

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

38 Grant

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	COD	13.74
Total Sales Price	\$365,000	PRD	105.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$365,000	COV	16.33
Total Assessed Value	\$355,501	STD	16.70
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$33,182	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.71
Avg. Assessed Value	\$32,318	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$26,417
Median	100	Wgt. Mean	97
Mean	102	Max	126
Min	80.90		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	82.16 to 123.42
95% Mean C.I	91.06 to 113.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.33 to 110.47

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	7.61
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.53
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.31

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	10	98	17.17	107.6
2007	7	112	29.29	129.83
2006	4	151	11.73	103.81
2005	4	83	38.9	114.05

2009 Commission Summary

38 Grant

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	1	COD	0.00
Total Sales Price	\$19,000	PRD	100.00
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$19,000	COV	0.00
Total Assessed Value	\$6,648	STD	0.00
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$19,000	Avg. Absolute Deviation	0.00
Avg. Assessed Value	\$6,648	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$20,754
Median	35	Wgt. Mean	35
Mean	35	Max	35
Min	35		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.38
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.39
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.44

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	1	35	0	100
2007	2	45	21.53	92.89
2006	2	68	20.49	110.27
2005	3	82	15.64	120.89

2009 Commission Summary

38 Grant

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	15	COD	16.87
Total Sales Price	\$3,039,218	PRD	102.18
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,039,218	COV	26.38
Total Assessed Value	\$1,994,939	STD	17.69
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$202,615	Avg. Absolute Deviation	12.48
Avg. Assessed Value	\$132,996	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$75,868
Median	74	Wgt. Mean	66
Mean	67	Max	87.14
Min	22.68		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	54.90 to 80.26
95% Mean C.I	57.27 to 76.87
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	53.88 to 77.40

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	91.01
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.15
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	13.50

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	14	70	13.55	108.01
2007	10	71	14.42	106.76
2006	8	75	9.4	100.3
2005	8	76	7.4	99.53

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Grant 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 Grant County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Grant 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 Grant County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Grant 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 Grant County is 74.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Grant County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	16.50	95% Median C.I.:	80.90 to 121.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	16.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.52 to 107.75
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.71	95% Mean C.I.:	86.27 to 107.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	329,001						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	12.40	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	29,909	PRD:	107.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	68.11		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:33

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	103.51	98.15	100.36	5.39	97.79	87.09	103.84	N/A		25,000	25,090
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	92.65	92.65	92.65			92.65	92.65	N/A		20,000	18,530
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	107.56	107.56	102.81	13.26	104.62	93.30	121.82	N/A		27,000	27,758
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	90.34	90.34	99.48	10.44	90.81	80.90	99.77	N/A		32,000	31,833
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	121.91	121.91	121.91			121.91	121.91	N/A		10,000	12,191
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08												
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	81.27	81.27	73.12	16.19	111.15	68.11	94.43	N/A		71,000	51,914
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	98.41	100.37	100.21	9.51	100.16	87.09	121.82	87.09 to 121.82		24,833	24,886
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	94.43	93.02	83.19	15.39	111.82	68.11	121.91	N/A		43,200	35,937
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	96.54	101.73	101.29	13.23	100.43	80.90	121.91	80.90 to 121.91		24,666	24,983
____ALL____												
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82		33,181	29,909

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
HYANNIS	5	99.77	98.64	100.82	11.51	97.83	80.90	121.91	N/A		23,800	23,995
RURAL	6	93.87	95.69	84.97	11.72	112.62	68.11	121.82	68.11 to 121.82		41,000	34,837
____ALL____												
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82		33,181	29,909

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	5	99.77	98.64	100.82	11.51	97.83	80.90	121.91	N/A		23,800	23,995
3	6	93.87	95.69	84.97	11.72	112.62	68.11	121.82	68.11 to 121.82		41,000	34,837
____ALL____												
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82		33,181	29,909

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	10	97.10	98.64	90.16	11.87	109.41	68.11	121.91	87.09 to 121.82		36,400	32,819
2	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A		1,000	809
____ALL____												
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82		33,181	29,909

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	16.50	95% Median C.I.:	80.90 to 121.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	16.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.52 to 107.75
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.71	95% Mean C.I.:	86.27 to 107.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	329,001						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	12.40	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	29,909	PRD:	107.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	68.11		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:33

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	10	93.87	96.35	88.91	12.72	108.37	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,500	29,784
06											
07	1	103.84	103.84	103.84			103.84	103.84	N/A	30,000	31,152
ALL	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909
NonValid School											
ALL	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

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	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	94.43	94.43	94.43			94.43	94.43	N/A	27,000	25,496
1920 TO 1939	5	99.77	101.10	100.30	9.01	100.79	87.09	121.82	N/A	32,400	32,498
1940 TO 1949	1	92.65	92.65	92.65			92.65	92.65	N/A	20,000	18,530
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	2	112.88	112.88	108.36	8.00	104.17	103.84	121.91	N/A	20,000	21,671
1980 TO 1989	1	68.11	68.11	68.11			68.11	68.11	N/A	115,000	78,332
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	16.50	95% Median C.I.:	80.90 to 121.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	16.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.52 to 107.75
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.71	95% Mean C.I.:	86.27 to 107.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	329,001						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	12.40	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	29,909	PRD:	107.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	68.11		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:34

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
10000 TO 29999	5	94.43	103.58	101.34	13.55	102.21	87.09	121.91	N/A	18,000	18,241
30000 TO 59999	3	103.51	100.22	99.79	3.39	100.43	93.30	103.84	N/A	32,000	31,931
60000 TO 99999	1	99.77	99.77	99.77			99.77	99.77	N/A	63,000	62,857
100000 TO 149999	1	68.11	68.11	68.11			68.11	68.11	N/A	115,000	78,332
ALL _____											
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

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	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
10000 TO 29999	5	94.43	103.58	101.34	13.55	102.21	87.09	121.91	N/A	18,000	18,241
30000 TO 59999	3	103.51	100.22	99.79	3.39	100.43	93.30	103.84	N/A	32,000	31,931
60000 TO 99999	2	83.94	83.94	79.32	18.86	105.82	68.11	99.77	N/A	89,000	70,594
ALL _____											
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
20	6	98.97	100.56	100.87	9.26	99.69	87.09	121.82	87.09 to 121.82	23,333	23,537
30	4	96.54	95.77	83.47	15.61	114.74	68.11	121.91	N/A	56,000	46,742
ALL _____											
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	94.43	94.68	88.78	11.79	106.64	68.11	121.82	80.90 to 103.84	35,444	31,469
100	1	121.91	121.91	121.91			121.91	121.91	N/A	10,000	12,191
104	1	93.30	93.30	93.30			93.30	93.30	N/A	36,000	33,589
ALL _____											
	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	16.50	95% Median C.I.:	80.90 to 121.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	16.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.52 to 107.75
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.71	95% Mean C.I.:	86.27 to 107.79
TOTAL Assessed Value:	329,001						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	12.40	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	29,909	PRD:	107.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	68.11		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:34

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
10	1	87.09	87.09	87.09			87.09	87.09	N/A	15,000	13,064
20	5	103.84	108.75	106.35	9.16	102.26	92.65	121.91	N/A	21,600	22,970
25	1	94.43	94.43	94.43			94.43	94.43	N/A	27,000	25,496
30	3	93.30	87.06	81.67	11.31	106.60	68.11	99.77	N/A	71,333	58,259
ALL	11	94.43	97.03	90.14	12.40	107.65	68.11	121.91	80.90 to 121.82	33,181	29,909

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

Residential

Within the three-year plan of assessment specific action for 2009 called for pick-up work to be conducted including a drive by inspection of all properties within the three towns of Grant County. The towns include Hyannis with 131 improved parcels; Whitman and Ashby each have 26 improved parcels. Sales review will also be completed for residential properties.

Appraisal work in Grant County is contracted through Heartland Appraisal Service. For 2009 the appraisal company re-calibrated the depreciation tables for the older properties and removed the economic factor of 18% from the outlots, it could not be justified from the market.

2009 Assessment Survey for Grant County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Data collection is done by Heartland Appraisal.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The contracted appraisal service will establish an initial value. However, ultimately the assessor will be responsible for setting the final value estimate.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	All pickup work will be done by Heartland Appraisal.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June of 2006
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2007
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Primarily the cost approach and utilizing sales to establish depreciation. The sales comparison approach is not used since there are so few sales.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	2 – Hyannis and Rural
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The Assessor Location “Hyannis” is identified by its political boundaries and is the only incorporated town in the county. Ashby and Whitman are unincorporated villages and are considered part of the “Rural” 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 <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No – The few outlots outside the political boundaries of the town have similar market influences as other rural properties, and are considered part of the rural area.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, they are valued in the same manner that would provide the same relationship to market.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0			0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	16.33	95% Median C.I.:	82.16 to 123.42
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	16.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.33 to 110.47
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	91.06 to 113.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	355,501						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	13.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	126.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,318	PRD:	105.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.90		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:26

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	103.86	104.57	108.20	11.87	96.65	86.43	123.42	N/A	25,000	27,050
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	112.10	112.10	112.10			112.10	112.10	N/A	20,000	22,420
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	107.82	107.82	102.98	13.47	104.70	93.30	122.34	N/A	27,000	27,805
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	90.37	90.37	99.53	10.47	90.79	80.90	99.83	N/A	32,000	31,850
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	126.36	126.36	126.36			126.36	126.36	N/A	10,000	12,636
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	88.30	88.30	84.50	6.95	104.50	82.16	94.43	N/A	71,000	59,991
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	107.98	106.91	106.83	11.46	100.07	86.43	123.42	86.43 to 123.42	24,833	26,530
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	94.43	96.74	90.89	13.37	106.43	80.90	126.36	N/A	43,200	39,264
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	105.97	105.81	104.30	13.65	101.44	80.90	126.36	80.90 to 126.36	24,666	25,728
____ALL____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
HYANNIS	5	99.83	99.48	101.23	12.60	98.27	80.90	126.36	N/A	23,800	24,092
RURAL	6	103.27	104.63	95.55	14.20	109.50	82.16	123.42	82.16 to 123.42	41,000	39,173
____ALL____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318
LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	5	99.83	99.48	101.23	12.60	98.27	80.90	126.36	N/A	23,800	24,092
3	6	103.27	104.63	95.55	14.20	109.50	82.16	123.42	82.16 to 123.42	41,000	39,173
____ALL____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318
STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	10	101.85	104.42	97.44	12.95	107.16	82.16	126.36	86.43 to 123.42	36,400	35,469
2	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
____ALL____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	16.33	95% Median C.I.:	82.16 to 123.42
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	16.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.33 to 110.47
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	91.06 to 113.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	355,501						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	13.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	126.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,318	PRD:	105.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.90		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:26

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	10	97.13	100.17	95.07	13.10	105.37	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 122.34	33,500	31,847
06											
07	1	123.42	123.42	123.42			123.42	123.42	N/A	30,000	37,027
ALL	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318
NonValid School											
ALL	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

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	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	94.43	94.43	94.43			94.43	94.43	N/A	27,000	25,496
1920 TO 1939	5	99.83	101.15	100.39	9.31	100.76	86.43	122.34	N/A	32,400	32,525
1940 TO 1949	1	112.10	112.10	112.10			112.10	112.10	N/A	20,000	22,420
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	2	124.89	124.89	124.16	1.18	100.59	123.42	126.36	N/A	20,000	24,831
1980 TO 1989	1	82.16	82.16	82.16			82.16	82.16	N/A	115,000	94,487
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	16.33	95% Median C.I.:	82.16 to 123.42
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	16.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.33 to 110.47
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	91.06 to 113.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	355,501						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	13.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	126.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,318	PRD:	105.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.90		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:26

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
10000 TO 29999	5	112.10	108.33	106.15	12.10	102.05	86.43	126.36	N/A	18,000	19,107
30000 TO 59999	3	103.86	106.86	106.02	9.67	100.80	93.30	123.42	N/A	32,000	33,925
60000 TO 99999	1	99.83	99.83	99.83			99.83	99.83	N/A	63,000	62,892
100000 TO 149999	1	82.16	82.16	82.16			82.16	82.16	N/A	115,000	94,487
ALL _____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

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	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
10000 TO 29999	5	112.10	108.33	106.15	12.10	102.05	86.43	126.36	N/A	18,000	19,107
30000 TO 59999	3	103.86	106.86	106.02	9.67	100.80	93.30	123.42	N/A	32,000	33,925
60000 TO 99999	2	91.00	91.00	88.42	9.71	102.92	82.16	99.83	N/A	89,000	78,689
ALL _____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
20	6	107.98	107.10	107.92	11.29	99.24	86.43	123.42	86.43 to 123.42	23,333	25,181
30	4	96.57	100.41	90.89	13.13	110.47	82.16	126.36	N/A	56,000	50,901
ALL _____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	99.83	100.61	96.95	13.11	103.77	80.90	123.42	82.16 to 122.34	35,444	34,364
100	1	126.36	126.36	126.36			126.36	126.36	N/A	10,000	12,636
104	1	93.30	93.30	93.30			93.30	93.30	N/A	36,000	33,589
ALL _____											
	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	16.33	95% Median C.I.:	82.16 to 123.42
TOTAL Sales Price:	365,000	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	16.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.33 to 110.47
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	365,000	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.71	95% Mean C.I.:	91.06 to 113.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	355,501						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	33,181	COD:	13.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	126.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,318	PRD:	105.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.90		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:26

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	80.90	80.90	80.90			80.90	80.90	N/A	1,000	809
10	1	86.43	86.43	86.43			86.43	86.43	N/A	15,000	12,964
20	5	122.34	117.62	115.99	5.53	101.41	103.86	126.36	N/A	21,600	25,052
25	1	94.43	94.43	94.43			94.43	94.43	N/A	27,000	25,496
30	3	93.30	91.76	89.24	6.31	102.83	82.16	99.83	N/A	71,333	63,656
ALL	11	99.83	102.28	97.40	13.74	105.02	80.90	126.36	82.16 to 123.42	33,181	32,318

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 100% and is supported somewhat by the trended statistics produced by the Division using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population, and indicates the sample is representative of the population. Even though the price related differential is slightly above the standard it is believed both qualitative measures are indicating the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner. The assessor with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Heartland Appraisal) has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the verification and review process. The assessor tries fulfilling the purposed goals within the three-year plan of assessment.

Within the substrata Status: Improved, Unimproved, and IOLL strata 1 Improved is showing a median of 101.85. Strata 1 Improved is not a valid valuation grouping as this subclass is a culmination of two different Assessor Locations: Hyannis (4 sales) and Rural (6 sales). The sub stratification into smaller groups decreases the reliability of the statistics.

There is no non-binding recommendation to adjust the substrata Status: Improved, Unimproved, and IOLL strata 1 Improved.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	16	11	68.75
2008	15	10	66.67
2007	12	7	58.33
2006	6	4	66.67
2005	6	4	66.67

RESIDENTIAL: The total residential sales transactions for 2009 have stayed somewhat constant with 2008. Eleven of the sixteen transactions have been deemed to be good sales; those disqualified were three family sales, one estate sale, and a liquidation of property. The Grant County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner, which is an advantage in the sales review process. There is ample opportunity to visit with professional people handling real property business and to visit with taxpayers of the county. The contracted appraisal company (Heartland Appraisal) will also assist in the review and verification process.

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant 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	94	5.02	99	100
2008	81.35	12.93	92	98.41
2007	112	-3.58	108	112
2006	151	1.41	153	151
2005	83	0.01	83	83

RESIDENTIAL: The approximate one point (1.28) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio is not a concern. The measures are similar and tend to support each other.

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant 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)
9.64	2009	5.02
16.99	2008	12.93
0.36	2007	-3.58
0.00	2006	1.41
0.00	2005	0.01

RESIDENTIAL: There is a point difference of 4.62 between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File and the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth). The percent change in the sales file is based on five sales, the percent change in the base is more reflective of the assessment actions to the population in that the contracted appraisal company (Heartland Appraisal) re-calibrated the depreciation on the older properties and removed the economic factor of 18% from the outlots since it could not be justified from the market.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	100	97	102

RESIDENTIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency only the mean is outside the acceptable range. There does not appear to be a particular outlier(s) affecting the statistic. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to best describe the level of value for the residential class of property, and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	13.74	105.02
Difference	0.00	2.02

RESIDENTIAL:Of the two qualitative measures only the price related differential is slightly above the range by 2.02 points. There does not appear to be a particular outlier(s) affecting the statistic. Based on the known assessment practices it is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	11	11	0
Median	94	100	6
Wgt. Mean	90	97	7
Mean	97	102	5
COD	12.40	13.74	1.34
PRD	107.65	105.02	-2.63
Minimum	68.11	80.90	12.79
Maximum	121.91	126.36	4.45

RESIDENTIAL: The above table is a reflection of the assessment action taken within the residential class of property in that for 2009 the appraisal company re-calibrated the depreciation tables for the older properties and removed the economic factor of 18% from the outlots since it could not be justified from the market.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	11	11	0
Median	100	93	7
Wgt. Mean	97	91	6
Mean	102	95	7
COD	13.74	29.00	-15.26
PRD	105.02	104.15	0.87
Minimum	80.90	17.63	63.27
Maximum	126.36	161.03	-34.67

The table is a direct comparison of the statistics in the Reports and Opinions, created using the 2009 assessed values, and the statistics produced using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. In Grant County the sample overall is small and barely representative of the population, subclasses reduce the reliability of these statistics even further. There is no other information available that would suggest that the sold and unsold properties are not being assessed in a uniform and proportionate manner.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	1	MEDIAN:	35	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,000	WGT. MEAN:	35	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,000	MEAN:	35	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,648						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	19,000	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	34.99		
AVG. Assessed Value:	6,648	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.99		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:39

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08											
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HYANNIS	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	1	MEDIAN:	35	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,000	WGT. MEAN:	35	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,000	MEAN:	35	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,648						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	19,000	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	34.99		
AVG. Assessed Value:	6,648	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.99		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:39

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
NonValid School											
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	1	MEDIAN:	35	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,000	WGT. MEAN:	35	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,000	MEAN:	35	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,648						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	19,000	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	34.99		
AVG. Assessed Value:	6,648	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.99		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:39

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
20	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
353	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
04											
____ALL____	____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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

Commercial

The three-year plan of assessment called for all pick-up work and sales review to be completed for commercial properties.

Appraisal work in Grant County is contracted through Heartland Appraisal Service. For 2009 only routine maintenance occurred within the commercial class of property.

2009 Assessment Survey for Grant County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Data collection is done by Heartland Appraisal.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The contracted appraisal service will establish an initial value. However, ultimately the assessor will be responsible for setting the final value estimate.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	All pickup work will be done by Heartland Appraisal.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June of 2006
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006
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?
	There are few commercial sales in Grant County, meaningful income and expense information is not available.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	1 – the entire county
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Not applicable
10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	No, there are too few commercial properties to rely on specific locations for assistance in determining values.

11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	In this rural area there are not enough sales of a particular occupancy code to determine if there are common value characteristics.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? <i>(Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</i>
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0			0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	1	MEDIAN:	35	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,000	WGT. MEAN:	35	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,000	MEAN:	35	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,648						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	19,000	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	34.99		
AVG. Assessed Value:	6,648	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.99		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:32

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08											
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HYANNIS	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	_____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	1	MEDIAN:	35	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,000	WGT. MEAN:	35	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,000	MEAN:	35	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,648						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	19,000	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	34.99		
AVG. Assessed Value:	6,648	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.99		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:32

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
NonValid School											
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

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	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
ALL	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	1	MEDIAN:	35	COV:	0.00	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,000	WGT. MEAN:	35	STD:	0.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,000	MEAN:	35	AVG.ABS.DEV:	0.00	95% Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,648						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	19,000	COD:	0.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	34.99		
AVG. Assessed Value:	6,648	PRD:	100.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.99		

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:32

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
20	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
353	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
____ALL____	____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648
04											
____ALL____	____										
	1	34.99	34.99	34.99			34.99	34.99	N/A	19,000	6,648

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The calculated median from the statistical sampling of one sale will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Grant County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. The sample is not representative of the population. There are few commercial sales in the county and the assessor has tried to utilize as many as possible through her verification process, but often this leaves little to no data in the file. The contracted appraisal company (Heartland Appraisal) will also assist in the review and verification process. The county has developed a three-year plan of assessment and tries to accomplish those goals. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	3	1	33.33
2008	4	1	25.00
2007	4	2	50.00
2006	4	2	50.00
2005	4	3	75.00

COMMERCIAL: There are seldom any commercial sales in Grant County, the one remaining sale occurred in 2005 and is not representative of the commercial class of property as a whole. The two sales that were disqualified both happened in 2006; one had been an exempt property that sold at auction so the seller could dissolve the organization and disperse the assets for what they could get, and the other was the liquidation of a motel in which the seller had left vacated and in poor condition, they took the first offer to get rid of it. It has been stated that the Grant County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner, which is beneficial in the sales review process, and the contracted appraisal company (Heartland Appraisal) will assist in the review and verification process.

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant 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	35	0.07	35	35
2008	34.99	0.00	35	34.99
2007	45	9.15	49	45
2006	68	-0.89	68	68
2005	82	0.09	82	82

COMMERCIAL: The two statistical measures, Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, are essentially identical (when rounded) and support one another and the assessment actions taken within the commercial class of property in that there were no major changes.

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0.00	2009	0.07
0.00	2008	0.00
0.00	2007	9.15
0.00	2006	-0.89
0.00	2005	0.09

COMMERCIAL: The very slight change in the base and no change in the sales file is reflective of the assessment actions in that there were no major changes within the commercial class of property other than routine maintenance.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	35	35	35

COMMERCIAL:With only one sale in the commercial sales file these qualitative measures are pointless.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	0.00	100.00
Difference	0.00	0.00

COMMERCIAL: With only one sale in the commercial sales file these qualitative measures are not meaningful.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	1	1	0
Median	35	35	0
Wgt. Mean	35	35	0
Mean	35	35	0
COD	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRD	100.00	100.00	0.00
Minimum	34.99	34.99	0.00
Maximum	34.99	34.99	0.00

COMMERCIAL: The above table is further support of the assessment actions stated for the commercial class of property in that nothing was done other than routine maintenance.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	48.39 to 70.34	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	15.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	47.27 to 67.81	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.98	95% Mean C.I.:	50.20 to 67.34	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,748,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.34			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,580	PRD:	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.16			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:53

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	66.48	66.48	67.33	5.81	98.73	62.62	70.34	N/A	368,573	248,175
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	70.34	70.34	70.34			70.34	70.34	N/A	450,000	316,536
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	61.85	61.85	59.84	9.99	103.36	55.67	68.03	N/A	110,750	66,272
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	70.72	70.72	72.80	7.94	97.14	65.11	76.34	N/A	98,090	71,414
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	65.96	61.24	50.38	12.31	121.56	46.70	71.06	N/A	173,039	87,175
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	58.44	58.44	53.57	17.20	109.08	48.39	68.49	N/A	242,500	129,918
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	34.63	37.50	32.32	36.15	116.02	20.16	57.72	N/A	143,424	46,360
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	68.03	65.40	67.12	6.58	97.44	55.67	70.34	N/A	281,729	189,086
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	65.96	65.03	56.53	10.79	115.04	46.70	76.34	N/A	143,059	80,870
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	48.39	45.88	43.58	29.52	105.26	20.16	68.49	N/A	183,054	79,783
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	68.03	67.10	68.22	7.61	98.36	55.67	76.34	N/A	173,536	118,381
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	65.96	61.24	50.38	12.31	121.56	46.70	71.06	N/A	173,039	87,175
____ALL____	_____										
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1423	1	62.62	62.62	62.62			62.62	62.62	N/A	287,147	179,814
1623	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	134,400	102,600
1625	1	68.49	68.49	68.49			68.49	68.49	N/A	125,000	85,616
1629	2	70.34	70.34	70.34	0.00	100.00	70.34	70.34	N/A	450,000	316,536
1905	5	65.11	54.99	44.51	17.87	123.54	20.16	68.03	N/A	117,948	52,496
1907	2	46.18	46.18	48.48	25.00	95.24	34.63	57.72	N/A	92,400	44,800
1913	3	48.39	55.38	48.34	16.78	114.56	46.70	71.06	N/A	272,709	131,839
____ALL____	_____										
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	48.39 to 70.34	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	15.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	47.27 to 67.81	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.98	95% Mean C.I.:	50.20 to 67.34	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,748,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.34			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,580	PRD:	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.16			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:53

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____											
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

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	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____											
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	2	52.85	52.85	45.18	34.47	116.97	34.63	71.06	N/A	52,023	23,504
180.01 TO 330.00	4	65.54	54.82	40.81	18.59	134.32	20.16	68.03	N/A	110,736	45,189
330.01 TO 650.00	4	63.11	64.56	64.58	12.46	99.96	55.67	76.34	N/A	129,270	83,485
650.01 +	5	62.62	59.68	60.10	14.56	99.30	46.70	70.34	N/A	395,029	237,399
____ALL____											
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	13	65.96	61.98	61.11	12.76	101.43	34.63	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	203,611	124,422
GRASS-N/A	2	37.92	37.92	33.45	46.83	113.36	20.16	55.67	N/A	196,136	65,602
____ALL____											
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____											
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	48.39 to 70.34	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	15.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	47.27 to 67.81	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.98	95% Mean C.I.:	50.20 to 67.34	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,748,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.34			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,580	PRD:	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.16			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:53

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
GRASS	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	____										
____Total \$____	____										
30000 TO 59999	1	71.06	71.06	71.06			71.06	71.06	N/A	30,127	21,408
60000 TO 99999	4	65.54	58.43	57.80	13.07	101.09	34.63	68.03	N/A	67,848	39,219
100000 TO 149999	4	63.11	64.56	64.58	12.46	99.96	55.67	76.34	N/A	129,270	83,485
150000 TO 249999	1	20.16	20.16	20.16			20.16	20.16	N/A	245,472	49,480
250000 TO 499999	5	62.62	59.68	60.10	14.56	99.30	46.70	70.34	N/A	395,029	237,399
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	____										
____Total \$____	____										
10000 TO 29999	2	52.85	52.85	45.18	34.47	116.97	34.63	71.06	N/A	52,023	23,504
30000 TO 59999	4	65.54	54.82	40.81	18.59	134.32	20.16	68.03	N/A	110,736	45,189
60000 TO 99999	3	57.72	60.63	60.45	7.40	100.29	55.67	68.49	N/A	127,560	77,113
100000 TO 149999	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	134,400	102,600
150000 TO 249999	3	48.39	52.57	51.52	10.97	102.04	46.70	62.62	N/A	358,382	184,641
250000 TO 499999	2	70.34	70.34	70.34	0.00	100.00	70.34	70.34	N/A	450,000	316,536
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	48.39 to 70.34	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	15.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	47.27 to 67.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.98	95% Mean C.I.:	50.20 to 67.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,748,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.34			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,580	PRD:	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.16			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:17:01

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	66.48	66.48	67.33	5.81	98.73	62.62	70.34	N/A		368,573	248,175
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	70.34	70.34	70.34			70.34	70.34	N/A		450,000	316,536
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	61.85	61.85	59.84	9.99	103.36	55.67	68.03	N/A		110,750	66,272
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	70.72	70.72	72.80	7.94	97.14	65.11	76.34	N/A		98,090	71,414
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	65.96	61.24	50.38	12.31	121.56	46.70	71.06	N/A		173,039	87,175
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	58.44	58.44	53.57	17.20	109.08	48.39	68.49	N/A		242,500	129,918
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	34.63	37.50	32.32	36.15	116.02	20.16	57.72	N/A		143,424	46,360
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	68.03	65.40	67.12	6.58	97.44	55.67	70.34	N/A		281,729	189,086
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	65.96	65.03	56.53	10.79	115.04	46.70	76.34	N/A		143,059	80,870
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	48.39	45.88	43.58	29.52	105.26	20.16	68.49	N/A		183,054	79,783
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	68.03	67.10	68.22	7.61	98.36	55.67	76.34	N/A		173,536	118,381
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	65.96	61.24	50.38	12.31	121.56	46.70	71.06	N/A		173,039	87,175
____ALL____												
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34		202,614	116,580
GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1423	1	62.62	62.62	62.62			62.62	62.62	N/A		287,147	179,814
1623	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A		134,400	102,600
1625	1	68.49	68.49	68.49			68.49	68.49	N/A		125,000	85,616
1629	2	70.34	70.34	70.34	0.00	100.00	70.34	70.34	N/A		450,000	316,536
1905	5	65.11	54.99	44.51	17.87	123.54	20.16	68.03	N/A		117,948	52,496
1907	2	46.18	46.18	48.48	25.00	95.24	34.63	57.72	N/A		92,400	44,800
1913	3	48.39	55.38	48.34	16.78	114.56	46.70	71.06	N/A		272,709	131,839
____ALL____												
	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34		202,614	116,580

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	48.39 to 70.34	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	15.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	47.27 to 67.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.98	95% Mean C.I.:	50.20 to 67.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,748,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.34			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,580	PRD:	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.16			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:17:01

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

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	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
NonValid School											
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	2	52.85	52.85	45.18	34.47	116.97	34.63	71.06	N/A	52,023	23,504
180.01 TO 330.00	4	65.54	54.82	40.81	18.59	134.32	20.16	68.03	N/A	110,736	45,189
330.01 TO 650.00	4	63.11	64.56	64.58	12.46	99.96	55.67	76.34	N/A	129,270	83,485
650.01 +	5	62.62	59.68	60.10	14.56	99.30	46.70	70.34	N/A	395,029	237,399
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	13	65.96	61.98	61.11	12.76	101.43	34.63	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	203,611	124,422
GRASS-N/A	2	37.92	37.92	33.45	46.83	113.36	20.16	55.67	N/A	196,136	65,602
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	48.39 to 70.34	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	15.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	47.27 to 67.81	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.98	95% Mean C.I.:	50.20 to 67.34	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,748,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.34			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,580	PRD:	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.16			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:17:01

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
GRASS	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	____										
____Total \$____	____										
30000 TO 59999	1	71.06	71.06	71.06			71.06	71.06	N/A	30,127	21,408
60000 TO 99999	4	65.54	58.43	57.80	13.07	101.09	34.63	68.03	N/A	67,848	39,219
100000 TO 149999	4	63.11	64.56	64.58	12.46	99.96	55.67	76.34	N/A	129,270	83,485
150000 TO 249999	1	20.16	20.16	20.16			20.16	20.16	N/A	245,472	49,480
250000 TO 499999	5	62.62	59.68	60.10	14.56	99.30	46.70	70.34	N/A	395,029	237,399
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	____										
____Total \$____	____										
10000 TO 29999	2	52.85	52.85	45.18	34.47	116.97	34.63	71.06	N/A	52,023	23,504
30000 TO 59999	4	65.54	54.82	40.81	18.59	134.32	20.16	68.03	N/A	110,736	45,189
60000 TO 99999	3	57.72	60.63	60.45	7.40	100.29	55.67	68.49	N/A	127,560	77,113
100000 TO 149999	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	134,400	102,600
150000 TO 249999	3	48.39	52.57	51.52	10.97	102.04	46.70	62.62	N/A	358,382	184,641
250000 TO 499999	2	70.34	70.34	70.34	0.00	100.00	70.34	70.34	N/A	450,000	316,536
____ALL____	15	65.11	58.77	57.54	16.86	102.14	20.16	76.34	48.39 to 70.34	202,614	116,580

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

Agricultural

Work is being done to implement the 2008 numeric soil conversion for assessment year 2010.

After an analysis of the agricultural market and all information available, the determination was made to adjust the various land classification groups as follows:

LCG	2008	2009	% Chg
1A1			
1A			
2A1			
2A			
3A1			
3A	315	400	26.98%
4A1	260	280	7.69%
4A	195	280	43.59%
1D1			
1D			
2D1			
2D			
3D1			
3D			
4D1			
4D			
1G1			
1G			
2G1			
2G			
3G1			
3G	180	183	1.67%
4G1	160	183	14.38%
4G	160	183	14.38%
waste	10	10	0.00%

2009 Assessment Survey for Grant County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Data collection will be done by Heartland Appraisal.
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor is responsible for establishing the final value estimate.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Heartland Appraisal will do all pickup work.
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	<p>Yes, defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural/Farm Residential – Less than 40 acres are classified as small acreages and or small farm sites – also known as a “non-working farm”. To the average consumer the “profits gained” are not considered actual income and are to be determined by the Internal Revenue Service and/or a qualified tax expert.
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	<p>Defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4000 Farm/Agricultural – the agricultural land is currently classified as “working farm/ranches” – agricultural sites with the determination of an income producing nature.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The income approach is not utilized in the valuation of the rural agricultural outbuildings or land.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1977
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	Grant County is comprised of 99% grassland, there is some irrigated land and a minimal amount of waste. The irrigated acres have recently been verified with the NRD office.

a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	During pickup work, reappraisal work, requested inspections, property protests, and NRD and FSA maps.
b.	By whom?
	The assessor and a commissioner will review upon taxpayer requests or protests, and the contracted appraiser will report observations during pickup work.
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100% - work continues on an annual basis.
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	The entire county is one market area.
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Not applicable
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	Not applicable
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Not applicable
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
			0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	26.38	95% Median C.I.:	54.90 to 80.26	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.88 to 77.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.48	95% Mean C.I.:	57.27 to 76.87	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,994,939							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	132,995	PRD:	102.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.68			

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:47

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	75.81	75.81	76.79	5.88	98.72	71.35	80.26	N/A	368,573	283,028
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	80.26	80.26	80.26			80.26	80.26	N/A	450,000	361,170
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	70.93	70.93	68.82	9.14	103.06	64.45	77.41	N/A	110,750	76,219
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	80.57	80.57	83.00	8.16	97.06	73.99	87.14	N/A	98,090	81,416
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	74.95	69.87	57.55	12.39	121.42	53.40	81.27	N/A	173,039	99,576
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	66.62	66.62	60.94	17.59	109.32	54.90	78.34	N/A	242,500	147,782
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	39.61	42.77	36.76	36.47	116.36	22.68	66.02	N/A	143,424	52,716
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	77.41	74.75	76.65	6.39	97.52	64.45	80.26	N/A	281,729	215,932
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	74.95	74.15	64.53	10.95	114.91	53.40	87.14	N/A	143,059	92,312
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	54.90	52.31	49.57	29.90	105.52	22.68	78.34	N/A	183,054	90,742
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	77.41	76.65	77.96	7.48	98.32	64.45	87.14	N/A	173,536	135,288
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	74.95	69.87	57.55	12.39	121.42	53.40	81.27	N/A	173,039	99,576
____ALL____											
	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1423	1	71.35	71.35	71.35			71.35	71.35	N/A	287,147	204,886
1623	1	87.14	87.14	87.14			87.14	87.14	N/A	134,400	117,120
1625	1	78.34	78.34	78.34			78.34	78.34	N/A	125,000	97,924
1629	2	80.26	80.26	80.26	0.00	100.00	80.26	80.26	N/A	450,000	361,170
1905	5	73.99	62.70	50.79	17.63	123.44	22.68	77.41	N/A	117,948	59,906
1907	2	52.82	52.82	55.45	25.00	95.24	39.61	66.02	N/A	92,400	51,240
1913	3	54.90	63.19	55.08	16.92	114.72	53.40	81.27	N/A	272,709	150,218
____ALL____											
	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

	NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	26.38	95% Median C.I.:	54.90 to 80.26	<i>(!: Derived)</i>
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.88 to 77.40	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.48	95% Mean C.I.:	57.27 to 76.87	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,994,939							
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.14			
	AVG. Assessed Value:	132,995	PRD:	102.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.68			
									<i>Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:47</i>

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:47

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

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	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
NonValid School											
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	2	60.44	60.44	51.67	34.46	116.96	39.61	81.27	N/A	52,023	26,882
180.01 TO 330.00	4	74.47	62.26	46.26	18.70	134.57	22.68	77.41	N/A	110,736	51,230
330.01 TO 650.00	4	72.18	73.99	74.04	12.13	99.93	64.45	87.14	N/A	129,270	95,713
650.01 +	5	71.35	68.03	68.52	14.64	99.29	53.40	80.26	N/A	395,029	270,679
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	13	74.95	70.68	69.69	12.87	101.43	39.61	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	203,611	141,896
GRASS-N/A	2	43.57	43.57	38.31	47.94	113.72	22.68	64.45	N/A	196,136	75,139
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	26.38	95% Median C.I.:	54.90 to 80.26	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.88 to 77.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.48	95% Mean C.I.:	57.27 to 76.87	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,994,939							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	132,995	PRD:	102.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.68			

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:47

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
GRASS	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
30000 TO 59999	1	81.27	81.27	81.27			81.27	81.27	N/A	30,127	24,485
60000 TO 99999	4	74.47	66.49	65.78	13.01	101.07	39.61	77.41	N/A	67,848	44,633
100000 TO 149999	4	72.18	73.99	74.04	12.13	99.93	64.45	87.14	N/A	129,270	95,713
150000 TO 249999	1	22.68	22.68	22.68			22.68	22.68	N/A	245,472	55,669
250000 TO 499999	5	71.35	68.03	68.52	14.64	99.29	53.40	80.26	N/A	395,029	270,679
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	2	60.44	60.44	51.67	34.46	116.96	39.61	81.27	N/A	52,023	26,882
30000 TO 59999	4	74.47	62.26	46.26	18.70	134.57	22.68	77.41	N/A	110,736	51,230
60000 TO 99999	3	66.02	69.60	69.44	7.01	100.23	64.45	78.34	N/A	127,560	88,578
100000 TO 149999	1	87.14	87.14	87.14			87.14	87.14	N/A	134,400	117,120
150000 TO 249999	3	54.90	59.88	58.69	10.90	102.02	53.40	71.35	N/A	358,382	210,352
250000 TO 499999	2	80.26	80.26	80.26	0.00	100.00	80.26	80.26	N/A	450,000	361,170
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	26.38	95% Median C.I.:	54.90 to 80.26	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.88 to 77.40	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.48	95% Mean C.I.:	57.27 to 76.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,994,939							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	132,995	PRD:	102.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.68			

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:55

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	75.81	75.81	76.79	5.88	98.72	71.35	80.26	N/A	368,573	283,028
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	80.26	80.26	80.26			80.26	80.26	N/A	450,000	361,170
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	70.93	70.93	68.82	9.14	103.06	64.45	77.41	N/A	110,750	76,219
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	80.57	80.57	83.00	8.16	97.06	73.99	87.14	N/A	98,090	81,416
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	74.95	69.87	57.55	12.39	121.42	53.40	81.27	N/A	173,039	99,576
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	66.62	66.62	60.94	17.59	109.32	54.90	78.34	N/A	242,500	147,782
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	39.61	42.77	36.76	36.47	116.36	22.68	66.02	N/A	143,424	52,716
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	77.41	74.75	76.65	6.39	97.52	64.45	80.26	N/A	281,729	215,932
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	74.95	74.15	64.53	10.95	114.91	53.40	87.14	N/A	143,059	92,312
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	54.90	52.31	49.57	29.90	105.52	22.68	78.34	N/A	183,054	90,742
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	77.41	76.65	77.96	7.48	98.32	64.45	87.14	N/A	173,536	135,288
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	74.95	69.87	57.55	12.39	121.42	53.40	81.27	N/A	173,039	99,576
____ALL____											
	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1423	1	71.35	71.35	71.35			71.35	71.35	N/A	287,147	204,886
1623	1	87.14	87.14	87.14			87.14	87.14	N/A	134,400	117,120
1625	1	78.34	78.34	78.34			78.34	78.34	N/A	125,000	97,924
1629	2	80.26	80.26	80.26	0.00	100.00	80.26	80.26	N/A	450,000	361,170
1905	5	73.99	62.70	50.79	17.63	123.44	22.68	77.41	N/A	117,948	59,906
1907	2	52.82	52.82	55.45	25.00	95.24	39.61	66.02	N/A	92,400	51,240
1913	3	54.90	63.19	55.08	16.92	114.72	53.40	81.27	N/A	272,709	150,218
____ALL____											
	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

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:	15	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	26.38	95% Median C.I.:	54.90 to 80.26	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.88 to 77.40	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.48	95% Mean C.I.:	57.27 to 76.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,994,939							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	132,995	PRD:	102.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.68			

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:56

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

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	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
38-0011	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
NonValid School											
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	2	60.44	60.44	51.67	34.46	116.96	39.61	81.27	N/A	52,023	26,882
180.01 TO 330.00	4	74.47	62.26	46.26	18.70	134.57	22.68	77.41	N/A	110,736	51,230
330.01 TO 650.00	4	72.18	73.99	74.04	12.13	99.93	64.45	87.14	N/A	129,270	95,713
650.01 +	5	71.35	68.03	68.52	14.64	99.29	53.40	80.26	N/A	395,029	270,679
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	13	74.95	70.68	69.69	12.87	101.43	39.61	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	203,611	141,896
GRASS-N/A	2	43.57	43.57	38.31	47.94	113.72	22.68	64.45	N/A	196,136	75,139
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	26.38	95% Median C.I.:	54.90 to 80.26	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,039,218	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	17.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.88 to 77.40	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,039,218	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.48	95% Mean C.I.:	57.27 to 76.87	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,994,939							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	202,614	COD:	16.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.14			
AVG. Assessed Value:	132,995	PRD:	102.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	22.68			

Printed: 03/24/2009 11:41:56

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
GRASS	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
30000 TO 59999	1	81.27	81.27	81.27			81.27	81.27	N/A	30,127	24,485
60000 TO 99999	4	74.47	66.49	65.78	13.01	101.07	39.61	77.41	N/A	67,848	44,633
100000 TO 149999	4	72.18	73.99	74.04	12.13	99.93	64.45	87.14	N/A	129,270	95,713
150000 TO 249999	1	22.68	22.68	22.68			22.68	22.68	N/A	245,472	55,669
250000 TO 499999	5	71.35	68.03	68.52	14.64	99.29	53.40	80.26	N/A	395,029	270,679
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	2	60.44	60.44	51.67	34.46	116.96	39.61	81.27	N/A	52,023	26,882
30000 TO 59999	4	74.47	62.26	46.26	18.70	134.57	22.68	77.41	N/A	110,736	51,230
60000 TO 99999	3	66.02	69.60	69.44	7.01	100.23	64.45	78.34	N/A	127,560	88,578
100000 TO 149999	1	87.14	87.14	87.14			87.14	87.14	N/A	134,400	117,120
150000 TO 249999	3	54.90	59.88	58.69	10.90	102.02	53.40	71.35	N/A	358,382	210,352
250000 TO 499999	2	80.26	80.26	80.26	0.00	100.00	80.26	80.26	N/A	450,000	361,170
____ALL____	15	73.99	67.07	65.64	16.87	102.18	22.68	87.14	54.90 to 80.26	202,614	132,995

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 74% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio. In the analyses of the agricultural market for Grant County there were no agricultural unimproved sales to include in the sample. The qualitative measures are indicating that the agricultural unimproved class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

In addition to the sales file and statistical profiles, the assessors of six counties in the sand hills went a step further this year in analyzing the agricultural market that is occurring in the sand hills of Nebraska, in an attempt to develop comparative values and gain support of county board members in the decisions that needed to be made. A meeting with assessors and county board members was held in Tryon on February 11, 2009, counties represented were Arthur, Grant, Hooker, Logan, McPherson, and Thomas. The appraiser from Keith County also attended.

The Liaison from the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division presented material to the group for their review and consideration in establishing values on information available to them. Each packet consisted of: a map noting 2008 values and 2009 if available and for comparison purposes included all counties surrounding them, a grass comparison by county using information from the administrative report County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 complete with pie charts to show the breakdown of land classes for each county and the surrounding counties, a spreadsheet of the property record card information for each sale per county, 2009 preliminary statistical profiles for each county (including minimally improved), and a copy of the agricultural sales roster for each county.

From the outstanding effort that was put forth by this group of individuals it is the opinion of the Division that the assessment action taken by Grant County to establish uniform and proportionate assessments and an acceptable level of value has been achieved. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Grant County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	23	15	65.22
2008	21	14	66.67
2007	17	10	58.82
2006	14	8	57.14
2005	13	8	61.54

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Again because of the Ex-Officio Assessor's position in the county she has a good deal of insight into real estate transactions. There were twenty-three agricultural transactions in the three year study period, fifteen were deemed qualified sales. The remaining eight involved a family transaction, partial interests, change of use to commercial, estate settlements, and splits.

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant 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	65	13.80	74	74
2008	70.34	-0.01	70	70.34
2007	61	16.93	71	71
2006	75	-0.01	75	75
2005	72	5.48	76	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The two statistical measures, Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, are essentially identical (when rounded) and support one another and the assessment actions taken within the agricultural unimproved class of property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
13.64	2009	13.80
0.00	2008	-0.01
17.56	2007	16.93
0.00	2006	-0.01
6.30	2005	5.48

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is very little difference between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File and the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) they are virtually the same when rounded. Both statistics reflect the change of value applied to the grass and irrigated land classification groups within the agricultural unimproved class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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 Grant County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	74	66	67

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Only the median measure of central tendency is within the prescribed parameters. The mean and weighted mean are being effected by two sales that have mixed land classes; book 12 page 568 sale date 05/31/06 is 90% grass and 10% irrigated, book 12 page 699 sale date 06/27/08 is 93% grass and 7% waste (lake). If these two sales were hypothetically removed from the sample the weighted mean changes to 69.69% and would give a better indication of the level of value for a county that is predominantly grass (approximately 97%). The median would move to 74.95% and the mean to 70.68%. All three measures would then indicate an acceptable level of value and be supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	16.87	102.18
Difference	0.00	0.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both qualitative measures are indicating there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the agricultural unimproved class, and the measures are further enhanced with the removal of two outliers, book 12 page 568 sale date 05/31/06 is 90% grass and 10% irrigated, book 12 page 699 sale date 06/27/08 is 93% grass and 7% waste (lake), the coefficient of dispersion changes to 12.87% and the price related differential becomes 101.43%.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Grant 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	15	15	0
Median	65	74	9
Wgt. Mean	58	66	8
Mean	59	67	8
COD	16.86	16.87	0.01
PRD	102.14	102.18	0.04
Minimum	20.16	22.68	2.52
Maximum	76.34	87.14	10.80

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is reflecting changes in grass and irrigated land values as established from an analysis of the market and reported in the assessment actions for the agricultural unimproved class.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,683

Value : 108,288,474

Growth 347,570

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	31	68,848	7	22,663	40	63,445	78	154,956	
02. Res Improve Land	133	203,810	13	73,420	78	113,464	224	390,694	
03. Res Improvements	141	4,227,573	14	1,165,312	79	2,303,647	234	7,696,532	
04. Res Total	172	4,500,231	21	1,261,395	119	2,480,556	312	8,242,182	150,096
% of Res Total	55.13	54.60	6.73	15.30	38.14	30.10	18.54	7.61	43.18
05. Com UnImp Land	6	10,073	1	1,038	8	4,071	15	15,182	
06. Com Improve Land	27	67,370	3	3,561	21	18,118	51	89,049	
07. Com Improvements	27	910,159	3	212,851	27	267,073	57	1,390,083	
08. Com Total	33	987,602	4	217,450	35	289,262	72	1,494,314	0
% of Com Total	45.83	66.09	5.56	14.55	48.61	19.36	4.28	1.38	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	172	4,500,231	21	1,261,395	119	2,480,556	312	8,242,182	150,096
% of Res & Rec Total	55.13	54.60	6.73	15.30	38.14	30.10	18.54	7.61	43.18
Com & Ind Total	33	987,602	4	217,450	35	289,262	72	1,494,314	0
% of Com & Ind Total	45.83	66.09	5.56	14.55	48.61	19.36	4.28	1.38	0.00
17. Taxable Total	205	5,487,833	25	1,478,845	154	2,769,818	384	9,736,496	150,096
% of Taxable Total	53.39	56.36	6.51	15.19	40.10	28.45	22.82	8.99	43.18

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	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	41	1	89	131

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	5,194	1,176	80,489,552	1,177	80,494,746
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	7,377	116	9,612,994	117	9,620,371
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	29,571	121	8,407,290	122	8,436,861
30. Ag Total							1,299	98,551,978

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	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	764.25	34.69%	305,700	43.14%	400.00
51. 4A1	234.56	10.65%	65,677	9.27%	280.00
52. 4A	1,204.44	54.67%	337,243	47.59%	280.00
53. Total	2,203.25	100.00%	708,620	100.00%	321.62
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	22,846.59	4.70%	4,180,930	4.70%	183.00
69. 4G1	39,688.13	8.17%	7,262,930	8.17%	183.00
70. 4G	423,450.86	87.13%	77,491,527	87.13%	183.00
71. Total	485,985.58	100.00%	88,935,387	100.00%	183.00
Irrigated Total	2,203.25	0.44%	708,620	0.79%	321.62
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	485,985.58	97.67%	88,935,387	99.11%	183.00
Waste	9,384.07	1.89%	93,840	0.10%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	976.08	0.20%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	497,572.90	100.00%	89,737,847	100.00%	180.35

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,203.25	708,620	2,203.25	708,620
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	67.95	12,436	485,917.63	88,922,951	485,985.58	88,935,387
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.50	5	9,383.57	93,835	9,384.07	93,840
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	380.16	0	0.00	0	595.92	0	976.08	0
82. Total	0.00	0	68.45	12,441	497,504.45	89,725,406	497,572.90	89,737,847

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	2,203.25	0.44%	708,620	0.79%	321.62
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	485,985.58	97.67%	88,935,387	99.11%	183.00
Waste	9,384.07	1.89%	93,840	0.10%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	976.08	0.20%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	497,572.90	100.00%	89,737,847	100.00%	180.35

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

38 Grant

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	7,705,044	8,242,182	537,138	6.97%	150,096	5.02%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	6,178,105	6,569,260	391,155	6.33%	197,474	3.13%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	13,883,149	14,811,442	928,293	6.69%	347,570	4.18%
05. Commercial	1,493,199	1,494,314	1,115	0.07%	0	0.07%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	2,231,565	2,244,871	13,306	0.60%	0	0.60%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	3,724,764	3,739,185	14,421	0.39%	0	0.39%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	17,607,913	18,550,627	942,714	5.35%	347,570	3.38%
11. Irrigated	560,129	708,620	148,491	26.51%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	78,202,086	88,935,387	10,733,301	13.73%		
14. Wasteland	93,840	93,840	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	78,856,055	89,737,847	10,881,792	13.80%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	96,463,968	108,288,474	11,824,506	12.26%	347,570	11.90%

2008 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
GRANT COUNTY, NEBRASKA
JUNE 15, 2007

I, Tonchita J. Ring, Grant County Assessor, submit a Three Year Plan of Assessment to the Grant County Board of Equalization and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, as required by Law, section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB170, Section 5.

COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Parcel/Acres	Count	% Parcel	Value	% Value	Land	Impr.
Resid/Rec	309	19%	6,890,317	7%	538,694	6,351,623
Comm	74	4%	1,524,626	2%	110,526	1,414,100
Agri	1294	77%	85,523,149	91%	79,252,990	7,270,159
	1677	100%	94,938,092	100%	79,902,210	15,035,882

BUDGET, STAFFING AND TRAINING

The 2007/2008 Budget for the Clerk ex officio office is \$80,079 with a separate Re-Appraisal Fund of \$22,000 to cover the expenses of the Contracted Appraiser firm Heartland Appraisal.

The Staff in the office consists of Assessor and one full time clerk. The responsibilities of the Assessor's office are divided between the Assessor and Clerk. The Clerk does the computer work. Our computer services are contracted through ASI/Terra Scan.

The Assessor has her 60 accredited hours that were needed by December 2006. The Assessor will continue attending workshops.

2007 R & O STATISTICS

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	112.36	29.29	129.83
Commercial	44.59	21.53	92.89
Agricultural Unimproved	71.11	14.42	106.76

The following appraisal plan is planned.

3 YEAR APPRAISAL PLAN

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2008

Residential - A complete reappraisal of all residential property in all three towns was started in 2006 and will be on the 2008 Tax Roll. Sales Review includes a physical inspection of property and a questionnaire sent to both buyers and sellers. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of building permits and information statements. The County is zoned, but the Village of Hyannis is not. All homes on acreages and outlots are being inspected also.

Commercial - There will be pick-up work and sales reviews conducted on Commercial properties for 2008 since a complete re-appraisal was completed in 2002. Questionnaires are sent out to both buyers and sellers.

Agricultural - To have the median at 71.11 we raised 4G1 and 4G to \$160 per acre in 2007, leaving 3G at \$180. A market analysis sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. There is not the money to start a complete inspection of Agricultural Land but an inspection of all homes and outbuildings located within the rural area being done. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for agricultural properties.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2009

Residential - Pick-up work will be conducted including a drive by inspection of all properties within the three towns of Grant County. The towns include Hyannis with 131 improved parcels; Whitman and Ashby each have 26 improved parcels. Sales review will also be completed for residential properties.

Commercial - Pick-up work and sales review will be completed for Commercial properties.

Agricultural - Pick-up work and sales review will be completed for agricultural properties.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2010

Residential - Pick-up work and sales review will be completed for residential properties.

Commercial - Only appraisal maintenance for commercial properties will be done. If appraisal adjustment needs to be made to comply with statistical measures required by law they will be made by either a percentage increase or decrease applied to all commercial properties. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed.

Agricultural - Pick-up work and sales review will be completed for agricultural properties.

PROPERTY CARDS, MAPS AND REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS

New property record cards were put in use in 1999 for residential property in the three towns, in 2000 for rural residential and 2002 for commercial properties. With each sale these property record cards are updated by ownership and whenever splits are made. If a value change is made the reason is recorded on the card. Maps are kept current with ownership and boundary lines.

Real Estate Transfer Statements are filed by year in a separate file drawer.

THE ANNUAL REPORTS

The abstracts for Real and Personal property are prepared and filed each year. Copies of assessed Personal Property of the year before are sent to property owners, are checked and returned including new items purchased.

The sales rosters are checked over and mistakes are corrected and rosters returned to the PA&T.

Homestead Exemption applications are sent out. We make sure each property owner that receives an application returns it.

Grant County's Field Liaison Pat Albrow works with the Assessor on sales ratio studies and any other questions the assessor has.

Respectfully submitted,

Tonchita J. Ring
Grant County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Grant County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	None
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	None
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	None
5.	Number of shared employees
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$22,000
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$2,243
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$ - 0 -
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$3,300 includes all ex officio education and training.
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$18,600
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$ - 0 -

13.	Total budget
	\$40,600
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$ 8,031.22 of the appraisal budget was unused.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software
	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	The assessor and clerk.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Not applicable
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None

4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2002

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Contracted with Heartland Appraisal.
2.	Other services

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 Grant County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts