

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

32 Frontier

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	81	COD	15.78
Total Sales Price	\$5,151,947	PRD	108.46
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,143,747	COV	27.67
Total Assessed Value	\$4,749,879	STD	27.71
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$63,503	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.43
Avg. Assessed Value	\$58,640	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$44,939
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	92
Mean	100	Max	213
Min	33.68		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.96 to 99.44
95% Mean C.I	94.12 to 106.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.26 to 97.42

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	15.71
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.93
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.04

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	89	92	20.79	107.45
2007	80	94	11.43	99.71
2006	82	96	6.89	100.97
2005	92	96	9.46	102.8

2009 Commission Summary

32 Frontier

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	COD	19.84
Total Sales Price	\$237,883	PRD	96.69
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$237,883	COV	28.64
Total Assessed Value	\$215,285	STD	25.06
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$21,626	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.34
Avg. Assessed Value	\$19,571	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$81,773
Median	92	Wgt. Mean	91
Mean	88	Max	124
Min	40		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	49.86 to 108.79
95% Mean C.I	70.67 to 104.34
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	71.72 to 109.28

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 4.62

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 5.82

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.39

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	16	93	14.33	95.56
2007	19	94	13.92	96.27
2006	19	94	10.94	110.04
2005	17	95	13.31	118.33

2009 Commission Summary

32 Frontier

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	70	COD	20.23
Total Sales Price	\$9,645,499	PRD	103.53
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,613,499	COV	26.83
Total Assessed Value	\$7,036,055	STD	20.33
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$137,336	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.11
Avg. Assessed Value	\$100,515	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$98,102
Median	75	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	76	Max	137.70
Min	23.45		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	71.70 to 82.08
95% Mean C.I	71.01 to 80.54
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	66.42 to 79.96

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	79.07
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.60
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.80

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	58	73	18.38	97.79
2007	48	75	13.25	97.9
2006	36	76	8.98	101.86
2005	41	77	11.16	101.12

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Frontier 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 Frontier County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Frontier 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 Frontier County is 92.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Frontier County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Frontier County is 75.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Frontier County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	84	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	24.30	95% Median C.I.:	80.80 to 93.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,182,447	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	21.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.92 to 83.95	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,174,247	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	82.52 to 91.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,135,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,598	COD:	18.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.27			
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,236	PRD:	108.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:14

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	14	95.69	90.92	83.84	9.91	108.44	69.71	105.52	75.71 to 102.37	66,399	55,671
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	94.16	89.25	84.57	12.93	105.53	56.49	112.16	63.96 to 102.83	62,750	53,068
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	80.19	85.71	74.99	22.47	114.29	56.07	127.67	56.07 to 127.67	62,781	47,081
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	15	79.42	85.28	78.50	27.29	108.64	43.53	171.27	62.84 to 97.34	60,265	47,307
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	8	98.50	91.52	83.01	11.43	110.24	65.40	106.20	65.40 to 106.20	41,250	34,242
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	88.56	82.41	78.55	13.99	104.92	49.57	101.00	66.87 to 98.69	68,711	53,974
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	88.25	88.68	75.98	14.65	116.72	59.93	120.10	72.58 to 105.93	69,740	52,988
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	86.19	82.11	79.62	20.49	103.12	33.68	116.57	61.44 to 114.67	56,512	44,995
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	47	85.91	87.88	80.87	19.97	108.67	43.53	171.27	79.42 to 96.04	63,049	50,986
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	37	88.56	85.99	78.68	16.11	109.29	33.68	120.10	80.30 to 93.80	59,754	47,014
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	40	83.25	85.97	78.40	21.73	109.66	43.53	171.27	76.18 to 93.80	58,865	46,149
____ALL____											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
CURTIS	36	88.54	86.84	85.09	14.54	102.06	54.76	116.57	79.88 to 97.34	48,553	41,312
EUSTIS	15	91.41	93.90	89.97	11.13	104.37	73.89	128.82	83.55 to 97.08	60,800	54,703
LAKE	5	79.42	70.48	60.21	26.81	117.06	33.68	103.86	N/A	63,276	38,096
MAYWOOD	15	96.04	98.63	86.58	15.95	113.92	63.96	171.27	88.22 to 105.52	51,246	44,369
MOOREFIELD	1	43.53	43.53	43.53			43.53	43.53	N/A	3,000	1,306
RURAL RES	5	70.33	77.83	67.68	23.23	114.99	58.64	127.67	N/A	147,700	99,965
STOCKVILLE	2	89.64	89.64	69.49	37.45	128.98	56.07	123.20	N/A	1,875	1,303
SUBURBAN	5	62.84	66.68	68.47	12.23	97.39	56.49	78.79	N/A	136,800	93,662
____ALL____											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	69	90.17	90.39	86.67	15.56	104.30	43.53	171.27	85.91 to 96.26	49,787	43,148
2	5	62.84	66.68	68.47	12.23	97.39	56.49	78.79	N/A	136,800	93,662
3	10	71.46	74.15	65.44	27.60	113.32	33.68	127.67	49.57 to 103.86	105,488	69,030
____ALL____											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

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:	84	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	24.30	95% Median C.I.:	80.80 to 93.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,182,447	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	21.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.92 to 83.95	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,174,247	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	82.52 to 91.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,135,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,598	COD:	18.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.27			
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,236	PRD:	108.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:15

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	76	88.71	87.27	81.15	17.09	107.53	43.53	171.27	80.49 to 93.80	63,692	51,688
2	4	110.30	107.81	100.47	10.08	107.31	87.45	123.20	N/A	6,312	6,342
3	4	64.50	62.13	59.07	31.80	105.18	33.68	85.86	N/A	77,095	45,543
ALL	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	77	89.05	88.65	81.85	17.08	108.31	43.53	171.27	83.55 to 94.84	60,316	49,366
06	5	79.42	70.48	60.21	26.81	117.06	33.68	103.86	N/A	63,276	38,096
07	2	66.83	66.83	67.55	4.30	98.94	63.96	69.71	N/A	106,750	72,112
ALL	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	20	89.62	92.53	79.36	21.29	116.59	56.07	171.27	75.71 to 101.50	59,472	47,198
32-0095	15	91.41	93.90	89.97	11.13	104.37	73.89	128.82	83.55 to 97.08	60,800	54,703
32-0125	42	83.16	83.34	79.08	17.39	105.39	43.53	116.57	76.18 to 95.33	60,307	47,689
33-0018											
33-0021	4	82.64	79.68	68.02	18.37	117.14	49.57	103.86	N/A	61,095	41,558
37-0030											
43-0079											
73-0017	1	33.68	33.68	33.68			33.68	33.68	N/A	72,000	24,250
73-0179	2	100.13	100.13	79.60	27.51	125.78	72.58	127.67	N/A	111,750	88,958
NonValid School											
ALL	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

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:	84	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	24.30	95% Median C.I.:	80.80 to 93.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,182,447	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	21.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.92 to 83.95	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,174,247	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	82.52 to 91.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,135,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,598	COD:	18.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.27			
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,236	PRD:	108.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:15

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	14	80.02	82.39	69.01	28.45	119.38	43.53	123.20	56.07 to 105.93	42,803	29,539
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	103.12	104.39	100.44	8.31	103.94	89.05	128.82	89.05 to 128.82	31,116	31,252
1900 TO 1919	20	97.12	97.54	95.08	15.47	102.59	63.93	171.27	89.31 to 102.83	35,261	33,527
1920 TO 1939	15	82.95	84.37	81.49	12.63	103.53	56.49	112.16	76.18 to 94.84	62,066	50,581
1940 TO 1949	2	96.25	96.25	95.44	3.90	100.85	92.49	100.00	N/A	31,270	29,843
1950 TO 1959	6	93.84	92.88	82.39	13.38	112.73	59.93	116.57	59.93 to 116.57	81,750	67,353
1960 TO 1969	6	75.27	68.86	68.07	24.94	101.15	33.68	93.48	33.68 to 93.48	80,730	54,956
1970 TO 1979	10	77.89	74.74	73.34	10.31	101.92	59.58	88.85	62.84 to 85.54	100,915	74,008
1980 TO 1989	2	86.61	86.61	88.07	8.30	98.35	79.42	93.80	N/A	106,500	93,789
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	81.28	81.28	81.14	6.85	100.17	75.71	86.85	N/A	179,500	145,643
2000 TO Present	1	69.71	69.71	69.71			69.71	69.71	N/A	133,500	93,057
ALL											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

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	101.00	84.96	78.21	24.67	108.63	43.53	123.20	N/A	2,550	1,994
5000 TO 9999	5	105.93	111.43	107.96	22.78	103.22	61.44	171.27	N/A	7,100	7,665
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	102.43	98.20	100.10	24.98	98.10	43.53	171.27	56.07 to 123.20	4,825	4,829
10000 TO 29999	16	100.75	96.62	98.42	16.10	98.18	54.76	128.82	74.62 to 112.16	20,854	20,523
30000 TO 59999	24	91.95	92.70	92.75	8.58	99.95	73.59	116.57	88.56 to 97.88	42,559	39,474
60000 TO 99999	19	80.30	77.24	77.56	12.02	99.59	33.68	97.34	66.99 to 85.54	81,231	63,000
100000 TO 149999	7	70.22	75.61	76.15	19.28	99.29	49.57	93.80	49.57 to 93.80	120,785	91,976
150000 TO 249999	8	71.46	70.30	70.26	11.45	100.06	58.64	86.85	58.64 to 86.85	172,750	121,373
ALL											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	84	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	24.30	95% Median C.I.:	80.80 to 93.48	(/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,182,447	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	21.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.92 to 83.95	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,174,247	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	82.52 to 91.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,135,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,598	COD:	18.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.27			
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,236	PRD:	108.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:15

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	81.22	81.04	71.74	33.69	112.96	43.53	123.20	43.53 to 123.20	3,458	2,481
5000 TO 9999	6	95.66	88.43	80.34	20.62	110.08	54.76	114.67	54.76 to 114.67	10,583	8,502
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	12	94.22	84.74	78.22	24.98	108.33	43.53	123.20	56.07 to 105.93	7,020	5,491
10000 TO 29999	15	100.00	96.30	83.00	20.53	116.03	33.68	171.27	73.89 to 106.20	25,544	21,201
30000 TO 59999	32	90.18	90.10	85.03	13.50	105.96	49.57	127.67	85.86 to 97.08	51,107	43,457
60000 TO 99999	16	80.55	80.07	78.41	9.91	102.12	59.58	97.34	70.22 to 85.91	98,400	77,152
100000 TO 149999	8	74.15	74.93	73.75	12.89	101.60	58.64	93.80	58.64 to 93.80	165,250	121,863
150000 TO 249999	1	86.85	86.85	86.85			86.85	86.85	N/A	175,000	151,980
ALL											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	70.33	77.26	65.32	20.94	118.29	58.64	102.82	N/A	114,000	74,462
0	11	87.45	83.78	73.92	26.76	113.34	43.53	123.20	54.76 to 114.67	23,386	17,288
10	2	137.57	137.57	132.75	24.50	103.63	103.86	171.27	N/A	7,000	9,292
20	2	76.82	76.82	65.05	26.46	118.09	56.49	97.15	N/A	47,500	30,898
25	20	95.69	95.26	93.94	14.98	101.40	63.93	128.82	88.22 to 103.48	28,960	27,206
30	44	84.54	82.82	78.85	14.42	105.03	33.68	116.57	78.79 to 89.63	81,449	64,221
35	2	90.32	90.32	89.79	3.85	100.60	86.85	93.80	N/A	151,500	136,025
ALL											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	70.33	77.26	65.32	20.94	118.29	58.64	102.82	N/A	114,000	74,462
0	11	87.45	83.78	73.92	26.76	113.34	43.53	123.20	54.76 to 114.67	23,386	17,288
101	63	89.31	88.70	82.08	16.51	108.07	33.68	171.27	85.52 to 94.84	62,720	51,483
102	2	67.28	67.28	61.80	10.92	108.85	59.93	74.62	N/A	106,063	65,552
103	1	80.80	80.80	80.80			80.80	80.80	N/A	99,900	80,716
104	3	82.95	89.76	85.79	10.34	104.63	80.30	106.02	N/A	71,866	61,652
111	1	85.54	85.54	85.54			85.54	85.54	N/A	96,000	82,122
ALL											
	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

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:	84	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	24.30	95% Median C.I.:	80.80 to 93.48	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,182,447	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	21.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.92 to 83.95	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,174,247	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.92	95% Mean C.I.:	82.52 to 91.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,135,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	61,598	COD:	18.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	171.27			
AVG. Assessed Value:	49,236	PRD:	108.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:15

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	3	70.33	77.26	65.32	20.94	118.29	58.64	102.82	N/A	114,000	74,462
0	11	87.45	83.78	73.92	26.76	113.34	43.53	123.20	54.76 to 114.67	23,386	17,288
10	2	137.57	137.57	132.75	24.50	103.63	103.86	171.27	N/A	7,000	9,292
20	2	85.89	85.89	84.18	13.12	102.02	74.62	97.15	N/A	23,563	19,835
25	9	102.37	99.48	99.05	12.50	100.44	65.40	127.67	73.59 to 120.10	27,782	27,518
30	56	85.88	84.45	79.84	14.83	105.78	33.68	128.82	80.30 to 90.17	73,014	58,293
40	1	86.85	86.85	86.85			86.85	86.85	N/A	175,000	151,980
ALL	84	88.39	87.05	79.93	18.01	108.90	33.68	171.27	80.80 to 93.48	61,598	49,236

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

Residential

A complete reappraisal was conducted by the assessor and the deputy during 2008 for the 2009 assessment year. Every residential parcel within the villages and the surrounding suburban areas of Curtis, Eustis, Maywood, Moorefield, and Stockville were physically reviewed. New photographs were taken; interior inspections were completed where permitted. The property record cards were taken on site to aid in reviewing the property. The assessor found it necessary to correct the quality and condition rating of several properties. Sketches of improvements were also corrected where necessary.

A study of lot values was completed and new land value charts were developed; neighborhoods were established based on lot size. Two charts were developed, one for the villages of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis and their suburban areas. A second chart was developed for the smaller villages of Stockville and Moorefield. The home site and farm site values of agricultural residential parcels were increased to match the values for rural residential parcels.

The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2008 tables. A sales study was completed and new market depreciation was developed. After completing the depreciation study the assessor went to the additional effort to develop a book of comparable properties to aid in explaining the reappraisal process. The book is a very nice reference tool complete with full page color photos of the properties used in the sales study, and is organized in an easy to follow manner. The assessor should be commended for taking the time and effort to compile this reference for the tax payers of Frontier County.

The rural residential parcels were identified on GIS this year; the number of acres in each parcel was recalculated, changing some land values. Due to the errors found during the residential reappraisal a decision was made by the assessor, and supported by the department, not to update costing and depreciation or apply a blanket adjustment to the rural properties until a physical review can be completed in 2010.

Pickup work was also completed, and several new houses were added for 2009 in Curtis and the rural area.

2009 Assessment Survey for Frontier County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	The assessor and the deputy.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The assessor and the deputy.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	Urban and Suburban properties were updated in 2008. The rural residential properties were last updated in 2003, and will be updated when a reappraisal is completed in 2010.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Urban and Suburban 2008, Rural Residential, 2003
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach is used, depreciation is developed using current sales information.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	5 Assessor locations with 17 neighborhoods within
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Assessor locations are defined using geographic area and similar characteristics, neighborhoods are established from a land valuation table.
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.)
	Yes, for Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood
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 the home site value and the farm site of the agricultural parcels were changed for 2009 to match the land values on rural residential parcels. Dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels are both valued at

	the same statutory level.
--	---------------------------

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
18	0	10	28

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:	81	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.67	95% Median C.I.:	95.96 to 99.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,151,947	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.26 to 97.42	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,143,747	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.43	95% Mean C.I.:	94.12 to 106.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,749,879							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,503	COD:	15.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,640	PRD:	108.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:48

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	14	100.95	101.40	98.62	7.12	102.82	80.27	117.40	95.54 to 111.22		66,399	65,480
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	99.54	122.61	107.13	27.58	114.45	88.63	213.00	94.84 to 194.85		62,750	67,226
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	96.77	92.68	84.63	16.48	109.51	57.33	127.09	57.33 to 127.09		62,781	53,132
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	15	97.94	96.78	94.35	13.31	102.57	40.80	139.47	85.86 to 108.70		60,265	56,860
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	8	98.78	94.00	85.65	8.90	109.75	70.58	111.64	70.58 to 111.64		41,250	35,329
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	98.37	107.08	91.43	22.64	117.12	49.57	189.67	94.21 to 122.54		68,711	62,819
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	95.84	88.47	79.99	10.22	110.60	59.93	102.63	59.93 to 102.63		95,271	76,210
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	95.78	93.86	88.73	20.37	105.78	33.68	165.75	64.90 to 104.76		56,512	50,143
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	47	97.94	102.95	96.75	15.35	106.41	40.80	213.00	95.96 to 101.51		63,049	60,999
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	34	97.15	96.28	86.36	16.39	111.49	33.68	189.67	94.16 to 99.44		64,130	55,380
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	40	97.89	97.72	90.29	15.23	108.23	40.80	189.67	94.80 to 99.58		58,865	53,149
_____ALL_____												
	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44		63,503	58,640

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CURTIS	33	97.08	101.17	97.62	10.93	103.64	64.90	165.75	94.70 to 99.81		52,042	50,803
EUSTIS	15	99.26	106.35	102.14	10.40	104.13	85.67	194.85	97.84 to 104.76		60,800	62,099
LAKE	5	79.42	70.48	60.21	26.81	117.06	33.68	103.86	N/A		63,276	38,096
MAYWOOD	15	100.38	114.21	100.66	16.50	113.46	95.22	213.00	97.53 to 108.92		51,246	51,585
MOOREFIELD	1	40.80	40.80	40.80			40.80	40.80	N/A		3,000	1,224
RURAL RES	5	70.58	77.98	67.99	23.12	114.70	58.94	127.09	N/A		147,700	100,421
STOCKVILLE	2	84.66	84.66	68.27	32.29	124.02	57.33	112.00	N/A		1,875	1,280
SUBURBAN	5	95.54	102.59	98.20	11.92	104.46	85.43	141.46	N/A		136,800	134,342
_____ALL_____												
	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44		63,503	58,640

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	66	98.60	103.90	99.43	13.49	104.49	40.80	213.00	97.19 to 100.38		51,588	51,296
2	5	95.54	102.59	98.20	11.92	104.46	85.43	141.46	N/A		136,800	134,342
3	10	71.97	74.23	65.66	27.36	113.06	33.68	127.09	49.57 to 103.86		105,488	69,259
_____ALL_____												
	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44		63,503	58,640

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:	81	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.67	95% Median C.I.:	95.96 to 99.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,151,947	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.26 to 97.42	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,143,747	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.43	95% Mean C.I.:	94.12 to 106.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,749,879							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,503	COD:	15.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,640	PRD:	108.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:48

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	75	97.94	102.22	94.47	14.72	108.20	40.80	213.00	96.28 to 99.81	64,381	60,823
2	2	98.84	98.84	88.59	13.32	111.56	85.67	112.00	N/A	3,375	2,990
3	4	64.50	62.13	59.07	31.80	105.18	33.68	85.86	N/A	77,095	45,543
ALL	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	74	97.89	102.21	94.23	15.12	108.46	40.80	213.00	96.28 to 99.58	62,349	58,752
06	5	79.42	70.48	60.21	26.81	117.06	33.68	103.86	N/A	63,276	38,096
07	2	98.37	98.37	99.16	3.20	99.20	95.22	101.51	N/A	106,750	105,848
ALL	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	20	99.74	110.76	101.68	17.73	108.93	57.33	213.00	97.19 to 108.92	59,472	60,472
32-0095	15	99.26	106.35	102.14	10.40	104.13	85.67	194.85	97.84 to 104.76	60,800	62,099
32-0125	39	95.84	96.13	89.48	13.82	107.43	40.80	165.75	94.16 to 99.44	64,164	57,414
33-0018											
33-0021	4	82.64	79.68	68.02	18.37	117.14	49.57	103.86	N/A	61,095	41,558
37-0030											
43-0079											
73-0017	1	33.68	33.68	33.68			33.68	33.68	N/A	72,000	24,250
73-0179	2	100.23	100.23	80.22	26.80	124.95	73.37	127.09	N/A	111,750	89,644
NonValid School											
ALL	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	81	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.67	95% Median C.I.:	95.96 to 99.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,151,947	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.26 to 97.42	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,143,747	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.43	95% Mean C.I.:	94.12 to 106.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,749,879							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,503	COD:	15.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,640	PRD:	108.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:48

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	11	85.67	109.69	72.62	55.06	151.05	40.80	213.00	57.33 to 189.67	51,704	37,545
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	103.25	100.64	99.60	6.63	101.04	80.27	109.90	80.27 to 109.90	31,116	30,991
1900 TO 1919	20	100.10	100.51	99.93	9.67	100.58	64.90	127.09	96.28 to 108.92	35,261	35,236
1920 TO 1939	15	97.94	108.87	104.90	12.91	103.79	94.21	194.85	95.97 to 104.47	62,066	65,104
1940 TO 1949	2	114.31	114.31	113.65	2.70	100.58	111.22	117.40	N/A	31,270	35,537
1950 TO 1959	6	96.88	91.03	82.79	7.97	109.94	59.93	99.44	59.93 to 99.44	81,750	67,684
1960 TO 1969	6	89.68	76.71	76.10	22.68	100.80	33.68	99.82	33.68 to 99.82	80,730	61,436
1970 TO 1979	10	95.01	95.55	94.50	3.04	101.12	85.43	103.62	94.06 to 99.26	100,915	95,359
1980 TO 1989	2	86.87	86.87	88.37	8.57	98.30	79.42	94.31	N/A	106,500	94,112
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	96.54	96.54	96.51	1.03	100.02	95.54	97.53	N/A	179,500	173,241
2000 TO Present	1	101.51	101.51	101.51			101.51	101.51	N/A	133,500	135,521
ALL	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

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	112.00	122.56	124.42	54.38	98.50	40.80	213.00	N/A	2,550	3,172
5000 TO 9999	4	106.39	116.05	118.73	20.01	97.74	85.67	165.75	N/A	7,000	8,311
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	108.92	119.67	120.51	40.07	99.30	40.80	213.00	57.33 to 189.67	4,527	5,456
10000 TO 29999	14	104.84	110.44	110.01	19.25	100.39	64.90	194.85	96.28 to 127.09	22,190	24,412
30000 TO 59999	24	99.34	100.75	100.81	6.96	99.94	80.27	122.54	95.97 to 104.76	42,559	42,905
60000 TO 99999	19	97.08	94.96	95.04	8.44	99.91	33.68	141.46	94.33 to 98.74	81,231	77,202
100000 TO 149999	7	94.80	90.00	90.64	8.94	99.29	49.57	101.51	49.57 to 101.51	120,785	109,485
150000 TO 249999	8	79.40	79.63	79.31	17.54	100.41	58.94	97.53	58.94 to 97.53	172,750	137,001
ALL	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

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:	81	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.67	95% Median C.I.:	95.96 to 99.44	(/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,151,947	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.26 to 97.42	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,143,747	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.43	95% Mean C.I.:	94.12 to 106.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,749,879							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,503	COD:	15.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,640	PRD:	108.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:48

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	57.33	70.04	56.06	41.40	124.95	40.80	112.00	N/A	2,250	1,261
5000 TO 9999	5	108.92	140.22	123.32	39.14	113.70	85.67	213.00	N/A	5,200	6,412
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	106.39	113.91	109.46	39.47	104.06	40.80	213.00	40.80 to 213.00	4,093	4,481
10000 TO 29999	15	99.44	100.82	87.42	20.47	115.33	33.68	165.75	88.63 to 114.23	24,711	21,602
30000 TO 59999	26	99.69	103.77	98.86	12.54	104.97	49.57	194.85	97.58 to 105.01	44,251	43,746
60000 TO 99999	18	97.09	96.20	96.10	3.06	100.11	79.42	102.63	94.70 to 98.74	83,127	79,884
100000 TO 149999	11	94.06	88.21	83.54	17.38	105.60	58.94	141.46	59.93 to 101.51	143,318	119,723
150000 TO 249999	3	95.71	96.26	96.27	0.69	99.99	95.54	97.53	N/A	172,333	165,901
ALL											
	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	64.76	64.76	64.23	8.99	100.83	58.94	70.58	N/A	165,000	105,979
0	9	112.00	119.67	84.21	44.71	142.12	40.80	213.00	57.33 to 189.67	26,527	22,337
10	2	106.39	106.39	106.03	2.38	100.34	103.86	108.92	N/A	7,000	7,422
20	2	127.03	127.03	135.38	11.36	93.83	112.60	141.46	N/A	47,500	64,306
25	20	102.30	106.52	106.23	13.93	100.27	64.90	194.85	97.58 to 111.22	28,960	30,765
30	44	95.97	93.56	91.71	7.92	102.02	33.68	122.54	94.80 to 98.37	81,449	74,698
35	2	95.92	95.92	96.17	1.68	99.74	94.31	97.53	N/A	151,500	145,699
ALL											
	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	64.76	64.76	64.23	8.99	100.83	58.94	70.58	N/A	165,000	105,979
0	9	112.00	119.67	84.21	44.71	142.12	40.80	213.00	57.33 to 189.67	26,527	22,337
101	63	97.84	99.89	96.38	10.36	103.65	33.68	194.85	96.28 to 99.82	62,720	60,448
102	2	62.42	62.42	60.56	3.98	103.06	59.93	64.90	N/A	106,063	64,233
103	1	94.33	94.33	94.33			94.33	94.33	N/A	99,900	94,231
104	3	98.74	98.05	97.70	1.26	100.37	95.84	99.58	N/A	71,866	70,210
111	1	99.26	99.26	99.26			99.26	99.26	N/A	96,000	95,292
ALL											
	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

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:	81	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.67	95% Median C.I.:	95.96 to 99.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,151,947	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	27.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.26 to 97.42	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,143,747	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.43	95% Mean C.I.:	94.12 to 106.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,749,879							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	63,503	COD:	15.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	58,640	PRD:	108.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.68			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:49

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	2	64.76	64.76	64.23	8.99	100.83	58.94	70.58	N/A	165,000	105,979
0	9	112.00	119.67	84.21	44.71	142.12	40.80	213.00	57.33 to 189.67	26,527	22,337
10	2	106.39	106.39	106.03	2.38	100.34	103.86	108.92	N/A	7,000	7,422
20	2	88.75	88.75	85.14	26.87	104.24	64.90	112.60	N/A	23,563	20,062
25	9	99.44	100.10	99.49	13.62	100.61	74.61	127.09	80.27 to 117.40	27,782	27,641
30	56	97.69	98.52	94.46	9.70	104.29	33.68	194.85	95.84 to 99.09	73,014	68,972
40	1	97.53	97.53	97.53			97.53	97.53	N/A	175,000	170,684
ALL	81	97.81	100.15	92.34	15.78	108.46	33.68	213.00	95.96 to 99.44	63,503	58,640

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The R&O median has been used to represent the level of value for Frontier County in the residential class. All three measures of central tendency and the trended preliminary ratio are within the required range and support that the median is an accurate level of value.

A sufficient number of sales were used in the measurement of the residential class. The residential sample was determined in the trended ratio analysis to be representative of the population. Because the sample is representative, the statistical measures produced in the following analysis are considered to be accurate and reliable measures of the level of value and quality of assessment for the residential class.

The three year plan demonstrates the assessor's commitment to reviewing the county in an ongoing cyclical pattern. This year the majority of the residential class, excluding properties located in the rural area, were reappraised. The R&O statistics show ten sales in the substrata rural location with a median of 71.97. This location is made up of two assessor locations, the rural res and the lake properties, with five sales in each. The assessor recognizes these as two separate valuation groups; and believes that, due to the errors found during the residential reappraisal, these assessor locations cannot be equalized without a complete reappraisal. A reappraisal of the rural area is scheduled to be completed for 2011.

The qualitative measures are affected by the sales in the rural location. Removing both the rural sales and two outliers in Maywood from the sample bring the qualitative measures within the acceptable range. Because of the known assessment practices in Frontier County; assessment practices have been determined to be in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

No recommended adjustment will be made to the substrata rural location.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	130	81	62.31
2008	126	89	70.63
2007	119	80	67.23
2006	128	82	64.06
2005	124	92	74.19

RESIDENTIAL:Frontier County has a thorough sales review process. Detailed questionnaire documents are mailed out to the buyer and seller involved in every real estate transaction, and follow-up phone calls are made to clarify responses when necessary. The assessor also uses her extensive knowledge of the county and information that she receives from realtors and other business professionals in the area to review sales. In 2009, the percent of sales used in the residential class decreased by eight percent while the number of sales rose slightly. A review of the 49 disqualified sales shows 18% were substantially improved, 21% were private sales not on the open market, 17% were family sales, 15% were foreclosures and the rest were a mixture of gifts, corrective deeds, and duplicate sales. Because of the known sales review practice and the reasons given for exclusion of sales it is evident that the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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	88	13.53	100	98
2008	91.65	3.46	95	92.49
2007	93	-1.88	91	94
2006	96	1.36	98	96
2005	96	-1.57	94	96

RESIDENTIAL: The difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio is 1.91. These two measures are reasonably similar. The trended ratio supports the R&O ratio as the level of value for the residential class; and reflects that the residential sample and the residential population have been treated uniformly.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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)
8.86	2009	13.53
1.50	2008	3.46
3.99	2007	-1.88
0.26	2006	1.36
-2.75	2005	-1.57

RESIDENTIAL: There is a 4.67% difference between the percent change in the sales file and the percent change in the base. Because the reappraisal of the residential class included numerous corrections to the property records, it is not unreasonable that the base would change slightly higher than the sales file. The assessor kept in contact with the Department during her reappraisal process, and is always willing to discuss her work with the Department. Because of the Department's knowledge of assessment practices in Frontier County, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	92	100

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The trended preliminary ratio also supports these measures of central tendency. For equalization purposes the median will be used to represent the level of value for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	15.78	108.46
Difference	0.78	5.46

RESIDENTIAL: Both qualitative measures are above the acceptable standards for the measurement of the residential class. The COD is slightly high at 15.78 while the PRD is 108.46 appearing to indicate that assessments are regressive. However, both measures are impacted by two outliers within the Village of Maywood and by the rural residential sales which were not reappraised this year. A hypothetical adjustment to value in the rural areas only worsens the quality statistics. Analyzing the sample without these sales brings both the COD and the PRD in at 12.23 and 102.74 respectively. Due to this analysis and knowledge of the assessment practices in Frontier County it is believed that assessments in the residential class are treated uniformly and proportionately.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	84	81	-3
Median	88	98	10
Wgt. Mean	80	92	12
Mean	87	100	13
COD	18.01	15.78	-2.23
PRD	108.90	108.46	-0.44
Minimum	33.68	33.68	0.00
Maximum	171.27	213.00	41.73

RESIDENTIAL: There are three less sales in the R&O Statistics than there were in the Preliminary Statistics. These sales were all lot sales that were removed because they were substantially improved with new homes added for 2009. Had the preliminary statistics been reproduced after the removal of the three substantially improved sales, they would show no statistically significant changes in either the measures of central tendency or the qualitative statistics. The changes in the reports and opinions statistics were a result of the assessment actions. A complete residential appraisal was done for 2009 in all the villages and surrounding suburban areas in the county.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	81	81	0
Median	98	101	-3
Wgt. Mean	92	96	-4
Mean	100	103	-3
COD	15.78	23.08	-7.30
PRD	108.46	107.07	1.39
Minimum	33.68	39.07	-5.39
Maximum	213.00	288.33	-75.33

The table above is a comparison of the reports and opinions statistics to a set of statistics produced by trended values. The trended values have been calculated by taking the assessed value one year prior to the sale date and trending the value forward by each year's percentage change in the base.

There is a three to four point difference between the R&O statistics and the trended statistics in all three measures of central tendency. Because these numbers are reasonably similar, they seem to indicate that the sample used in the measurement of the residential class is representative of the residential population. Because representativeness has been established, reliance can be placed upon the statistical measures used to evaluate the level of value and quality of assessment in the residential class. The correlation between the two sets of qualitative statistics support that assessment practices are uniform and proportionate.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:23

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												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	99.49	99.49	102.98	24.24	96.62	75.37	123.61	N/A		34,950	35,990
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	67.44	67.44	59.61	26.07	113.15	49.86	85.03	N/A		20,750	12,368
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	88.44	88.44	88.07	4.53	100.41	84.43	92.44	N/A		27,500	24,219
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A		21,133	21,133
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	106.88	104.10	100.97	3.80	103.09	96.62	108.79	N/A		15,783	15,937
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	39.50	39.50	39.50			39.50	39.50	N/A		3,000	1,185
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	80.20	83.47	86.82	26.00	96.14	49.86	123.61	N/A		27,850	24,179
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	92.44	92.29	91.38	5.61	100.99	84.43	100.00	N/A		25,377	23,190
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	101.75	87.95	97.31	19.55	90.38	39.50	108.79	N/A		12,587	12,249
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	84.73	85.12	87.23	17.98	97.58	49.86	123.61	49.86 to 123.61		27,733	24,192
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	103.44	103.07	100.67	4.60	102.38	96.62	108.79	N/A		17,120	17,236
____ALL____	_____											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79		21,625	19,571

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
CURTIS	3	106.88	104.10	100.97	3.80	103.09	96.62	108.79	N/A		15,783	15,937
EUSTIS	5	84.43	83.66	86.31	19.76	96.93	49.86	123.61	N/A		28,280	24,409
MAYWOOD	2	96.22	96.22	95.91	3.93	100.33	92.44	100.00	N/A		23,066	22,122
RURAL	1	39.50	39.50	39.50			39.50	39.50	N/A		3,000	1,185
____ALL____	_____											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79		21,625	19,571

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
1	10	94.53	92.30	91.15	15.74	101.26	49.86	123.61	75.37 to 108.79		23,488	21,410
3	1	39.50	39.50	39.50			39.50	39.50	N/A		3,000	1,185
____ALL____	_____											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79		21,625	19,571

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:23

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	9	92.44	90.68	90.98	16.15	99.68	49.86	123.61	75.37 to 108.79	25,809	23,480
2	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
____ALL____	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	2	96.22	96.22	95.91	3.93	100.33	92.44	100.00	N/A	23,066	22,122
32-0095	6	79.90	76.30	85.34	26.77	89.41	39.50	123.61	39.50 to 123.61	24,066	20,538
32-0125	3	106.88	104.10	100.97	3.80	103.09	96.62	108.79	N/A	15,783	15,937
33-0018											
33-0021											
37-0030											
43-0079											
73-0017											
73-0179											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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	8	88.74	84.09	88.84	24.39	94.65	39.50	123.61	39.50 to 123.61	20,391	18,115
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	96.62	96.62	96.62			96.62	96.62	N/A	30,000	28,986
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	30,000	25,328
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	1	108.79	108.79	108.79			108.79	108.79	N/A	14,750	16,046
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:23

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
10000 TO 29999	5	92.44	92.33	90.54	10.47	101.97	75.37	108.79	N/A	20,456	18,521
30000 TO 59999	4	90.53	88.63	91.32	23.73	97.05	49.86	123.61	N/A	32,500	29,679
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
5000 TO 9999	1	85.03	85.03	85.03			85.03	85.03	N/A	11,500	9,778
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	85.03	77.14	80.36	26.41	95.99	39.50	106.88	N/A	5,700	4,580
10000 TO 29999	7	92.44	86.79	84.13	14.80	103.15	49.86	108.79	49.86 to 108.79	25,826	21,728
30000 TO 59999	1	123.61	123.61	123.61			123.61	123.61	N/A	40,000	49,443
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
20	4	84.73	86.21	85.13	7.44	101.26	75.37	100.00	N/A	23,133	19,694
30	5	96.62	94.26	94.84	18.65	99.39	49.86	123.61	N/A	27,950	26,509
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
343	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	21,133	21,133
344	1	108.79	108.79	108.79			108.79	108.79	N/A	14,750	16,046
353	5	85.03	86.10	88.90	22.35	96.85	49.86	123.61	N/A	28,280	25,140
446	1	92.44	92.44	92.44			92.44	92.44	N/A	25,000	23,111
528	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	30,000	25,328
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:23

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	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571
04											
ALL	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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

Commercial

Only routine maintenance was completed for 2009. A contracted appraiser has been retained to complete a county wide reappraisal of the commercial class for 2010. A new motel in the City of Curtis was appraised by the contracted appraiser for 2009; this project has been placed under tax increment financing and will not appear as growth on the abstract.

2009 Assessment Survey for Frontier County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	The assessor and the deputy.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The assessor and the deputy.
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?
	2003
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?
	Income and expense information is typically not available with the limited number of sales in Frontier County.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach is used, as there is typically not enough market information to compare sales.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	There are five towns or villages with subclasses within them.
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Assessor locations are defined by geographical boundaries and similar characteristics.
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?
	No, in a rural setting, subclasses of commercial property do not have similar value characteristics, and cannot be valued the same county wide. The value of commercial property in rural areas is strongly impacted by factors such as availability of suitable facilities and the size of the population base.
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>)
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
2	0	1	3

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:56

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	99.49	99.49	102.98	24.24	96.62	75.37	123.61	N/A	34,950	35,990
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	67.44	67.44	59.61	26.07	113.15	49.86	85.03	N/A	20,750	12,368
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	88.44	88.44	88.07	4.53	100.41	84.43	92.44	N/A	27,500	24,219
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	21,133	21,133
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	106.88	104.10	100.97	3.80	103.09	96.62	108.79	N/A	15,783	15,937
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	39.50	39.50	39.50			39.50	39.50	N/A	3,000	1,185
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	80.20	83.47	86.82	26.00	96.14	49.86	123.61	N/A	27,850	24,179
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	92.44	92.29	91.38	5.61	100.99	84.43	100.00	N/A	25,377	23,190
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	101.75	87.95	97.31	19.55	90.38	39.50	108.79	N/A	12,587	12,249
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	84.73	85.12	87.23	17.98	97.58	49.86	123.61	49.86 to 123.61	27,733	24,192
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	103.44	103.07	100.67	4.60	102.38	96.62	108.79	N/A	17,120	17,236
____ALL____	_____										
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CURTIS	3	106.88	104.10	100.97	3.80	103.09	96.62	108.79	N/A	15,783	15,937
EUSTIS	5	84.43	83.66	86.31	19.76	96.93	49.86	123.61	N/A	28,280	24,409
MAYWOOD	2	96.22	96.22	95.91	3.93	100.33	92.44	100.00	N/A	23,066	22,122
RURAL	1	39.50	39.50	39.50			39.50	39.50	N/A	3,000	1,185
____ALL____	_____										
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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	10	94.53	92.30	91.15	15.74	101.26	49.86	123.61	75.37 to 108.79	23,488	21,410
3	1	39.50	39.50	39.50			39.50	39.50	N/A	3,000	1,185
____ALL____	_____										
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:56

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	9	92.44	90.68	90.98	16.15	99.68	49.86	123.61	75.37 to 108.79	25,809	23,480
2	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
____ALL____	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	2	96.22	96.22	95.91	3.93	100.33	92.44	100.00	N/A	23,066	22,122
32-0095	6	79.90	76.30	85.34	26.77	89.41	39.50	123.61	39.50 to 123.61	24,066	20,538
32-0125	3	106.88	104.10	100.97	3.80	103.09	96.62	108.79	N/A	15,783	15,937
33-0018											
33-0021											
37-0030											
43-0079											
73-0017											
73-0179											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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	8	88.74	84.09	88.84	24.39	94.65	39.50	123.61	39.50 to 123.61	20,391	18,115
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	96.62	96.62	96.62			96.62	96.62	N/A	30,000	28,986
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	30,000	25,328
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	1	108.79	108.79	108.79			108.79	108.79	N/A	14,750	16,046
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:56

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
10000 TO 29999	5	92.44	92.33	90.54	10.47	101.97	75.37	108.79	N/A	20,456	18,521
30000 TO 59999	4	90.53	88.63	91.32	23.73	97.05	49.86	123.61	N/A	32,500	29,679
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
5000 TO 9999	1	85.03	85.03	85.03			85.03	85.03	N/A	11,500	9,778
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	85.03	77.14	80.36	26.41	95.99	39.50	106.88	N/A	5,700	4,580
10000 TO 29999	7	92.44	86.79	84.13	14.80	103.15	49.86	108.79	49.86 to 108.79	25,826	21,728
30000 TO 59999	1	123.61	123.61	123.61			123.61	123.61	N/A	40,000	49,443
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
20	4	84.73	86.21	85.13	7.44	101.26	75.37	100.00	N/A	23,133	19,694
30	5	96.62	94.26	94.84	18.65	99.39	49.86	123.61	N/A	27,950	26,509
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	73.19	73.19	70.79	46.03	103.40	39.50	106.88	N/A	2,800	1,982
343	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	21,133	21,133
344	1	108.79	108.79	108.79			108.79	108.79	N/A	14,750	16,046
353	5	85.03	86.10	88.90	22.35	96.85	49.86	123.61	N/A	28,280	25,140
446	1	92.44	92.44	92.44			92.44	92.44	N/A	25,000	23,111
528	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	30,000	25,328
ALL											
	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

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:	11	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	28.64	95% Median C.I.:	49.86 to 108.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	237,883	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	25.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.72 to 109.28	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	237,883	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.34	95% Mean C.I.:	70.67 to 104.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	21,625	COD:	19.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	19,571	PRD:	96.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.50			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:45:56

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	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571
04											
ALL	11	92.44	87.50	90.50	19.84	96.69	39.50	123.61	49.86 to 108.79	21,625	19,571

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Only the median measure of central tendency is within the acceptable range. However, sale 2008-150 has been identified as an outlier affecting the measures of central tendency and the qualitative measures alike. The removal of this sale brings all statistical measures into the acceptable range, except the weighted mean which is only one point out. The median will be used to represent the level of value in the commercial class. The trended preliminary ratio is somewhat supportive of the median as the level of value.

Because the removal of the identified outlier brings both qualitative measures into the acceptable range, and because of the known assessment practices of the Frontier County Assessor; assessments are determined to be uniform and proportionate.

The preliminary and the R&O statistics as well as the assessment survey indicate that the assessor has reached an acceptable level of value. There will be no recommended adjustment for the commercial class of property in Frontier County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	26	11	42.31
2008	25	16	64.00
2007	27	19	70.37
2006	25	19	76.00
2005	19	17	89.47

COMMERCIAL:Frontier County has a small number of commercial sales. The percentage of sales used has decreased sharply from last year. The assessor has implemented a sales verification process that includes mailing questionnaires to the buyers and sellers, and following up with phone calls to provide clarity to the responses. Four of the sales that were excluded were substantially improved. Were these sales hypothetically added back into the sample the percentage of sales used would be 57.7%. The rest of the sales that were excluded were a mixture of partial interest, legal action, private sales, and one sale with excessive amounts of personal property. An attempt was made to use every sale possible; the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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	92	-1.52	91	92
2008	91.26	9.91	100	92.54
2007	94	0.08	94	94
2006	94	-2.27	92	94
2005	105	-7.21	97	95

COMMERCIAL: There is little difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio, indicating that the sample and the population have been treated uniformly.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	-1.52
0.00	2008	9.91
12.09	2007	0.08
0.00	2006	-2.27
-12.93	2005	-7.21

COMMERCIAL: Comparing the percent change in the sales file to the percent change in assessed value shows that the sales file did not change, while the total assessed value decreased slightly 1.52%. This comparison supports the assessor's statement that only routine maintenance was completed in the commercial class for 2009.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	92	91	88

COMMERCIAL:Only the median measure of central tendency is within the acceptable parameters. The trended preliminary median, which rounds to 91, is supportive of the median and weighted mean measures. Sale 2008-150 is an apparent outlier; the hypothetical removal of this sale brings the mean within the acceptable level at 92%, and increases the median to 95%. The weighted mean increases only slightly but still rounds to 91%, and is not brought in to the acceptable range. For direct equalization purposes the median will be used to represent the level of value in the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	19.84	96.69
Difference	0.00	-1.31

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range; while the price related differential is slightly low. Removal of the outlier identified in table V (sale 2008-150) improves the COD to 15.74 and brings the PRD into the acceptable range at 101.26. Based on the known practices of the Frontier County Assessor it is believed that assessments in the commercial class are uniform and proportionate.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	11	11	0
Median	92	92	0
Wgt. Mean	91	91	0
Mean	88	88	0
COD	19.84	19.84	0.00
PRD	96.69	96.69	0.00
Minimum	39.50	39.50	0.00
Maximum	123.61	123.61	0.00

COMMERCIAL: There is no difference between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics. This supports the assessor's statement that routine maintenance was completed in the commercial class for the 2009 assessment year.

**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:	70	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	29.42	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.92 to 72.02	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.40	95% Mean C.I.:	62.67 to 71.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,341,718							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	90,595	PRD:	102.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:46

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	2	83.38	83.38	84.79	8.02	98.33	76.69	90.06	N/A		50,760	43,040
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	24.84	39.09	55.73	71.42	70.14	19.61	72.83	N/A		140,586	78,355
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	78.56	72.48	81.02	23.09	89.46	8.85	104.58	54.56 to 98.43		155,777	126,212
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	72.86	75.56	77.10	4.87	98.00	71.31	83.20	71.31 to 83.20		59,746	46,066
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	66.49	66.49	68.24	10.50	97.44	59.51	73.47	N/A		40,000	27,295
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	53.81	67.87	78.06	31.59	86.95	46.14	117.41	46.14 to 117.41		124,654	97,303
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	69.42	74.91	69.83	20.31	107.28	51.40	128.23	56.35 to 86.88		163,071	113,872
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	64.10	64.10	65.06	8.50	98.52	58.65	69.55	N/A		121,300	78,918
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	70.55	69.33	61.40	11.26	112.92	57.47	78.77	N/A		175,200	107,578
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	71.46	70.33	66.64	11.66	105.54	49.97	88.08	49.97 to 88.08		113,275	75,483
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	12	56.18	55.68	49.49	19.62	112.51	30.36	94.58	47.22 to 60.39		178,840	88,509
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	66.88	65.65	63.90	9.68	102.75	56.76	79.98	N/A		150,150	95,939
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	74.54	69.48	75.90	21.32	91.54	8.85	104.58	71.31 to 81.93		114,188	86,672
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	68.64	70.73	71.92	20.79	98.36	46.14	128.23	56.35 to 77.84		134,566	96,774
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	29	63.67	63.32	57.20	17.64	110.72	30.36	94.58	56.76 to 72.00		155,304	88,827
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	72.86	71.41	79.17	20.34	90.19	8.85	117.41	59.51 to 81.93		113,044	89,501
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	69.75	71.55	66.97	15.00	106.85	49.97	128.23	63.67 to 77.06		145,013	97,113
____ALL____												
	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83		137,335	90,595

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:	70	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	29.42	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.83	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.92 to 72.02	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.40	95% Mean C.I.:	62.67 to 71.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,341,718							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	90,595	PRD:	102.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:46

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3623	2	75.02	75.02	75.75	2.73	99.03	72.97	77.06	N/A	124,200	94,085
3625	6	65.28	53.65	57.99	26.97	92.51	19.61	79.98	19.61 to 79.98	95,193	55,202
3627	1	88.08	88.08	88.08			88.08	88.08	N/A	2,400	2,114
3629	2	73.91	73.91	63.04	21.86	117.23	57.75	90.06	N/A	187,760	118,367
3631	3	73.23	74.20	73.97	1.68	100.31	72.83	76.53	N/A	151,966	112,405
3635	6	63.15	63.28	58.46	17.91	108.23	47.22	83.61	47.22 to 83.61	142,027	83,034
3795	5	68.64	72.21	73.77	10.79	97.88	62.06	86.88	N/A	161,883	119,425
3797	2	105.07	105.07	107.30	22.05	97.91	81.90	128.23	N/A	77,500	83,161
3799	3	58.92	62.33	61.96	8.23	100.61	56.76	71.31	N/A	50,143	31,066
3801	1	75.79	75.79	75.79			75.79	75.79	N/A	77,800	58,968
3859	3	81.93	87.45	89.63	11.69	97.57	75.85	104.58	N/A	227,333	203,767
3861	3	59.51	71.80	63.64	22.94	112.82	57.47	98.43	N/A	213,333	135,775
3863	4	74.16	71.33	73.46	13.02	97.10	53.81	83.20	N/A	84,850	62,334
3865	1	57.98	57.98	57.98			57.98	57.98	N/A	109,800	63,659
3867	3	76.69	75.41	81.71	7.64	92.30	65.99	83.56	N/A	104,666	85,518
3869	9	64.40	65.67	59.78	18.55	109.86	49.97	94.58	52.31 to 80.89	112,892	67,483
4033	2	65.45	65.45	64.63	10.39	101.27	58.65	72.25	N/A	89,250	57,683
4035	2	30.13	30.13	43.14	70.62	69.84	8.85	51.40	N/A	193,150	83,316
4037	3	65.31	76.29	102.92	36.38	74.12	46.14	117.41	N/A	125,260	128,917
4039	6	66.19	61.86	54.65	19.37	113.19	30.36	78.56	30.36 to 78.56	188,250	102,873
4041	3	47.84	46.01	47.17	15.19	97.55	34.20	56.00	N/A	248,000	116,976
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
2	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

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:	70	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	29.42	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.92 to 72.02	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.40	95% Mean C.I.:	62.67 to 71.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,341,718							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	90,595	PRD:	102.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:47

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	11	66.88	60.09	63.85	20.56	94.12	19.61	79.98	24.84 to 77.06	88,014	56,196
32-0095	27	70.20	71.51	68.52	15.47	104.38	47.22	128.23	62.06 to 76.69	121,350	83,145
32-0125	3	88.08	78.54	61.06	12.33	128.63	57.47	90.06	N/A	192,973	117,826
33-0018											
33-0021	6	62.32	57.88	64.58	25.76	89.63	8.85	83.56	8.85 to 83.56	106,216	68,590
37-0030	3	52.31	51.66	51.60	1.74	100.12	49.97	52.70	N/A	172,160	88,834
43-0079											
73-0017	4	78.89	79.59	81.83	17.32	97.26	56.00	104.58	N/A	222,000	181,666
73-0179	16	67.43	66.46	62.60	25.90	106.16	30.36	117.41	47.84 to 78.77	171,761	107,527
NonValid School											
ALL											
	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	88.08	88.08	88.08			88.08	88.08	N/A	2,400	2,114
10.01 TO 30.00	1	58.92	58.92	58.92			58.92	58.92	N/A	5,000	2,946
30.01 TO 50.00	3	65.99	61.54	59.78	13.31	102.93	46.14	72.48	N/A	19,426	11,614
50.01 TO 100.00	7	59.51	55.04	53.28	31.03	103.32	19.61	78.77	19.61 to 78.77	57,937	30,866
100.01 TO 180.00	25	71.31	68.41	65.10	17.87	105.09	8.85	98.43	63.67 to 76.69	71,821	46,752
180.01 TO 330.00	12	60.02	64.88	57.71	25.64	112.42	30.36	128.23	52.33 to 72.00	176,478	101,846
330.01 TO 650.00	17	65.62	66.41	64.23	16.23	103.40	47.84	86.88	56.00 to 78.56	239,587	153,884
650.01 +	4	93.26	94.19	93.32	18.02	100.93	72.83	117.41	N/A	289,000	269,688
ALL											
	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	2	69.76	69.76	69.79	8.73	99.96	63.67	75.85	N/A	85,575	59,720
DRY-N/A	17	68.64	60.88	56.38	21.88	107.99	8.85	90.06	47.84 to 77.06	178,848	100,830
GRASS	17	59.51	63.23	58.92	23.17	107.32	19.61	94.58	52.31 to 77.84	57,757	34,032
GRASS-N/A	28	70.08	71.37	73.95	17.25	96.50	24.84	117.41	65.62 to 79.98	157,907	116,777
IRRGTD-N/A	6	66.07	77.31	66.08	35.59	116.99	52.33	128.23	52.33 to 128.23	166,437	109,975
ALL											
	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

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:	70	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	29.42	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.92 to 72.02	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.40	95% Mean C.I.:	62.67 to 71.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,341,718							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	90,595	PRD:	102.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:47

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	67.96	60.53	46.07	19.89	131.38	30.36	75.85	N/A	159,662	73,563
DRY-N/A	15	68.64	62.16	59.83	20.73	103.89	8.85	90.06	57.47 to 77.06	171,528	102,620
GRASS	28	65.65	63.83	61.16	20.78	104.37	19.61	94.58	54.56 to 73.23	86,384	52,836
GRASS-N/A	17	70.20	75.64	79.37	17.59	95.29	56.00	117.41	65.31 to 83.56	175,561	139,346
IRRGTD	2	75.57	75.57	65.99	30.26	114.52	52.70	98.43	N/A	163,500	107,887
IRRGTD-N/A	4	66.07	78.18	66.12	36.08	118.23	52.33	128.23	N/A	167,906	111,020
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

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	18	68.88	62.06	57.02	20.67	108.83	8.85	90.06	57.75 to 75.85	149,809	85,421
DRY-N/A	1	57.47	57.47	57.47			57.47	57.47	N/A	515,000	295,962
GRASS	43	66.89	67.62	70.45	19.80	95.99	19.61	117.41	59.51 to 73.23	118,065	83,177
GRASS-N/A	2	82.73	82.73	83.20	1.00	99.43	81.90	83.56	N/A	163,250	135,829
IRRGTD	6	66.07	77.31	66.08	35.59	116.99	52.33	128.23	52.33 to 128.23	166,437	109,975
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	88.08	88.08	88.08			88.08	88.08	N/A	2,400	2,114
5000 TO 9999	1	58.92	58.92	58.92			58.92	58.92	N/A	5,000	2,946
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	73.50	73.50	68.38	19.84	107.49	58.92	88.08	N/A	3,700	2,530
10000 TO 29999	3	65.99	61.54	59.78	13.31	102.93	46.14	72.48	N/A	19,426	11,614
30000 TO 59999	12	75.08	74.22	74.42	10.45	99.73	53.81	94.58	66.89 to 80.89	43,731	32,544
60000 TO 99999	19	68.64	65.28	65.94	27.54	99.00	8.85	128.23	54.56 to 75.85	79,016	52,103
100000 TO 149999	9	69.55	67.26	67.74	13.42	99.30	47.22	83.20	57.98 to 79.98	120,434	81,579
150000 TO 249999	13	64.40	61.48	61.15	14.77	100.54	34.20	78.56	52.70 to 72.00	197,322	120,665
250000 TO 499999	11	72.83	71.53	69.17	29.29	103.42	30.36	117.41	47.84 to 104.58	305,238	211,135
500000 +	1	57.47	57.47	57.47			57.47	57.47	N/A	515,000	295,962
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

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:	70	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	29.42	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.92 to 72.02	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.40	95% Mean C.I.:	62.67 to 71.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,341,718							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.91	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	90,595	PRD:	102.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:47

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	73.50	73.50	68.38	19.84	107.49	58.92	88.08	N/A	3,700	2,530
5000 TO 9999	1	8.85	8.85	8.85			8.85	8.85	N/A	75,000	6,638
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	58.92	51.95	14.20	44.82	365.93	8.85	88.08	N/A	27,466	3,899
10000 TO 29999	9	59.51	54.93	47.12	27.27	116.57	19.61	78.77	24.84 to 73.23	38,537	18,159
30000 TO 59999	24	70.63	68.75	64.67	14.91	106.29	34.20	94.58	60.39 to 76.69	73,687	47,657
60000 TO 99999	9	70.20	71.91	69.67	15.50	103.22	49.97	98.43	57.98 to 83.20	123,614	86,122
100000 TO 149999	13	64.40	66.03	59.40	22.18	111.14	30.36	128.23	52.70 to 76.53	202,763	120,451
150000 TO 249999	7	65.62	65.37	63.40	16.97	103.10	47.84	83.56	47.84 to 83.56	283,902	179,994
250000 TO 499999	5	86.88	89.65	84.64	19.01	105.93	57.47	117.41	N/A	336,000	284,374
ALL	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83	137,335	90,595

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:	87	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	28.50	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.25	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,587,535	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.69 to 69.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,555,535	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.98	95% Mean C.I.:	63.17 to 71.22	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,433,178							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,787	COD:	20.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,415	PRD:	103.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:58

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	83.38	83.38	84.79	8.02	98.33	76.69	90.06	N/A	50,760	43,040
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	48.84	49.91	62.87	56.69	79.38	19.61	82.35	N/A	140,951	88,619
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	10	80.25	75.62	84.77	23.51	89.21	8.85	104.58	54.56 to 103.93	163,432	138,535
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	73.23	75.65	77.36	4.73	97.80	71.31	83.20	71.31 to 83.20	87,569	67,743
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	68.60	67.19	69.05	6.78	97.31	59.51	73.47	N/A	83,146	57,413
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	57.91	66.51	73.29	25.08	90.74	46.14	117.41	52.31 to 83.61	164,066	120,247
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	69.42	73.23	69.65	19.69	105.14	51.40	128.23	56.35 to 81.90	182,045	126,798
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	65.60	70.45	72.57	15.70	97.08	58.65	91.94	N/A	153,869	111,658
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	65.31	61.75	50.78	20.11	121.60	31.41	78.77	N/A	221,051	112,255
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	69.95	69.58	65.51	11.60	106.21	49.97	88.08	63.59 to 77.06	161,745	105,958
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	15	56.36	56.59	57.94	18.04	97.66	30.36	94.58	47.84 to 60.39	347,463	201,332
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	66.88	64.17	58.68	10.31	109.34	52.49	79.98	52.49 to 79.98	334,844	196,500
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	23	76.22	71.83	78.97	20.10	90.96	8.85	104.58	72.25 to 82.35	126,636	100,004
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	28	67.11	70.02	71.20	19.52	98.35	46.14	128.23	58.65 to 73.47	161,645	115,095
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	36	61.99	62.03	58.42	17.68	106.17	30.36	94.58	56.76 to 68.41	281,023	164,177
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	29	72.48	71.93	78.37	19.80	91.78	8.85	117.41	65.54 to 80.89	137,012	107,379
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	30	69.10	69.85	64.97	16.81	107.51	31.41	128.23	63.59 to 76.32	178,699	116,103
<u>ALL</u>											
	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

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:	87	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	28.50	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.25	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,587,535	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.69 to 69.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,555,535	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.98	95% Mean C.I.:	63.17 to 71.22	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,433,178							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,787	COD:	20.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,415	PRD:	103.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:58

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
3623	2	75.02	75.02	75.75	2.73	99.03	72.97	77.06	N/A		124,200	94,085
3625	6	65.28	53.65	57.99	26.97	92.51	19.61	79.98	19.61 to 79.98		95,193	55,202
3627	1	88.08	88.08	88.08			88.08	88.08	N/A		2,400	2,114
3629	2	73.91	73.91	63.04	21.86	117.23	57.75	90.06	N/A		187,760	118,367
3631	4	74.88	81.63	85.24	11.49	95.76	72.83	103.93	N/A		172,055	146,664
3633	1	76.22	76.22	77.72			76.22	76.22	N/A		254,508	197,801
3635	7	56.35	61.85	57.51	17.97	107.54	47.22	83.61	47.22 to 83.61		155,524	89,449
3795	5	68.64	72.21	73.77	10.79	97.88	62.06	86.88	N/A		161,883	119,425
3797	4	79.11	87.51	75.45	22.19	115.98	63.59	128.23	N/A		255,456	192,749
3799	4	60.29	62.16	61.90	7.17	100.41	56.76	71.31	N/A		87,432	54,124
3801	2	67.76	67.76	60.95	11.85	111.17	59.73	75.79	N/A		681,425	415,330
3807	1	52.49	52.49	52.69			52.49	52.49	N/A		1,245,712	656,376
3859	3	81.93	87.45	89.63	11.69	97.57	75.85	104.58	N/A		227,333	203,767
3861	4	75.72	76.84	70.41	24.23	109.13	57.47	98.43	N/A		203,394	143,206
3863	5	69.55	68.65	69.10	14.45	99.35	53.81	83.20	N/A		102,519	70,839
3865	2	44.70	44.70	37.85	29.72	118.10	31.41	57.98	N/A		257,129	97,311
3867	5	68.89	72.71	71.43	7.50	101.80	65.99	83.56	N/A		416,675	297,611
3869	10	64.97	65.66	62.45	16.73	105.13	49.97	94.58	52.31 to 80.89		144,685	90,358
4033	3	58.65	60.98	57.59	11.49	105.88	52.03	72.25	N/A		179,131	103,158
4035	2	30.13	30.13	43.14	70.62	69.84	8.85	51.40	N/A		193,150	83,316
4037	3	65.31	76.29	102.92	36.38	74.12	46.14	117.41	N/A		125,260	128,917
4039	8	70.30	65.26	59.29	16.12	110.08	30.36	82.35	30.36 to 82.35		180,123	106,788
4041	3	47.84	46.01	47.17	15.19	97.55	34.20	56.00	N/A		248,000	116,976
ALL												
	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25		201,787	131,415

AREA (MARKET)

											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25		201,787	131,415
ALL												
	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25		201,787	131,415

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	17	65.54	66.72	64.11	18.36	104.08	31.41	103.93	53.31 to 76.32		467,178	299,497
2	70	68.88	67.31	65.97	20.91	102.03	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.83		137,335	90,595
ALL												
	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25		201,787	131,415

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:	87	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	28.50	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.25	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,587,535	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.69 to 69.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,555,535	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.98	95% Mean C.I.:	63.17 to 71.22	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,433,178							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,787	COD:	20.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,415	PRD:	103.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:58

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	15	61.65	59.52	58.75	18.96	101.31	19.61	79.98	53.81 to 72.97	258,094	151,625
32-0095	34	70.08	71.71	70.16	15.49	102.21	47.22	128.23	64.40 to 76.32	166,026	116,484
32-0125	4	89.07	81.89	68.97	10.23	118.73	57.47	91.94	N/A	188,124	129,744
33-0018											
33-0021	9	58.65	55.51	61.24	26.60	90.64	8.85	83.56	31.41 to 72.25	313,619	192,075
37-0030	3	52.31	51.66	51.60	1.74	100.12	49.97	52.70	N/A	172,160	88,834
43-0079											
73-0017	4	78.89	79.59	81.83	17.32	97.26	56.00	104.58	N/A	222,000	181,666
73-0179	18	69.07	67.46	63.98	23.58	105.45	30.36	117.41	51.40 to 78.77	169,981	108,750
NonValid School											
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	88.08	88.08	88.08			88.08	88.08	N/A	2,400	2,114
10.01 TO 30.00	1	58.92	58.92	58.92			58.92	58.92	N/A	5,000	2,946
30.01 TO 50.00	3	65.99	61.54	59.78	13.31	102.93	46.14	72.48	N/A	19,426	11,614
50.01 TO 100.00	7	59.51	55.04	53.28	31.03	103.32	19.61	78.77	19.61 to 78.77	57,937	30,866
100.01 TO 180.00	25	71.31	68.41	65.10	17.87	105.09	8.85	98.43	63.67 to 76.69	71,821	46,752
180.01 TO 330.00	13	57.98	62.30	53.65	28.02	116.13	30.36	128.23	47.22 to 72.00	194,015	104,085
330.01 TO 650.00	28	66.25	68.18	66.65	17.16	102.29	47.84	103.93	57.75 to 76.53	246,776	164,473
650.01 +	9	72.83	77.75	69.15	20.38	112.43	52.49	117.41	59.73 to 104.58	650,759	450,004
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

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	2	69.76	69.76	69.79	8.73	99.96	63.67	75.85	N/A	85,575	59,720
DRY-N/A	19	60.39	60.02	56.00	24.31	107.16	8.85	90.06	52.03 to 72.97	191,359	107,166
GRASS	19	59.51	62.87	59.56	21.06	105.55	19.61	94.58	53.81 to 76.69	71,283	42,458
GRASS-N/A	38	70.08	72.20	70.27	17.06	102.75	24.84	117.41	65.99 to 76.53	237,359	166,795
IRRGTD-N/A	9	63.59	69.75	63.20	31.20	110.36	31.41	128.23	52.33 to 98.43	374,945	236,960
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

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:	87	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	28.50	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.25	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,587,535	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.69 to 69.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,555,535	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.98	95% Mean C.I.:	63.17 to 71.22	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,433,178							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,787	COD:	20.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,415	PRD:	103.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:58

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	67.96	60.53	46.07	19.89	131.38	30.36	75.85	N/A	159,662	73,563
DRY-N/A	17	60.39	61.04	58.75	23.09	103.90	8.85	90.06	52.03 to 77.06	186,371	109,491
GRASS	32	63.23	63.28	59.54	19.98	106.28	19.61	94.58	54.56 to 72.83	139,618	83,130
GRASS-N/A	25	76.22	76.53	75.93	15.61	100.79	56.00	117.41	66.88 to 81.93	236,250	179,389
IRRGTD	2	75.57	75.57	65.99	30.26	114.52	52.70	98.43	N/A	163,500	107,887
IRRGTD-N/A	7	63.59	68.08	62.90	29.84	108.24	31.41	128.23	31.41 to 128.23	435,358	273,838
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

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	20	66.16	61.12	56.49	21.79	108.19	8.85	90.06	53.31 to 72.97	164,598	92,982
DRY-N/A	1	57.47	57.47	57.47			57.47	57.47	N/A	515,000	295,962
GRASS	54	67.65	68.46	68.17	19.08	100.43	19.61	117.41	62.06 to 72.83	181,352	123,619
GRASS-N/A	3	81.90	80.56	80.80	2.99	99.70	76.22	83.56	N/A	193,669	156,486
IRRGTD	9	63.59	69.75	63.20	31.20	110.36	31.41	128.23	52.33 to 98.43	374,945	236,960
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	88.08	88.08	88.08			88.08	88.08	N/A	2,400	2,114
5000 TO 9999	1	58.92	58.92	58.92			58.92	58.92	N/A	5,000	2,946
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	73.50	73.50	68.38	19.84	107.49	58.92	88.08	N/A	3,700	2,530
10000 TO 29999	3	65.99	61.54	59.78	13.31	102.93	46.14	72.48	N/A	19,426	11,614
30000 TO 59999	12	75.08	74.22	74.42	10.45	99.73	53.81	94.58	66.89 to 80.89	43,731	32,544
60000 TO 99999	19	68.64	65.28	65.94	27.54	99.00	8.85	128.23	54.56 to 75.85	79,016	52,103
100000 TO 149999	10	69.88	68.77	69.63	13.85	98.77	47.22	83.20	57.98 to 82.35	122,595	85,362
150000 TO 249999	19	64.40	65.08	65.54	17.59	99.31	34.20	103.93	56.00 to 72.00	197,344	129,333
250000 TO 499999	17	68.41	68.05	66.46	26.75	102.39	30.36	117.41	51.40 to 83.56	321,828	213,879
500000 +	5	59.73	60.43	61.11	7.54	98.90	52.49	68.89	N/A	1,003,437	613,170
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

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:	87	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	28.50	95% Median C.I.:	62.06 to 72.25	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,587,535	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.69 to 69.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,555,535	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.98	95% Mean C.I.:	63.17 to 71.22	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,433,178							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,787	COD:	20.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,415	PRD:	103.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	8.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:11:58

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	73.50	73.50	68.38	19.84	107.49	58.92	88.08	N/A	3,700	2,530
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	73.50	73.50	68.38	19.84	107.49	58.92	88.08	N/A	3,700	2,530
10000 TO 29999	9	59.51	54.93	47.12	27.27	116.57	19.61	78.77	24.84 to 73.23	38,537	18,159
30000 TO 59999	25	69.95	66.35	62.40	17.95	106.32	8.85	94.58	60.39 to 75.79	73,739	46,016
60000 TO 99999	9	70.20	71.91	69.67	15.50	103.22	49.97	98.43	57.98 to 83.20	123,614	86,122
100000 TO 149999	19	61.65	63.87	57.82	22.06	110.47	30.36	128.23	53.31 to 72.00	208,467	120,526
150000 TO 249999	11	68.41	67.83	65.89	17.07	102.95	47.84	91.94	51.40 to 83.56	283,794	186,982
250000 TO 499999	9	81.93	84.18	80.13	20.33	105.06	57.47	117.41	63.59 to 104.58	356,663	285,803
500000 +	3	59.73	60.37	61.23	9.15	98.60	52.49	68.89	N/A	1,317,563	806,711
ALL	87	68.41	67.19	65.13	20.43	103.18	8.85	128.23	62.06 to 72.25	201,787	131,415

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

Agricultural

A land use study was completed in 2008 using GIS, and the soil conversion was completed to update soil codes from the old alpha codes to the new numerical codes established by United States Department of Agriculture.

A sales study was completed; the study indicated a need to raise both irrigated and grass land values. The dry land values were not changed as the sales indicated they are still at an acceptable level of value.

<u>2008</u>		<u>2009</u>
750	1A1	810
750	1A	810
700	2A1	755
625	2A	675
625	3A1	675
500	3A	540
500	4A1	540
500	4A	540
280	1G1	305
280	1G	305
270	2G1	305
270	2G	305
255	3G1	305
255	3G	305
255	4G1	305
255	4G	305

2009 Assessment Survey for Frontier County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	The assessor and the deputy.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The assessor and the deputy.
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	<p style="text-align: center;">LAND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</p> <p>Land in Frontier County classified as either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved lots by neighborhood 2. Unimproved lots by neighborhood 3. Acreages either as rural residential, suburban 4. Agland 5. Recreational 6. Agland home site and/or farm site <p>If a whole, half section, quarter section, or half quarter section belongs to the same owner; it shall be included in one description. If all lots on the same block belong to one owner, they shall be included in one description.</p> <p>Any item of real property that is situated in more than one tax district, the portion thereof in each district shall be listed separately.</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved lots – land upon which buildings are located or land which has utilities available. 2. Unimproved lots – land without buildings or structures and no utilities available. 3. Acreages – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Suburban acreage is a parcel of land, which the <u>PRIMARY</u> use is not for Ag or Horticultural production and is within a mile of the city limits. b. Rural Residential acreage is a parcel of land, which the <u>PRIMARY</u> use is not for Ag or Horticultural production and is greater than 1

	<p>mile from city limits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Agland and horticultural land – land primarily used for the production of agricultural or horticultural products, including wasteland lying adjacent to it. 5. Farm home site – 1 acre of land that is contiguous to a farm site and upon which is located an inhabitable residence. 6. Farm site – land containing improvements that are Ag or horticultural in nature including an uninhabitable or unimproved farm home site and contiguous to Ag or horticultural land. 7. Market/Sales valuation approach – process of analyzing sales information of similar recently sold properties in order to derive an indication of the most probable sales price of the property being appraised. <p>Classes and subclasses divide Agland in Frontier County. The classes in the county are: irrigated cropland, dryland cropland, grassland and irrigated grassland, wasteland, roads and ditches, and exempt acres. The subclasses are based on soil classification standards developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service.</p>
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?
	Not applicable
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1974, a soil conversion was completed in 2008 to include the new numerical soil codes.
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	GIS
b.	By whom?
	The assessor
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100% complete
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	0
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Not applicable
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?

	Not applicable
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
13	0	8	21

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:	70	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.83	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 82.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.42 to 79.96	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.11	95% Mean C.I.:	71.01 to 80.54	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,036,055							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	100,515	PRD:	103.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:18

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	2	92.93	92.93	93.62	3.52	99.26	89.66	96.20	N/A		50,760	47,523
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	29.26	45.97	65.32	70.33	70.37	23.45	85.19	N/A		140,586	91,830
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	83.32	86.67	92.18	14.61	94.02	64.37	112.79	74.68 to 106.13		155,777	143,597
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	85.44	86.44	87.54	6.96	98.74	73.61	95.89	73.61 to 95.89		59,746	52,303
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	78.32	78.32	80.50	11.15	97.29	69.59	87.05	N/A		40,000	32,200
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	61.57	75.87	86.03	30.37	88.19	52.86	129.20	52.86 to 129.20		124,654	107,240
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	77.21	83.47	77.99	20.34	107.03	59.71	137.70	60.65 to 95.96		163,071	127,185
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	70.65	70.65	72.32	13.47	97.69	61.13	80.17	N/A		121,300	87,728
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	77.50	75.24	66.19	10.65	113.67	61.58	84.39	N/A		175,200	115,972
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	76.07	76.84	73.00	11.94	105.27	58.30	100.92	58.30 to 100.92		113,275	82,688
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	12	62.25	61.44	53.58	20.78	114.69	30.90	105.59	50.51 to 68.93		178,840	95,816
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	73.27	72.98	69.49	12.13	105.02	60.25	89.49	N/A		150,150	104,344
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	84.88	81.12	86.56	16.51	93.72	23.45	112.79	76.05 to 93.00		114,188	98,836
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	74.02	79.23	80.06	21.70	98.96	52.86	137.70	61.13 to 89.22		134,566	107,733
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	29	68.93	69.58	62.10	17.93	112.05	30.90	105.59	61.58 to 76.68		155,304	96,445
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	83.32	82.77	89.25	16.82	92.74	52.86	129.20	73.61 to 93.00		113,044	100,886
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	76.07	78.82	73.92	15.43	106.63	58.30	137.70	71.70 to 84.04		145,013	107,196
____ALL____												
	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08		137,335	100,515

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:	70	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.83	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 82.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.42 to 79.96	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.11	95% Mean C.I.:	71.01 to 80.54	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,036,055							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	100,515	PRD:	103.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:18

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
3623	2	79.38	79.38	80.36	3.40	98.78	76.68	82.08	N/A		124,200	99,807
3625	6	68.49	59.62	63.93	30.39	93.25	23.45	89.49	23.45 to 89.49		95,193	60,858
3627	1	100.92	100.92	100.92			100.92	100.92	N/A		2,400	2,422
3629	2	78.22	78.22	66.14	22.98	118.28	60.25	96.20	N/A		187,760	124,179
3631	3	85.19	85.18	84.95	0.89	100.28	84.04	86.32	N/A		151,966	129,091
3635	6	68.05	70.87	64.59	19.61	109.72	55.60	96.98	55.60 to 96.98		142,027	91,731
3795	5	74.22	81.45	82.74	12.00	98.45	71.70	95.96	N/A		161,883	133,936
3797	2	113.46	113.46	115.81	21.36	97.97	89.22	137.70	N/A		77,500	89,750
3799	3	67.78	71.90	70.96	10.43	101.32	63.35	84.56	N/A		50,143	35,582
3801	1	82.59	82.59	82.59			82.59	82.59	N/A		77,800	64,256
3859	3	93.00	93.95	98.26	13.17	95.61	76.05	112.79	N/A		227,333	223,381
3861	3	69.59	79.10	68.57	21.34	115.36	61.58	106.13	N/A		213,333	146,275
3863	4	82.28	79.99	83.69	12.34	95.57	59.51	95.89	N/A		84,850	71,014
3865	1	68.93	68.93	68.93			68.93	68.93	N/A		109,800	75,683
3867	3	89.66	85.18	90.08	6.14	94.56	74.68	91.20	N/A		104,666	94,288
3869	9	73.57	74.73	67.39	17.62	110.90	56.94	105.59	58.30 to 94.94		112,892	76,076
4033	2	67.37	67.37	66.62	9.26	101.12	61.13	73.61	N/A		89,250	59,460
4035	2	69.10	69.10	63.36	13.58	109.06	59.71	78.48	N/A		193,150	122,375
4037	3	72.40	84.82	113.49	35.15	74.74	52.86	129.20	N/A		125,260	142,155
4039	6	70.43	67.25	58.18	20.51	115.59	30.90	87.05	30.90 to 87.05		188,250	109,519
4041	3	50.51	50.00	50.96	17.66	98.11	36.36	63.12	N/A		248,000	126,381
ALL												
	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08		137,335	100,515

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08		137,335	100,515
ALL												
	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08		137,335	100,515

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08		137,335	100,515
ALL												
	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08		137,335	100,515

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:	70	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.83	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 82.08	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.42 to 79.96	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.11	95% Mean C.I.:	71.01 to 80.54	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,036,055							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	100,515	PRD:	103.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:18

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	11	73.27	66.20	69.64	20.33	95.06	23.45	89.49	29.26 to 82.59	88,014	61,289
32-0095	27	80.19	80.60	76.38	16.46	105.54	55.60	137.70	71.70 to 89.22	121,350	92,683
32-0125	3	96.20	86.23	65.42	13.63	131.81	61.58	100.92	N/A	192,973	126,243
33-0018											
33-0021	6	74.15	74.67	78.53	9.15	95.09	61.13	91.20	61.13 to 91.20	106,216	83,410
37-0030	3	58.30	58.94	58.25	2.65	101.17	56.94	61.57	N/A	172,160	100,291
43-0079											
73-0017	4	84.53	86.24	90.11	19.70	95.70	63.12	112.79	N/A	222,000	200,044
73-0179	16	73.56	73.19	68.38	26.39	107.04	30.90	129.20	52.86 to 87.05	171,761	117,448
NonValid School											
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	100.92	100.92	100.92			100.92	100.92	N/A	2,400	2,422
10.01 TO 30.00	1	67.78	67.78	67.78			67.78	67.78	N/A	5,000	3,389
30.01 TO 50.00	3	74.68	70.28	68.29	13.59	102.91	52.86	83.31	N/A	19,426	13,267
50.01 TO 100.00	7	69.59	60.78	58.56	26.98	103.80	23.45	84.39	23.45 to 84.39	57,937	33,926
100.01 TO 180.00	25	78.48	78.89	74.52	16.42	105.87	36.36	106.13	71.70 to 89.22	71,821	53,517
180.01 TO 330.00	12	70.75	71.50	62.95	23.48	113.59	30.90	137.70	56.32 to 80.19	176,478	111,087
330.01 TO 650.00	17	73.57	73.44	70.63	15.89	103.98	50.51	95.96	60.25 to 84.04	239,587	169,231
650.01 +	4	102.90	105.05	104.24	15.50	100.77	85.19	129.20	N/A	289,000	301,259
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

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	2	69.88	69.88	69.91	8.84	99.95	63.70	76.05	N/A	85,575	59,824
DRY-N/A	17	73.61	68.36	61.20	16.89	111.70	30.90	96.20	60.25 to 82.08	178,848	109,453
GRASS	17	69.59	73.63	69.09	23.16	106.58	23.45	105.59	59.51 to 92.82	57,757	39,904
GRASS-N/A	28	80.18	80.36	82.91	16.72	96.93	29.26	129.20	73.57 to 89.22	157,907	130,925
IRRGTD-N/A	6	71.62	83.39	71.24	35.49	117.06	56.32	137.70	56.32 to 137.70	166,437	118,566
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

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:	70	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.83	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 82.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.42 to 79.96	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.11	95% Mean C.I.:	71.01 to 80.54	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,036,055							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	100,515	PRD:	103.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:18

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	68.66	61.07	46.61	20.05	131.02	30.90	76.05	N/A	159,662	74,413
DRY-N/A	15	74.02	70.50	65.40	15.15	107.80	36.36	96.20	61.13 to 82.08	171,528	112,180
GRASS	28	76.06	74.25	71.28	20.89	104.17	23.45	105.59	64.37 to 86.32	86,384	61,572
GRASS-N/A	17	80.19	83.70	87.79	16.65	95.34	61.37	129.20	72.40 to 93.00	175,561	154,133
IRRGTD	2	81.54	81.54	71.23	30.16	114.46	56.94	106.13	N/A	163,500	116,466
IRRGTD-N/A	4	71.62	84.32	71.24	36.07	118.35	56.32	137.70	N/A	167,906	119,616
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

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	18	73.82	68.90	61.68	15.93	111.71	30.90	96.20	61.13 to 78.48	149,809	92,401
DRY-N/A	1	61.58	61.58	61.58			61.58	61.58	N/A	515,000	317,125
GRASS	43	75.46	77.25	79.73	19.94	96.88	23.45	129.20	69.59 to 85.19	118,065	94,137
GRASS-N/A	2	90.21	90.21	90.78	1.10	99.38	89.22	91.20	N/A	163,250	148,193
IRRGTD	6	71.62	83.39	71.24	35.49	117.06	56.32	137.70	56.32 to 137.70	166,437	118,566
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	100.92	100.92	100.92			100.92	100.92	N/A	2,400	2,422
5000 TO 9999	1	67.78	67.78	67.78			67.78	67.78	N/A	5,000	3,389
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	84.35	84.35	78.53	19.64	107.42	67.78	100.92	N/A	3,700	2,905
10000 TO 29999	3	74.68	70.28	68.29	13.59	102.91	52.86	83.31	N/A	19,426	13,267
30000 TO 59999	12	86.69	85.83	86.37	10.01	99.37	59.51	105.59	78.54 to 94.94	43,731	37,771
60000 TO 99999	19	73.61	74.11	74.60	21.63	99.35	23.45	137.70	63.70 to 82.59	79,016	58,942
100000 TO 149999	9	80.17	76.44	77.05	12.67	99.22	55.60	95.89	61.13 to 89.49	120,434	92,791
150000 TO 249999	13	73.27	67.07	66.81	13.14	100.38	36.36	83.32	58.30 to 74.71	197,322	131,841
250000 TO 499999	11	85.19	78.64	75.98	28.22	103.50	30.90	129.20	50.51 to 112.79	305,238	231,916
500000 +	1	61.58	61.58	61.58			61.58	61.58	N/A	515,000	317,125
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

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:	70	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.83	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 82.08	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,645,499	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.42 to 79.96	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,613,499	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.11	95% Mean C.I.:	71.01 to 80.54	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,036,055							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	137,335	COD:	20.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	100,515	PRD:	103.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:18

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	84.35	84.35	78.53	19.64	107.42	67.78	100.92	N/A	3,700	2,905
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	84.35	84.35	78.53	19.64	107.42	67.78	100.92	N/A	3,700	2,905
10000 TO 29999	7	59.51	56.09	45.02	29.29	124.61	23.45	83.31	23.45 to 83.31	38,691	17,417
30000 TO 59999	22	78.51	78.37	72.85	15.63	107.59	36.36	105.59	66.14 to 89.66	67,296	49,023
60000 TO 99999	9	76.05	73.66	72.53	10.29	101.56	55.60	89.22	61.13 to 82.59	97,684	70,848
100000 TO 149999	18	73.79	75.48	67.78	21.82	111.36	30.90	137.70	60.65 to 84.04	183,791	124,578
150000 TO 249999	7	74.22	72.06	69.88	17.18	103.11	50.51	91.20	50.51 to 91.20	283,902	198,401
250000 TO 499999	5	95.96	98.51	92.91	18.22	106.02	61.58	129.20	N/A	336,000	312,189
ALL	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515

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:	85	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.62	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 80.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,088,089	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.90 to 76.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,056,089	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.99	95% Mean C.I.:	71.37 to 79.93	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,256,033							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	200,659	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	144,188	PRD:	105.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:30

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	92.93	92.93	93.62	3.52	99.26	89.66	96.20	N/A	50,760	47,523	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	57.23	57.22	71.89	53.94	79.60	23.45	90.99	N/A	141,690	101,854	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	10	87.26	89.59	95.65	16.29	93.67	64.37	115.91	74.68 to 112.79	164,200	157,055	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	86.32	86.65	87.70	6.17	98.80	73.61	95.89	73.61 to 95.89	88,282	77,426	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	77.31	77.98	78.32	7.53	99.56	69.59	87.05	N/A	83,833	65,662	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	61.57	75.87	86.03	30.37	88.19	52.86	129.20	52.86 to 129.20	124,654	107,240	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	77.21	81.58	77.05	19.89	105.89	58.54	137.70	60.65 to 92.82	183,726	141,555	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	76.41	78.68	80.65	15.44	97.56	61.13	100.78	N/A	155,650	125,531	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	72.40	66.86	53.93	19.91	123.96	33.33	84.39	N/A	223,560	120,574	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	75.46	75.81	70.94	11.87	106.87	58.30	100.92	63.70 to 84.04	161,800	114,775	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	15	63.12	62.52	63.27	18.75	98.81	30.90	105.59	55.60 to 68.93	350,075	221,491	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	73.27	71.39	65.26	11.53	109.40	60.05	89.49	60.05 to 89.49	335,900	219,192	
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	23	86.32	83.36	89.30	16.04	93.34	23.45	115.91	78.48 to 93.00	127,315	113,695	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	26	74.12	79.18	79.68	20.54	99.38	52.86	137.70	61.57 to 87.05	151,976	121,094	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	36	67.69	68.17	63.80	17.52	106.85	30.90	105.59	61.58 to 74.77	282,678	180,349	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	27	83.32	83.98	90.43	16.87	92.87	52.86	129.20	74.02 to 93.00	125,335	113,341	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	30	74.84	77.01	71.03	17.24	108.42	33.33	137.70	71.70 to 82.59	180,044	127,887	
<u>ALL</u>												
	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188	

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	85	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.62	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 80.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,088,089	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.90 to 76.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,056,089	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.99	95% Mean C.I.:	71.37 to 79.93	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,256,033							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	200,659	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	144,188	PRD:	105.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:30

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3623	2	79.38	79.38	80.36	3.40	98.78	76.68	82.08	N/A	124,200	99,807
3625	6	68.49	59.62	63.93	30.39	93.25	23.45	89.49	23.45 to 89.49	95,193	60,858
3627	1	100.92	100.92	100.92			100.92	100.92	N/A	2,400	2,422
3629	2	78.22	78.22	66.14	22.98	118.28	60.25	96.20	N/A	187,760	124,179
3631	4	85.76	92.87	95.62	9.62	97.11	84.04	115.91	N/A	173,975	166,362
3633	1	87.93	87.93	87.93			87.93	87.93	N/A	259,500	228,170
3635	7	60.65	69.11	63.26	19.35	109.24	55.60	96.98	55.60 to 96.98	156,023	98,698
3795	5	74.22	81.45	82.74	12.00	98.45	71.70	95.96	N/A	161,883	133,936
3797	4	87.47	95.04	80.58	21.05	117.94	67.54	137.70	N/A	259,750	209,318
3799	4	70.21	72.08	71.92	9.28	100.23	63.35	84.56	N/A	87,607	63,004
3801	2	75.10	75.10	68.46	9.97	109.69	67.61	82.59	N/A	684,900	468,904
3807	1	60.05	60.05	60.05			60.05	60.05	N/A	1,250,550	750,934
3859	3	93.00	93.95	98.26	13.17	95.61	76.05	112.79	N/A	227,333	223,381
3861	4	85.19	84.52	75.64	22.23	111.74	61.58	106.13	N/A	205,000	155,056
3863	4	82.28	79.99	83.69	12.34	95.57	59.51	95.89	N/A	84,850	71,014
3865	2	51.13	51.13	40.75	34.81	125.48	33.33	68.93	N/A	263,400	107,331
3867	5	75.31	81.12	77.43	8.34	104.78	74.68	91.20	N/A	420,800	325,807
3869	9	73.57	74.73	67.39	17.62	110.90	56.94	105.59	58.30 to 94.94	112,892	76,076
4033	3	61.13	64.08	60.46	8.78	105.99	57.51	73.61	N/A	183,846	111,153
4035	2	69.10	69.10	63.36	13.58	109.06	59.71	78.48	N/A	193,150	122,375
4037	3	72.40	84.82	113.49	35.15	74.74	52.86	129.20	N/A	125,260	142,155
4039	8	76.01	71.47	63.74	17.36	112.14	30.90	90.99	30.90 to 90.99	180,750	115,204
4041	3	50.51	50.00	50.96	17.66	98.11	36.36	63.12	N/A	248,000	126,381
ALL											
	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

AREA (MARKET)

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188
ALL											
	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

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	15	74.77	75.06	70.14	19.32	107.02	33.33	115.91	60.05 to 87.93	496,172	347,998
2	70	74.69	75.77	73.19	20.23	103.53	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 82.08	137,335	100,515
ALL											
	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

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:	85	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.62	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 80.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,088,089	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.90 to 76.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,056,089	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.99	95% Mean C.I.:	71.37 to 79.93	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,256,033							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	200,659	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	144,188	PRD:	105.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:30

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
32-0046	14	71.12	66.32	65.86	18.29	100.69	23.45	89.49	59.51 to 82.08	265,050	174,566
32-0095	33	80.19	80.81	77.50	16.82	104.27	55.60	137.70	72.56 to 86.32	159,089	123,295
32-0125	4	98.49	89.87	73.81	11.15	121.76	61.58	100.92	N/A	189,730	140,032
33-0018											
33-0021	9	73.61	68.24	67.60	14.91	100.94	33.33	91.20	57.51 to 78.48	318,593	215,384
37-0030	3	58.30	58.94	58.25	2.65	101.17	56.94	61.57	N/A	172,160	100,291
43-0079											
73-0017	4	84.53	86.24	90.11	19.70	95.70	63.12	112.79	N/A	222,000	200,044
73-0179	18	76.01	74.41	69.95	24.08	106.38	30.90	129.20	59.71 to 87.05	170,260	119,094
NonValid School											
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	100.92	100.92	100.92			100.92	100.92	N/A	2,400	2,422
10.01 TO 30.00	1	67.78	67.78	67.78			67.78	67.78	N/A	5,000	3,389
30.01 TO 50.00	3	74.68	70.28	68.29	13.59	102.91	52.86	83.31	N/A	19,426	13,267
50.01 TO 100.00	7	69.59	60.78	58.56	26.98	103.80	23.45	84.39	23.45 to 84.39	57,937	33,926
100.01 TO 180.00	25	78.48	78.89	74.52	16.42	105.87	36.36	106.13	71.70 to 89.22	71,821	53,517
180.01 TO 330.00	13	68.93	68.56	58.07	26.22	118.06	30.90	137.70	55.60 to 80.19	194,979	113,232
330.01 TO 650.00	27	74.22	76.02	73.17	17.09	103.89	50.51	115.91	61.58 to 84.04	251,186	183,802
650.01 +	8	85.46	88.61	76.75	19.39	115.45	60.05	129.20	60.05 to 129.20	684,068	525,038
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

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	2	69.88	69.88	69.91	8.84	99.95	63.70	76.05	N/A	85,575	59,824
DRY-N/A	19	71.70	67.27	60.65	17.66	110.92	30.90	96.20	58.54 to 78.48	192,287	116,618
GRASS	18	71.08	73.58	69.69	21.66	105.58	23.45	105.59	61.57 to 89.66	65,660	45,758
GRASS-N/A	37	80.19	81.39	78.56	16.74	103.60	29.26	129.20	74.68 to 87.93	233,620	183,531
IRRGTD-N/A	9	67.54	75.17	67.72	32.00	111.00	33.33	137.70	56.32 to 106.13	378,402	256,258
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

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:	85	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.62	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 80.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,088,089	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.90 to 76.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,056,089	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.99	95% Mean C.I.:	71.37 to 79.93	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,256,033							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	200,659	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	144,188	PRD:	105.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:30

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	68.66	61.07	46.61	20.05	131.02	30.90	76.05	N/A	159,662	74,413
DRY-N/A	17	71.70	69.04	63.96	16.23	107.93	36.36	96.20	58.54 to 82.08	187,409	119,867
GRASS	30	73.10	73.72	67.72	20.94	108.87	23.45	105.59	64.37 to 85.19	128,977	87,341
GRASS-N/A	25	84.04	84.96	83.84	15.44	101.33	61.37	129.20	74.68 to 90.99	238,261	199,762
IRRGTD	2	81.54	81.54	71.23	30.16	114.46	56.94	106.13	N/A	163,500	116,466
IRRGTD-N/A	7	67.54	73.35	67.35	30.73	108.91	33.33	137.70	33.33 to 137.70	439,803	296,199
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

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	20	72.66	67.81	60.98	16.71	111.20	30.90	96.20	60.25 to 76.68	165,480	100,913
DRY-N/A	1	61.58	61.58	61.58			61.58	61.58	N/A	515,000	317,125
GRASS	52	76.38	78.22	76.73	19.32	101.94	23.45	129.20	72.56 to 85.19	177,689	136,341
GRASS-N/A	3	89.22	89.45	89.51	1.22	99.93	87.93	91.20	N/A	195,333	174,852
IRRGTD	9	67.54	75.17	67.72	32.00	111.00	33.33	137.70	56.32 to 106.13	378,402	256,258
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	100.92	100.92	100.92			100.92	100.92	N/A	2,400	2,422
5000 TO 9999	1	67.78	67.78	67.78			67.78	67.78	N/A	5,000	3,389
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	84.35	84.35	78.53	19.64	107.42	67.78	100.92	N/A	3,700	2,905
10000 TO 29999	3	74.68	70.28	68.29	13.59	102.91	52.86	83.31	N/A	19,426	13,267
30000 TO 59999	12	86.69	85.83	86.37	10.01	99.37	59.51	105.59	78.54 to 94.94	43,731	37,771
60000 TO 99999	19	73.61	74.11	74.60	21.63	99.35	23.45	137.70	63.70 to 82.59	79,016	58,942
100000 TO 149999	10	80.18	77.90	78.69	12.75	98.99	55.60	95.89	61.13 to 90.99	122,891	96,705
150000 TO 249999	18	73.42	72.06	72.06	16.25	100.00	36.36	115.91	60.65 to 77.31	199,816	143,992
250000 TO 499999	16	79.98	75.27	72.30	27.95	104.11	30.90	129.20	56.32 to 93.00	318,197	230,048
500000 +	5	67.54	66.42	67.31	6.30	98.67	60.05	75.31	N/A	1,009,510	679,512
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

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:	85	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	26.62	95% Median C.I.:	71.70 to 80.19	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,088,089	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.90 to 76.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,056,089	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.99	95% Mean C.I.:	71.37 to 79.93	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,256,033							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	200,659	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.70			
AVG. Assessed Value:	144,188	PRD:	105.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.45			

Printed: 03/06/2009 12:46:30

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	84.35	84.35	78.53	19.64	107.42	67.78	100.92	N/A	3,700	2,905
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	84.35	84.35	78.53	19.64	107.42	67.78	100.92	N/A	3,700	2,905
10000 TO 29999	7	59.51	56.09	45.02	29.29	124.61	23.45	83.31	23.45 to 83.31	38,691	17,417
30000 TO 59999	22	78.51	78.37	72.85	15.63	107.59	36.36	105.59	66.14 to 89.66	67,296	49,023
60000 TO 99999	9	76.05	73.66	72.53	10.29	101.56	55.60	89.22	61.13 to 82.59	97,684	70,848
100000 TO 149999	22	73.79	75.37	68.71	20.14	109.70	30.90	137.70	60.65 to 84.04	184,761	126,941
150000 TO 249999	11	74.22	71.27	66.89	22.92	106.54	33.33	100.78	50.51 to 91.20	292,441	195,627
250000 TO 499999	9	93.00	92.94	87.46	19.62	106.26	61.58	129.20	67.54 to 115.91	350,444	306,509
500000 +	3	67.61	67.66	68.02	7.52	99.46	60.05	75.31	N/A	1,327,516	902,989
ALL	85	74.71	75.65	71.86	20.07	105.27	23.45	137.70	71.70 to 80.19	200,659	144,188

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median measure of central tendency best reflects the level of value for the Agricultural Unimproved class in Frontier County. This determination was made based on the data and analysis in the following tables. An appropriate number of sales were used in the measurement of the agricultural class. All three measures of central tendency are supportive of each other. If an outlier, identified to possibly include an excessive deduction of personal property, were removed, all three measures would be within the accepted range. The trended preliminary ratio is also somewhat supportive of the measures of central tendency.

The assessor also considered the minimally improved sample to determine land values for 2009. The minimally improve statistics include 15 additional sales, and are nearly identical to the unimproved statistics, and support the median as the accurate level of value.

Removal of the outlier previously mentioned also brings both qualitative measures into the acceptable range, indicating that Frontier County has achieved assessment practices in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards. No recommended adjustment will be made in the agricultural unimproved class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	110	70	63.64
2008	77	58	75.32
2007	77	48	62.34
2006	68	36	52.94
2005	82	41	50.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:For the agricultural class in 2009, the percentage of sales used decreased but remains reasonably high. Of the 40 sales that were excluded, 35% were family sales or sales of partial interests only, 33% were combination or duplicate sales, and the rest were deed corrections, land use changes, parcel splits, private sales, and land exchanges. The verification questionnaire that Frontier County uses for agricultural sales is a two page document that asks detailed questions including how the selling price was set, how the land is used, how the property was put on the market, if the buyer and seller had any prior association, what factors influenced the buyer to purchase the land, and if any unconventional financing was obtained. An attempt is made to utilize every possible sale; an adequate number of sales have been used for the measurement of the agricultural class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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	69	10.96	77	75
2008	67.72	8.64	74	73.03
2007	74	0.94	74	75
2006	76	-0.03	76	76
2005	69	7.85	75	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: With only a 1.56 point difference, the trended preliminary ratio is somewhat supportive of the Reports and Opinions ratio. The similarity between the two would indicate that assessment actions have been applied to the sample and the population uniformly in the unimproved agricultural class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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)
8.77	2009	10.96
13.02	2008	8.64
1.89	2007	0.94
0.00	2006	-0.03
16.43	2005	7.85

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: In the Frontier County Agricultural Unimproved class, the assessed value in the base increased by 2.19% more than the assessed value in the sales file. Dry land is somewhat over represented in the sales file as it accounts for 32% of all acres sold, while the county overall consists of only 28% dry land; grass and irrigated sales are slightly under represented in the sales file. Dry land values remained unchanged for 2009 while irrigated and grass land values both increased. Because of the makeup of land classification groups in the sales file, one would expect the percent change in the base to be slightly larger. This minor difference supports that the sample and the population have been treated uniformly.

2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	75	73	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the statutory guidelines. The mean is slightly high at 76% and is affected by an outlier. (Sale 70-230 contains a large personal property deduction on the 521; the true selling price of the agricultural land may not be represented in the sale). The hypothetical removal of this outlier does not change the median or the weighted mean, but does bring the mean into the acceptable range at 75%. All three measures of central tendency are similar and support that the median is representative of the level of value in the agricultural class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	20.23	103.53
Difference	0.23	0.53

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both qualitative measures are only slightly high for the agricultural class. Removal of sale 70-230, identified as an outlier in Table V, brings both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential in at 19.30 and 103.12 (rounds to 103) respectively. Assessment uniformity in the agricultural class of property has been achieved for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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	70	70	0
Median	69	75	6
Wgt. Mean	66	73	7
Mean	67	76	9
COD	20.91	20.23	-0.68
PRD	102.03	103.53	1.50
Minimum	8.85	23.45	14.60
Maximum	128.23	137.70	9.47

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The changes between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics support the assessment actions. Irrigated and grass land values were increased as the sales study indicated a need for adjustment. The dry land values remained unchanged for 2009.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 4,058

Value : 334,501,615

Growth 2,676,144

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	74	343,776	14	130,998	13	55,714	101	530,488	
02. Res Improve Land	718	3,515,109	45	481,591	76	1,120,537	839	5,117,237	
03. Res Improvements	725	34,324,734	46	3,938,429	89	4,933,060	860	43,196,223	
04. Res Total	799	38,183,619	60	4,551,018	102	6,109,311	961	48,843,948	679,892
% of Res Total	83.14	78.17	6.24	9.32	10.61	12.51	23.68	14.60	25.41
05. Com UnImp Land	16	66,122	1	4,500	7	38,880	24	109,502	
06. Com Improve Land	125	451,179	2	3,000	13	467,883	140	922,062	
07. Com Improvements	134	9,948,503	3	73,277	28	4,401,824	165	14,423,604	
08. Com Total	150	10,465,804	4	80,777	35	4,908,587	189	15,455,168	921,755
% of Com Total	79.37	67.72	2.12	0.52	18.52	31.76	4.66	4.62	34.44
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	4	36,777	4	36,777	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	9	47,715	9	47,715	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	204	3,605,302	204	3,605,302	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	208	3,689,794	208	3,689,794	26,644
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	5.13	1.10	1.00
Res & Rec Total	799	38,183,619	60	4,551,018	310	9,799,105	1,169	52,533,742	706,536
% of Res & Rec Total	68.35	72.68	5.13	8.66	26.52	18.65	28.81	15.71	26.40
Com & Ind Total	150	10,465,804	4	80,777	35	4,908,587	189	15,455,168	921,755
% of Com & Ind Total	79.37	67.72	2.12	0.52	18.52	31.76	4.66	4.62	34.44
17. Taxable Total	949	48,649,423	64	4,631,795	345	14,707,692	1,358	67,988,910	1,628,291
% of Taxable Total	69.88	71.55	4.71	6.81	25.41	21.63	33.46	20.33	60.84

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	3	43,938	1,245,633		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		3	43,938	1,245,633
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					3	43,938	1,245,633

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	4	2,028,430	4	2,028,430	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	4	2,028,430	4	2,028,430	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	105	0	272	377

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	7	43,090	0	0	2,007	158,019,362	2,014	158,062,452
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	15,421	0	0	654	79,153,988	655	79,169,409
29. Ag Improvements	2	55,955	0	0	680	27,196,459	682	27,252,414
30. Ag Total							2,696	264,484,275

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	7,250	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	1.00	35,865	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	20,090	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.28	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	383	399.50	2,890,625	384	400.50	2,897,875	
33. HomeSite Improvements	457	392.50	18,657,189	458	393.50	18,693,054	1,047,853
34. HomeSite Total				458	400.50	21,590,929	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	48	138.88	94,863	48	138.88	94,863	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	631	2,988.42	2,112,873	631	2,988.42	2,112,873	
37. FarmSite Improvements	627	0.00	8,539,270	628	0.00	8,559,360	0
38. FarmSite Total				676	3,127.30	10,767,096	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,690.96	0	0	5,691.24	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,134	9,219.04	32,358,025	1,047,853

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	141.68	0.19%	114,760	0.20%	809.99
46. 1A	60,077.12	79.76%	48,641,794	83.66%	809.66
47. 2A1	2,047.72	2.72%	1,519,696	2.61%	742.14
48. 2A	939.64	1.25%	632,959	1.09%	673.62
49. 3A1	5,279.44	7.01%	3,562,386	6.13%	674.77
50. 3A	9.56	0.01%	5,162	0.01%	539.96
51. 4A1	1,444.33	1.92%	779,865	1.34%	539.95
52. 4A	5,386.77	7.15%	2,885,565	4.96%	535.68
53. Total	75,326.26	100.00%	58,142,187	100.00%	771.87
Dry					
54. 1D1	732.83	0.47%	315,118	0.50%	430.00
55. 1D	115,628.52	73.45%	49,142,605	77.89%	425.00
56. 2D1	2,087.52	1.33%	855,893	1.36%	410.00
57. 2D	1,303.35	0.83%	534,383	0.85%	410.01
58. 3D1	21,549.18	13.69%	7,326,725	11.61%	340.00
59. 3D	1.63	0.00%	529	0.00%	324.54
60. 4D1	5,109.81	3.25%	1,558,507	2.47%	305.00
61. 4D	11,011.81	6.99%	3,358,705	5.32%	305.01
62. Total	157,424.65	100.00%	63,092,465	100.00%	400.78
Grass					
63. 1G1	565.66	0.00%	172,529	0.16%	305.00
64. 1G	29,241.09	8.04%	8,918,659	8.04%	305.00
65. 2G1	2,556.74	0.70%	779,806	0.70%	305.00
66. 2G	982.03	0.27%	299,531	0.27%	305.01
67. 3G1	4,837.04	1.33%	1,475,340	1.33%	305.01
68. 3G	0.92	0.00%	280	0.00%	304.35
69. 4G1	7,639.80	2.10%	2,330,180	2.10%	305.01
70. 4G	317,754.61	87.40%	96,915,273	87.40%	305.00
71. Total	363,577.89	100.00%	110,891,598	100.00%	305.00
Irrigated Total	75,326.26	12.63%	58,142,187	25.05%	771.87
Dry Total	157,424.65	26.40%	63,092,465	27.18%	400.78
Grass Total	363,577.89	60.97%	110,891,598	47.77%	305.00
Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	156.81	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	596,328.80	100.00%	232,126,250	100.00%	389.26

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.88	664	0.00	0	75,325.38	58,141,523	75,326.26	58,142,187
77. Dry Land	98.77	40,760	0.00	0	157,325.88	63,051,705	157,424.65	63,092,465
78. Grass	32.25	9,837	0.00	0	363,545.64	110,881,761	363,577.89	110,891,598
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	156.81	0	156.81	0
82. Total	131.90	51,261	0.00	0	596,196.90	232,074,989	596,328.80	232,126,250

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	75,326.26	12.63%	58,142,187	25.05%	771.87
Dry Land	157,424.65	26.40%	63,092,465	27.18%	400.78
Grass	363,577.89	60.97%	110,891,598	47.77%	305.00
Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	156.81	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	596,328.80	100.00%	232,126,250	100.00%	389.26

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

32 Frontier

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	42,009,725	48,843,948	6,834,223	16.27%	679,892	14.65%
02. Recreational	3,641,283	3,689,794	48,511	1.33%	26,644	0.60%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	20,563,566	21,590,929	1,027,363	5.00%	1,047,853	-0.10%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	66,214,574	74,124,671	7,910,097	11.95%	1,754,389	9.30%
05. Commercial	14,757,254	15,455,168	697,914	4.73%	921,755	-1.52%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	9,872,506	10,767,096	894,590	9.06%	0	9.06%
08. Minerals	3,126,830	2,028,430	-1,098,400	-35.13	0	-35.13
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	27,756,590	28,250,694	494,104	1.78%	921,755	-1.54%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	93,971,164	102,375,365	8,404,201	8.94%	2,676,144	6.10%
11. Irrigated	53,733,219	58,142,187	4,408,968	8.21%		
12. Dryland	61,867,828	63,092,465	1,224,637	1.98%		
13. Grassland	93,593,352	110,891,598	17,298,246	18.48%		
14. Wasteland	0	0	0			
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	209,194,399	232,126,250	22,931,851	10.96%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	303,165,563	334,501,615	31,336,052	10.34%	2,676,144	9.45%

FRONTIER COUNTY ASSESSOR'S 3-YEAR PLAN

The following is a revised 3-year plan of assessment for years 2009, 2010, and 2011 pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB170, Section 5 and directive 05-4. The purpose of this plan is to update and inform the County Board of Equalization and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division of the progress this county has achieved from year to year. The plan and any updates shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment within Frontier County.

Property Summary in Frontier County (Parcel Summary):

Personal Property

Property Type	Total Parcel Count	Percent Of Parcels	Total Value	Percent Of Total Value
Commercial	146	28%	3,202,298	17%
Agricultural	385	73%	15,937,820	84%
2008 Total	531		19,140,118	

2007 totals: Parcel count: 541 Total value: \$16,826,261 increase in value for '08 by \$2,313,857

Real Property

Property Type	Taxable Acres	Unimproved Parcels	Improved Parcels	Total Parcel Count	Percent Of Parcels	Total Value	Percent Total Value
Commercial		27	165	192	4.67%	14,805,961	5%
Agricultural	596,644	2046	692	2738	66.54% Irrigated= 13% Dry= 26% Grass= 61%	239,716,475	80%
Residential	Urban= 189	121	857	978	23.77%	41,945,062	14%
Recreational	0	4	203	207	5.04%	3,633,553	1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Val	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008 Total	596,833	2198	1917	4115	100%	300,101,051	100%

2007 totals:

Parcel count: 4,128 - decrease of 13 for '08

Commercial: \$13,342,972 – increase of \$1,462,989 for '08

Agricultural: \$224,860,247 – increase of \$14,856,228 for '08

Residential: \$40,485,577 – increase of \$1,459,485 for '08

Recreational: \$3,521,884 – increase of \$111,669 for '08

Total value for '07: \$282,210,680 increase of \$17,890,371 for '08

Misc. Parcel Counts

Property Type	Total Parcel Count	Total Value
TIF	2	Excess= 330,563 Base=19,266
Mineral / Oil Interest	4	3,126,830
Exempt	374	0
Homesteads	116	4,039,684

Applications for 2007		
Building / Zoning Info Applications for 2008	Permits = 40 Found = 15	

2007 totals: TIF Ex: \$330,563 – No change for '08 Mineral:\$565,900 increase of \$434,100 for '08

Current Resources in Frontier County:

Budget: **Requested Budget for 2008-2009 = \$ 140,111**
Requested Reappraisal Budget for 2008-2009 = \$33,500
Adopted Budget for 2008-2009 = \$ 140,111
Adopted Reappraisal Budget for 2008-2009 = \$ 33,500

Out of the \$140,111, \$33,500 of that was requested to hire an appraiser to conduct a complete review of all commercial properties for the 2010 tax year.

Staffing: **Assessor** – Regina Andrijeski, full time,
Deputy Assessor – Connie Aspenleiter, full time
Contract Appraiser –None at this time.

Training: Both the assessor and deputy hold their assessor's certificate and are in good standing with the state and are completing continuing education to comply with required hours to be current through December 31, 2010. So far the assessor has taken the following classes for continuing education: 2007 Assessor GIS Seminar, Sales File Practice Manual, Residential Quality, Condition & Effective Age Seminar, IAAO 101 Fundamentals of Real Estate Property Appraisal, IAAO 300 Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal & Basic Depreciation.

Maps: Frontier County aerial maps are dated 1972 and cadastral maps 1966. Frontier County has contracted with GIS Workshop for their GIS mapping program and as of January 1st, 2008 it was fully implemented. The aerial maps and cadastral maps are no longer updated, due to the fact that all that information is now on the GIS system and kept current on there.

CAMA: Frontier County uses the TerraScan Administrative System. This county began using the system in 1999. As stated above the office is now contracting its mapping system with GIS Workshop. The office server is a Dell and was purchased in July of 2005. The office purchased a new Dell PC for the deputy assessor's workstation in 2007. The office has a Sony digital camera, 8 years old, that we use for taking photos of improvements, upon which are later entered into the Terra-Scan electronic file. The office intends to continuously review and update our equipment as needed to keep our records accurate and the office running well.

Web: Frontier County, with system provider GIS Workshop, now offers a basic web property information service. Any individual with access to the

Internet will have access to county parcel information by going to the following site <http://frontier.gisworkshop.com>

Property Record Cards:

The assessor and the deputy assessor update each property record file, as needed both electronically and with hard copies. Only the most recent data is kept in the record card. Historic information on each parcel is kept in a separate file cabinet from the current files. Each property record file is interrelated through codes and references and contains the following:

1. Parcel information.
 - ◆ Current owner and address
 - ◆ Ownership changes, sales information, splits or additions, and deed recordings
 - ◆ Legal description and situs
 - ◆ Property classification code, tax district, and school district
 - ◆ Current year and up to 4 years prior history of land and improvements assessed values
2. Ag-land land use and soil type worksheets.
3. Current copy of the electronic appraisal file worksheet.
4. Parcel tracking worksheet.
5. Supplemental data - Photographs, sketches, aerial photographs

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

Discover, List and Inventory all property:

Sales review and procedures for processing 521's in Frontier County:

* Current data available on sales file:

1. Agricultural land & Commercial = 3 years of data. July 1 - June 30
2. Residential = 2 years of data. July 1 – June 30

* All sales are deemed to be qualified sales. For a sale to be considered non-qualified or if any adjustments are to be made to the selling price the sale is reviewed pursuant to professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques and through the review documenting sufficient and compelling information regarding the sale. Opinions are based on the results of returned questionnaires.

* All 521's are entered into the computer, however, only the 521's with an amount stated for Documentary Stamp Tax greater than \$2.25 or consideration greater than \$100.00 is captured in the sales file database as a qualified sale.

* If the stated value of personal property is more than 5% of the total sale price for residential property or more than 25% for commercial property, the sale is EXCLUDED unless the sales sample is small and there is strong evidence to support the value estimate of personal property.

* Both the assessor and the deputy process sales. Every transfer statement has the following work done: Updates made to the property record card, electronic appraisal file, GIS if applicable, and sales book. All sales are now sent electronically to the PAD but we still make a copy of the transfer statement and green sheets and send to our liaison. Sales questionnaires are sent to BOTH buyer and seller of ALL types of property (Ag, residential, commercial). A physical improvements data confirmation sheet is also sent to either the buyer or the seller. When the data sheet is returned the information is compared to that already present in the appraisal file and updated as needed. A record is kept of all individuals receiving a questionnaire and all individuals returning the questionnaire. Our return rate on the verification questionnaires is at 37% this year. The office also initiates phone contact with the buyer and seller on any sales with questions or concerns. All sales whether qualified or not are recorded in the TerraScan computer sales file. The Treasurer's office, FSA, and the NRD office are informed of ownership changes. Lastly the offices sales spreadsheet, used to determine sales ratios, is updated.

Building Permits / Information Sheets:

* No building amounting to a value of \$2,500 or more shall be erected, or structurally altered or repaired, and no electrical, heating, plumbing, or other installation or connection, or other improvement to real property, amounting to a value of \$2,500 or more, shall hereafter be made until an information statement or building permit has been filed with the assessor.

* Urban Zoning regulations in place in: Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood. No zoning regulations in place in: Stockville and Moorefield. Entire rural areas of the county require a zoning permit when changes are made to the property.

* When there is an increase in square footage of a current improvement or the addition of another improvement to an urban property a building permit is required in the towns of Curtis and Eustis. Information sheets shall be used in a city or village that does not require a building permit under its zoning laws.

* All permits and information sheets are reviewed for percentage of completion and value changes in the fall (November/December), prior to January 1, of the year the permits were turned into the assessors' office.

- * Frontier County data logs include: Spiral pick-up work listing notebook, permit collection envelope, and the electronic Terra-scan permits file.

Data Collection:

- * Real Property Improvements:

Appraisal work is being done on a continuing basis. Our office uses data gathered from sales questionnaires as well as detailed reviews and updates. Detailed reviews include an on-site physical inspection of all improvements, by the county assessor, interior inspections when possible, new digital photographs and any needed updating of improvement sketches. Frontier County is scheduling detailed reviews to be performed on all property types with improvements throughout the entire County on a 6-year cycle. Residential properties are scheduled to be reviewed for the 2009 tax year, commercial properties are scheduled to be done again for the 2010 tax year, rural properties again for the tax year 2011, lake and cabin properties again for the tax year 2012 and a review of all ag parcels for accuracy of land classification in 2013. Then the process will start all over again. Either the county assessor or deputy completes updates annually. All property types are reviewed on the computer for correctness of parcel information/ appraisal record data.

- * Personal Property:

Currently data is gathered primarily from the taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule and previous personal property schedules. Occasionally owners will report new property themselves and we review all copies of any UCC filing statements and zoning permits that are recorded in the clerk's office. Our office sends reminders one month prior to the May first deadline as well as advertises in the local newspaper.

- * Ag land:

As of January 1st Frontier County has fully implemented the GIS system and it is now used to keep all of our land use current by viewing the current satellite imagery for Frontier County.

- * Improvements on Leased Land:

Improvements on leased land have been inspected using the same methods as those used with other real property improvements.

Assessment sales ratios and assessment actions:

- * Our office now performs three review assessments. Two prior to the AVU and abstract submission and one after the Reports and Opinions has been released.

* Reviews of the level of value for all types of property are done using the sales rosters provided by the state and the TerraScan sales statistical analysis function as well as using “what if’s” spread sheet. The office also utilizes our field liaison when needed. We understand that the reliability of the ratio studies depends on representativeness of the sample. Therefore, when information is entered into the sales file and the rosters they are reviewed for correctness several times.

* The appraisal uniformity guide our offices employs and strives to be in compliance with is:

1. Mean / Median / Aggregate lie between:

- * 92-100% for residential properties
- * 92-100% for commercial properties
- * 69-75% for Agland
- * In normal distribution all 3 should be equal

2. COD lies between:

- * <15 for residential
- * <20 for Agland & commercial
- * <5 considered extremely low, maybe a flawed study

3. PRD lies between:

- * 98-103% for all types of properties
- * PRD <98 means high value parcels are over appraised
- * PRD >103 means high valued parcels are underappraised and low valued parcels are overappraised

4. Fairness and uniformity between sold and unsold properties equals a trended preliminary ratio that correlates closely with the R & O median ratio and a percentage change in the sales file and the assessed base would be similar.

Approaches to value:

* Land valuation process in Frontier County is based upon site date and the market (sales) approach for land.

1. Site data

a. Lots evaluated per use, neighborhood / location, square-foot, acre, size and shape, road type and access, topography, improved or unimproved, and zoning. Evaluated through onsite review and measurement (tape measure and GIS), city maps / cadastral maps, property record card, and owner.

b. Agland evaluated per acre, class (use), and subclass. Evaluated through GIS satellite imagery, GIS soil layer and landuse calculator, property record card, and landowner.

2. Market sales data

a. Lots. Use comparable sales within a 2-year period for residential lots and a 3-year period for commercial lots. Only arms lengths transactions used (based upon 521 and questionnaire information). All assessments must be done on or before March 19 of each year. Review ratio studies (mean, median, aggregate, COD, and PRD)

b. Agland. Valued at 75% of actual value. Use unimproved comparable sales within a 3-year period. Use only arms lengths transactions used (based upon 521 and questionnaire information). All assessments must be done on or before March 19 of each year. Review ratio studies (mean, median, aggregate, COD, and PRD)

* Real property, improvement valuation process in Frontier County is based upon the cost approach (physical data), and the sales approach.

1. Improvements data noted includes conforming to highest and best use for site, size, style, construction characteristics, actual age / remaining life / effective age, plus any rehabilitation, modernization and or remodeling
2. Physical data evaluated through onsite physical inspection by assessor and or deputy, photographs, owner, property record card, and questionnaires.
3. Cost approach. Estimate replacement cost of improvements using Marshall & Swift cost handbook for year 2005. Deduct for physical depreciation and or economic depreciation. (Percent depreciation determined by assessor (reviews done within last 3 years) depreciation tables (built in 2004 for homes), age / life components, income loss, cost to correct, completion of improvements, questionnaires, property record card, and the market.)
4. Sales approach. Use comparable sales within a 2-year period. Only arm's lengths transactions used (based upon 521 information, owner/buyer questionnaires or one on one contact with owner/buyer). Valued at 100% of actual value. Review of ratio studies (mean/median/aggregate/COD/PRD).

Customer service, Notices and Public Relations:

* Our office regularly aids realtors, appraisers, insurance agents, title insurance agents, and property owners in locating parcel information by the availability of all our parcel information online. In order to access sales information and more detailed information about a parcel, we have also implemented a premium parcel information portion on our website, that requires a \$200/year subscription. This allows realtors, appraisers and others access to sales information and other information not available to the general public on the website. This has helped in reducing phone calls to the office as well as having to copy and fax parcel information to these people. We currently have 5 premium subscribers.

* In addition to the required publications our office has begun to publish reminders and notices regarding several issues. Such topics include personal property schedule reminders, homestead application reminders, zoning and building permit information, etc.

* In an attempt to educate and inform taxpayers, thus increasing public relations, the assessor produces property information newsletters. One newsletter is mailed to all property owners in their valuation change notice and another in their tax statement notice.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2008:

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD	Trended prelim ratio	Percent change
Residential	92.49% (92-100)	20.79 (<15)	107.45 (98-103)	94.82	3.46
Commercial	92.54% (92-100)	14.33 (<20)	95.56 (98-103)	100.3	9.91
Ag-land	73.03% (69-75)	18.38 (<20)	97.79 (98-103)	73.57	8.64

Functions performed by the Assessor's Office:

Along with the sales reviews, property record keeping, mapping updates, ownership changes and valuing property, the assessor's office will annually:

1. Administer Homestead Exemption Applications. Carry out the approval or denial process. Provide taxpayer assistance and notification.
2. Administer Organization Exemptions & Affidavits to PAD. Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to the county board.

3. Review government owned property not used for public purpose and send notices of intent to tax.
4. File personal property schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and apply penalties as required.
5. Review the level of value for all types of property and adjust by proper percentage to achieve the standards set out by TERC.
6. When applicable prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
7. When applicable attend TERC Statewide Equalization hearings to defend values, and or implement orders of the TERC.
8. Prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
9. Complete valuation reports due to each subdivision for levy setting.
10. Prepare and certify tax lists to the county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Review centrally assessed values, establish assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.
12. Management of properties in the community redevelopment projects, TIF properties, for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
13. Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information.
14. Review of Sales and Sales Ratios especially noting the median, the COD, PRD, and aggregate.
15. Review the level of value for all Agland types and adjust by proper amount to achieve the standards set out TERC.
16. Attend CBE hearings. Prior to hearings assessor will re-inspect all protest properties and bring to the hearings recommendations. Assessor will attend CBE meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide all needed information by the CBE.
17. Perform pickup work. Review improvements or changes that have been reported by individuals or have been found by driving by or have received building or zoning permits on or found on sales questionnaires. The assessor or deputy does pickup work. Pickup work usually begins in October and is completed by January 1.

18. Send out a notice of valuation change to every owner of real property where there has been either an increase or decrease in value.
19. Attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.
20. Complete administrative reports due to PAD. Reports include the Real Property Abstract, Personal Property Abstract, School District Taxable Value Report, Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Summary certificate, Certificate of Taxable values, and the Certificate of Taxes Levied Report, Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions, Assessor survey, Assessed Value Update, Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands and Funds, the Annual Plan of Assessment Report, and the Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property.
21. Re-grade land at owners request or because of changes noticed upon evaluation of GIS maps.

3-Year Appraisal Plan

2009:

Residential. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy was completed in 2008 for the 2009 tax year on all residential properties located in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield, and Stockville. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. Lot data was also reviewed for current and accurate information. The cost and sales value approaches were used whenever applicable to the property.

Commercial. A complete review (reappraisal) is scheduled to be performed for all commercial properties in 2009 for the 2010 tax year. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. Lot data will also be reviewed for current and accurate information. The cost and sale value approaches will also be used whenever applicable to the property.

Ag-land. The new soils layer changing all soil from alpha to numeric was installed on our GIS and all Ag land parcels were re-graded and recalculated according to the new soil layer on the GIS mapping system. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will also be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

Ag-improvements. Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for ag-improvements in 2009 for the 2010 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all ag-improvements for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

Recreational improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) by appraiser Gene Witte and the assessor was completed for tax year 2008 on all mobile homes and cabins located at the Hugh Butler and Harry Strunk lakes. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

2010:

Residential. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor was completed for tax year 2009 on all properties in Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield, and Stockville. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

Commercial. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy was completed in 2009 for the 2010 tax year on all commercial properties. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. Lot data was also reviewed for current and accurate information. The cost and sales value approaches were used whenever applicable to the property.

Ag-land. A complete review of all ag-land in the county was completed by the county assessor and deputy in 2009. Therefore a market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

Ag-improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) is scheduled to be performed for all ag-improvements in 2009 for the 2010 tax year. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches will also be used whenever applicable to the property.

Recreational improvements. Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for recreational properties at Hugh Butler Lake and Harry Strunk Lake for the 2010 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all recreational improvements for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

2011:

Residential. Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for all residential properties in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield, and Stockville for 2011 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all residential improvements for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires, and or building permits or information sheets.

Commercial. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor will have been completed in 2010 on all commercial properties. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

Ag-land. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

Ag-improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy was completed in 2010 for the 2011 tax year on all ag-improvements. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sales value approaches were used whenever applicable to the property.

Recreational improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) is scheduled to be performed for all recreational properties in 2011 for the 2012 tax year. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches will also be used whenever applicable to the property.

CLASS	2009	2010	2011
Residential	Complete reappraisal of all residential parcels in the county for tax year 2009.	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance
Recreational / lake MH	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance
Commercial	Appraisal maintenance	Complete reappraisal of all commercial parcels in the county for tax year 2010.	Appraisal maintenance
Agricultural Land & Improvements	Countywide re-grading per new GIS soil layer. Market analysis by land classification groupings Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements	Market analysis by land classification groupings Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements	Complete reappraisal of all ag parcels in the county for tax year 2011. Market analysis by land classification groupings

Miscellaneous Accomplishments for 2007-2008

- * Created and mailed out information letters to go along with the personal property schedules and valuation changes.
- * As a public service the office began having announcements regarding homestead exemptions and personal property schedule information published in the local newspaper.
- * In regards to the homestead exemption application process our office provides personal assistance not only in our office but also in three other locations throughout the county to better serve this group of individuals.
- * Have a web page up and running that contains parcel and sales information.
<http://frontier.gisworkshop.com>
- * Completed the GIS land use layer and recalculated and re-graded all ag-land parcels. Also sent notification to all landowners regarding the implementation of the new GIS and their new maps and land classifications. Was fully implemented as of January 1st 2008.
- * Posted in our office a large county plat map with the agricultural sales appropriately mapped for taxpayers to effortlessly view recent markets trends.
- * Modified and adopted a new county Ag Land Policy. Completed a county review of all rural residential properties, acreages and certain Ag policies to implement new Ag Land Policy for 2008 tax year.
- * Made miscellaneous changes to Terrascan to fix certain assessment values and listings made by prior assessor –such as Flat Values and Roads.
- * In the process of completing various GIS annotation layers for the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Stockville, Eustis and Moorefield. This layer will allow us to print new maps for each town, with street names, subdivisions, blocks, lot numbers, and lot dimensions displayed.

2009 Assessment Survey for Frontier 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
	0
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$140,111
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$16,500 which includes \$8,800 for GIS, \$5,500 for TerraScan software, \$1,000 for county website, \$700 for network maintenance, and \$500 for other miscellaneous.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$34,150
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,900
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	Not applicable
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$4,500 office supplies, publishing notices, etc.
13.	Total budget
	\$140,111
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes, \$3,349

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software

	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	No, replaced by GIS.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Not applicable
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes – GIS Workshop
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Office staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

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?
	Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Larry Rexroth has been hired to complete a reappraisal of all commercial parcels in the county. The reappraisal is to begin in 2009, and be completed for 2010.
2.	Other services
	Pritchard & Abbott have been retained to conduct the oil and gas mineral appraisals.

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 Frontier County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts