

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

35 Garden

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	76	COD	15.82
Total Sales Price	\$3,204,240	PRD	109.84
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,204,240	COV	27.29
Total Assessed Value	\$3,172,660	STD	29.68
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,161	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.58
Avg. Assessed Value	\$41,746	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$37,865
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	99
Mean	109	Max	242
Min	79.98		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.21 to 103.67
95% Mean C.I	102.09 to 115.43
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.37 to 101.66

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.57
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.65
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.44

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	72	98	15.34	106.96
2007	89	95	28.39	116.49
2006	79	95	18.74	109.1
2005	86	97	17.46	102.86

2009 Commission Summary

35 Garden

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	21	COD	8.54
Total Sales Price	\$384,415	PRD	103.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$384,115	COV	12.02
Total Assessed Value	\$375,068	STD	12.19
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$18,291	Avg. Absolute Deviation	8.45
Avg. Assessed Value	\$17,860	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$40,444
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	98
Mean	101	Max	135
Min	83		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.32 to 105.55
95% Mean C.I	95.79 to 106.89
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.24 to 103.05

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 2.12

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 12.35

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 5.46

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	15	99	15.55	105.79
2007	14	96	10.58	100.82
2006	17	95	17.4	104.05
2005	16	98	19.11	102.05

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Garden 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 Garden County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Garden 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 Garden County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Garden 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 Garden County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Garden County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	26.82	95% Median C.I.:	97.25 to 108.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,204,240	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	97.75 to 103.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,204,240	MEAN:	111	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	104.25 to 117.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,219,797						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,161	COD:	17.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,365	PRD:	110.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.98		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:19

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	7	111.89	105.65	99.58	7.86	106.09	92.40	115.29	92.40 to 115.29		20,571	20,485
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	100.16	104.27	99.31	7.54	105.00	92.94	119.74	92.94 to 119.74		46,634	46,310
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	97.76	98.40	95.75	4.80	102.77	92.27	108.87	N/A		50,000	47,876
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	14	98.21	99.23	98.25	5.54	101.00	83.95	124.82	95.24 to 99.62		52,603	51,682
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	10	97.44	112.58	98.81	18.57	113.93	90.92	229.76	92.68 to 111.23		49,830	49,239
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	104.78	123.17	106.76	25.04	115.37	93.78	242.24	94.58 to 136.85		34,866	37,223
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	112.70	118.99	100.26	20.15	118.68	90.46	213.40	91.53 to 132.25		46,000	46,120
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	14	116.06	118.33	105.35	21.31	112.32	79.98	191.72	90.52 to 141.30		33,946	35,762
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	33	98.59	101.53	98.19	7.15	103.41	83.95	124.82	95.83 to 100.16		44,148	43,348
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	43	106.26	118.16	102.40	22.35	115.39	79.98	242.24	96.52 to 121.36		40,636	41,611
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	38	98.21	108.30	99.54	14.12	108.80	83.95	242.24	96.16 to 100.00		47,330	47,114
_____ALL_____												
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92		42,161	42,365
ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
LEWELLEN	12	110.99	113.55	110.78	11.69	102.50	83.95	141.30	99.62 to 132.46		25,770	28,548
LISCO	2	119.11	119.11	109.93	11.04	108.35	105.96	132.25	N/A		26,500	29,131
OSHKOSH	43	98.31	110.73	99.00	17.80	111.85	79.98	229.76	96.21 to 108.96		37,081	36,710
RURAL	19	96.62	108.90	99.43	15.45	109.52	91.53	242.24	93.37 to 115.05		65,657	65,283
_____ALL_____												
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92		42,161	42,365
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	54	99.83	111.47	100.83	17.66	110.55	79.98	229.76	97.41 to 111.23		34,495	34,781
2	5	107.28	135.64	111.68	30.42	121.46	99.09	242.24	N/A		36,100	40,315
3	17	96.16	101.99	98.19	8.64	103.87	91.53	132.25	92.40 to 115.05		68,294	67,060
_____ALL_____												
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92		42,161	42,365
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	70	99.27	109.09	100.10	15.20	108.98	79.98	229.76	97.25 to 107.28		45,207	45,252
2	6	114.66	132.49	131.13	29.04	101.04	90.92	242.24	90.92 to 242.24		6,625	8,687
_____ALL_____												
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92		42,161	42,365

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	26.82	95% Median C.I.:	97.25 to 108.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,204,240	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	97.75 to 103.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,204,240	MEAN:	111	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	104.25 to 117.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,219,797						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,161	COD:	17.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,365	PRD:	110.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:20

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	68	99.53	111.71	100.11	18.02	111.58	79.98	242.24	96.62 to 108.92	42,297	42,344
06											
07	8	102.68	104.44	103.78	8.03	100.64	92.34	121.36	92.34 to 121.36	41,000	42,548
ALL	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0025											
25-0095											
35-0001	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365
NonValid School											
ALL	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

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	114.27	135.26	115.46	34.32	117.15	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	10,431	12,044
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	10	98.74	112.10	101.73	17.31	110.19	90.46	144.37	94.58 to 136.85	36,540	37,173
1920 TO 1939	25	108.87	112.39	102.92	13.79	109.20	90.52	229.76	97.41 to 115.29	40,624	41,811
1940 TO 1949	5	97.76	97.16	97.68	1.72	99.47	92.57	99.65	N/A	27,790	27,146
1950 TO 1959	4	109.02	110.12	101.67	14.42	108.30	92.27	130.16	N/A	53,500	54,394
1960 TO 1969	6	95.72	96.37	93.03	7.40	103.59	81.80	111.89	81.80 to 111.89	56,256	52,335
1970 TO 1979	7	95.83	100.58	96.83	10.79	103.87	79.98	116.22	79.98 to 116.22	55,000	53,257
1980 TO 1989	6	98.60	102.78	102.39	6.21	100.38	95.24	121.36	95.24 to 121.36	68,166	69,796
1990 TO 1994	1	92.34	92.34	92.34			92.34	92.34	N/A	69,000	63,717
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	95.26	95.26	95.26			95.26	95.26	N/A	155,000	147,651
ALL	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 76 **MEDIAN: 100** COV: 26.82 95% Median C.I.: 97.25 to 108.92
TOTAL Sales Price: 3,204,240 WGT. MEAN: 100 STD: 29.75 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 97.75 to 103.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 3,204,240 MEAN: 111 AVG.ABS.DEV: 16.92 95% Mean C.I.: 104.25 to 117.63
TOTAL Assessed Value: 3,219,797
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 42,161 COD: 17.00 MAX Sales Ratio: 242.24
AVG. Assessed Value: 42,365 PRD: 110.40 MIN Sales Ratio: 79.98

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:20

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	165.90	162.20	169.44	29.80	95.73	83.95	229.76	83.95 to 229.76	2,775	4,701
5000 TO 9999	7	112.59	129.34	131.55	24.67	98.33	90.92	242.24	90.92 to 242.24	6,928	9,114
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	13	119.14	144.51	141.23	34.83	102.32	83.95	242.24	96.38 to 213.40	5,011	7,077
10000 TO 29999	24	109.86	111.87	111.56	11.80	100.28	90.52	144.37	97.76 to 121.51	18,391	20,518
30000 TO 59999	18	99.27	102.84	101.64	9.20	101.18	79.98	130.16	95.24 to 108.92	46,466	47,229
60000 TO 99999	16	95.37	96.31	96.23	5.15	100.08	81.80	121.36	92.34 to 99.62	72,893	70,148
100000 TO 149999	2	94.05	94.05	94.08	1.89	99.97	92.27	95.83	N/A	101,500	95,487
150000 TO 249999	3	95.80	95.89	95.91	0.47	99.98	95.26	96.62	N/A	164,000	157,291
ALL											
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

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	127.17	139.06	128.35	33.56	108.34	83.95	213.40	83.95 to 213.40	2,791	3,583
5000 TO 9999	4	112.24	110.00	108.95	5.23	100.96	96.38	119.14	N/A	7,000	7,626
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	113.43	127.43	116.21	24.94	109.66	83.95	213.40	90.92 to 191.72	4,475	5,200
10000 TO 29999	25	110.75	121.28	113.62	19.77	106.74	90.52	242.24	99.03 to 121.51	16,372	18,602
30000 TO 59999	20	102.11	105.41	103.22	10.90	102.12	79.98	132.46	95.25 to 112.84	44,445	45,876
60000 TO 99999	18	95.21	96.06	95.91	4.80	100.15	81.80	121.36	92.34 to 98.59	76,071	72,963
100000 TO 149999	1	95.26	95.26	95.26			95.26	95.26	N/A	155,000	147,651
150000 TO 249999	2	96.21	96.21	96.21	0.43	100.00	95.80	96.62	N/A	168,500	162,111
ALL											
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	115.05	142.67	135.08	39.20	105.62	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	5,083	6,866
10	3	111.23	106.12	100.95	4.99	105.12	95.24	111.89	N/A	18,000	18,171
20	36	102.22	109.41	101.49	15.19	107.80	79.98	229.76	97.47 to 112.59	36,469	37,014
30	25	98.31	104.20	99.67	9.40	104.55	90.46	132.46	95.80 to 105.96	57,503	57,311
40	3	95.83	95.13	95.54	1.28	99.58	92.94	96.62	N/A	118,000	112,731
ALL											
	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	26.82	95% Median C.I.:	97.25 to 108.92
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,204,240	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	97.75 to 103.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,204,240	MEAN:	111	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	104.25 to 117.63
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,219,797						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,161	COD:	17.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,365	PRD:	110.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.98		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:20

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	115.05	142.67	135.08	39.20	105.62	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	5,083	6,866
100	8	102.68	102.85	95.27	9.04	107.95	81.80	119.14	81.80 to 119.14	32,500	30,963
101	45	98.59	107.60	100.96	13.87	106.58	79.98	229.76	96.38 to 108.92	47,072	47,525
102	2	99.80	99.80	99.86	0.36	99.94	99.44	100.16	N/A	53,770	53,695
103	1	95.25	95.25	95.25			95.25	95.25	N/A	56,000	53,340
104	11	99.03	107.97	99.06	12.73	108.99	93.37	136.85	93.78 to 132.25	56,063	55,535
ALL	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	115.05	142.67	135.08	39.20	105.62	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	5,083	6,866
15	13	111.23	118.55	107.99	17.20	109.78	90.52	229.76	96.38 to 124.82	16,569	17,893
20	14	110.73	112.57	106.11	12.25	106.09	91.53	144.37	95.24 to 136.85	29,321	31,112
25	4	109.21	108.17	98.77	18.66	109.52	81.80	132.46	N/A	45,350	44,791
30	29	98.31	99.94	99.09	6.44	100.86	79.98	122.20	95.25 to 100.16	53,334	52,847
40	5	95.83	102.22	97.66	7.99	104.67	92.68	130.16	N/A	113,500	110,841
50	2	94.10	94.10	94.46	1.23	99.62	92.94	95.26	N/A	118,500	111,930
ALL	76	99.53	110.94	100.49	17.00	110.40	79.98	242.24	97.25 to 108.92	42,161	42,365

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

Residential

After Garden County completed a countywide reappraisal for all residential properties in 2008 the assessor reviewed the most recent market data to equalize the property class for 2009. The assessor location of Lewellen was adjusted by increasing the economic depreciation to the improvements in this village which decreased valuations. A 25% economic depreciation is used countywide for 2009 to equalize the residential property class.

2009 Assessment Survey for Garden County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and Jerry Knoche
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and Jerry Knoche
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June/2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2008
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Cost Approach and Sales Comparison
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	4 Assessor Locations; Oshkosh, Lewellen, Lisco and Rural Residential
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These are defined by market and location
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.)
	N/A
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, the same costing tables are used to value both.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
16	0	2	18

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.29	95% Median C.I.:	96.21 to 103.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,204,240	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	29.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.37 to 101.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,204,240	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.58	95% Mean C.I.:	102.09 to 115.43
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,172,660						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,161	COD:	15.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	41,745	PRD:	109.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.98		

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:36

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	7	103.67	104.47	99.18	8.49	105.33	92.40	115.29	92.40 to 115.29	20,571	20,403
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	100.16	104.27	99.31	7.54	105.00	92.94	119.74	92.94 to 119.74	46,634	46,310
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	97.76	96.36	91.66	6.90	105.13	82.04	108.87	N/A	50,000	45,829
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	14	96.01	98.14	97.15	5.94	101.02	83.95	122.43	91.95 to 99.44	52,603	51,103
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	10	96.79	111.03	98.44	17.43	112.79	90.92	229.76	92.68 to 108.92	49,830	49,054
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	104.78	123.17	106.76	25.04	115.37	93.78	242.24	94.58 to 136.85	34,866	37,223
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	108.25	118.10	99.82	21.80	118.32	90.46	213.40	91.53 to 132.25	46,000	45,915
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	14	99.26	110.65	100.23	20.76	110.39	79.98	191.72	90.52 to 140.07	33,946	34,025
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	33	98.31	100.51	96.89	7.48	103.74	82.04	122.43	95.25 to 100.16	44,148	42,775
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	43	98.58	115.09	100.79	22.20	114.19	79.98	242.24	96.16 to 114.03	40,636	40,955
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	38	97.44	107.23	98.42	14.36	108.95	82.04	242.24	95.26 to 99.44	47,330	46,582
____ALL____											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
LEWELLEN	12	97.97	102.15	100.83	9.59	101.31	83.95	140.07	93.15 to 104.78	25,770	25,984
LISCO	2	119.11	119.11	109.93	11.04	108.35	105.96	132.25	N/A	26,500	29,131
OSHKOSH	43	98.31	110.36	98.65	17.42	111.87	79.98	229.76	96.21 to 108.96	37,081	36,579
RURAL	19	96.62	108.23	98.57	15.88	109.80	82.04	242.24	93.37 to 115.05	65,657	64,719
____ALL____											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	54	98.04	108.64	98.87	15.92	109.87	79.98	229.76	96.21 to 103.67	34,495	34,106
2	5	107.28	135.16	111.41	29.98	121.32	99.09	242.24	N/A	36,100	40,220
3	17	96.16	101.39	97.31	9.27	104.19	82.04	132.25	92.40 to 115.05	68,294	66,458
____ALL____											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	70	98.04	106.73	98.61	13.88	108.23	79.98	229.76	96.21 to 100.00	45,207	44,579
2	6	114.66	132.49	131.13	29.04	101.04	90.92	242.24	90.92 to 242.24	6,625	8,687
____ALL____											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

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: 76 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 27.29 95% Median C.I.: 96.21 to 103.67
 TOTAL Sales Price: 3,204,240 WGT. MEAN: 99 STD: 29.68 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 96.37 to 101.66
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 3,204,240 MEAN: 109 AVG.ABS.DEV: 15.58 95% Mean C.I.: 102.09 to 115.43
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 3,172,660
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 42,161 COD: 15.82 MAX Sales Ratio: 242.24
 AVG. Assessed Value: 41,745 PRD: 109.84 MIN Sales Ratio: 79.98

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:37

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	68	98.59	109.82	98.70	16.95	111.26	79.98	242.24	96.38 to 105.96	42,297	41,749
06											
07	8	96.56	99.75	101.73	5.82	98.05	92.34	121.36	92.34 to 121.36	41,000	41,710
ALL	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0025											
25-0095											
35-0001	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745
NonValid School											
ALL	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

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	114.27	135.26	115.46	34.32	117.15	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	10,431	12,044
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	10	98.03	108.71	99.42	13.98	109.35	90.46	144.37	94.58 to 136.85	36,540	36,326
1920 TO 1939	25	105.96	109.68	101.34	13.73	108.23	90.52	229.76	95.80 to 112.59	40,624	41,168
1940 TO 1949	5	97.76	97.16	97.68	1.72	99.47	92.57	99.65	N/A	27,790	27,146
1950 TO 1959	4	105.28	103.53	94.25	13.53	109.84	82.04	121.51	N/A	53,500	50,424
1960 TO 1969	6	95.72	95.00	92.86	5.97	102.31	81.80	103.67	81.80 to 103.67	56,256	52,239
1970 TO 1979	7	95.77	98.37	96.35	8.50	102.09	79.98	116.22	79.98 to 116.22	55,000	52,992
1980 TO 1989	6	96.99	100.47	101.34	5.63	99.14	93.15	121.36	93.15 to 121.36	68,166	69,083
1990 TO 1994	1	92.34	92.34	92.34			92.34	92.34	N/A	69,000	63,717
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	95.26	95.26	95.26			95.26	95.26	N/A	155,000	147,651
ALL	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	27.29	95% Median C.I.:	96.21 to 103.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,204,240	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	29.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.37 to 101.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,204,240	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.58	95% Mean C.I.:	102.09 to 115.43
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,172,660						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	42,161	COD:	15.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	242.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	41,745	PRD:	109.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.98		

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:37

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	165.90	162.20	169.44	29.80	95.73	83.95	229.76	83.95 to 229.76	2,775	4,701
5000 TO 9999	7	112.59	128.17	130.36	25.71	98.32	90.92	242.24	90.92 to 242.24	6,928	9,032
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	13	119.14	143.87	140.35	35.36	102.51	83.95	242.24	96.38 to 213.40	5,011	7,033
10000 TO 29999	24	99.34	106.95	106.34	11.23	100.57	90.52	144.37	97.25 to 115.29	18,391	19,557
30000 TO 59999	18	99.27	101.67	100.70	8.58	100.96	79.98	122.20	93.78 to 108.92	46,466	46,792
60000 TO 99999	16	93.97	95.82	95.77	5.08	100.05	81.80	121.36	91.95 to 98.59	72,893	69,811
100000 TO 149999	2	88.94	88.94	89.03	7.75	99.89	82.04	95.83	N/A	101,500	90,368
150000 TO 249999	3	95.80	95.89	95.91	0.47	99.98	95.26	96.62	N/A	164,000	157,291
ALL											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

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	127.17	139.06	128.35	33.56	108.34	83.95	213.40	83.95 to 213.40	2,791	3,583
5000 TO 9999	4	108.13	107.95	106.90	7.32	100.98	96.38	119.14	N/A	7,000	7,482
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	113.43	126.61	114.93	25.66	110.17	83.95	213.40	90.92 to 191.72	4,475	5,143
10000 TO 29999	26	99.79	117.17	109.40	21.13	107.10	90.52	242.24	97.35 to 119.74	16,703	18,273
30000 TO 59999	19	99.44	102.88	101.46	9.45	101.40	79.98	124.63	93.78 to 112.84	45,468	46,133
60000 TO 99999	18	93.97	95.06	94.77	5.33	100.30	81.80	121.36	91.95 to 97.41	76,071	72,095
100000 TO 149999	1	95.26	95.26	95.26			95.26	95.26	N/A	155,000	147,651
150000 TO 249999	2	96.21	96.21	96.21	0.43	100.00	95.80	96.62	N/A	168,500	162,111
ALL											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	115.05	142.67	135.08	39.20	105.62	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	5,083	6,866
10	3	95.77	98.23	96.45	2.93	101.84	95.24	103.67	N/A	18,000	17,361
20	36	99.27	107.08	99.57	14.54	107.53	79.98	229.76	96.16 to 108.92	36,469	36,314
30	25	97.41	101.88	98.31	7.61	103.63	90.46	132.25	95.26 to 100.16	57,503	56,530
40	3	95.83	95.13	95.54	1.28	99.58	92.94	96.62	N/A	118,000	112,731
ALL											
	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 76 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 27.29 95% Median C.I.: 96.21 to 103.67
TOTAL Sales Price: 3,204,240 WGT. MEAN: 99 STD: 29.68 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 96.37 to 101.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 3,204,240 MEAN: 109 AVG.ABS.DEV: 15.58 95% Mean C.I.: 102.09 to 115.43
TOTAL Assessed Value: 3,172,660
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 42,161 COD: 15.82 MAX Sales Ratio: 242.24
AVG. Assessed Value: 41,745 PRD: 109.84 MIN Sales Ratio: 79.98

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:37

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	115.05	142.67	135.08	39.20	105.62	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	5,083	6,866
100	8	96.56	98.15	92.69	6.90	105.89	81.80	119.14	81.80 to 119.14	32,500	30,124
101	45	97.76	104.81	99.08	12.06	105.79	79.98	229.76	96.16 to 105.96	47,072	46,638
102	2	99.80	99.80	99.86	0.36	99.94	99.44	100.16	N/A	53,770	53,695
103	1	95.25	95.25	95.25			95.25	95.25	N/A	56,000	53,340
104	11	99.03	107.75	98.98	12.52	108.86	93.37	136.85	93.78 to 132.25	56,063	55,491
ALL	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	115.05	142.67	135.08	39.20	105.62	83.95	242.24	90.92 to 213.40	5,083	6,866
15	13	99.93	115.72	105.81	19.49	109.36	90.52	229.76	96.16 to 122.43	16,569	17,532
20	14	108.08	108.88	103.51	11.68	105.18	91.53	144.37	93.15 to 119.74	29,321	30,351
25	4	96.18	99.70	94.10	12.38	105.95	81.80	124.63	N/A	45,350	42,674
30	29	97.41	99.01	97.94	6.71	101.09	79.98	122.20	94.58 to 100.00	53,334	52,237
40	5	95.83	98.99	96.66	4.63	102.41	92.68	114.03	N/A	113,500	109,712
50	2	94.10	94.10	94.46	1.23	99.62	92.94	95.26	N/A	118,500	111,930
ALL	76	98.44	108.76	99.01	15.82	109.84	79.98	242.24	96.21 to 103.67	42,161	41,745

2009 Correlation Section
for Garden County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:Garden County applied a new residential appraisal for all properties in 2008 and reviewed market data for 2009. The assessor applied a 25% economic depreciation to improvements within the small village of Lewellen to equalize this assessor location. This improved the level of value from the preliminary statistics. In reviewing the study years, the average adjusted sale price has decreased from one year to the most recent year also. Through the qualified residential statistics and the known assessment achievements in Garden County, the median at 98 best describes the level of value. It is believed the county has attained uniform and proportionate assessment practices for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	122	76	62.30
2008	128	72	56.25
2007	130	89	68.46
2006	112	79	70.54
2005	123	86	69.92

RESIDENTIAL:Garden County improved the percent of sales utilized by over 6 percent from 2008. Even though the total number of sales declined, the assessor increased the qualified sales for the purposes of statistical measurements.

2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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 Garden County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	100	-1.48	99	98
2008	87.97	17.73	104	98.21
2007	94	2.58	97	95
2006	94	1.61	96	95
2005	90	4.98	95	97

RESIDENTIAL: The exact R&O Median calculates at 98.44%, which is nearly identical to the Trended Preliminary Ratio. Rounding the mathematically number creates a 1% difference. The assessment actions taken in 2009 were fairly done as represented through the Trended Preliminary Ratio.

2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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 Garden 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)
- .98	2009	-1.48
10.81	2008	17.73
0.92	2007	2.58
3.22	2006	1.61
6.72	2005	4.98

RESIDENTIAL: The decreased percent change in the sales file is similar to the percent change in the overall population (excl. growth). These statistics would reflect the assessors actions to apply a 25% economic depreciation to the assessor location of Lewellen. Both support uniform and proportionate treatment to sold and unsold properties.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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 Garden County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	99	109

RESIDENTIAL: The median and weighted mean are statistical only .57 points apart and both strongly support each other. The mean is subject to outliers reflecting above the acceptable range. The Trended Preliminary Ratio strongly supports both the median and weighted mean at 98.52. For direct equalization purposes the median will be use to best describe the level of value for the residential class of property in Garden County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	15.82	109.84
Difference	0.82	6.84

RESIDENTIAL: Although the calculations round to above the parameters used, this is no indication that the county has not met qualitative measurement standards. With few sales in various assessor locations, (such as Lisco with 2) a review of the sample determines these sales in small locations may not accurately reflect the population of the base. Based on the known assessment practices of the assessor, and no other information available, it is believed the county has uniform and proportionate assessment practices for residential property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	76	76	0
Median	100	98	-2
Wgt. Mean	100	99	-1
Mean	111	109	-2
COD	17.00	15.82	-1.18
PRD	110.40	109.84	-0.56
Minimum	79.98	79.98	0.00
Maximum	242.24	242.24	0.00

RESIDENTIAL:Table VII accurately represents the reported actions taken since the date of Preliminary Statistics. Only improvements within Lewellen received a 25% decrease due to economic depreciation, which in turn lowered the R&O statistics to be equalized for this assessor location.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	76	76	0
Median	98	105	-7
Wgt. Mean	99	100	-1
Mean	109	114	-5
COD	15.82	30.52	-14.70
PRD	109.84	114.38	-4.54
Minimum	79.98	49.30	30.68
Maximum	242.24	265.52	-23.28

Table VIII is a result of comparing the R&O statistics to a set of trending statistics that are generated beginning with the taxable value of the sold property prior to the sale date. Each year thereafter the value is trended by the county overall percent of change in the residential base.

After reviewing the trended sample and the county residential base, it is believed that the sample is not representative of the population. Only two sales are representing Lisco and 12 sales are included in Lewellen. These may be outliers that are skewing the trended median statistic. The rural residential properties are only represented with 19 sales. Garden County is a large county in the rural areas and it is apparent the 19 is not representative of the base.

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:	24	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	138.60	95% Median C.I.:	61.47 to 107.03	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	419,715	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	160.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.14 to 95.46	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	424,415	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	57.35	95% Mean C.I.:	48.09 to 183.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	332,317							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	17,683	COD:	58.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	855.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	13,846	PRD:	148.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.06			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:26

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	1	79.20	79.20	79.20			79.20	79.20	N/A	10,000	7,920
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	98.56	98.56	98.66	0.33	99.90	98.23	98.88	N/A	19,000	18,745
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	119.70	119.70	119.70			119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,197
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	97.88	99.81	107.52	23.94	92.83	65.63	135.93	N/A	17,833	19,174
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	115.71	115.71	115.71			115.71	115.71	N/A	3,500	4,050
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	73.95	229.45	75.67	230.09	303.22	45.73	855.00	N/A	12,860	9,731
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	80.35	80.35	64.32	23.50	124.92	61.47	99.24	N/A	29,807	19,173
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	79.68	81.64	70.55	44.36	115.72	20.31	145.61	20.31 to 145.61	13,250	9,348
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	37.59	37.59	25.62	57.27	146.68	16.06	59.11	N/A	22,500	5,765
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.88	99.06	97.58	8.41	101.52	79.20	119.70	N/A	23,800	23,224
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	106.80	103.79	108.02	20.63	96.08	65.63	135.93	N/A	14,250	15,393
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	65.56	124.87	62.24	118.46	200.61	16.06	855.00	57.42 to 107.03	16,561	10,308
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	99.30	103.69	103.00	18.55	100.67	65.63	135.93	N/A	24,900	25,646
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	86.60	177.96	71.46	134.28	249.03	45.73	855.00	45.73 to 855.00	15,926	11,381
____ALL____											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
LEWELLEN	5	107.15	239.69	69.52	158.68	344.77	59.11	855.00	N/A	14,583	10,138
LISCO	1	119.70	119.70	119.70			119.70	119.70	N/A	1,000	1,197
OSHKOSH	17	79.20	80.35	75.19	35.29	106.86	16.06	145.61	57.42 to 99.24	16,500	12,406
RURAL	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
____ALL____											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

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	20	88.54	120.00	72.41	74.54	165.72	16.06	855.00	61.15 to 107.03	15,745	11,401
2	2	82.26	82.26	87.22	20.21	94.31	65.63	98.88	N/A	19,250	16,790
3	2	109.50	109.50	99.59	9.32	109.95	99.30	119.70	N/A	35,500	35,355
____ALL____											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

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:	24	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	138.60	95% Median C.I.:	61.47 to 107.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	419,715	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	160.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.14 to 95.46	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	424,415	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	57.35	95% Mean C.I.:	48.09 to 183.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	332,317							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	17,683	COD:	58.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	855.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	13,846	PRD:	148.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.06			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:27

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	21	97.88	121.20	78.71	62.12	153.99	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	19,162	15,082
2	3	98.23	79.41	70.87	33.73	112.05	20.31	119.70	N/A	7,333	5,197
____ALL____											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0025											
25-0095											
35-0001	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

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	7	97.88	185.23	82.12	138.42	225.55	20.31	855.00	20.31 to 855.00	9,257	7,602
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	7	79.20	85.58	63.57	39.12	134.62	16.06	145.61	16.06 to 145.61	23,159	14,721
1920 TO 1939	3	98.20	85.86	81.37	12.59	105.51	61.15	98.23	N/A	11,000	8,951
1940 TO 1949	3	99.24	90.65	82.75	13.97	109.55	65.56	107.15	N/A	6,166	5,102
1950 TO 1959	1	65.63	65.63	65.63			65.63	65.63	N/A	13,500	8,860
1960 TO 1969	1	135.93	135.93	135.93			135.93	135.93	N/A	25,000	33,982
1970 TO 1979	1	57.42	57.42	57.42			57.42	57.42	N/A	37,500	21,533
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	138.60	95% Median C.I.:	61.47 to 107.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	419,715	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	160.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.14 to 95.46	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	424,415	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	57.35	95% Mean C.I.:	48.09 to 183.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	332,317							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	17,683	COD:	58.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	855.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	13,846	PRD:	148.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.06			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:27

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	111.43	233.97	120.89	116.21	193.54	99.24	855.00	99.24 to 855.00	2,800	3,385
5000 TO 9999	3	45.73	54.75	48.92	56.78	111.91	20.31	98.20	N/A	6,166	3,016
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	107.03	174.23	83.17	96.97	209.48	20.31	855.00	45.73 to 119.70	3,922	3,262
10000 TO 29999	10	88.54	90.72	94.97	27.77	95.52	59.11	145.61	61.15 to 135.93	14,650	13,913
30000 TO 59999	4	59.45	52.22	54.64	26.05	95.59	16.06	73.95	N/A	43,153	23,577
60000 TO 99999	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
ALL											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

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	9	107.03	174.23	83.17	96.97	209.48	20.31	855.00	45.73 to 119.70	3,922	3,262
5000 TO 9999	6	63.36	57.79	47.10	19.49	122.68	16.06	79.20	16.06 to 79.20	15,583	7,340
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	79.20	127.65	56.99	98.36	224.00	16.06	855.00	59.11 to 107.15	8,586	4,893
10000 TO 29999	5	98.23	99.60	87.83	18.16	113.41	57.42	145.61	N/A	20,100	17,653
30000 TO 59999	3	73.95	90.45	80.84	33.56	111.89	61.47	135.93	N/A	41,705	33,712
60000 TO 99999	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
ALL											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	98.38	84.19	86.17	25.51	97.70	20.31	119.70	N/A	12,250	10,556
10	5	107.03	243.68	72.03	155.10	338.30	61.47	855.00	N/A	14,483	10,432
20	15	73.95	81.88	78.53	37.23	104.28	16.06	145.61	59.11 to 99.30	20,200	15,862
ALL											
	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	138.60	95% Median C.I.:	61.47 to 107.03	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	419,715	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	160.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.14 to 95.46	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	424,415	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	57.35	95% Mean C.I.:	48.09 to 183.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	332,317							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	17,683	COD:	58.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	855.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	13,846	PRD:	148.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.06			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:14:27

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	98.88	238.35	90.85	173.24	262.36	20.31	855.00	N/A	9,860	8,957
170	3	65.56	86.30	85.62	39.92	100.80	57.42	135.93	N/A	24,166	20,690
25	1	99.24	99.24	99.24			99.24	99.24	N/A	4,500	4,466
326	1	79.20	79.20	79.20			79.20	79.20	N/A	10,000	7,920
344	1	98.23	98.23	98.23			98.23	98.23	N/A	13,000	12,770
353	1	65.63	65.63	65.63			65.63	65.63	N/A	13,500	8,860
391	1	107.03	107.03	107.03			107.03	107.03	N/A	3,500	3,746
438	1	99.30	99.30	99.30			99.30	99.30	N/A	70,000	69,513
47	1	73.95	73.95	73.95			73.95	73.95	N/A	45,000	33,276
48	1	61.47	61.47	61.47			61.47	61.47	N/A	55,115	33,880
50	4	78.66	72.27	38.30	44.10	188.69	16.06	115.71	N/A	13,375	5,122
80	1	107.15	107.15	107.15			107.15	107.15	N/A	4,000	4,286
98	3	61.15	84.16	86.06	54.45	97.79	45.73	145.61	N/A	10,166	8,749
ALL	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	97.88	97.88	97.88			97.88	97.88	N/A	15,000	14,682
03	23	98.20	116.76	77.58	60.93	150.50	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,800	13,810
04											
ALL	24	98.04	115.98	78.30	58.50	148.12	16.06	855.00	61.47 to 107.03	17,683	13,846

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

Commercial

Garden County has completed a two year process of a commercial reappraisal countywide. Every assessor location had new land and improvement values implemented for 2009. Jerry Knoche, a certified appraiser conducted the appraisal process with training to the assessor and staff. Updated costing tables of June/2005 plus 2009 depreciation tables were used for the valuation of this property class. Garden County has a limited amount of market information to assist in the development of depreciation and the market value of the commercial land. This completes a large goal and plan within the Garden County Three Year Plan of Assessment under the Commercial Property actions for 2009.

2009 Assessment Survey for Garden County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and Jerry Knoche
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor, staff and Jerry Knoche
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June/2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2009
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	It is not used for Garden County Commercial properties
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Cost approach and sales comparison
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	4 Assessor Locations; Oshkosh, Lewellen, Lisco and Rural
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These are defined by market and location
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
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>)
	N/A

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
4	0	2	6

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:	21	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	12.02	95% Median C.I.:	96.32 to 105.55	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	384,415	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	12.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.24 to 103.05	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	384,115	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.45	95% Mean C.I.:	95.79 to 106.89	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	375,068							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	18,291	COD:	8.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	17,860	PRD:	103.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	83.11			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:44

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	135.14	135.14	135.14			135.14	135.14	N/A		10,000	13,514
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	104.37	104.37	102.59	5.41	101.74	98.72	110.02	N/A		19,000	19,492
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	112.50	112.50	112.50			112.50	112.50	N/A		1,000	1,125
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	100.79	100.79	100.79			100.79	100.79	N/A		70,000	70,555
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	97.88	93.56	94.75	4.88	98.74	84.23	98.56	N/A		17,833	16,897
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	121.40	121.40	121.40			121.40	121.40	N/A		3,500	4,249
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	102.89	101.75	98.52	3.07	103.27	96.32	104.91	N/A		16,000	15,763
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	88.50	88.50	83.92	6.09	105.46	83.11	93.89	N/A		29,807	25,014
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	98.97	98.79	99.02	6.18	99.77	84.35	107.23	N/A		14,900	14,754
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	90.94	90.94	90.94			90.94	90.94	N/A		10,000	9,094
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	110.02	111.43	104.35	8.75	106.79	98.72	135.14	N/A		23,800	24,835
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	98.22	100.52	96.39	9.63	104.28	84.23	121.40	N/A		14,250	13,735
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	98.42	97.41	94.15	6.43	103.46	83.11	107.23	90.94 to 104.91		17,342	16,329
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	98.56	98.79	98.29	6.33	100.51	84.23	112.50	N/A		24,900	24,474
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	100.87	100.77	92.30	8.20	109.17	83.11	121.40	83.11 to 121.40		18,159	16,761
____ALL____												
	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55		18,291	17,860

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
LEWELLEN	4	99.09	100.67	87.36	13.77	115.24	83.11	121.40	N/A		18,153	15,859
LISCO	1	112.50	112.50	112.50			112.50	112.50	N/A		1,000	1,125
OSHKOSH	15	98.72	100.81	99.77	7.24	101.04	84.23	135.14	96.32 to 104.91		16,033	15,996
RURAL	1	100.79	100.79	100.79			100.79	100.79	N/A		70,000	70,555
____ALL____												
	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55		18,291	17,860

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	17	98.97	101.88	97.35	8.74	104.65	83.11	135.14	93.89 to 107.23		16,153	15,725
2	2	91.47	91.47	93.64	7.92	97.69	84.23	98.72	N/A		19,250	18,026
3	2	106.65	106.65	100.96	5.49	105.63	100.79	112.50	N/A		35,500	35,840
____ALL____												
	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55		18,291	17,860

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:	21	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	12.02	95% Median C.I.:	96.32 to 105.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	384,415	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	12.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.24 to 103.05	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	384,115	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.45	95% Mean C.I.:	95.79 to 106.89	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	375,068							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	18,291	COD:	8.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	17,860	PRD:	103.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	83.11			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:45

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	18	98.85	101.18	97.45	7.77	103.83	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 104.91	20,117	19,605
2	3	110.02	102.29	100.80	8.53	101.48	84.35	112.50	N/A	7,333	7,392
____ALL____	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0025											
25-0095											
35-0001	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860
NonValid School											
____ALL____	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	98.30	97.54	95.93	6.60	101.68	84.35	112.50	84.35 to 112.50	10,750	10,313
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	6	101.39	106.46	94.69	13.83	112.42	83.11	135.14	83.11 to 135.14	21,185	20,061
1920 TO 1939	2	107.79	107.79	107.63	2.07	100.15	105.55	110.02	N/A	14,000	15,068
1940 TO 1949	3	104.90	102.01	102.72	4.24	99.30	93.89	107.23	N/A	6,166	6,334
1950 TO 1959	1	84.23	84.23	84.23			84.23	84.23	N/A	13,500	11,371
1960 TO 1969	1	98.56	98.56	98.56			98.56	98.56	N/A	25,000	24,640
1970 TO 1979	1	98.97	98.97	98.97			98.97	98.97	N/A	37,500	37,113
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	100.79	100.79	100.79			100.79	100.79	N/A	70,000	70,555
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	12.02	95% Median C.I.:	96.32 to 105.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	384,415	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	12.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.24 to 103.05	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	384,115	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.45	95% Mean C.I.:	95.79 to 106.89	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	375,068							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	18,291	COD:	8.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	17,860	PRD:	103.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	83.11			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:45

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	107.23	107.99	106.42	6.55	101.47	93.89	121.40	N/A	3,300	3,512
5000 TO 9999	2	92.61	92.61	91.08	8.92	101.68	84.35	100.87	N/A	6,750	6,148
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	104.91	103.59	99.52	8.45	104.09	84.35	121.40	84.35 to 121.40	4,285	4,265
10000 TO 29999	10	98.64	102.38	101.29	8.60	101.07	84.23	135.14	90.94 to 110.02	14,650	14,839
30000 TO 59999	3	96.32	92.80	91.75	5.49	101.14	83.11	98.97	N/A	45,871	42,087
60000 TO 99999	1	100.79	100.79	100.79			100.79	100.79	N/A	70,000	70,555
ALL											
	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	107.23	107.99	106.42	6.55	101.47	93.89	121.40	N/A	3,300	3,512
5000 TO 9999	4	94.41	93.51	93.07	6.21	100.47	84.35	100.87	N/A	8,375	7,794
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	100.87	101.55	97.47	8.70	104.18	84.35	121.40	90.94 to 112.50	5,555	5,415
10000 TO 29999	8	101.81	104.38	102.38	9.36	101.95	84.23	135.14	84.23 to 135.14	15,812	16,189
30000 TO 59999	3	96.32	92.80	91.75	5.49	101.14	83.11	98.97	N/A	45,871	42,087
60000 TO 99999	1	100.79	100.79	100.79			100.79	100.79	N/A	70,000	70,555
ALL											
	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	98.30	98.36	96.40	7.37	102.04	84.35	112.50	N/A	12,250	11,809
10	4	113.16	111.14	93.24	15.14	119.20	83.11	135.14	N/A	18,028	16,809
20	13	98.97	99.24	99.08	5.25	100.16	84.23	110.02	93.89 to 105.55	20,230	20,045
ALL											
	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	12.02	95% Median C.I.:	96.32 to 105.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	384,415	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	12.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.24 to 103.05	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	384,115	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.45	95% Mean C.I.:	95.79 to 106.89	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	375,068							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	18,291	COD:	8.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	135.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	17,860	PRD:	103.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	83.11			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:22:45

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	98.30	98.36	96.40	7.37	102.04	84.35	112.50	N/A	12,250	11,809
170	3	98.97	100.81	99.65	2.14	101.17	98.56	104.90	N/A	24,166	24,081
25	1	93.89	93.89	93.89			93.89	93.89	N/A	4,500	4,225
326	1	135.14	135.14	135.14			135.14	135.14	N/A	10,000	13,514
344	1	110.02	110.02	110.02			110.02	110.02	N/A	13,000	14,303
353	1	84.23	84.23	84.23			84.23	84.23	N/A	13,500	11,371
391	1	104.91	104.91	104.91			104.91	104.91	N/A	3,500	3,672
438	1	100.79	100.79	100.79			100.79	100.79	N/A	70,000	70,555
47	1	96.32	96.32	96.32			96.32	96.32	N/A	45,000	43,345
48	1	83.11	83.11	83.11			83.11	83.11	N/A	55,115	45,804
50	2	106.17	106.17	98.84	14.34	107.42	90.94	121.40	N/A	6,750	6,671
80	1	107.23	107.23	107.23			107.23	107.23	N/A	4,000	4,289
98	3	100.87	101.43	102.19	2.54	99.26	97.87	105.55	N/A	10,166	10,389
ALL	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	97.88	97.88	97.88			97.88	97.88	N/A	15,000	14,682
03	20	99.88	101.51	97.64	8.83	103.97	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,455	18,019
04											
ALL	21	98.97	101.34	97.64	8.54	103.78	83.11	135.14	96.32 to 105.55	18,291	17,860

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:For this assessment year, Garden County completed a two year process of a commercial reappraisal countywide. June/2005 costing tables were applied for this valuation process. The county contracted Jerry Knoche, a certified appraiser to conduct the reappraisal. Typically Garden County has a limited number of commercial sales to analyze for valuation purposes. This study period includes a total of 21 sales, which 71% of those or 15 sales are located within the assessor location Oshkosh. Typically, Oshkosh is comprised of 54% of the commercial county valuation. These 15 sales would reflect a fair representation of the sample. Both the median level of central tendency and the median for Oshkosh calculate a level of value of 99, which support each other and will be used to best describe the county level of commercial value. Based on the coefficient of dispersion qualitative measure, and the accomplishments of the commercial reappraisal, it is believed that Garden County has attained uniform assessment practices.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	35	21	60.00
2008	29	15	51.72
2007	27	14	51.85
2006	29	17	58.62
2005	55	16	29.09

COMMERCIAL: The highest percent of total commercial sales has been used by the county for the statistical profile since 2002. The county continues to follow review procedures to ensure accurate market data. With the limited number of commercial sales in Garden County, the assessor uses every arm's length transaction for the valuation process.

2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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 Garden 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	98	13.58	111	99
2008	98.88	0.89	100	98.88
2007	96	0.50	97	96
2006	95	1.84	96	95
2005	98	-0.28	98	98

COMMERCIAL: The 13.58% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) represents the new valuations done through a contract appraiser, Jerry Knoche countywide. A two year completed process of the reappraisal included new land and improvement values. The Trended Preliminary Ratio and R&O Ratio are not similar with a spread of 12.31 points.

2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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 Garden 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)
51.61	2009	13.58
0.00	2008	0.89
0.00	2007	0.50
0.00	2006	1.84
0.00	2005	-0.28

COMMERCIAL:As the historical data indicates, 2009 there is a large difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the assessed value base (excl. growth). The reappraisal implemented was done by a licensed appraiser, which may be the source to answer the large percents between the sample and the base.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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 Garden County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	98	101

COMMERCIAL: Although the mean measure of central tendency is slightly over the acceptable parameters by less than one point, the median and weighted mean are similar and support each other. For direct equalization purposes the median at 99 will best describe the level of value which is supported also through the 15 qualified sales in Oshkosh at 99%.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	8.54	103.78
Difference	0.00	0.78

COMMERCIAL: Both statistics are a reflection of the new commercial values applied by the county, although the price related differential is slightly over the parameters. These qualitative statistics highly improved since the preliminary calculations through the assessment actions of the reappraisal. Both qualitative measures reflect commercial properties meet uniform and proportionate assessment standards.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Garden 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	24	21	-3
Median	98	99	1
Wgt. Mean	78	98	20
Mean	116	101	-15
COD	58.50	8.54	-49.96
PRD	148.12	103.78	-44.34
Minimum	16.06	83.11	67.05
Maximum	855.00	135.14	-719.86

COMMERCIAL: The weighted mean improved by 20 points after the new commercial values were implemented in 2009. The qualitative measures also show a large improvement and brought the COD within acceptable measures.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

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

Agricultural

Garden County reviewed the most current market information within the county to set the 2009 land values. With over 30,350 sold acres in the current three year study period, new 2009 values were supported to equalize the agricultural land class.

Irrigated subclasses increased from \$5 to \$100 per acre. The sales represent nearly 1,000 acres of irrigated land this year. Despite the nationwide economy, the market is reflecting increased agricultural land values.

Over 6,300 acres are included in the sold dry land acres. This compares to 4,180 sold acres of dry land in 2008. Similar increases affected dry and irrigated subclasses. Increases range from \$10 to \$100 per acre.

A much larger inventory for grassland supports the \$20-40 increases for all grass classifications in 2009. In 2008 Garden County had approximately 18,100 acres of sold grass acres in the study period compared to the 23,000 acres of sold grass this assessment year. These increases support neighboring county's values and market factors. Over 80% of the agricultural land in the county is grass. Sub classifications of CRP also increased by \$55 per acre and waste increased to \$25 for this year.

2009 Assessment Survey for Garden County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
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?
	Through the specifications in the policy
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1998
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	It is kept current each assessment year.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Information statements, questionnaires, web-sites, personal property schedules, Farm Service Agency and self reporting are all methods used.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	By the entire county line boundaries.
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
	The new soil conversion may be the most current and appropriate valuation groupings.

a.	If yes, list.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	69-75%
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	Yes, it was implemented in 1999.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	12	12

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7260

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	44	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	27.84	95% Median C.I.:	65.12 to 77.12	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,113,112	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.46 to 71.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,047,777	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.05	95% Mean C.I.:	64.87 to 76.50	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,885,677							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	205,631	COD:	19.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	133,765	PRD:	108.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.28			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:07:37

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	74.22	73.27	67.87	18.77	107.95	49.06	95.58	N/A	89,047	60,440
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	79.69	72.03	79.51	17.65	90.60	41.97	86.78	N/A	154,000	122,438
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	77.12	80.03	82.12	8.65	97.45	65.12	93.43	65.12 to 93.43	146,660	120,437
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	76.73	78.17	71.75	10.89	108.94	58.97	97.08	58.97 to 97.08	77,595	55,675
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	79.47	79.47	79.47			79.47	79.47	N/A	682,000	541,975
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	77.07	92.07	70.12	28.14	131.31	67.04	132.11	N/A	527,757	370,066
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	70.46	66.61	54.06	19.79	123.22	30.57	89.58	30.57 to 89.58	115,516	62,448
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	67.92	67.92	68.38	5.45	99.33	64.22	71.62	N/A	176,700	120,821
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	60.08	61.03	62.24	10.82	98.06	53.12	70.86	N/A	107,413	66,857
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	50.40	47.70	50.12	27.64	95.18	16.28	70.00	16.28 to 70.00	460,728	230,906
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	22	76.96	76.75	77.27	12.85	99.32	41.97	97.08	71.04 to 86.64	115,544	89,286
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	73.80	75.54	68.51	22.25	110.25	30.57	132.11	57.05 to 89.58	295,837	202,686
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	59.25	55.51	53.41	19.80	103.95	16.28	71.62	48.47 to 70.00	295,618	157,875
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	15	77.12	79.12	78.82	9.33	100.39	58.97	97.08	75.96 to 86.64	150,119	118,317
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	70.38	70.39	65.17	19.06	108.00	30.57	132.11	57.05 to 77.07	203,961	132,930
<u>ALL</u>											
	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7260

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	44	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	27.84	95% Median C.I.:	65.12 to 77.12	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,113,112	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.46 to 71.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,047,777	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.05	95% Mean C.I.:	64.87 to 76.50	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,885,677							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	205,631	COD:	19.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	133,765	PRD:	108.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.28			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:07:37

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1917	1	30.57	30.57	30.57			30.57	30.57	N/A		260,000	79,479
1985	1	67.04	67.04	67.04			67.04	67.04	N/A		1,193,571	800,123
2207	1	58.97	58.97	58.97			58.97	58.97	N/A		225,000	132,688
2209	1	77.07	77.07	77.07			77.07	77.07	N/A		372,000	286,693
2261	1	62.56	62.56	62.56			62.56	62.56	N/A		812,000	507,986
2263	2	79.18	79.18	77.36	3.01	102.35	76.79	81.56	N/A		139,820	108,159
2265	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A		102,371	71,659
2269	2	70.46	70.46	70.46	0.11	100.00	70.38	70.53	N/A		100,800	71,020
2491	3	70.86	65.20	66.68	8.70	97.78	53.12	71.62	N/A		101,066	67,389
2493	3	49.06	52.92	60.15	52.42	87.99	16.28	93.43	N/A		137,166	82,503
2495	1	97.08	97.08	97.08			97.08	97.08	N/A		20,000	19,415
2551	7	78.82	81.26	79.80	6.51	101.84	73.96	95.58	73.96 to 95.58		183,491	146,417
2553	3	89.58	102.37	89.87	17.37	113.91	85.42	132.11	N/A		74,459	66,914
2557	3	52.32	50.45	53.97	9.61	93.47	41.97	57.05	N/A		113,833	61,434
2783	2	66.34	66.34	70.34	15.67	94.31	55.94	76.73	N/A		24,135	16,976
2785	5	79.48	77.53	79.81	9.74	97.13	65.12	86.78	N/A		108,963	86,968
2787	1	36.57	36.57	36.57			36.57	36.57	N/A		560,000	204,787
2789	4	70.25	72.38	71.57	11.62	101.14	64.21	84.80	N/A		191,496	137,045
2791	2	59.76	59.76	49.87	18.89	119.81	48.47	71.04	N/A		549,250	273,935
ALL	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12		205,631	133,765

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12		205,631	133,765
ALL	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12		205,631	133,765

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	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12		205,631	133,765
ALL	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12		205,631	133,765

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7260

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	44	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	27.84	95% Median C.I.:	65.12 to 77.12	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,113,112	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.46 to 71.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,047,777	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.05	95% Mean C.I.:	64.87 to 76.50	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,885,677							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	205,631	COD:	19.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	133,765	PRD:	108.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.28			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:07:37

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
25-0025	1	48.47	48.47	48.47			48.47	48.47	N/A	1,030,000	499,210
25-0095											
35-0001	43	71.62	71.20	67.18	19.33	105.98	16.28	132.11	67.04 to 77.12	186,459	125,266
NonValid School											
ALL											
	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	41.97	41.97	41.97			41.97	41.97	N/A	18,000	7,555
30.01 TO 50.00	3	78.82	77.28	79.28	17.40	97.47	55.94	97.08	N/A	18,099	14,350
50.01 TO 100.00	4	73.80	60.84	45.32	23.40	134.23	16.28	79.48	N/A	46,179	20,929
100.01 TO 180.00	10	76.12	77.42	68.37	18.27	113.23	52.32	132.11	53.12 to 89.58	66,775	45,655
180.01 TO 330.00	6	69.81	65.63	64.60	6.69	101.60	49.06	70.53	49.06 to 70.53	118,811	76,750
330.01 TO 650.00	14	75.38	71.21	64.71	19.99	110.04	30.57	95.58	57.05 to 86.78	224,826	145,476
650.01 +	6	72.06	71.34	65.63	16.63	108.70	48.47	93.43	48.47 to 93.43	710,428	466,271
ALL											
	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

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	13	73.96	70.61	62.19	10.66	113.55	36.57	84.80	64.22 to 78.82	153,896	95,701
DRY-N/A	4	64.54	68.66	50.87	27.68	134.96	48.47	97.08	N/A	296,187	150,678
GRASS	18	70.46	69.39	67.38	22.96	102.98	16.28	132.11	57.05 to 79.47	258,609	174,255
GRASS-N/A	6	86.71	85.88	84.52	4.86	101.60	76.79	95.58	76.79 to 95.58	133,234	112,611
IRRGTD-N/A	3	52.32	51.09	55.53	10.83	91.99	41.97	58.97	N/A	136,000	75,524
ALL											
	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	14	72.50	69.36	61.84	12.15	112.17	36.57	84.80	64.21 to 78.82	148,617	91,901
DRY-N/A	3	75.96	73.84	50.71	21.33	145.61	48.47	97.08	N/A	368,250	186,738
GRASS	19	70.53	70.77	67.87	23.60	104.26	16.28	132.11	57.05 to 85.42	249,358	169,252
GRASS-N/A	5	86.64	83.94	83.24	3.77	100.83	76.79	87.91	N/A	143,311	119,296
IRRGTD	3	52.32	51.09	55.53	10.83	91.99	41.97	58.97	N/A	136,000	75,524
ALL											
	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7260

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	44	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	27.84	95% Median C.I.:	65.12 to 77.12	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,113,112	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	19.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.46 to 71.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,047,777	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.05	95% Mean C.I.:	64.87 to 76.50	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,885,677							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	205,631	COD:	19.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	133,765	PRD:	108.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.28			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:07:37

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	17	73.96	70.15	57.98	13.83	121.00	36.57	97.08	64.21 to 78.82	187,376	108,637
GRASS	23	71.62	73.16	69.82	22.49	104.78	16.28	132.11	67.04 to 86.64	235,712	164,580
GRASS-N/A	1	81.56	81.56	81.56			81.56	81.56	N/A	33,000	26,916
IRRGTD	3	52.32	51.09	55.53	10.83	91.99	41.97	58.97	N/A	136,000	75,524
ALL	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	6	74.84	79.46	79.76	31.01	99.63	41.97	132.11	41.97 to 132.11	19,133	15,260
30000 TO 59999	5	79.48	80.66	80.46	4.64	100.25	75.96	89.58	N/A	38,533	31,003
60000 TO 99999	7	71.04	64.93	63.00	23.02	103.07	16.28	95.58	16.28 to 95.58	76,449	48,165
100000 TO 149999	6	70.19	69.58	68.52	9.53	101.54	49.06	87.91	49.06 to 87.91	111,311	76,275
150000 TO 249999	11	76.79	74.37	74.49	15.73	99.84	52.32	93.43	57.05 to 86.78	186,247	138,732
250000 TO 499999	4	69.08	61.45	63.10	20.36	97.39	30.57	77.07	N/A	302,750	191,039
500000 +	5	62.56	58.82	59.71	19.65	98.51	36.57	79.47	N/A	855,514	510,816
ALL	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	48.96	48.96	48.29	14.27	101.38	41.97	55.94	N/A	16,427	7,932
1 TO 9999	2	48.96	48.96	48.29	14.27	101.38	41.97	55.94	N/A	16,427	7,932
10000 TO 29999	8	79.15	79.12	61.40	23.30	128.86	16.28	132.11	16.28 to 132.11	34,357	21,094
30000 TO 59999	7	75.96	72.60	70.77	10.10	102.59	53.12	89.58	53.12 to 89.58	64,578	45,703
60000 TO 99999	11	69.61	65.20	59.94	18.44	108.78	30.57	95.58	49.06 to 87.91	135,383	81,146
100000 TO 149999	5	85.42	77.89	76.39	10.03	101.95	58.97	86.78	N/A	183,199	139,954
150000 TO 249999	6	75.38	71.63	64.28	17.75	111.42	36.57	93.43	36.57 to 93.43	298,871	192,125
250000 TO 499999	2	62.77	62.77	56.06	22.78	111.98	48.47	77.07	N/A	701,000	392,951
500000 +	3	67.04	69.69	68.84	8.41	101.24	62.56	79.47	N/A	895,857	616,694
ALL	44	71.33	70.68	65.05	19.70	108.66	16.28	132.11	65.12 to 77.12	205,631	133,765

**Janet L. Shaul
Garden County Assessor
Oshkosh, NE 69154
308-772-4464
gcasr1@embarqmail.com**

Ruth Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
DOR, Property Assessment Division
301 Centennial Mall South
P O Box 98919
Lincoln, NE 68509-8919

February 26, 2009

Dear Ms Sorensen:

Below is information regarding the procedures and methodologies used in Garden County to implement special valuation on qualified parcels of agricultural and horticultural land (per PAT Regulation-11-005.04).

1. *Methodology for determining special valuation of agricultural land (uninfluenced value).*

The 2009 ag land valuations were determined by using the compilation and statistics received from the PAT of all ag sales deemed qualified in the required three-year sales period, the number of acres in each classification of land that sold, and the median of market value of each classification (at approximately 75%). Because the sales do not indicate any specific market areas, the value for each class (i.e., 3G1, 3G, etc.) will remain the same per class throughout the County.

The level of assessment for agricultural land is from 69% to 75%. Garden County sales in the three-year sales period indicate grass values are between 58% to 60%, depending on the majority land use. Therefore, all grass values are being increase. We had four qualified sales of irrigated land; which showed a median in the 40% range, depending on the majority land use. Every year irrigated sales are few, but consistently low. Therefore we are also raising all irrigated land. This will improve our overall statistics. We had 18 dryland sales, and the median is in the around 67% (again depending on majority land use). We will raise all dryland classifications to bring this class of land in line.

02. *Methodology for determining recapture valuation of agricultural land (market value).*

In each three-year sales period, we generally have a small number of land sales along the North Platte River (most of which are not representative in the number of acres purchased). These sales are primarily for recreational purposes (goose hunting, etc.). Much of the land along the river, however, is used just for agricultural purposes. In an attempt to fairly and accurately value this land, we have implemented Special Valuation in Garden County. Taxpayers who own land near the river, with adjoining accretion and river acres, file a Form 456 (Special Valuation Application). As a rule of thumb, the land owners that have hunting blinds, but that also use the land for agricultural purposes (usually cattle grazing) have completed these forms by considering *each* blind to be one acre of recreational land, and the rest as agricultural land. The acres with blinds are then valued as recreational at 100% of market or \$2,160 per acre, based on past sales of this real estate. The remaining land is valued as agricultural, *if used as such*, and based on approximately 75% of market per ag sales. *One very important point to remember in Garden County is that a State Game Refuge lies along the river 110 yards out from the banks of the North Platte River, and landowners cannot hunt or have blinds on any of this land. They also have no control over who has access to use accretion land for walking, etc. (See attached copies of NE Statutes 37-706, 37-706.1, 37-707, 37-708, 37-712.)* We have had only two qualified, unimproved sales of ag land including accretion in the three year sales period used for the current sales roster. Therefore, we have insufficient sales to indicate any change in the \$2,160 per acre, so this value will remain in effect for 2009.

Above are the methods Garden County uses to determine valuations for ag properties and recreational properties. The methods were decided on after much market analysis, deliberation and thought, and we feel it is the most equitable and uniform method of dealing with the above addressed land.

Sincerely,

2009 CORRELATION SECTION

For Garden County

Agricultural or Special Valuation

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL LAND: Garden County is comprised of approximately 84% grassland acres. The assessor increased nearly every land classification to equalize the agricultural property class for the 2009 assessment year. The only subclass that experienced no change was 1G. Over 30,350 sold acres are represented by the 44 unimproved agricultural statistics and the 50 minimally improved statistics. Approximately 1,000 acres of sold irrigated acres were in the sample, compared to 6,300 acres of dry land acres. A large inventory of 18,100 sold grass acres supported the assessment actions to increase grass land values \$20-\$40. The assessor also reviews the market of agricultural land across the neighboring counties. For direct equalization purposes, the median of agricultural unimproved land at 71% will be used to describe the level of value. This is also supported by the 15 minimally improved dry sales in the >80% majority land use subclass and the 24 grass sales at 71. In the unimproved agricultural set of statistics there are 19 grass sales in the >80% majority land use reflecting a 71% median to support this level of value countywide. It is believed that the county has attained uniform and proportionate assessment practices as shown through the statistics and the individual subclasses that meet acceptable standards.

SPECIAL VALUATION: Only a small area within Garden County is affected by special value. Primarily the areas bordering the North Platte River are influenced. For assessment purposes, the special value has been established using similar uninfluenced sales that have occurred in the surrounding area and valued in the same manner as other agricultural property within the county. It is the opinion that the level of value for special value within Garden County is equal to the uninfluenced agricultural level of value.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 4,445

Value : 324,897,624

Growth 1,112,627

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	70	145,398	17	54,013	27	90,818	114	290,229	
02. Res Improve Land	642	1,933,760	73	816,799	155	1,911,329	870	4,661,888	
03. Res Improvements	644	21,336,645	74	3,148,516	161	8,162,864	879	32,648,025	
04. Res Total	714	23,415,803	91	4,019,328	188	10,165,011	993	37,600,142	298,957
% of Res Total	71.90	62.28	9.16	10.69	18.93	27.03	22.34	11.57	26.87
05. Com UnImp Land	14	30,735	4	13,675	2	4,125	20	48,535	
06. Com Improve Land	121	429,405	11	135,689	18	343,888	150	908,982	
07. Com Improvements	121	3,912,664	11	745,485	18	1,259,766	150	5,917,915	
08. Com Total	135	4,372,804	15	894,849	20	1,607,779	170	6,875,432	84,142
% of Com Total	79.41	63.60	8.82	13.02	11.76	23.38	3.82	2.12	7.56
09. Ind UnImp Land									
10. Ind Improve Land									
11. Ind Improvements									
12. Ind Total									
% of Ind Total									
13. Rec UnImp Land									
14. Rec Improve Land									
15. Rec Improvements									
16. Rec Total									
% of Rec Total									
Res & Rec Total									
% of Res & Rec Total									
Com & Ind Total									
% of Com & Ind Total									
17. Taxable Total							1,163	44,475,574	383,099
% of Taxable Total							26.16	13.69	34.43

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial							
20. Industrial							
21. Other							
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial							
20. Industrial							
21. Other							
22. Total Sch II							

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	28	222,970	28	222,970	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	7	39,757	7	39,757	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	35	262,727	35	262,727	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	65	3	24	92

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	29	1,014,732	2,713	212,467,937	2,742	213,482,669
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	24	1,203,553	481	40,296,747	505	41,500,300
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	24	1,044,951	481	24,131,403	505	25,176,354
30. Ag Total							3,247	280,159,323

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI							

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	
46. 1A	3,593.03	9.18%	2,910,358	14.93%	810.00
47. 2A1	1,351.23	3.45%	1,013,427	5.20%	750.00
48. 2A	4,939.89	12.62%	3,210,965	16.47%	650.01
49. 3A1	14.67	0.04%	7,702	0.04%	525.02
50. 3A	11,679.18	29.83%	5,372,422	27.56%	460.00
51. 4A1	15,436.88	39.42%	6,174,752	31.68%	400.00
52. 4A	2,141.17	5.47%	802,953	4.12%	375.01
53. Total	39,156.05	100.00%	19,492,579	100.00%	497.82
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	66,617.56	62.51%	21,983,862	65.94%	330.00
56. 2D1	2,657.39	2.49%	850,366	2.55%	320.00
57. 2D	17,405.81	16.33%	5,395,828	16.18%	310.00
58. 3D1	540.12	0.51%	148,544	0.45%	275.02
59. 3D	11,358.36	10.66%	3,123,610	9.37%	275.01
60. 4D1	5,642.31	5.29%	1,297,745	3.89%	230.00
61. 4D	2,352.59	2.21%	541,101	1.62%	230.00
62. Total	106,574.14	100.00%	33,341,056	100.00%	312.84
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	4,200.86	0.48%	1,036,901	0.54%	246.83
65. 2G1	925.33	0.11%	227,286	0.12%	245.63
66. 2G	7,191.53	0.83%	1,687,523	0.87%	234.65
67. 3G1	68.72	0.01%	16,056	0.01%	233.64
68. 3G	40,579.02	4.67%	9,519,731	4.93%	234.60
69. 4G1	280,129.88	32.27%	63,041,438	32.63%	225.04
70. 4G	534,953.76	61.63%	117,696,552	60.91%	220.01
71. Total	868,049.10	100.00%	193,225,487	100.00%	222.60
Irrigated Total	39,156.05	3.78%	19,492,579	7.85%	497.82
Dry Total	106,574.14	10.28%	33,341,056	13.43%	312.84
Grass Total	868,049.10	83.71%	193,225,487	77.81%	222.60
Waste	15,673.09	1.51%	391,929	0.16%	25.01
Other	7,529.39	0.73%	1,878,265	0.76%	249.46
Exempt	338.41	0.03%	77,482	0.03%	228.96
Market Area Total	1,036,981.77	100.00%	248,329,316	100.00%	239.47

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	1,714.07	814,886	37,441.98	18,677,693	39,156.05	19,492,579
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	138.50	39,993	106,435.64	33,301,063	106,574.14	33,341,056
78. Grass	0.00	0	3,865.34	868,879	864,183.76	192,356,608	868,049.10	193,225,487
79. Waste	0.00	0	10.18	255	15,662.91	391,674	15,673.09	391,929
80. Other	0.00	0	642.00	190,101	6,887.39	1,688,164	7,529.39	1,878,265
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	338.41	77,482	338.41	77,482
82. Total	0.00	0	6,370.09	1,914,114	1,030,611.68	246,415,202	1,036,981.77	248,329,316

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	39,156.05	3.78%	19,492,579	7.85%	497.82
Dry Land	106,574.14	10.28%	33,341,056	13.43%	312.84
Grass	868,049.10	83.71%	193,225,487	77.81%	222.60
Waste	15,673.09	1.51%	391,929	0.16%	25.01
Other	7,529.39	0.73%	1,878,265	0.76%	249.46
Exempt	338.41	0.03%	77,482	0.03%	228.96
Total	1,036,981.77	100.00%	248,329,316	100.00%	239.47

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

35 Garden

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	37,861,835	37,600,142	-261,693	-0.69%	298,957	-1.48%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	18,568,535	19,202,303	633,768	3.41%	4,025	3.39%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	56,430,370	56,802,445	372,075	0.66%	302,982	0.12%
05. Commercial	5,979,079	6,875,432	896,353	14.99%	84,142	13.58%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	13,086,629	12,627,704	-458,925	-3.51%	725,503	-9.05%
08. Minerals	617,017	262,727	-354,290	-57.42	0	-57.42
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	19,682,725	19,765,863	83,138	0.42%	809,645	-3.69%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	76,113,095	76,568,308	455,213	0.60%	1,112,627	-0.86%
11. Irrigated	17,388,344	19,492,579	2,104,235	12.10%		
12. Dryland	31,457,936	33,341,056	1,883,120	5.99%		
13. Grassland	160,047,428	193,225,487	33,178,059	20.73%		
14. Wasteland	156,726	391,929	235,203	150.07%		
15. Other Agland	1,600,693	1,878,265	277,572	17.34%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	210,651,127	248,329,316	37,678,189	17.89%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	286,764,222	324,897,624	38,133,402	13.30%	1,112,627	12.91%

2008 Plan of Assessment for Garden County
Assessment Years 2009, 2010 AND 2011
Date: June 1, 2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Nebraska Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the County Board of Equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the County Board of Commissioners. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Garden County:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Base Of Real Estate</u>
Residential	994	22.45	13.22
Commercial	171	3.86	2.06
Agricultural	3,243	73.26	84.66
Mineral	19	.43	.06

Garden County has 1,036,859.99 acres of agricultural land; 3.67% consists of irrigated land, 83.71% consists of grassland, 10.39% is dryland, and 2.23% is waste etc.

Garden County has a State Game Refuge which lies 210 yards back from the river banks of the North Platte River (NE Statute 37-706). In the northern half of the county lies Crescent Lake National Wildlife. It is a Federal refuge consisting of approximately 45,698 acres.

New Property: For assessment year 2008, several building permits and/or information statements and zoning permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. The 2008 yearly pickup work consisted of these permits, which included newly constructed buildings, removed/deteriorated improvements, updating any land uses, etc. These were listed and appraised as part of the countywide residential reappraisal implemented this year.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training:

The Assessor's staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor, and one full-time clerk.

We will submit a budget for around \$76,000 (not fully determined yet) for the office and around \$30,000 for appraisal work. The assessor and deputy obtain the required hours of training necessary to retain assessor's certificates.

B. Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos:

The Garden County Cadastral Maps were prepared in the 1940's. The assessor and staff keep ownership current, and all split outs are updated on the maps. We also have aerial photos of all land in the county, and mylar overlays with soil types and acres. These aeriels were purchased in 1997 from the Bureau of Land Management in Cheyenne. In March of 2005, we had aerial photos taken of all improvements in the county.

C. Property Record Cards:

The Garden County Assessor's property record cards are very complete, detailed, and easy to follow. Our records list the legal description of each property, 911 address (situs), cadastral map and aerial photo numbers, pictures of improvements, and assessed summary of current and prior values. The records also have the PAT's six digit school codes on each property card. In addition we have the combination code which includes all districts each parcel pays taxes into (school, county, community college, Natural Resource District, ESU District, Ag Society, Airport Authority, etc.); we also have the school district number, fire district number and cemetery number (i.e. 1F2C2).

Our property record cards have all necessary information to show values, how the values are arrived at, and physical, locational and any functional depreciations appropriate for the final values. We have an appraisal book with depreciation and cost tables etc. available for anyone who wishes to view it.

Improvements on our records show the Replacement Cost New, with depreciation applied for the current condition, location, etc. This reflects the cost approach. The sales approach is shown by the current adjusted valuations. In a rural county like ours, for most properties the income approach is not applicable.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration:

The Garden County Assessor's office has contracted with MIPS/County Solutions for CAMA pricing and an administrative package. This works very well. Currently we do not have GIS, but at the last County Board meeting (June 23rd) the board signed a contract with GIS Workshop to begin the process of implementing the system in the Assessor's office.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List and Inventory all property:

The appropriate paperwork for Real Estate Transfers is completed as soon as possible after they are brought to our office by the County Clerk's personnel. Ownership changes, etc. are completed in the computer, on the property record card and folder, in the real estate books, in the cadastral map, on index cards, on a tablet of changes for the Treasurer's office, and on soil mylars if the sale includes agricultural land.

Methods of discovering changes in real estate include county zoning permits, city building permits, information from realtors and appraisers, reports by taxpayers and neighbors, ongoing inspections by staff as we travel throughout the county, and a variety of other sources. New pivots listed on Personal Property Schedules indicate newly irrigated land.

B. Data Collection:

We perform extensive pick-up work each year. Data and information is collected by two staff members, under guidance from Jerry Knoche, our contracted appraiser.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions:

We monitor sales of each classification of property; sales studies are ongoing, and are used extensively for valuation updates each year. We prepare spread sheets of residential, commercial and agricultural sales each year based on the qualified sales rosters. We also prepare maps with ag sales plotted to indicate any potential market areas of value, etc. We run miscellaneous "what-ifs" to determine the most appropriate percentage valuation increases to bring values within the ranges.

D. Approaches to Value:

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons:

As mentioned above we perform extensive sales studies, and the market approach is shown by the current adjusted valuations.

2) Cost Approach; cost manual used and date of manual and latest depreciation study:

The date of the Marshal & Swift manual used on all residential improvements is 2005. Our records have the Replacement Cost New of improvements, with depreciation applied for the current condition, location, etc. This reflects the cost approach.

3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market:

In a rural county like Garden County, for most properties the income approach is not applicable or workable.

4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land:

As stated above, we complete extensive sales studies, prepare various spread sheets of sales, plot all sales on a map of the county to indicate any potential areas of market, etc. We also run various "what ifs" using numerous potential changes in values to different classes of land to determine the most equitable and appropriate overall increases/decreases in values to achieve the required statistics for levels of values.

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and Documentation:

Our property record cards have all necessary information to show values, how values were arrived at, etc. On improved parcels we have the Replacement Cost New of improvements and physical, locational and any functional depreciations appropriate for the final values. Each file contains a correlation section that summarizes the results of each approach to value that has been

completed for each parcel. We have appraisal information with depreciation tables, cost tables, etc. easily available for anyone who wishes to view it.

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions:

All assessment actions are taken with the assessment sales ratio studies in mind, to insure that the actions taken result in the proper valuations to meet the required statistics.

G. Notices and Public Relations:

The assessor and staff believe in keeping the public informed of laws and requirements of the office. Articles are put in the paper about homestead exemptions, personal property filing deadlines, valuation changes, budgets of all taxing entities to inform taxpayers where their taxes go, etc.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Coefficient of Dispersion</u>	<u>Price Related Differential</u>
Residential	98	15.34	106.96
Commercial	99	15.55	105.79
Agricultural	73	15.77	100.15
Special Value	73		

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential:

In October of 2005 we hired an outside appraiser, Jerry Knoche, to train our staff in listing property, and to oversee a countywide reappraisal project of all residential, agricultural and commercial improvements. We hired two local personnel to assist our office in achieving this project. We have finished reviewing the residential properties in the county. Our appraiser created depreciation tables using sales in the appropriate time frame, and effective ages were determined using appropriate price per square foot figures derived from sales. All residential properties were repriced with current information and using the applicable effective ages and depreciations.

Commercial:

See above. Last August Jerry Knoche trained our staff to list commercial properties. This review process of all commercial improvements has now been completed, and the information has been entered into the CAMA pricing system. This fall Jerry will use sales in the appropriate sales period to create a depreciation table for commercial properties. New values will be set and will be implemented in 2009.

Agricultural Land:

As stated earlier, all arm's length sales are very closely studied, and if our stats are out of range for 2008, values will again be adjusted. We will continue to monitor land use changes, new pivots, etc. on personal property schedules, etc. and update land records accordingly. On June 23, 2008 the Garden County Board of Commissioners signed a contract with GIS Workshop to attain a GIS system in the Assessor's office. This will be the first step in implementing the new soil survey.

Special Value:

Agland: As with agricultural land, sales will be monitored. Because we have so few sales of river land in each three-year sales period, any changes in value are hard to determine and/or justify.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

We will continue doing pickup work on residential and commercial properties, and continue to monitor land use changes, sales, etc., and value all classes of property accordingly. We will also make preparations for reviewing one-sixth of the county.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

We will continue the above.

Other Functions Performed by the Assessor's Office, But Not Limited to:

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership change.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Real Estate Abstract and Personal Property Abstract
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Reporting Sales information to PA&T rosters
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Land & Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 550 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer approximately 150 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates - management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.

13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Anyone currently holding an assessor's certificate is required to obtain a minimum of 60 hours every 4 years.
16. Prepare, maintain and update a Garden County Procedures Manual.

Conclusion

The Garden County Assessor and staff strive very diligently to complete all duties and responsibilities required of the office, while doing so within the budget we are allowed. We are attempting to do a reappraisal of the county, but it will be in conjunction with all other duties of the office.

We run an efficient, user-friendly office which both serves the public and obeys the Nebraska Statutes, Regulations, and Directives that we are obligated to follow. I believe we do so in a very appropriate, congenial manner.

Respectfully submitted:

Janet L. Shaul, Garden County Assessor

Date

2009 Assessment Survey for Garden 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
	1
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$86,545
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$8,500
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$97,550 The salaries were adjusted between the assessor and appraisal budgets.
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	Separate appraisal budget listed in item 11.
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$700
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$55,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0
13.	Total budget
	Same as item 8 and item 11
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$709.43 was the assessor's balance and \$1124.97 was the appraisal budget balance.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS/County Solution
2.	CAMA software
	MIPS/County Solution

3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	A new contract with signed with GIS in 2008 for Garden County
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	The County is in the beginning stages of implementing GIS
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS/County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Oshkosh and Lewellen
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1998

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Jerry Knoche
2.	Other services
	Pritchard & Abbott for producing mineral interests.

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 Garden 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