008:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	99%	8.64	102.35
Commerical	98%	18.76	106.14
Agricultural Land	74%	16.96	104.76

Our three year plan is as follows:

- 2009 Continue sales review of all classes of property
 Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county
 Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property
 Review agland for any changes in land areas and values
 Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)
 Add new construction

Fillmore County board purchased the GIS for the following offices:

Assessor, roads department, clerk's office and zoning office (8-9-05)

2006 - The staff had the parcel layer in and aerial photos identified.

2008 - Land use layer was completed and the numeric codes applied

Continue our systematic review of property –

2006 - reviewed the rural homes and buildings and Geneva

2007 –reviewed all the small towns

2008 –worked on completing the land use layer and converted the land
classification codes from the old soil symbols to the new numeric
codes

Start entering the tables for land values in our current computer system

Start reviewing the commercial/industrial properties

Photo update for commercial/industrial and other properties

2010 Continue sales review for all classes of property

Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county

Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property

Review agland for any changes in land areas and values

Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)

Add new construction

Continue our systematic review of property

2011 Continue sales review for all classes of property

Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county

Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property

Review agland for any changes in land areas and values

Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)

Add new construction

Continue our systematic review of property

2009 Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$168,212
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	N/A
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$156,212
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$27,000
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,550
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	N/A
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$12,000 for GIS annual support and office support
13.	Total budget
	\$168,212
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	County Solutions

2.	CAMA software
	County Solutions-Microsolve
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor, staff, and GIS Workshop
7.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

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?
	All towns in the county are zoned with the exception of Strang.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Knoche Consulting LLC
2.	Other services
	GIS Workshop

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 Fillmore County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts