

# **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

### 41 Hamilton

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	310	COD	12.10
Total Sales Price	\$30,520,876	PRD	103.89
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$30,643,876	COV	26.33
Total Assessed Value	\$28,879,322	STD	25.78
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$98,851	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.97
Avg. Assessed Value	\$93,159	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$84,247
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	98	Max	415
Min	40.33		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.68 to 99.30
95% Mean C.I	95.04 to 100.78
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.32 to 96.17

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	28.13
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.12
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.97

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	334	100	8.74	103.76
2007	375	100	9.29	103.61
2006	357	97	11.7	103.44
2005	324	98	11.14	103.39

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 41 Hamilton

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	31	COD	30.62
Total Sales Price	\$2,887,445	PRD	133.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,869,945	COV	68.36
Total Assessed Value	\$2,307,205	STD	73.52
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$92,579	Avg. Absolute Deviation	28.15
Avg. Assessed Value	\$74,426	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$253,465
Median	92	Wgt. Mean	80
Mean	108	Max	395
Min	26		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.72 to 97.53
95% Mean C.I	80.59 to 134.51
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	67.89 to 92.90

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 11.41

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 6.02

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.77

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	36	93	15.38	98.53
2007	46	98	13.73	100.69
2006	56	98	12.76	102.2
2005	56	98	11.22	100.47

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 41 Hamilton

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	92	COD	15.44
Total Sales Price	\$27,607,982	PRD	104.70
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$27,612,876	COV	21.03
Total Assessed Value	\$19,240,885	STD	15.34
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$300,140	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.21
Avg. Assessed Value	\$209,140	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$206,284
Median	73	Wgt. Mean	70
Mean	73	Max	128.39
Min	20.25		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	70.13 to 75.82
95% Mean C.I	69.82 to 76.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	66.72 to 72.64

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	60.46
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.74
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.02

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	103	72	14.3	102.1
2007	95	72	14.86	102.05
2006	111	77	14.49	101.66
2005	118	78	13.62	102.42



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Hamilton 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 Hamilton County is 92.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Hamilton 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 Hamilton County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Hamilton County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	345	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	21.66	95% Median C.I.:	96.69 to 99.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	31,887,395	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	20.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.02 to 94.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	32,010,395	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	93.64 to 98.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	29,749,409						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,783	COD:	12.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	230.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,230	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.60		

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

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

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	52	99.77	99.48	93.84	6.86	106.01	53.59	125.17	99.28 to 100.54		99,073	92,973
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	38	99.66	99.12	99.59	6.56	99.53	40.33	144.54	99.05 to 99.94		92,622	92,243
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	27	99.63	96.35	95.33	6.43	101.07	52.48	117.24	96.72 to 100.22		90,290	86,077
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	61	97.74	97.32	93.09	12.82	104.54	64.08	230.82	93.96 to 99.07		93,799	87,320
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	61	93.03	93.68	91.85	18.87	101.99	12.60	173.48	86.50 to 97.68		85,072	78,139
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	95.35	98.28	91.59	14.65	107.31	59.00	146.46	90.70 to 107.08		75,912	69,527
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	23	95.84	96.64	91.64	16.94	105.46	52.50	161.13	84.39 to 103.98		84,657	77,580
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	56	92.28	89.14	88.95	15.47	100.21	26.40	207.88	84.78 to 95.41		107,019	95,194
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	178	99.52	98.19	95.01	8.80	103.35	40.33	230.82	99.06 to 99.71		94,556	89,834
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	167	93.77	93.31	90.64	16.89	102.94	12.60	207.88	90.87 to 95.63		90,893	82,388
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	176	96.71	96.06	92.83	14.31	103.48	12.60	230.82	94.61 to 98.70		87,492	81,217
<u>ALL</u>												
	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13		92,783	86,230

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	345	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	21.66	95% Median C.I.:	96.69 to 99.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	31,887,395	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	20.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.02 to 94.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	32,010,395	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	93.64 to 98.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	29,749,409						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,783	COD:	12.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	230.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,230	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.60		

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

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ACREAGE	41	95.02	93.58	87.40	15.23	107.07	59.07	173.48	86.58 to 100.00	147,854	129,229
AURORA	208	98.96	97.13	95.17	9.77	102.07	49.44	230.82	97.71 to 99.50	96,726	92,051
GILTNER	12	81.88	87.71	96.44	31.75	90.95	26.40	158.43	60.00 to 112.08	61,845	59,643
HAMPTON	26	95.39	97.43	94.64	12.58	102.95	68.89	128.43	87.55 to 101.79	55,399	52,428
HILLCREST	2	95.86	95.86	94.52	7.96	101.41	88.23	103.49	N/A	166,000	156,910
HORDVILLE	6	91.33	96.34	82.46	25.77	116.83	58.38	161.13	58.38 to 161.13	40,962	33,778
LAC DENADO	1	93.29	93.29	93.29			93.29	93.29	N/A	58,500	54,575
MARQUETTE	11	107.44	106.42	104.68	19.94	101.65	40.33	142.29	76.40 to 136.10	26,795	28,050
OVER THE HILL CAMP	2	95.27	95.27	95.45	4.91	99.81	90.59	99.95	N/A	9,625	9,187
PARADISE LAKE	2	62.63	62.63	70.82	16.20	88.43	52.48	72.77	N/A	130,000	92,060
PHILLIPS	8	92.72	95.10	86.26	26.33	110.25	61.25	164.61	61.25 to 164.61	33,112	28,561
PLATTE VIEW EST	8	99.39	99.71	99.14	1.87	100.58	95.24	104.40	95.24 to 104.40	43,121	42,750
SHOUPS	1	101.27	101.27	101.27			101.27	101.27	N/A	30,000	30,380
STOCKHAM	1	117.24	117.24	117.24			117.24	117.24	N/A	49,000	57,450
SUNSET TERRACE	2	89.88	89.88	90.09	1.05	99.77	88.94	90.83	N/A	185,000	166,667
TIMBER COVE	1	110.36	110.36	110.36			110.36	110.36	N/A	35,000	38,625
TURTLE BEACH	4	81.47	80.13	79.60	4.72	100.67	73.33	84.26	N/A	84,650	67,382
VALLEY VIEW	2	37.10	37.10	39.82	66.04	93.16	12.60	61.60	N/A	22,500	8,960
WILLOW BEND	7	91.89	88.97	86.08	18.71	103.36	53.59	113.74	53.59 to 113.74	137,000	117,925
ALL	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	274	98.94	96.83	95.06	12.50	101.86	12.60	230.82	97.42 to 99.47	84,637	80,456
2	2	89.13	89.13	87.76	16.67	101.55	74.27	103.98	N/A	114,500	100,490
3	69	94.79	92.05	87.34	14.11	105.39	52.48	173.48	88.82 to 99.12	124,504	108,744
ALL	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	294	98.77	97.61	93.22	11.78	104.71	53.59	230.82	97.08 to 99.30	104,045	96,987
2	48	95.44	84.81	86.49	20.42	98.06	12.60	142.29	76.48 to 100.00	28,578	24,716
3	3	99.95	97.27	98.99	3.56	98.26	90.59	101.27	N/A	16,416	16,251
ALL	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	345	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	21.66	95% Median C.I.:	96.69 to 99.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	31,887,395	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	20.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.02 to 94.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	32,010,395	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	93.64 to 98.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	29,749,409						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,783	COD:	12.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	230.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,230	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.60		

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

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	338	98.56	95.72	92.92	12.89	103.01	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.12	94,246	87,570
06	5	99.95	96.64	95.43	6.72	101.27	84.26	107.14	N/A	24,470	23,351
07	2	112.61	112.61	103.51	20.86	108.79	89.12	136.10	N/A	16,325	16,897
ALL	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002											
18-0011											
40-0126	3	100.31	94.27	98.14	8.74	96.06	78.11	104.40	N/A	148,333	145,575
41-0002	15	79.38	84.57	86.09	28.40	98.23	26.40	144.54	61.89 to 104.41	79,176	68,166
41-0091	34	99.82	100.81	98.26	12.87	102.59	68.89	173.48	93.77 to 102.55	64,772	63,646
41-0504	264	98.82	96.63	93.27	11.30	103.61	40.33	230.82	97.22 to 99.28	98,146	91,540
61-0004	16	81.47	80.02	81.92	22.86	97.68	12.60	113.74	61.60 to 104.76	97,875	80,178
72-0075	9	100.00	99.66	93.79	18.12	106.26	58.38	161.13	75.90 to 112.62	51,474	48,280
93-0096	4	97.49	98.29	102.80	5.63	95.61	90.59	107.61	N/A	58,904	60,556
NonValid School											
ALL	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

**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	50	98.70	88.40	91.34	19.67	96.78	12.60	173.48	84.26 to 100.00	32,325	29,526
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	101.65	112.05	95.98	22.39	116.74	75.66	150.42	75.66 to 150.42	66,416	63,744
1900 TO 1919	82	96.32	96.15	90.41	14.68	106.36	54.20	164.61	92.51 to 99.52	76,000	68,709
1920 TO 1939	37	97.42	97.18	90.18	14.12	107.76	58.38	230.82	94.08 to 99.98	74,753	67,410
1940 TO 1949	4	93.88	90.54	90.86	3.64	99.66	80.46	93.96	N/A	93,250	84,723
1950 TO 1959	16	99.26	97.69	93.94	13.95	103.99	59.07	158.43	83.06 to 107.79	81,838	76,883
1960 TO 1969	29	99.54	103.27	100.20	9.36	103.06	76.75	207.88	96.72 to 100.98	108,231	108,447
1970 TO 1979	49	98.39	96.47	94.29	9.01	102.31	72.72	136.10	94.91 to 99.38	114,933	108,366
1980 TO 1989	16	92.43	89.36	86.19	13.50	103.68	53.59	128.43	78.04 to 99.88	129,203	111,362
1990 TO 1994	14	99.96	98.58	98.70	4.98	99.87	84.39	113.74	92.34 to 103.98	148,085	146,164
1995 TO 1999	16	99.38	96.29	88.96	8.31	108.24	59.93	117.24	87.08 to 103.89	159,137	141,569
2000 TO Present	26	97.72	95.77	94.48	7.48	101.37	66.68	130.05	91.64 to 99.97	148,392	140,194
ALL	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	345	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	21.66	95% Median C.I.:	96.69 to 99.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	31,887,395	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	20.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.02 to 94.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	32,010,395	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	93.64 to 98.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	29,749,409						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,783	COD:	12.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	230.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,230	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.60		

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

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

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	121.15	121.15	133.91	17.45	90.46	100.00	142.29	N/A	1,091	1,461
5000 TO 9999	8	112.20	121.64	123.11	42.07	98.81	40.33	230.82	40.33 to 230.82	7,343	9,040
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	112.20	121.54	123.50	37.43	98.42	40.33	230.82	61.25 to 164.61	6,093	7,524
10000 TO 29999	48	99.75	98.26	99.78	21.56	98.48	12.60	207.88	95.63 to 103.72	19,513	19,470
30000 TO 59999	71	99.13	98.29	97.29	12.11	101.03	49.44	150.42	98.19 to 100.54	45,367	44,138
60000 TO 99999	81	97.12	94.39	94.37	9.20	100.02	58.38	158.43	94.08 to 99.24	80,707	76,164
100000 TO 149999	69	97.22	94.74	94.44	9.46	100.32	59.07	124.50	93.96 to 99.50	123,861	116,970
150000 TO 249999	61	95.52	90.98	90.79	9.81	100.21	53.59	109.46	91.89 to 98.92	180,694	164,048
250000 TO 499999	4	91.26	89.38	89.31	10.14	100.07	73.17	101.84	N/A	296,400	264,728
500000 +	1	59.93	59.93	59.93			59.93	59.93	N/A	500,000	299,645
ALL											
	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	50.79	63.81	31.78	73.57	200.77	12.60	142.29	12.60 to 142.29	7,780	2,472
5000 TO 9999	9	86.40	84.88	80.36	19.59	105.63	60.00	118.81	63.37 to 105.58	10,750	8,638
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	70.37	76.46	64.55	38.92	118.44	12.60	142.29	60.00 to 100.00	9,562	6,172
10000 TO 29999	42	99.75	100.65	91.27	20.77	110.27	49.44	230.82	96.66 to 103.72	21,420	19,549
30000 TO 59999	79	99.06	101.14	97.13	14.47	104.13	58.38	207.88	97.68 to 100.00	46,374	45,042
60000 TO 99999	83	95.94	91.88	89.42	9.87	102.75	54.20	128.43	90.87 to 99.00	88,763	79,374
100000 TO 149999	78	96.65	95.83	93.74	9.97	102.23	53.59	158.43	94.79 to 99.50	131,343	123,119
150000 TO 249999	44	99.02	96.62	95.81	6.02	100.84	72.77	113.74	95.41 to 99.97	187,634	179,781
250000 TO 499999	4	91.26	86.07	81.89	13.77	105.10	59.93	101.84	N/A	358,900	293,908
ALL											
	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	345	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	21.66	95% Median C.I.:	96.69 to 99.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	31,887,395	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	20.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.02 to 94.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	32,010,395	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.68	95% Mean C.I.:	93.64 to 98.02
TOTAL Assessed Value:	29,749,409						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,783	COD:	12.87	MAX Sales Ratio:	230.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,230	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.60		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:23

QUALITY										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	52	98.60	88.09	88.82	19.47	99.18	12.60	173.48	84.26 to 100.00	28,033	24,900
10	4	102.31	105.29	98.65	13.15	106.73	86.50	130.05	N/A	47,750	47,106
20	56	99.61	99.71	94.96	11.72	104.99	53.59	164.61	98.94 to 100.13	64,828	61,562
25	1	99.85	99.85	99.85			99.85	99.85	N/A	128,000	127,810
30	200	97.10	96.89	93.17	12.35	103.99	54.20	230.82	95.37 to 99.05	101,288	94,369
35	1	95.43	95.43	95.43			95.43	95.43	N/A	265,600	253,460
40	29	98.92	93.53	91.33	7.96	102.41	59.93	109.46	88.36 to 99.88	186,548	170,376
50	2	94.46	94.46	92.91	7.81	101.66	87.08	101.84	N/A	335,000	311,265
____ALL____											
	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	50	98.70	88.31	89.31	19.58	98.88	12.60	173.48	84.26 to 100.00	28,025	25,028
100	6	96.34	103.98	95.48	15.62	108.90	84.39	136.10	84.39 to 136.10	34,025	32,486
101	188	98.93	97.12	93.49	11.20	103.88	53.59	230.82	97.08 to 99.51	106,253	99,337
102	26	98.60	92.26	88.76	12.15	103.94	54.20	117.24	80.17 to 100.23	122,520	108,754
103	5	99.28	102.09	101.64	6.36	100.44	92.58	122.06	N/A	116,600	118,509
104	67	95.55	97.98	93.18	13.49	105.14	59.07	207.88	92.58 to 99.10	95,202	88,711
111	1	87.72	87.72	87.72			87.72	87.72	N/A	151,750	133,110
301	2	100.19	100.19	100.07	0.48	100.12	99.70	100.67	N/A	65,250	65,292
____ALL____											
	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	70	97.10	89.83	91.00	17.10	98.71	12.60	173.48	91.33 to 99.91	55,228	50,260
10	1	230.82	230.82	230.82			230.82	230.82	N/A	5,500	12,695
15	2	99.31	99.31	99.44	0.21	99.87	99.10	99.52	N/A	61,750	61,402
20	10	99.75	102.78	104.92	17.55	97.96	63.87	158.43	68.89 to 127.52	33,600	35,252
25	3	99.58	105.35	104.97	6.03	100.36	99.24	117.24	N/A	51,666	54,236
30	246	98.56	96.63	93.00	11.52	103.90	53.59	207.88	96.12 to 99.28	104,070	96,788
40	13	97.12	94.48	92.07	6.71	102.61	75.66	107.45	87.08 to 99.67	147,923	136,199
____ALL____											
	345	98.56	95.83	92.94	12.87	103.11	12.60	230.82	96.69 to 99.13	92,783	86,230

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

### **Residential**

For 2009 the county reviewed the towns of Giltner and Marquette. In Giltner the county reviewed vacant lot sales and increased lot values from \$3,000 to \$5,000 in a new subdivision. In the town of Marquette all dwellings and outbuildings were lowered by 10 percent to bring the level of value of the town within the acceptable range.

In addition, the county revalued several properties that were damaged by the May 2008 tornado in Hamilton County. This resulted in several reductions in value as well as building permits for major reconstructions.

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

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	Urban properties in 2006 and rural properties in 2005
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	Urban properties in 2006 and rural properties in 2005
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Cost approach and Sales Comparison Approach
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	19
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	Areas are defined by town and by locational characteristics.
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	No
11.	<b>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?</b>
	Yes. Both areas are valued using the same costing and depreciation schedule.

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
58			58



**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:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	97.68 to 99.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	30,520,876	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	25.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.32 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,643,876	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.97	95% Mean C.I.:	95.04 to 100.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,879,322						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	98,851	COD:	12.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	414.69		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,159	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.33		

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

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:27:51

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	51	99.67	104.76	94.11	13.65	111.32	53.59	414.69	99.12 to 100.56		100,284	94,379
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	33	99.70	99.32	99.69	6.83	99.62	40.33	144.54	99.04 to 99.97		98,383	98,082
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	24	99.50	96.45	95.70	7.75	100.78	52.48	117.24	96.66 to 100.67		97,764	93,562
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	50	97.20	97.76	93.71	11.73	104.32	68.50	230.82	93.96 to 99.44		103,771	97,242
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	55	97.21	96.19	94.09	15.10	102.24	49.44	173.48	90.59 to 99.84		90,135	84,807
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	26	96.82	97.87	92.16	14.15	106.20	59.00	146.46	90.70 to 103.35		78,351	72,205
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	20	98.68	102.62	95.76	14.72	107.16	68.40	164.15	95.15 to 105.55		93,131	89,184
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	51	92.96	90.98	91.61	10.29	99.32	58.38	109.46	90.87 to 96.93		115,501	105,807
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	158	99.44	100.15	95.36	10.73	105.03	40.33	414.69	99.04 to 99.70		100,608	95,934
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	152	95.87	95.58	93.04	13.52	102.73	49.44	173.48	93.77 to 98.48		97,024	90,273
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	155	97.54	97.02	93.94	12.74	103.28	49.44	230.82	95.65 to 99.07		93,738	88,060
<u>ALL</u>												
	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30		98,851	93,159

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	97.68 to 99.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	30,520,876	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	25.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.32 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,643,876	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.97	95% Mean C.I.:	95.04 to 100.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,879,322						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	98,851	COD:	12.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	414.69		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,159	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.33		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:27:52

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ACREAGE	40	94.91	93.96	87.76	14.71	107.06	59.07	173.48	86.57 to 99.24	148,175	130,041
AURORA	188	99.10	100.04	97.13	8.98	103.00	49.44	414.69	98.88 to 99.52	103,003	100,046
GILTNER	11	85.19	96.55	99.28	23.35	97.24	59.00	158.43	76.22 to 121.60	66,104	65,630
HAMPTON	22	97.64	96.82	94.71	13.22	102.22	68.89	128.43	86.75 to 106.02	59,614	56,464
HILLCREST	2	95.86	95.86	94.52	7.96	101.41	88.23	103.49	N/A	166,000	156,910
HORDVILLE	6	91.33	96.34	82.46	25.77	116.83	58.38	161.13	58.38 to 161.13	40,962	33,778
LAC DENADO	1	93.46	93.46	93.46			93.46	93.46	N/A	58,500	54,675
MARQUETTE	11	97.54	98.64	95.96	21.40	102.80	40.33	142.29	70.18 to 130.05	26,795	25,711
OVER THE HILL CAMP	2	95.27	95.27	95.45	4.91	99.81	90.59	99.95	N/A	9,625	9,187
PARADISE LAKE	2	62.81	62.81	71.15	16.45	88.28	52.48	73.14	N/A	130,000	92,497
PHILLIPS	7	99.10	100.28	90.86	24.05	110.37	61.25	164.61	61.25 to 164.61	32,342	29,385
PLATTE VIEW EST	2	99.82	99.82	98.11	4.59	101.75	95.24	104.40	N/A	58,100	57,000
SHOUPS	1	101.27	101.27	101.27			101.27	101.27	N/A	30,000	30,380
STOCKHAM	1	117.24	117.24	117.24			117.24	117.24	N/A	49,000	57,450
SUNSET TERRACE	2	89.88	89.88	90.09	1.05	99.77	88.94	90.83	N/A	185,000	166,667
TIMBER COVE	1	110.36	110.36	110.36			110.36	110.36	N/A	35,000	38,625
TURTLE BEACH	3	79.25	78.95	78.96	4.60	99.99	73.33	84.26	N/A	97,533	77,010
VALLEY VIEW	1	61.60	61.60	61.60			61.60	61.60	N/A	25,000	15,400
WILLOW BEND	7	91.89	88.51	85.66	19.22	103.33	53.59	113.74	53.59 to 113.74	137,000	117,356
ALL	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	248	99.07	99.40	96.83	11.37	102.65	40.33	414.69	98.70 to 99.52	89,807	86,963
2	2	89.13	89.13	87.76	16.67	101.55	74.27	103.98	N/A	114,500	100,490
3	60	93.22	92.03	87.34	14.62	105.37	52.48	173.48	87.08 to 96.93	135,709	118,523
ALL	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	285	98.94	98.86	94.47	11.35	104.65	53.59	414.69	97.71 to 99.30	105,340	99,512
2	22	89.75	85.59	82.03	24.80	104.34	40.33	142.29	61.60 to 104.40	26,021	21,344
3	3	99.95	97.27	98.99	3.56	98.26	90.59	101.27	N/A	16,416	16,251
ALL	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	97.68 to 99.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	30,520,876	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	25.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.32 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,643,876	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.97	95% Mean C.I.:	95.04 to 100.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,879,322						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	98,851	COD:	12.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	414.69		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,159	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.33		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:27:52

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	303	98.93	97.89	94.23	12.16	103.88	40.33	414.69	97.54 to 99.30	100,623	94,820
06	5	99.95	96.64	95.43	6.72	101.27	84.26	107.14	N/A	24,470	23,351
07	2	104.04	104.04	98.25	14.34	105.88	89.12	118.95	N/A	16,325	16,040
ALL	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002											
18-0011											
40-0126	2	91.62	91.62	97.71	14.74	93.76	78.11	105.12	N/A	155,000	151,455
41-0002	14	84.79	91.84	88.77	20.49	103.46	59.00	144.54	72.72 to 112.08	83,760	74,355
41-0091	30	100.35	100.55	98.21	13.27	102.38	68.89	173.48	91.57 to 103.35	69,114	67,879
41-0504	237	98.97	98.71	94.76	10.79	104.17	40.33	414.69	98.34 to 99.31	105,016	99,512
61-0004	14	81.76	84.35	82.53	20.12	102.20	53.59	113.74	61.60 to 107.14	107,142	88,425
72-0075	9	100.00	99.65	93.76	18.11	106.28	58.38	161.13	75.90 to 112.62	51,474	48,263
93-0096	4	97.49	98.29	102.80	5.63	95.61	90.59	107.61	N/A	58,904	60,556
NonValid School											
ALL	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

## 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	26	99.91	91.39	91.73	22.23	99.63	40.33	173.48	75.59 to 105.12	33,422	30,659
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	102.19	111.78	105.05	13.04	106.40	96.66	164.15	96.66 to 164.15	66,416	69,773
1900 TO 1919	75	98.34	100.96	93.37	17.22	108.13	59.00	414.69	92.51 to 99.24	79,244	73,988
1920 TO 1939	37	97.54	97.71	92.40	12.12	105.75	58.38	230.82	94.35 to 99.50	74,753	69,072
1940 TO 1949	4	93.96	95.02	94.94	1.22	100.09	93.80	98.38	N/A	93,250	88,530
1950 TO 1959	16	99.26	97.69	93.94	13.94	103.99	59.07	158.43	83.06 to 107.79	81,838	76,880
1960 TO 1969	28	99.60	99.55	99.66	5.98	99.89	76.75	122.06	96.72 to 100.98	111,382	111,001
1970 TO 1979	48	98.72	96.69	94.74	7.53	102.06	72.72	130.74	95.37 to 99.67	114,473	108,449
1980 TO 1989	16	93.54	91.54	88.36	12.54	103.60	53.59	128.43	78.60 to 101.33	129,203	114,162
1990 TO 1994	14	100.32	98.86	98.76	5.03	100.10	84.39	113.74	92.34 to 103.98	148,085	146,255
1995 TO 1999	16	99.52	97.38	89.52	9.28	108.78	59.93	117.24	87.42 to 105.55	159,137	142,464
2000 TO Present	24	98.41	97.45	95.18	6.30	102.39	73.14	130.05	92.05 to 100.43	153,529	146,134
ALL	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	97.68 to 99.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	30,520,876	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	25.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.32 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,643,876	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.97	95% Mean C.I.:	95.04 to 100.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,879,322						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	98,851	COD:	12.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	414.69		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,159	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.33		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:27:52

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	121.15	121.15	133.91	17.45	90.46	100.00	142.29	N/A	1,091	1,461
5000 TO 9999	7	105.58	122.04	123.79	49.30	98.59	40.33	230.82	40.33 to 230.82	7,250	8,974
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	105.58	121.84	124.20	42.80	98.10	40.33	230.82	61.25 to 164.61	5,881	7,304
10000 TO 29999	31	101.81	113.14	114.17	26.10	99.11	52.48	414.69	98.50 to 108.33	20,391	23,280
30000 TO 59999	58	99.10	98.51	97.70	11.95	100.83	49.44	144.54	98.48 to 102.76	46,620	45,547
60000 TO 99999	81	98.38	95.34	95.39	8.78	99.95	58.38	158.43	95.02 to 99.31	80,707	76,986
100000 TO 149999	66	99.21	95.91	95.70	7.53	100.23	59.07	122.06	95.68 to 99.69	123,629	118,308
150000 TO 249999	60	96.18	92.71	92.41	8.20	100.32	53.59	109.46	92.05 to 98.97	181,205	167,454
250000 TO 499999	4	91.26	89.38	89.31	10.14	100.07	73.17	101.84	N/A	296,400	264,728
500000 +	1	59.93	59.93	59.93			59.93	59.93	N/A	500,000	299,645
ALL											
	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	80.63	85.97	63.58	43.63	135.21	40.33	142.29	N/A	3,545	2,254
5000 TO 9999	4	95.27	91.25	89.64	12.08	101.80	68.89	105.58	N/A	8,812	7,900
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	95.27	88.61	82.17	24.50	107.84	40.33	142.29	40.33 to 142.29	6,179	5,077
10000 TO 29999	29	99.91	101.56	89.82	23.69	113.08	49.44	230.82	89.12 to 108.33	21,160	19,005
30000 TO 59999	67	99.00	100.04	96.57	13.71	103.59	58.38	173.48	97.27 to 101.81	47,678	46,043
60000 TO 99999	78	98.47	98.82	94.34	11.85	104.75	59.07	414.69	94.08 to 99.38	84,012	79,260
100000 TO 149999	78	98.99	96.15	94.19	8.83	102.08	53.59	158.43	95.52 to 99.67	130,440	122,863
150000 TO 249999	46	98.94	96.56	95.80	5.99	100.79	73.14	113.74	95.41 to 99.97	187,465	179,593
250000 TO 499999	4	91.26	86.07	81.89	13.77	105.10	59.93	101.84	N/A	358,900	293,908
ALL											
	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	26.33	95% Median C.I.:	97.68 to 99.30
TOTAL Sales Price:	30,520,876	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	25.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.32 to 96.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	30,643,876	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.97	95% Mean C.I.:	95.04 to 100.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	28,879,322						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	98,851	COD:	12.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	414.69		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,159	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.33		

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

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:27:52

QUALITY										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	27	99.91	91.46	87.56	21.27	104.46	40.33	173.48	75.59 to 104.40	24,888	21,791
10	4	97.36	103.05	97.84	11.04	105.33	87.42	130.05	N/A	47,750	46,716
20	51	99.63	106.45	98.06	16.77	108.55	53.59	414.69	98.86 to 101.45	67,036	65,737
25	1	99.85	99.85	99.85			99.85	99.85	N/A	128,000	127,810
30	195	98.55	97.16	94.58	10.34	102.73	58.38	230.82	96.60 to 99.28	101,992	96,460
35	1	95.43	95.43	95.43			95.43	95.43	N/A	265,600	253,460
40	29	98.92	93.46	91.27	7.94	102.40	59.93	109.46	88.23 to 99.88	186,548	170,271
50	2	94.46	94.46	92.91	7.81	101.66	87.08	101.84	N/A	335,000	311,265
____ALL____											
	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	26	99.91	91.19	87.26	22.03	104.51	40.33	173.48	75.59 to 104.40	25,153	21,947
100	6	99.37	102.13	95.41	13.23	107.05	84.39	121.60	84.39 to 121.60	34,025	32,463
101	181	98.97	97.69	94.26	10.07	103.64	53.59	230.82	97.27 to 99.63	108,153	101,950
102	25	99.13	95.56	93.31	8.11	102.42	68.02	117.24	95.94 to 100.00	125,520	117,117
103	5	99.31	103.76	103.36	5.34	100.39	97.21	122.06	N/A	116,600	120,513
104	64	97.18	101.13	94.30	15.87	107.24	59.07	414.69	94.08 to 99.10	96,979	91,456
111	1	87.72	87.72	87.72			87.72	87.72	N/A	151,750	133,110
301	2	108.47	108.47	110.41	7.19	98.24	100.67	116.26	N/A	65,250	72,040
____ALL____											
	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	45	99.44	93.79	93.52	15.32	100.29	40.33	173.48	93.46 to 100.66	68,449	64,010
10	1	230.82	230.82	230.82			230.82	230.82	N/A	5,500	12,695
15	2	99.31	99.31	99.44	0.21	99.87	99.10	99.52	N/A	61,750	61,402
20	9	100.56	100.45	104.55	16.55	96.08	63.87	158.43	68.89 to 114.96	35,944	37,581
25	2	108.24	108.24	105.73	8.31	102.38	99.24	117.24	N/A	68,000	71,895
30	238	98.88	98.06	94.09	11.28	104.23	53.59	414.69	97.22 to 99.28	105,261	99,037
40	13	96.93	95.48	94.14	5.07	101.42	84.39	107.45	87.08 to 99.52	147,923	139,259
____ALL____											
	310	98.94	97.91	94.24	12.10	103.89	40.33	414.69	97.68 to 99.30	98,851	93,159



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Hamilton County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL:In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population. The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

The assessment actions reported for the residential class describe adjustments to assessments made in the towns of Giltner and Marquette. After the assessment actions to these towns, the county and Department reviewed the statistical outcome. The result of the county's efforts moved the median of both towns within the acceptable range.However, for 2009, one of the vacant lot sales in Giltner is currently being upon which will reflect in the 2009 assessed value. Directive 05-8 requires assessors to remove substantially changed sales from the sales file for measurement purposes, but encourages their use in the appraisal process. The assessor removed the sale from the qualified file for our measurement and the median for the subclass dropped from 92% to 85%. However, in the analysis produced by the county using all relevant information, the town of Giltner has a level of value within the acceptable range.

Considering all relevant information available, it is the opinion of the Department that the town of Giltner, as well as all valuation groupings in Hamilton County, are valued within the acceptable range for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>61.88</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>64.35</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>78.62</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>78.29</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>72.32</b>

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



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>99.51</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>99.51</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>12.11</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
2.2	2009	0.62
0.32	2008	1.01
11.46	2007	12.11
1.93	2006	0.97
2.96	2005	3.00

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

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>98</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>12.10</b>	<b>103.89</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.89</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>-35</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>12.87</b>	<b>12.10</b>	<b>-0.77</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>103.11</b>	<b>103.89</b>	<b>0.78</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>12.60</b>	<b>40.33</b>	<b>27.73</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>230.82</b>	<b>414.69</b>	<b>183.87</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. No changes were made to the residential class for 2009. The 35 sales removed after the preliminary statistics were a combined effort between the county and the Department to remove sales that had substantially changed because of physical or economic changes to the properties after the sale occurred.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Trended Ratio</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>-17</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>-39</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>12.10</b>	<b>51.13</b>	<b>-39.03</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>103.89</b>	<b>124.03</b>	<b>-20.14</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>40.33</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>-19.67</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>414.69</b>	<b>714.09</b>	<b>-299.40</b>

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

In Hamilton County the measures of central tendency are similar suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. This analysis suggests sold properties are treated similarly to the unsold properties and the assessor has no bias in the assignment of residential assessments. The quality statistics however are significantly different than one another, suggesting assessment uniformity and assessment vertical uniformity is lacking in the residential class.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	70.63	95% Median C.I.:	76.80 to 98.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	74.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.28 to 90.37
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.12	95% Mean C.I.:	78.06 to 132.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,247,793						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	33.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,509	PRD:	134.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:32

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	100.63	100.63	100.63			100.63	100.63	N/A		225,000	226,420
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	92.54	89.37	88.20	9.47	101.32	74.63	100.93	N/A		40,333	35,575
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	69.04	69.04	65.11	9.47	106.02	62.50	75.57	N/A		37,500	24,417
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	93.30	93.43	88.46	4.65	105.62	86.98	100.00	N/A		43,415	38,403
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	104.99	104.99	103.38	7.09	101.55	97.55	112.43	N/A		25,500	26,363
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	100.13	95.59	98.10	6.36	97.44	83.76	102.87	N/A		75,000	73,573
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	97.79	91.56	92.61	7.13	98.87	71.84	98.81	N/A		120,250	111,360
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	89.26	85.77	83.69	6.44	102.47	71.11	93.43	N/A		75,625	63,293
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	223.27	216.83	27.72	70.84	782.24	25.78	395.00	N/A		64,175	17,788
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	72.03	87.46	73.89	26.03	118.37	67.05	123.30	N/A		156,666	115,760
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	71.46	71.46	67.63	7.47	105.67	66.12	76.80	N/A		266,250	180,052
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	92.54	87.45	90.19	11.43	96.96	62.50	100.93	74.63 to 100.63		61,249	55,243
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	13	97.33	92.77	91.75	8.80	101.12	71.11	112.43	83.76 to 100.13		81,500	74,774
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	76.80	141.40	61.83	106.17	228.70	25.78	395.00	66.12 to 355.00		139,911	86,504
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	95.43	91.51	90.91	11.62	100.66	62.50	112.43	75.57 to 102.87		48,124	43,749
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	92.49	131.38	74.00	62.99	177.54	25.78	395.00	71.84 to 98.81		86,683	64,147
____ALL____												
	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81		92,578	72,509

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
AURORA	16	93.37	89.37	90.91	11.30	98.30	62.50	112.43	75.57 to 98.81	80,031	72,759
GILTNER	1	123.30	123.30	123.30			123.30	123.30	N/A	20,000	24,660
HAMPTON	6	71.57	76.41	70.52	11.62	108.36	66.12	92.54	66.12 to 92.54	181,250	127,809
HORDVILLE	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	245	245
MARQUETTE	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	6,500	5,950
RURAL	4	91.94	78.14	60.04	25.41	130.15	25.78	102.87	N/A	118,750	71,293
STOCKHAM	2	375.00	375.00	375.00	5.33	100.00	355.00	395.00	N/A	100	375
____ALL____											
	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

# 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:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	70.63	95% Median C.I.:	76.80 to 98.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	74.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.28 to 90.37
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.12	95% Mean C.I.:	78.06 to 132.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,247,793						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	33.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,509	PRD:	134.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:32

## 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	29	92.54	106.27	77.22	35.34	137.62	25.78	395.00	75.57 to 98.81	93,273	72,027
2	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A	127,000	127,170
3	1	83.76	83.76	83.76			83.76	83.76	N/A	38,000	31,830
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

## 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	25	93.30	100.39	78.43	26.79	127.99	25.78	395.00	86.98 to 98.81	109,664	86,013
2	6	79.66	126.00	75.94	67.26	165.92	67.05	355.00	67.05 to 355.00	21,390	16,244
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002											
18-0011											
40-0126											
41-0002	1	123.30	123.30	123.30			123.30	123.30	N/A	20,000	24,660
41-0091	6	71.57	76.41	70.52	11.62	108.36	66.12	92.54	66.12 to 92.54	181,250	127,809
41-0504	22	93.37	112.78	81.91	39.82	137.68	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 100.13	77,372	63,377
61-0004	1	102.87	102.87	102.87			102.87	102.87	N/A	60,000	61,720
72-0075	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	245	245
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

**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:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	70.63	95% Median C.I.:	76.80 to 98.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	74.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.28 to 90.37
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.12	95% Mean C.I.:	78.06 to 132.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,247,793						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	33.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,509	PRD:	134.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:32

**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	9	97.33	150.13	87.29	74.42	171.99	67.05	395.00	74.63 to 355.00	26,382	23,030
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	99.24	103.33	104.02	8.85	99.33	91.54	123.30	N/A	22,750	23,665
1920 TO 1939	1	89.60	89.60	89.60			89.60	89.60	N/A	25,000	22,400
1940 TO 1949	1	112.43	112.43	112.43			112.43	112.43	N/A	20,000	22,486
1950 TO 1959	2	59.54	59.54	33.02	56.70	180.34	25.78	93.30	N/A	140,000	46,222
1960 TO 1969	2	92.99	92.99	93.14	0.48	99.83	92.54	93.43	N/A	66,250	61,707
1970 TO 1979	4	81.89	83.29	84.77	11.39	98.25	71.11	98.25	N/A	107,375	91,022
1980 TO 1989	2	93.87	93.87	95.96	5.27	97.82	88.92	98.81	N/A	130,000	124,747
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	4	86.08	84.73	77.97	18.18	108.67	66.12	100.63	N/A	307,375	239,650
2000 TO Present	2	67.17	67.17	68.44	6.95	98.14	62.50	71.84	N/A	82,500	56,465
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

**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	3	355.00	283.33	223.60	27.70	126.72	100.00	395.00	N/A	148	331
5000 TO 9999	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	6,500	5,950
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	227.50	235.39	100.00	61.37	235.39	91.54	395.00	N/A	1,736	1,736
10000 TO 29999	4	101.02	100.23	101.10	17.46	99.13	75.57	123.30	N/A	20,000	20,220
30000 TO 59999	8	92.92	88.39	88.49	9.57	99.88	67.05	100.93	67.05 to 100.93	37,375	33,073
60000 TO 99999	5	88.92	84.90	85.44	12.82	99.37	62.50	102.87	N/A	72,000	61,519
100000 TO 149999	5	86.98	85.66	86.80	12.75	98.69	71.11	100.13	N/A	117,300	101,818
150000 TO 249999	2	99.72	99.72	99.81	0.91	99.91	98.81	100.63	N/A	205,000	204,612
250000 TO 499999	3	66.12	54.64	59.38	23.32	92.03	25.78	72.03	N/A	375,833	223,155
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

**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:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	70.63	95% Median C.I.:	76.80 to 98.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	74.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.28 to 90.37
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.12	95% Mean C.I.:	78.06 to 132.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,247,793						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	33.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,509	PRD:	134.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:32

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	355.00	283.33	223.60	27.70	126.72	100.00	395.00	N/A	148	331
5000 TO 9999	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	6,500	5,950
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	227.50	235.39	100.00	61.37	235.39	91.54	395.00	N/A	1,736	1,736
10000 TO 29999	6	91.45	93.54	92.13	17.64	101.53	67.05	123.30	67.05 to 123.30	23,333	21,497
30000 TO 59999	8	88.15	85.76	83.31	12.86	102.93	62.50	100.93	62.50 to 100.93	46,750	38,948
60000 TO 99999	7	86.98	77.28	65.53	19.13	117.92	25.78	102.87	25.78 to 102.87	113,214	74,193
100000 TO 149999	2	99.19	99.19	99.14	0.95	100.05	98.25	100.13	N/A	134,500	133,343
150000 TO 249999	2	99.72	99.72	99.81	0.91	99.91	98.81	100.63	N/A	205,000	204,612
250000 TO 499999	2	69.08	69.08	68.95	4.28	100.19	66.12	72.03	N/A	438,750	302,505
ALL											
	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	91.88	157.93	81.07	89.98	194.80	67.05	395.00	67.05 to 395.00	18,555	15,043
10	5	91.54	76.98	59.47	19.27	129.45	25.78	98.25	N/A	103,200	61,370
20	18	93.37	89.85	82.55	12.65	108.85	62.50	123.30	72.03 to 100.13	122,527	101,144
ALL											
	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

**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:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	70.63	95% Median C.I.:	76.80 to 98.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	74.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.28 to 90.37
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.12	95% Mean C.I.:	78.06 to 132.64
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,247,793						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	33.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,509	PRD:	134.50	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:32

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	79.66	126.00	75.94	67.26	165.92	67.05	355.00	67.05 to 355.00	21,390	16,244
140	2	101.50	101.50	101.01	1.35	100.48	100.13	102.87	N/A	93,500	94,445
352	4	98.53	92.20	94.62	7.63	97.44	71.11	100.63	N/A	166,125	157,185
353	4	91.52	163.71	86.52	87.97	189.21	76.80	395.00	N/A	47,525	41,120
384	2	95.43	95.43	95.46	2.23	99.96	93.30	97.55	N/A	30,500	29,115
386	2	80.38	80.38	78.96	10.62	101.80	71.84	88.92	N/A	90,000	71,060
387	1	112.43	112.43	112.43			112.43	112.43	N/A	20,000	22,486
406	1	97.33	97.33	97.33			97.33	97.33	N/A	49,000	47,690
407	2	69.08	69.08	68.95	4.28	100.19	66.12	72.03	N/A	438,750	302,505
442	2	107.42	107.42	115.51	14.78	93.00	91.54	123.30	N/A	13,250	15,305
471	2	44.14	44.14	32.89	41.59	134.21	25.78	62.50	N/A	155,000	50,977
50	1	100.93	100.93	100.93			100.93	100.93	N/A	33,500	33,811
528	1	92.54	92.54	92.54			92.54	92.54	N/A	42,500	39,330
531	1	86.98	86.98	86.98			86.98	86.98	N/A	100,000	86,975
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	4	98.53	92.20	94.62	7.63	97.44	71.11	100.63	N/A	166,125	157,185
03	27	91.54	107.29	73.41	37.31	146.15	25.78	395.00	75.57 to 100.00	81,683	59,964
04											
ALL	31	92.54	105.35	78.32	33.63	134.50	25.78	395.00	76.80 to 98.81	92,578	72,509

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

### **Commercial**

For 2009 Hamilton County reviewed and revalued all commercial and industrial properties in the town of Aurora and within one mile of the town. This amounted to approximately 350 parcels. Cost tables were updated for commercial and industrial properties in this area using 2008 costing. Preliminary notices of valuation change were also sent out to commercial and industrial property owners in this area. The county assessor and contract appraiser subsequently met with taxpayers wanting to discuss their preliminary assessment. After these hearings the county assessor applied a 5% economic depreciation factor to all commercial properties located in Aurora, and within one mile of Aurora.

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



## 2009 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Contract Appraiser
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2008
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2008
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	2009
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The county reconciles all three approaches
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	8
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	Each town is a separate market area and the remainder of the county is in the Rural market area.
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Yes, the land has a common characteristic
12.	<b>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>)</b>
	No

### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
18			18

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	68.36	95% Median C.I.:	89.72 to 97.53
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	73.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.89 to 92.90
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.15	95% Mean C.I.:	80.59 to 134.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,307,205						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	30.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,425	PRD:	133.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:04

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	100.62	100.62	100.62			100.62	100.62	N/A		225,000	226,400
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	92.54	93.32	93.58	2.14	99.72	90.75	96.68	N/A		40,333	37,745
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	83.70	83.70	88.58	9.71	94.49	75.57	91.83	N/A		37,500	33,217
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	97.53	96.09	92.31	3.17	104.09	90.73	100.00	N/A		43,415	40,076
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	92.31	92.31	92.38	0.41	99.92	91.93	92.68	N/A		25,500	23,557
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	95.00	93.88	95.20	6.71	98.61	83.76	102.87	N/A		75,000	71,401
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	97.93	96.29	96.76	2.43	99.51	90.48	98.81	N/A		120,250	116,348
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	89.66	90.47	88.18	11.29	102.60	71.11	111.47	N/A		75,625	66,687
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	223.27	216.83	27.72	70.84	782.24	25.78	395.00	N/A		64,175	17,788
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	72.03	87.46	73.89	26.03	118.37	67.05	123.30	N/A		156,666	115,760
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	77.40	77.40	69.30	14.57	111.69	66.12	88.67	N/A		266,250	184,502
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	92.54	92.92	95.47	5.52	97.32	75.57	100.62	90.73 to 100.00		61,249	58,477
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	13	92.68	93.33	93.77	7.25	99.53	71.11	111.47	89.60 to 98.81		81,500	76,420
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	88.67	142.72	62.53	91.96	228.23	25.78	395.00	66.12 to 355.00		139,911	87,493
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	10	92.31	92.19	93.09	5.88	99.03	75.57	102.87	83.76 to 100.00		48,124	44,798
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	94.44	134.53	77.23	61.59	174.20	25.78	395.00	89.60 to 111.47		86,683	66,941
____ALL____												
	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53		92,578	74,425

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
AURORA	16	92.31	93.96	96.06	5.68	97.81	75.57	111.47	90.48 to 98.52		80,031	76,880
GILTNER	1	123.30	123.30	123.30			123.30	123.30	N/A		20,000	24,660
HAMPTON	6	71.57	76.41	70.52	11.62	108.36	66.12	92.54	66.12 to 92.54		181,250	127,809
HORDVILLE	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A		245	245
MARQUETTE	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A		6,500	5,950
RURAL	4	89.38	76.85	58.67	24.71	131.00	25.78	102.87	N/A		118,750	69,665
STOCKHAM	2	375.00	375.00	375.00	5.33	100.00	355.00	395.00	N/A		100	375
____ALL____												
	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53		92,578	74,425

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	68.36	95% Median C.I.:	89.72 to 97.53
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	73.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.89 to 92.90
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.15	95% Mean C.I.:	80.59 to 134.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,307,205						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	30.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,425	PRD:	133.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:04

**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	29	91.93	108.80	79.66	32.31	136.59	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 98.52	93,273	74,300
2	1	95.00	95.00	95.00			95.00	95.00	N/A	127,000	120,655
3	1	83.76	83.76	83.76			83.76	83.76	N/A	38,000	31,830
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

**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	25	91.93	102.24	80.24	23.81	127.42	25.78	395.00	90.48 to 97.53	109,664	87,992
2	6	90.22	129.68	83.67	60.09	154.99	67.05	355.00	67.05 to 355.00	21,390	17,897
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002											
18-0011											
40-0126											
41-0002	1	123.30	123.30	123.30			123.30	123.30	N/A	20,000	24,660
41-0091	6	71.57	76.41	70.52	11.62	108.36	66.12	92.54	66.12 to 92.54	181,250	127,809
41-0504	22	92.31	115.88	85.40	35.84	135.69	25.78	395.00	90.48 to 98.52	77,372	66,078
61-0004	1	102.87	102.87	102.87			102.87	102.87	N/A	60,000	61,720
72-0075	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	245	245
93-0096											
NonValid School											
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	68.36	95% Median C.I.:	89.72 to 97.53
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	73.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.89 to 92.90
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.15	95% Mean C.I.:	80.59 to 134.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,307,205						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	30.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,425	PRD:	133.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

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

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:04

## 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	9	97.33	152.58	91.47	71.90	166.81	67.05	395.00	75.57 to 355.00	26,382	24,132
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	92.11	99.57	98.62	9.14	100.97	90.75	123.30	N/A	22,750	22,435
1920 TO 1939	1	89.60	89.60	89.60			89.60	89.60	N/A	25,000	22,400
1940 TO 1949	1	91.93	91.93	91.93			91.93	91.93	N/A	20,000	18,385
1950 TO 1959	2	61.66	61.66	33.47	58.19	184.21	25.78	97.53	N/A	140,000	46,857
1960 TO 1969	2	91.13	91.13	90.63	1.55	100.56	89.72	92.54	N/A	66,250	60,040
1970 TO 1979	4	89.70	87.26	87.81	8.21	99.38	71.11	98.52	N/A	107,375	94,281
1980 TO 1989	2	105.14	105.14	102.46	6.02	102.61	98.81	111.47	N/A	130,000	133,202
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	4	83.52	83.44	77.44	17.20	107.76	66.12	100.62	N/A	307,375	238,016
2000 TO Present	2	91.16	91.16	90.97	0.74	100.20	90.48	91.83	N/A	82,500	75,050
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

## 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	3	355.00	283.33	223.60	27.70	126.72	100.00	395.00	N/A	148	331
5000 TO 9999	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	6,500	5,950
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	227.50	235.39	100.00	61.37	235.39	91.54	395.00	N/A	1,736	1,736
10000 TO 29999	4	90.77	95.10	95.97	13.79	99.09	75.57	123.30	N/A	20,000	19,195
30000 TO 59999	8	92.61	89.79	90.59	6.76	99.12	67.05	97.53	67.05 to 97.53	37,375	33,857
60000 TO 99999	5	91.83	96.91	96.58	7.83	100.35	88.67	111.47	N/A	72,000	69,534
100000 TO 149999	5	90.73	89.17	89.73	7.04	99.37	71.11	98.52	N/A	117,300	105,256
150000 TO 249999	2	99.72	99.72	99.81	0.91	99.91	98.81	100.62	N/A	205,000	204,602
250000 TO 499999	3	66.12	54.64	59.38	23.32	92.03	25.78	72.03	N/A	375,833	223,155
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

**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:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	68.36	95% Median C.I.:	89.72 to 97.53
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	73.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.89 to 92.90
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.15	95% Mean C.I.:	80.59 to 134.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,307,205						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	30.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,425	PRD:	133.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:04

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	355.00	283.33	223.60	27.70	126.72	100.00	395.00	N/A	148	331
5000 TO 9999	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	6,500	5,950
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	227.50	235.39	100.00	61.37	235.39	91.54	395.00	N/A	1,736	1,736
10000 TO 29999	7	91.93	91.09	90.58	12.63	100.57	67.05	123.30	67.05 to 123.30	24,428	22,126
30000 TO 59999	6	92.19	92.15	92.48	3.65	99.64	83.76	97.33	83.76 to 97.33	44,666	41,309
60000 TO 99999	8	90.10	83.85	71.79	16.69	116.81	25.78	111.47	25.78 to 111.47	108,437	77,843
100000 TO 149999	2	96.76	96.76	96.86	1.82	99.90	95.00	98.52	N/A	134,500	130,277
150000 TO 249999	2	99.72	99.72	99.81	0.91	99.91	98.81	100.62	N/A	205,000	204,602
250000 TO 499999	2	69.08	69.08	68.95	4.28	100.19	66.12	72.03	N/A	438,750	302,505
ALL											
	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	94.31	158.12	84.99	83.29	186.05	67.05	395.00	67.05 to 395.00	18,555	15,770
10	5	91.54	79.41	61.27	16.74	129.61	25.78	98.52	N/A	103,200	63,227
20	18	92.26	92.89	84.56	10.07	109.85	66.12	123.30	89.72 to 98.81	122,527	103,605
ALL											
	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	31	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	68.36	95% Median C.I.:	89.72 to 97.53
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,887,445	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	73.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.89 to 92.90
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,869,945	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.15	95% Mean C.I.:	80.59 to 134.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,307,205						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,578	COD:	30.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	395.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,425	PRD:	133.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.78		

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:04

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.22	129.68	83.67	60.09	154.99	67.05	355.00	67.05 to 355.00	21,390	17,897
140	2	98.94	98.94	97.53	3.98	101.44	95.00	102.87	N/A	93,500	91,187
352	4	98.66	92.27	94.67	7.55	97.46	71.11	100.62	N/A	166,125	157,276
353	4	89.66	165.75	89.45	85.45	185.30	88.67	395.00	N/A	47,525	42,511
384	2	95.11	95.11	95.07	2.55	100.04	92.68	97.53	N/A	30,500	28,995
386	2	100.98	100.98	99.22	10.39	101.77	90.48	111.47	N/A	90,000	89,300
387	1	91.93	91.93	91.93			91.93	91.93	N/A	20,000	18,385
406	1	97.33	97.33	97.33			97.33	97.33	N/A	49,000	47,690
407	2	69.08	69.08	68.95	4.28	100.19	66.12	72.03	N/A	438,750	302,505
442	2	107.42	107.42	115.51	14.78	93.00	91.54	123.30	N/A	13,250	15,305
471	2	58.81	58.81	38.57	56.16	152.48	25.78	91.83	N/A	155,000	59,777
50	1	90.75	90.75	90.75			90.75	90.75	N/A	33,500	30,400
528	1	92.54	92.54	92.54			92.54	92.54	N/A	42,500	39,330
531	1	90.73	90.73	90.72			90.73	90.73	N/A	100,000	90,725
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	4	98.66	92.27	94.67	7.55	97.46	71.11	100.62	N/A	166,125	157,276
03	27	91.83	109.81	76.09	33.46	144.32	25.78	395.00	89.60 to 97.33	81,683	62,151
04											
ALL	31	91.93	107.55	80.39	30.62	133.78	25.78	395.00	89.72 to 97.53	92,578	74,425



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>51.67</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>54.55</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>75.41</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>71.79</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>73.68</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of the commercial sales file indicates that the county has utilized a reasonable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. All sales are appropriately coded as non-qualified and none appear to be arbitrarily excluded. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>6.46</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>93.37</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93.37</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>14.11</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>

COMMERCIAL: The trended preliminary ratio compared to the R&O ratio shows a seven point difference. For 2009 the county conducted a commercial revaluation of the town of Aurora which is responsible for the 6.46 percent increase to the commercial base. Roughly half of the sales in the sales file were included in the commercial revaluation and the resulting assessed values were an even mix of increases and decreases in assessment. This had little effect on the calculated median in the sales file, which explains the minimal change displayed between the Preliminary median and the R&O median.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Hamilton 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 Hamilton 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)
1.61	2009	6.46
0.00	2008	-5.01
5.78	2007	4.30
0.00	2006	14.11
3.47	2005	1.78

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties displays about a 5 percentage point difference. This tends to suggest the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are not an accurate measure of the population. In the case of Hamilton County however, the percent change in assessed value reflects some rather large increases to a few properties. A majority of these parcels are not reflected in the sales file, therefore inaccurately suggesting that all parcels in the commercial class moved by 6.46 percent while all sales moved 1.61 percent.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>108</b>

COMMERCIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency, only the median is within the acceptable range. Both the mean and weighted mean are well beyond the acceptable range. Small dollar sales with outlier ratios are skewing the measures of central tendency in this county. Analysis of a level of value for direct equalization purposes is most appropriately determined by the median measure because of its resistance to the influence of outlier ratios.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>30.62</b>	<b>133.78</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>10.62</b>	<b>30.78</b>

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. Further analysis of this class revealed outlier ratios that are responsible for skewing these quality statistics. While these statistics are arm's length and appropriately included in the qualified base, the hypothetical removal of their influence on the quality statistics produces a COD within the range and PRD slightly above the acceptable range. Based on this analysis and the systematic method the county uses to review and value commercial property, it is reasonable to assume the county has valued properties uniformly and proportionately.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>33.63</b>	<b>30.62</b>	<b>-3.01</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>134.50</b>	<b>133.78</b>	<b>-0.72</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>25.78</b>	<b>25.78</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>395.00</b>	<b>395.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. The county revalued all commercial property within the town of Aurora for 2009.

**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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	62.48 to 70.10	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,669,122	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.59 to 65.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,674,016	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.33	95% Mean C.I.:	61.56 to 67.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,270,631							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,804	COD:	17.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	187,724	PRD:	103.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:54

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	3	72.39	84.72	85.35	22.60	99.26	66.35	115.42	N/A	176,692	150,813
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	65.89	63.16	64.14	20.46	98.48	18.14	92.20	49.71 to 74.60	258,242	165,629
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	15	72.44	67.87	67.49	15.03	100.57	0.00	84.40	62.48 to 79.50	255,324	172,312
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	73.02	73.02	72.86	0.78	100.22	72.45	73.59	N/A	175,400	127,792
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	75.21	74.65	71.26	14.51	104.76	60.33	87.86	N/A	283,935	202,331
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	70.73	69.70	67.88	6.57	102.67	58.63	76.58	N/A	261,501	177,520
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	16	70.71	68.93	66.97	10.47	102.92	49.48	90.18	57.97 to 74.92	260,997	174,800
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	12	58.37	63.40	62.58	17.69	101.31	37.86	97.30	55.18 to 70.03	276,087	172,773
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	61.46	61.46	61.46			61.46	61.46	N/A	460,575	283,065
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	59.92	56.88	54.02	16.86	105.31	39.93	72.77	40.02 to 66.82	515,888	278,660
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	54.49	53.14	54.06	11.18	98.30	42.44	62.70	43.62 to 62.61	354,224	191,496
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	55.57	59.71	60.55	16.61	98.61	48.09	74.47	N/A	309,022	187,123
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	29	72.39	68.51	67.99	16.43	100.76	0.00	115.42	63.06 to 74.60	242,583	164,943
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	37	69.93	67.86	66.12	13.41	102.63	37.86	97.30	60.33 to 70.84	268,439	177,486
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	26	55.95	56.16	55.29	14.90	101.57	39.93	74.47	50.34 to 62.61	411,800	227,701
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	72.44	69.66	68.50	12.38	101.70	0.00	87.86	67.14 to 76.58	254,766	174,507
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	39	64.49	63.95	60.57	15.70	105.58	37.86	97.30	57.36 to 70.03	336,114	203,583
____ALL____											
	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

# 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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	62.48 to 70.10	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,669,122	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.59 to 65.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,674,016	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.33	95% Mean C.I.:	61.56 to 67.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,270,631							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,804	COD:	17.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	187,724	PRD:	103.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:55

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
3005	2	81.91	81.91	72.00	18.78	113.77	66.53	97.30	N/A		281,000	202,327
3219	2	37.71	37.71	52.30	51.90	72.10	18.14	57.28	N/A		641,666	335,587
3221	9	62.13	60.27	53.65	17.15	112.35	39.93	74.47	40.02 to 74.45		330,033	177,047
3223	7	55.18	54.85	51.65	10.60	106.18	44.08	70.71	44.08 to 70.71		409,727	211,644
3301	6	65.38	65.27	63.61	11.57	102.60	53.06	82.31	53.06 to 82.31		210,236	133,740
3303	6	64.94	64.57	64.92	10.66	99.46	49.71	79.50	49.71 to 79.50		274,153	177,993
3305	7	61.46	63.97	67.31	24.81	95.05	37.86	90.18	37.86 to 90.18		200,396	134,879
3307	4	74.32	71.38	65.20	9.94	109.48	55.91	80.96	N/A		184,032	119,983
3441	11	70.70	70.11	69.33	5.64	101.12	62.56	77.85	62.70 to 77.23		351,476	243,687
3443	8	70.35	60.82	64.23	16.96	94.68	0.00	74.92	0.00 to 74.92		294,611	189,239
3445	4	68.46	62.78	63.35	11.90	99.09	42.44	71.76	N/A		410,187	259,871
3447	2	53.11	53.11	54.00	17.88	98.37	43.62	62.61	N/A		410,000	221,380
3525	9	57.97	57.95	58.11	8.55	99.73	44.33	73.92	51.81 to 61.07		276,907	160,912
3527	3	58.63	62.44	61.26	7.28	101.93	57.95	70.75	N/A		292,317	179,068
3529	7	76.35	80.88	75.10	17.63	107.69	52.59	115.42	52.59 to 115.42		253,950	190,727
3531	5	83.13	77.92	74.31	8.61	104.86	62.96	87.86	N/A		222,879	165,629
____ALL____												
	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10		300,804	187,724

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1	72	68.48	65.96	63.71	16.85	103.53	0.00	115.42	62.96 to 70.75		307,511	195,909
2	15	58.78	60.11	58.90	13.41	102.07	43.62	82.31	53.06 to 66.26		263,398	155,130
4	5	62.13	61.44	52.98	16.99	115.97	39.93	74.47	N/A		316,440	167,642
____ALL____												
	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10		300,804	187,724

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A		151,140	1
2	91	66.35	65.47	62.75	16.17	104.33	18.14	115.42	62.48 to 70.70		302,449	189,787
____ALL____												
	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10		300,804	187,724

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	62.48 to 70.10	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,669,122	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.59 to 65.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,674,016	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.33	95% Mean C.I.:	61.56 to 67.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,270,631							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,804	COD:	17.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	187,724	PRD:	103.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:55

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	1	57.36	57.36	57.36			57.36	57.36	N/A	309,000	177,255
18-0011	1	52.59	52.59	52.59			52.59	52.59	N/A	469,000	246,635
40-0126	3	74.60	76.19	75.27	5.62	101.22	70.70	83.27	N/A	342,537	257,836
41-0002	16	72.61	77.53	74.12	11.90	104.61	62.96	115.42	70.00 to 84.40	241,825	179,232
41-0091	12	57.26	59.76	56.33	13.39	106.08	44.08	82.31	53.06 to 66.26	335,668	189,091
41-0504	46	66.12	62.46	61.68	17.09	101.27	0.00	90.18	60.33 to 70.75	308,403	190,212
61-0004	1	56.22	56.22	56.22			56.22	56.22	N/A	431,561	242,630
72-0075	4	68.62	71.22	62.98	18.63	113.09	50.34	97.30	N/A	277,871	174,998
93-0096	8	56.98	55.94	55.50	12.28	100.79	43.62	73.92	43.62 to 73.92	280,195	155,504
NonValid School											
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.00 TO 0.00	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	151,140	1
10.01 TO 30.00	4	75.52	70.43	70.64	11.05	99.69	49.71	80.96	N/A	51,880	36,648
30.01 TO 50.00	9	53.86	55.53	52.39	30.75	106.00	18.14	97.30	37.86 to 70.71	109,303	57,259
50.01 TO 100.00	33	69.93	69.24	66.64	12.83	103.91	43.62	92.20	65.89 to 72.93	212,372	141,515
100.01 TO 180.00	42	62.83	64.48	61.98	15.11	104.03	39.93	115.42	60.33 to 70.70	406,956	252,231
180.01 TO 330.00	3	57.28	61.12	60.28	8.21	101.40	55.99	70.10	N/A	743,721	448,325
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

## 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
! zeroes!	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	151,140	1
DRY	6	70.65	70.83	72.68	15.62	97.46	48.09	87.86	48.09 to 87.86	161,913	117,676
DRY-N/A	2	58.37	58.37	58.11	0.71	100.44	57.95	58.78	N/A	196,221	114,027
GRASS	1	18.14	18.14	18.14			18.14	18.14	N/A	163,333	29,625
GRASS-N/A	1	73.59	73.59	73.59			73.59	73.59	N/A	126,000	92,725
IRRGTD	54	67.43	67.17	63.03	15.32	106.57	39.93	115.42	62.56 to 70.71	333,657	210,311
IRRGTD-N/A	27	62.96	62.85	61.86	16.23	101.60	37.86	83.13	55.99 to 72.07	290,819	179,901
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	62.48 to 70.10	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,669,122	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.59 to 65.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,674,016	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.33	95% Mean C.I.:	61.56 to 67.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,270,631							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,804	COD:	17.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	187,724	PRD:	103.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:55

## 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
! zeroes!	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	151,140	1
DRY	7	66.82	68.99	69.05	16.05	99.91	48.09	87.86	48.09 to 87.86	184,132	127,147
DRY-N/A	1	58.78	58.78	58.78			58.78	58.78	N/A	75,000	44,085
GRASS	1	18.14	18.14	18.14			18.14	18.14	N/A	163,333	29,625
GRASS-N/A	1	73.59	73.59	73.59			73.59	73.59	N/A	126,000	92,725
IRRGTD	72	66.44	66.20	62.73	15.03	105.53	37.86	115.42	62.56 to 70.70	325,584	204,254
IRRGTD-N/A	9	60.33	61.96	62.11	20.70	99.75	42.44	82.78	44.33 to 77.23	269,729	167,538
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

## 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
! zeroes!	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	151,140	1
DRY	7	66.82	68.99	69.05	16.05	99.91	48.09	87.86	48.09 to 87.86	184,132	127,147
DRY-N/A	1	58.78	58.78	58.78			58.78	58.78	N/A	75,000	44,085
GRASS	2	45.87	45.87	42.29	60.45	108.46	18.14	73.59	N/A	144,666	61,175
IRRGTD	80	66.31	65.64	62.57	15.67	104.91	37.86	115.42	62.13 to 70.70	320,079	200,282
IRRGTD-N/A	1	72.77	72.77	72.77			72.77	72.77	N/A	263,250	191,570
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

## 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	4	75.52	70.43	70.64	11.05	99.69	49.71	80.96	N/A	51,880	36,648
60000 TO 99999	3	58.78	61.12	61.21	9.56	99.84	53.86	70.71	N/A	87,000	53,256
100000 TO 149999	12	74.03	70.94	71.17	19.49	99.67	37.86	97.30	48.09 to 87.86	122,024	86,849
150000 TO 249999	22	70.38	68.29	68.98	17.42	99.00	0.00	115.42	66.35 to 73.92	198,738	137,096
250000 TO 499999	41	62.61	63.53	63.37	12.15	100.26	42.44	83.27	58.63 to 70.03	367,221	232,699
500000 +	10	55.59	53.43	53.31	13.85	100.24	39.93	70.10	40.02 to 62.56	631,287	336,527
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

# 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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	62.48 to 70.10	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,669,122	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.59 to 65.22	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,674,016	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.33	95% Mean C.I.:	61.56 to 67.96	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,270,631							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,804	COD:	17.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	187,724	PRD:	103.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:19:55

## 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	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	151,140	1
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	N/A	151,140	1
10000 TO 29999	2	33.93	33.93	25.47	46.53	133.20	18.14	49.71	N/A	106,366	27,090
30000 TO 59999	8	56.32	59.36	54.34	23.67	109.25	37.86	80.96	37.86 to 80.96	84,565	45,951
60000 TO 99999	6	72.15	75.21	74.80	9.11	100.54	64.49	97.30	64.49 to 97.30	113,298	84,752
100000 TO 149999	14	71.57	73.84	72.00	12.51	102.55	56.04	92.20	65.89 to 84.40	177,594	127,868
150000 TO 249999	35	62.13	64.67	61.61	17.53	104.97	40.02	115.42	57.36 to 70.84	302,964	186,663
250000 TO 499999	25	63.06	64.37	62.80	11.91	102.49	39.93	82.78	62.48 to 70.70	469,750	295,015
500000 +	1	57.28	57.28	57.28			57.28	57.28	N/A	1,120,000	641,550
ALL	92	66.31	64.76	62.41	17.09	103.77	0.00	115.42	62.48 to 70.10	300,804	187,724

# 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:	104	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	22.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.07 to 69.93	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	33,858,878	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	14.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.60 to 64.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	33,802,222	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.93	95% Mean C.I.:	61.64 to 67.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,811,555							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	325,021	COD:	16.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	200,111	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.14			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:06

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	69.37	78.45	72.87	22.28	107.66	59.63	115.42	N/A	257,519	187,646
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	66.53	63.56	64.42	18.43	98.67	18.14	92.20	49.71 to 74.60	256,418	165,187
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	15	72.44	71.41	69.85	10.14	102.24	53.12	84.40	62.48 to 79.50	251,248	175,499
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	73.02	73.02	72.86	0.78	100.22	72.45	73.59	N/A	175,400	127,792
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	75.21	74.65	71.26	14.51	104.76	60.33	87.86	N/A	283,935	202,331
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	70.73	68.60	68.34	6.81	100.38	58.63	76.58	58.63 to 76.58	257,157	175,735
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	18	70.35	68.37	66.51	10.44	102.78	49.48	90.18	60.63 to 72.07	292,318	194,432
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	13	58.78	64.54	66.23	18.77	97.46	37.86	97.30	55.18 to 78.28	324,465	214,885
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	61.46	61.46	61.46			61.46	61.46	N/A	460,575	283,065
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	57.28	56.72	54.10	16.38	104.84	39.93	72.77	40.02 to 66.82	494,380	267,477
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	50.09	49.76	48.60	15.04	102.37	34.82	62.70	42.44 to 58.95	444,923	216,237
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	55.57	59.71	60.55	16.61	98.61	48.09	74.47	N/A	309,022	187,123
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	31	71.76	69.89	68.59	13.90	101.91	18.14	115.42	63.06 to 74.45	248,832	170,662
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	42	69.28	67.82	67.12	12.99	101.05	37.86	97.30	60.63 to 70.84	295,610	198,399
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	31	55.10	54.21	52.57	16.07	103.11	34.82	74.47	48.09 to 61.46	441,058	231,879
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	72.10	71.29	69.84	9.57	102.07	53.12	87.86	67.14 to 76.35	251,977	175,983
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	43	64.49	64.07	61.90	15.30	103.51	37.86	97.30	57.95 to 70.00	357,640	221,363
<u>ALL</u>											
	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	104	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	22.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.07 to 69.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	33,858,878	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	14.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.60 to 64.54	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	33,802,222	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.93	95% Mean C.I.:	61.64 to 67.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,811,555							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	325,021	COD:	16.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	200,111	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.14			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:06

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3005	2	81.91	81.91	72.00	18.78	113.77	66.53	97.30	N/A	281,000	202,327
3219	2	37.71	37.71	52.30	51.90	72.10	18.14	57.28	N/A	641,666	335,587
3221	9	62.13	60.27	53.65	17.15	112.35	39.93	74.47	40.02 to 74.45	330,033	177,047
3223	9	55.20	56.75	53.79	11.55	105.50	44.08	70.71	49.48 to 67.17	400,899	215,651
3301	6	65.38	65.27	63.61	11.57	102.60	53.06	82.31	53.06 to 82.31	210,236	133,740
3303	7	66.35	65.50	66.12	9.96	99.06	49.71	79.50	49.71 to 79.50	291,656	192,844
3305	11	60.63	63.68	69.43	19.91	91.71	37.86	90.18	48.09 to 82.78	274,830	190,818
3307	5	72.07	70.52	66.28	9.59	106.39	55.91	80.96	N/A	258,491	171,340
3441	13	70.03	66.53	64.01	9.99	103.93	45.30	77.85	62.56 to 74.60	394,155	252,315
3443	7	70.71	69.51	68.63	5.00	101.27	62.48	74.92	62.48 to 74.92	315,107	216,273
3445	5	66.82	57.19	53.63	19.34	106.62	34.82	71.76	N/A	500,099	268,228
3447	2	53.11	53.11	54.00	17.88	98.37	43.62	62.61	N/A	410,000	221,380
3525	9	57.97	57.95	58.11	8.55	99.73	44.33	73.92	51.81 to 61.07	276,907	160,912
3527	4	58.29	60.61	59.92	7.00	101.14	55.10	70.75	N/A	289,064	173,213
3529	8	74.56	75.35	65.89	22.45	114.37	36.66	115.42	36.66 to 115.42	293,351	193,282
3531	5	83.13	77.92	74.31	8.61	104.86	62.96	87.86	N/A	222,879	165,629
____ALL____											
	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	84	66.95	65.32	62.42	16.56	104.64	18.14	115.42	62.48 to 70.71	336,536	210,076
2	15	58.78	60.11	58.90	13.41	102.07	43.62	82.31	53.06 to 66.26	263,398	155,130
4	5	62.13	61.44	52.98	16.99	115.97	39.93	74.47	N/A	316,440	167,642
____ALL____											
	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	8	54.49	53.97	54.39	23.27	99.23	34.82	78.28	34.82 to 78.28	596,670	324,520
2	96	66.31	65.25	62.75	15.91	103.98	18.14	115.42	62.13 to 70.10	302,383	189,743
____ALL____											
	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	104	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	22.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.07 to 69.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	33,858,878	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	14.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.60 to 64.54	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	33,802,222	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.93	95% Mean C.I.:	61.64 to 67.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,811,555							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	325,021	COD:	16.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	200,111	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.14			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:06

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	1	57.36	57.36	57.36			57.36	57.36	N/A	309,000	177,255
18-0011	1	52.59	52.59	52.59			52.59	52.59	N/A	469,000	246,635
40-0126	3	74.60	76.19	75.27	5.62	101.22	70.70	83.27	N/A	342,537	257,836
41-0002	17	72.45	75.13	69.37	14.13	108.30	36.66	115.42	67.14 to 84.40	261,080	181,110
41-0091	14	59.29	60.28	57.22	12.15	105.34	44.08	82.31	53.06 to 67.17	340,573	194,889
41-0504	55	63.52	62.68	61.14	16.42	102.52	18.14	90.18	60.33 to 70.10	345,556	211,275
61-0004	1	56.22	56.22	56.22			56.22	56.22	N/A	431,561	242,630
72-0075	4	68.62	71.22	62.98	18.63	113.09	50.34	97.30	N/A	277,871	174,998
93-0096	8	56.98	55.94	55.50	12.28	100.79	43.62	73.92	43.62 to 73.92	280,195	155,504
NonValid School											
ALL	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	4	75.52	70.43	70.64	11.05	99.69	49.71	80.96	N/A	51,880	36,648
30.01 TO 50.00	11	53.86	55.77	53.33	26.43	104.59	18.14	97.30	37.86 to 70.71	106,332	56,704
50.01 TO 100.00	35	68.63	68.78	66.25	13.00	103.82	43.62	92.20	65.89 to 72.45	215,073	142,481
100.01 TO 180.00	49	62.56	62.54	59.48	16.23	105.15	34.82	115.42	59.63 to 67.14	432,754	257,395
180.01 TO 330.00	4	62.18	62.61	61.77	9.61	101.37	55.99	70.10	N/A	696,872	430,435
330.01 TO 650.00	1	78.28	78.28	79.58			78.28	78.28	N/A	904,995	720,220
ALL	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	66.82	68.30	71.02	17.08	96.17	48.09	87.86	48.09 to 87.86	151,640	107,695
DRY-N/A	2	58.37	58.37	58.11	0.71	100.44	57.95	58.78	N/A	196,221	114,027
GRASS	1	18.14	18.14	18.14			18.14	18.14	N/A	163,333	29,625
GRASS-N/A	1	73.59	73.59	73.59			73.59	73.59	N/A	126,000	92,725
IRRGTD	63	66.26	65.77	61.77	15.95	106.49	34.82	115.42	61.46 to 70.03	367,382	226,924
IRRGTD-N/A	30	62.55	62.18	60.70	16.67	102.43	36.66	83.13	57.36 to 70.84	297,129	180,368
ALL	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	104	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	22.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.07 to 69.93	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	33,858,878	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	14.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.60 to 64.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	33,802,222	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.93	95% Mean C.I.:	61.64 to 67.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,811,555							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	325,021	COD:	16.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	200,111	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.14			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:06

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	65.66	67.01	68.01	16.90	98.52	48.09	87.86	48.09 to 87.86	172,365	117,230
DRY-N/A	1	58.78	58.78	58.78			58.78	58.78	N/A	75,000	44,085
GRASS	1	18.14	18.14	18.14			18.14	18.14	N/A	163,333	29,625
GRASS-N/A	1	73.59	73.59	73.59			73.59	73.59	N/A	126,000	92,725
IRRGTD	83	65.89	64.82	61.29	15.76	105.77	34.82	115.42	61.46 to 69.93	352,225	215,873
IRRGTD-N/A	10	65.71	62.87	63.37	18.74	99.21	42.44	82.78	44.33 to 77.23	282,424	178,979
ALL	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	65.66	67.01	68.01	16.90	98.52	48.09	87.86	48.09 to 87.86	172,365	117,230
DRY-N/A	1	58.78	58.78	58.78			58.78	58.78	N/A	75,000	44,085
GRASS	2	45.87	45.87	42.29	60.45	108.46	18.14	73.59	N/A	144,666	61,175
IRRGTD	92	64.71	64.52	61.38	16.43	105.13	34.82	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	345,605	212,127
IRRGTD-N/A	1	72.77	72.77	72.77			72.77	72.77	N/A	263,250	191,570
ALL	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

## 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	4	75.52	70.43	70.64	11.05	99.69	49.71	80.96	N/A	51,880	36,648
60000 TO 99999	4	56.32	59.12	59.14	9.99	99.96	53.12	70.71	N/A	87,750	51,895
100000 TO 149999	13	73.59	70.14	70.68	19.45	99.24	37.86	97.30	48.09 to 87.86	120,016	84,830
150000 TO 249999	22	70.38	71.35	71.22	13.08	100.17	18.14	115.42	66.82 to 73.92	202,777	144,423
250000 TO 499999	43	62.61	63.51	63.43	12.18	100.13	42.44	83.27	58.63 to 70.03	365,862	232,053
500000 +	18	55.59	53.62	53.95	17.73	99.38	34.82	78.28	44.08 to 60.63	638,351	344,387
ALL	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

# 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:	104	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	22.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.07 to 69.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	33,858,878	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	14.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.60 to 64.54	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	33,802,222	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.93	95% Mean C.I.:	61.64 to 67.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,811,555							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	325,021	COD:	16.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	200,111	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.14			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:06

## 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	33.93	33.93	25.47	46.53	133.20	18.14	49.71	N/A	106,366	27,090
30000 TO 59999	9	53.86	58.67	54.20	22.15	108.25	37.86	80.96	44.33 to 76.58	85,168	46,158
60000 TO 99999	7	70.71	73.12	73.37	10.01	99.67	60.60	97.30	60.60 to 97.30	110,815	81,302
100000 TO 149999	14	71.57	73.84	72.00	12.51	102.55	56.04	92.20	65.89 to 84.40	177,594	127,868
150000 TO 249999	38	61.60	63.75	60.39	17.89	105.56	36.66	115.42	56.22 to 70.03	307,690	185,822
250000 TO 499999	32	62.83	62.38	60.34	13.24	103.38	34.82	82.78	59.72 to 70.10	495,116	298,738
500000 +	2	67.78	67.78	67.25	15.49	100.79	57.28	78.28	N/A	1,012,497	680,885
_____ALL_____	_____										
	104	65.19	64.38	61.57	16.76	104.57	18.14	115.42	61.07 to 69.93	325,021	200,111

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

### **Agricultural**

For the 2009 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. The market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be below the statutory range at 65%. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the three market areas.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, Hamilton County increased Irrigated, Dry, and Grassland in all three market areas. Irrigated values increased 150 dollars per acre in the top class of Area 1, and increased as much as 550 dollars per acre for the 4A in Area 2. Dryland values for 1D1 increased from 1510 dollars per acre to 1735 dollars per acre in Areas One and Two, and from 550 to 950 dollars per acre for 4D in Area 2. Grass increased approximately 15% from the previous years' values.

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

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	No
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Agricultural land is defined by statute
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	N/A
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1984
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	Last full land use study was completed in 2003
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	Physical inspections and owner reporting
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	Land use is constantly being updated
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	3
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	By water availability and location
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	<b>Yes or No</b>
	No
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>

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

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>60</b>			<b>60</b>

**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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	21.03	95% Median C.I.:	70.13 to 75.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,607,982	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.72 to 72.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,612,876	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.82 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,240,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,139	COD:	15.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	209,140	PRD:	104.70	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:33

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	82.91	95.98	96.65	20.81	99.31	76.64	128.39	N/A	176,692	170,773	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	9	74.90	70.87	70.71	19.06	100.22	20.25	102.46	61.49 to 86.03	258,242	182,613	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	15	78.76	80.26	78.13	10.25	102.73	66.47	97.26	71.97 to 86.64	251,248	196,299	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	82.39	82.39	81.10	5.57	101.59	77.80	86.98	N/A	175,400	142,247	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	86.00	85.80	81.52	15.60	105.25	68.68	102.52	N/A	283,935	231,452	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	75.82	77.66	75.87	6.18	102.35	69.29	86.29	N/A	261,501	198,413	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	16	75.22	75.07	73.17	11.40	102.60	54.99	99.32	64.49 to 79.73	260,997	190,967	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	12	69.75	71.09	69.54	15.16	102.22	45.88	105.31	60.36 to 80.70	276,087	191,997	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	66.53	66.53	66.53			66.53	66.53	N/A	460,575	306,430	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	63.84	63.26	59.69	16.46	105.97	45.86	79.62	48.90 to 77.80	515,888	307,945	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	60.89	60.13	61.06	10.17	98.47	47.34	74.04	50.63 to 67.26	354,224	216,298	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	65.45	66.30	66.65	13.79	99.46	55.06	80.20	N/A	309,022	205,975	
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	29	77.80	79.12	77.22	14.27	102.47	20.25	128.39	72.45 to 85.27	240,475	185,683	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	37	74.74	75.29	73.27	13.08	102.75	45.88	105.31	70.13 to 77.40	268,439	196,684	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	26	62.31	62.76	61.44	13.70	102.15	45.86	80.20	55.39 to 67.73	411,800	253,028	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	78.28	80.78	78.42	10.33	103.00	66.47	102.52	75.23 to 86.29	252,414	197,955	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	39	71.22	70.60	66.72	14.19	105.82	45.86	105.31	64.49 to 75.71	336,114	224,239	
<u>ALL</u>												
	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140	



# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	21.03	95% Median C.I.:	70.13 to 75.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,607,982	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.72 to 72.64	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,612,876	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.82 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,240,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,139	COD:	15.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	209,140	PRD:	104.70	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:34

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
3005	2	88.27	88.27	77.29	19.31	114.20	71.22	105.31	N/A		281,000	217,180
3219	2	40.07	40.07	54.84	49.46	73.06	20.25	59.88	N/A		641,666	351,867
3221	9	71.97	67.98	61.24	14.11	111.01	45.86	86.03	49.14 to 80.20		330,033	202,109
3223	7	58.93	60.38	56.84	11.12	106.24	48.90	78.76	48.90 to 78.76		409,727	232,880
3301	6	71.63	74.80	73.58	15.55	101.66	61.06	99.32	61.06 to 99.32		210,236	154,690
3303	6	72.41	72.08	71.22	9.57	101.20	61.49	84.57	61.49 to 84.57		274,153	195,255
3305	8	66.50	70.41	73.06	20.33	96.37	45.88	94.58	45.88 to 94.58		186,596	136,325
3307	4	76.86	75.27	68.24	11.55	110.30	60.71	86.64	N/A		184,032	125,587
3441	11	76.08	77.37	75.83	6.91	102.04	67.26	94.80	67.73 to 87.00		351,476	266,516
3443	7	75.71	75.98	75.36	5.45	100.82	68.36	84.03	68.36 to 84.03		315,107	237,479
3445	4	73.93	67.96	68.48	10.89	99.24	47.34	76.63	N/A		410,187	280,887
3447	2	62.34	62.34	63.42	18.78	98.29	50.63	74.04	N/A		410,000	260,015
3525	9	68.68	67.46	67.11	10.37	100.52	51.55	86.29	59.46 to 72.45		276,907	185,833
3527	3	70.49	71.73	71.17	2.89	100.78	69.29	75.41	N/A		292,317	208,056
3529	7	85.27	89.15	83.12	17.43	107.26	59.95	128.39	59.95 to 128.39		253,950	211,078
3531	5	95.91	89.87	85.17	9.62	105.52	70.76	102.52	N/A		222,879	189,834
____ALL____												
	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82		300,139	209,140

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1	72	74.82	73.79	70.51	15.21	104.67	20.25	128.39	70.49 to 76.63		306,662	216,214
2	15	70.13	69.95	68.64	13.95	101.92	50.63	99.32	61.06 to 77.80		263,398	180,790
4	5	71.97	69.90	60.78	15.27	115.01	45.86	86.03	N/A		316,440	192,317
____ALL____												
	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82		300,139	209,140

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
2	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82		300,139	209,140
____ALL____												
	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82		300,139	209,140

**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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	21.03	95% Median C.I.:	70.13 to 75.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,607,982	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.72 to 72.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,612,876	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.82 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,240,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,139	COD:	15.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	209,140	PRD:	104.70	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:34

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	1	62.60	62.60	62.60			62.60	62.60	N/A	309,000	193,445
18-0011	1	59.95	59.95	59.95			59.95	59.95	N/A	469,000	281,165
40-0126	3	80.67	84.38	82.99	7.99	101.68	76.57	95.91	N/A	342,537	284,266
41-0002	16	83.47	87.09	83.13	13.26	104.77	70.55	128.39	75.71 to 97.26	241,825	201,018
41-0091	12	64.97	67.64	63.69	14.66	106.20	48.90	99.32	58.93 to 77.80	335,668	213,802
41-0504	46	72.27	70.19	68.23	13.36	102.87	20.25	94.58	67.73 to 75.82	307,074	209,531
61-0004	1	65.42	65.42	65.42			65.42	65.42	N/A	431,561	282,345
72-0075	4	74.99	77.59	68.26	19.27	113.66	55.06	105.31	N/A	277,871	189,680
93-0096	8	66.85	65.81	64.78	14.22	101.59	50.63	86.29	50.63 to 86.29	280,195	181,501
NonValid School											
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	4	83.85	78.96	79.28	8.80	99.59	61.49	86.64	N/A	51,880	41,132
30.01 TO 50.00	10	63.15	63.15	59.76	26.25	105.68	20.25	105.31	45.88 to 78.76	107,373	64,163
50.01 TO 100.00	33	76.64	77.43	74.54	13.34	103.88	50.63	102.52	72.47 to 80.70	212,372	158,302
100.01 TO 180.00	42	70.66	71.68	68.84	13.79	104.13	45.86	128.39	68.36 to 75.23	406,956	280,136
180.01 TO 330.00	3	63.56	66.27	64.76	8.13	102.33	59.88	75.38	N/A	743,721	481,661
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	72.47	76.78	79.65	18.19	96.39	55.39	102.52	55.39 to 102.52	151,640	120,784
DRY-N/A	2	71.44	71.44	70.86	1.33	100.82	70.49	72.39	N/A	196,221	139,035
GRASS	1	20.25	20.25	20.25			20.25	20.25	N/A	163,333	33,075
GRASS-N/A	1	86.98	86.98	86.98			86.98	86.98	N/A	126,000	109,590
IRRGTD	54	74.39	74.27	69.58	14.21	106.75	45.86	128.39	69.01 to 76.63	333,657	232,142
IRRGTD-N/A	27	71.97	70.88	69.27	15.05	102.33	45.88	97.26	62.60 to 78.76	290,819	201,442
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	21.03	95% Median C.I.:	70.13 to 75.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,607,982	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.72 to 72.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,612,876	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.82 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,240,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,139	COD:	15.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	209,140	PRD:	104.70	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:34

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.48	75.99	77.54	16.48	98.00	55.39	102.52	55.39 to 102.52	172,365	133,658
DRY-N/A	1	72.39	72.39	72.39			72.39	72.39	N/A	75,000	54,290
GRASS	1	20.25	20.25	20.25			20.25	20.25	N/A	163,333	33,075
GRASS-N/A	1	86.98	86.98	86.98			86.98	86.98	N/A	126,000	109,590
IRRGTD	72	74.39	73.58	69.57	14.00	105.77	45.86	128.39	70.13 to 76.57	325,584	226,496
IRRGTD-N/A	9	68.68	69.64	68.67	17.83	101.41	47.34	94.80	51.55 to 87.63	269,729	185,215
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.48	75.99	77.54	16.48	98.00	55.39	102.52	55.39 to 102.52	172,365	133,658
DRY-N/A	1	72.39	72.39	72.39			72.39	72.39	N/A	75,000	54,290
GRASS	2	53.62	53.62	49.31	62.23	108.73	20.25	86.98	N/A	144,666	71,332
IRRGTD	80	73.10	73.06	69.38	14.75	105.31	45.86	128.39	69.01 to 76.08	320,079	222,063
IRRGTD-N/A	1	79.62	79.62	79.62			79.62	79.62	N/A	263,250	209,590
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**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	4	83.85	78.96	79.28	8.80	99.59	61.49	86.64	N/A	51,880	41,132
60000 TO 99999	4	69.43	69.36	69.18	8.95	100.27	59.82	78.76	N/A	87,750	60,702
100000 TO 149999	12	83.59	80.21	80.66	21.54	99.44	45.88	105.31	55.39 to 102.46	122,024	98,429
150000 TO 249999	21	77.80	79.33	79.15	13.45	100.22	20.25	128.39	74.90 to 84.57	201,004	159,101
250000 TO 499999	41	70.55	70.72	70.44	10.54	100.40	47.34	95.91	67.26 to 74.04	367,221	258,675
500000 +	10	60.12	59.07	58.70	12.17	100.64	45.86	75.38	48.90 to 67.73	631,287	370,556
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**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:	92	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	21.03	95% Median C.I.:	70.13 to 75.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	27,607,982	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.72 to 72.64	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	27,612,876	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	69.82 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,240,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	300,139	COD:	15.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	209,140	PRD:	104.70	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:34

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	10	63.98	63.60	56.24	23.50	113.10	20.25	86.64	45.88 to 86.03	85,985	48,356
60000 TO 99999	4	70.10	67.63	66.77	13.71	101.29	51.55	78.76	N/A	110,047	73,477
100000 TO 149999	12	84.94	87.38	84.96	12.77	102.84	63.82	105.31	76.64 to 102.46	151,026	128,315
150000 TO 249999	34	72.61	74.22	71.76	13.15	103.42	47.34	128.39	69.29 to 77.40	266,402	191,180
250000 TO 499999	31	70.55	70.12	68.09	13.22	102.98	45.86	95.91	65.42 to 76.08	462,027	314,607
500000 +	1	59.88	59.88	59.88			59.88	59.88	N/A	1,120,000	670,660
ALL	92	72.61	72.96	69.68	15.44	104.70	20.25	128.39	70.13 to 75.82	300,139	209,140

**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:	105	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	21.92	95% Median C.I.:	68.36 to 75.38	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,502,708	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.51 to 70.92	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,446,052	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.60	95% Mean C.I.:	68.47 to 74.46	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,325,270							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	328,057	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	222,145	PRD:	105.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:49

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	79.78	88.52	81.84	21.48	108.17	66.13	128.39	N/A	257,519	210,742	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	73.47	70.99	70.84	17.88	100.21	20.25	102.46	61.49 to 86.03	256,418	181,638	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	15	78.76	80.26	78.13	10.25	102.73	66.47	97.26	71.97 to 86.64	251,248	196,299	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	82.39	82.39	81.10	5.57	101.59	77.80	86.98	N/A	175,400	142,247	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	86.00	85.80	81.52	15.60	105.25	68.68	102.52	N/A	283,935	231,452	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	75.23	74.92	74.22	7.27	100.95	65.10	86.29	65.10 to 86.29	257,740	191,301	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	18	75.22	74.73	72.96	11.31	102.42	54.99	99.32	64.49 to 79.73	293,089	213,848	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	13	70.49	72.08	72.68	15.32	99.17	45.88	105.31	60.36 to 83.99	325,619	236,670	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	66.53	66.53	66.53			66.53	66.53	N/A	460,575	306,430	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	59.92	61.39	58.26	16.82	105.36	44.93	79.62	48.90 to 72.47	501,111	291,963	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	55.84	56.17	54.37	14.99	103.31	38.01	74.04	47.34 to 65.69	447,474	243,297	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	65.45	66.30	66.65	13.79	99.46	55.06	80.20	N/A	309,022	205,975	
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	31	76.64	78.47	76.34	14.24	102.80	20.25	128.39	72.03 to 84.57	248,832	189,946	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	42	74.10	75.00	73.83	12.86	101.58	45.88	105.31	70.13 to 77.40	296,395	218,830	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	32	59.92	60.03	57.73	15.45	103.99	38.01	80.20	51.83 to 66.53	446,364	257,688	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	77.22	79.87	77.82	10.63	102.63	65.10	102.52	72.45 to 85.27	252,123	196,210	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	44	70.85	70.12	67.17	14.79	104.39	44.93	105.31	64.10 to 75.71	363,240	243,999	
<u>ALL</u>												
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145	

**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:	105	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	21.92	95% Median C.I.:	68.36 to 75.38	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,502,708	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.51 to 70.92	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,446,052	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.60	95% Mean C.I.:	68.47 to 74.46	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,325,270							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	328,057	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	222,145	PRD:	105.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:50

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
3005	2	88.27	88.27	77.29	19.31	114.20	71.22	105.31	N/A		281,000	217,180
3219	2	40.07	40.07	54.84	49.46	73.06	20.25	59.88	N/A		641,666	351,867
3221	9	71.97	67.98	61.24	14.11	111.01	45.86	86.03	49.14 to 80.20		330,033	202,109
3223	9	60.36	62.32	59.14	11.92	105.38	48.90	78.76	54.99 to 72.03		400,899	237,075
3301	6	71.63	74.80	73.58	15.55	101.66	61.06	99.32	61.06 to 99.32		210,236	154,690
3303	7	71.08	71.93	71.19	8.36	101.04	61.49	84.57	61.49 to 84.57		291,656	207,640
3305	11	66.47	70.59	74.51	17.70	94.73	45.88	94.58	55.39 to 87.63		277,343	206,661
3307	5	79.94	76.20	73.30	8.89	103.96	60.71	86.64	N/A		259,556	190,261
3441	13	75.23	73.47	69.91	10.75	105.10	51.83	94.80	67.26 to 80.67		395,865	276,740
3443	7	75.71	75.98	75.36	5.45	100.82	68.36	84.03	68.36 to 84.03		315,107	237,479
3445	5	72.47	61.97	57.95	18.40	106.93	38.01	76.63	N/A		501,430	290,575
3447	2	62.34	62.34	63.42	18.78	98.29	50.63	74.04	N/A		410,000	260,015
3525	10	66.12	65.20	62.97	13.28	103.55	44.93	86.29	51.55 to 72.45		306,411	192,950
3527	4	69.89	68.59	68.25	6.24	100.50	59.16	75.41	N/A		289,863	197,821
3529	8	82.44	83.39	73.31	22.18	113.75	43.04	128.39	43.04 to 128.39		294,206	215,683
3531	5	95.91	89.87	85.17	9.62	105.52	70.76	102.52	N/A		222,879	189,834
____ALL____												
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38		328,057	222,145

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	85	72.07	71.82	67.97	16.56	105.67	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.82		340,151	231,198
2	15	70.13	69.95	68.64	13.95	101.92	50.63	99.32	61.06 to 77.80		263,398	180,790
4	5	71.97	69.90	60.78	15.27	115.01	45.86	86.03	N/A		316,440	192,317
____ALL____												
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38		328,057	222,145

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	9	52.22	58.13	57.85	24.54	100.49	38.01	83.99	43.04 to 79.94		601,555	347,978
2	96	72.42	72.71	69.56	15.14	104.54	20.25	128.39	69.29 to 75.71		302,417	210,348
____ALL____												
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38		328,057	222,145

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	105	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	21.92	95% Median C.I.:	68.36 to 75.38	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,502,708	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.51 to 70.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,446,052	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.60	95% Mean C.I.:	68.47 to 74.46	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,325,270							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	328,057	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	222,145	PRD:	105.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:50

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0002	1	62.60	62.60	62.60			62.60	62.60	N/A	309,000	193,445
18-0011	1	59.95	59.95	59.95			59.95	59.95	N/A	469,000	281,165
40-0126	3	80.67	84.38	82.99	7.99	101.68	76.57	95.91	N/A	342,537	284,266
41-0002	17	82.91	84.50	77.93	15.40	108.43	43.04	128.39	74.74 to 97.26	261,482	203,777
41-0091	14	65.57	67.85	64.37	13.24	105.41	48.90	99.32	58.93 to 77.80	340,573	219,225
41-0504	55	71.08	68.99	66.67	14.47	103.48	20.25	94.58	66.53 to 75.38	346,739	231,171
61-0004	1	65.42	65.42	65.42			65.42	65.42	N/A	431,561	282,345
72-0075	4	74.99	77.59	68.26	19.27	113.66	55.06	105.31	N/A	277,871	189,680
93-0096	9	63.56	63.49	60.74	16.55	104.52	44.93	86.29	50.63 to 72.45	312,612	189,890
NonValid School											
ALL	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	4	83.85	78.96	79.28	8.80	99.59	61.49	86.64	N/A	51,880	41,132
30.01 TO 50.00	11	65.10	63.33	60.21	23.15	105.18	20.25	105.31	45.88 to 78.76	106,703	64,248
50.01 TO 100.00	35	75.82	76.76	73.88	13.51	103.89	50.63	102.52	72.45 to 80.20	215,165	158,970
100.01 TO 180.00	50	69.71	68.84	65.18	15.56	105.61	38.01	128.39	66.13 to 72.07	436,424	284,467
180.01 TO 330.00	4	69.47	69.69	67.81	11.47	102.77	59.88	79.94	N/A	698,203	473,485
330.01 TO 650.00	1	83.99	83.99	83.99			83.99	83.99	N/A	920,000	772,740
ALL	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	72.47	76.78	79.65	18.19	96.39	55.39	102.52	55.39 to 102.52	151,640	120,784
DRY-N/A	2	71.44	71.44	70.86	1.33	100.82	70.49	72.39	N/A	196,221	139,035
GRASS	1	20.25	20.25	20.25			20.25	20.25	N/A	163,333	33,075
GRASS-N/A	1	86.98	86.98	86.98			86.98	86.98	N/A	126,000	109,590
IRRGTD	64	72.60	72.23	67.39	15.64	107.18	38.01	128.39	67.26 to 75.82	371,531	250,392
IRRGTD-N/A	30	70.92	69.77	67.61	15.38	103.20	43.04	97.26	63.56 to 76.64	297,493	201,130
ALL	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	105	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	21.92	95% Median C.I.:	68.36 to 75.38	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,502,708	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.51 to 70.92	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,446,052	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.60	95% Mean C.I.:	68.47 to 74.46	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,325,270							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	328,057	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	222,145	PRD:	105.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:50

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.48	75.99	77.54	16.48	98.00	55.39	102.52	55.39 to 102.52	172,365	133,658
DRY-N/A	1	72.39	72.39	72.39			72.39	72.39	N/A	75,000	54,290
GRASS	1	20.25	20.25	20.25			20.25	20.25	N/A	163,333	33,075
GRASS-N/A	1	86.98	86.98	86.98			86.98	86.98	N/A	126,000	109,590
IRRGTD	84	72.24	71.65	67.31	15.53	106.45	38.01	128.39	67.73 to 75.71	355,697	239,406
IRRGTD-N/A	10	69.88	69.78	69.01	16.11	101.12	47.34	94.80	51.55 to 87.63	282,424	194,889
ALL											
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.48	75.99	77.54	16.48	98.00	55.39	102.52	55.39 to 102.52	172,365	133,658
DRY-N/A	1	72.39	72.39	72.39			72.39	72.39	N/A	75,000	54,290
GRASS	2	53.62	53.62	49.31	62.23	108.73	20.25	86.98	N/A	144,666	71,332
IRRGTD	93	71.97	71.36	67.35	15.68	105.95	38.01	128.39	67.73 to 75.38	348,812	234,940
IRRGTD-N/A	1	79.62	79.62	79.62			79.62	79.62	N/A	263,250	209,590
ALL											
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145

## 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	4	83.85	78.96	79.28	8.80	99.59	61.49	86.64	N/A	51,880	41,132
60000 TO 99999	4	69.43	69.36	69.18	8.95	100.27	59.82	78.76	N/A	87,750	60,702
100000 TO 149999	13	80.20	79.05	79.67	22.18	99.22	45.88	105.31	55.39 to 102.46	120,330	95,865
150000 TO 249999	22	77.60	79.00	78.77	13.21	100.29	20.25	128.39	74.74 to 84.57	202,777	159,727
250000 TO 499999	43	70.55	70.46	70.25	10.44	100.29	47.34	95.91	67.26 to 73.45	365,936	257,087
500000 +	19	59.88	58.68	58.57	17.33	100.18	38.01	83.99	48.90 to 66.13	638,256	373,837
ALL											
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145



**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:	105	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	21.92	95% Median C.I.:	68.36 to 75.38	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,502,708	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.66	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.51 to 70.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,446,052	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.60	95% Mean C.I.:	68.47 to 74.46	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,325,270							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	328,057	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	128.39			
AVG. Assessed Value:	222,145	PRD:	105.53	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25			

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:28:50

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	10	63.98	63.60	56.24	23.50	113.10	20.25	86.64	45.88 to 86.03	85,985	48,356
60000 TO 99999	5	65.10	67.12	66.46	11.81	101.00	51.55	78.76	N/A	108,038	71,801
100000 TO 149999	12	84.94	87.38	84.96	12.77	102.84	63.82	105.31	76.64 to 102.46	151,026	128,315
150000 TO 249999	36	72.46	73.74	71.40	12.97	103.28	47.34	128.39	69.29 to 76.66	266,115	190,002
250000 TO 499999	40	68.05	67.13	64.54	15.62	104.00	38.01	95.91	64.10 to 74.04	490,337	316,485
500000 +	2	71.94	71.94	70.75	16.76	101.67	59.88	83.99	N/A	1,020,000	721,700
_____ALL_____	_____										
	105	72.03	71.46	67.72	16.11	105.53	20.25	128.39	68.36 to 75.38	328,057	222,145

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Hamilton County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

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

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

The agricultural market in Hamilton County has been determined by the assessor to have three distinct market areas. The systematic valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics confirm that the three market areas are valued within the acceptable range indicating uniformity and proportionality in the class exists. The assessment practices are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>53.18</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>52.55</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>53.98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>57.22</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>55.40</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>12.07</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>67.59</b>	<b>6.30</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71.76</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>1.74</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>78</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>10.91</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>12.07</b>
<b>6.93</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>6.30</b>
<b>1.79</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>1.74</b>
<b>3.93</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>4.31</b>
<b>19.28</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>4.04</b>

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



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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 Hamilton County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	73	70	73

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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.

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>15.44</b>	<b>104.70</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.70</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, while the price related differential is 1.70 points above the acceptable range. However, given the systematic methodology the county uses to value agricultural land, one can reasonably assume the assessment practices in this county do not lend an assessment bias based on the size of the parcel.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton 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
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>17.09</b>	<b>15.44</b>	<b>-1.65</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>103.77</b>	<b>104.70</b>	<b>0.93</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>20.25</b>	<b>20.25</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>115.42</b>	<b>128.39</b>	<b>12.97</b>

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



**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 7,688

Value : 1,144,028,555

Growth 27,120,301

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	388	3,353,949	3	27,545	124	2,178,128	515	5,559,622	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,276	26,105,610	37	862,375	842	21,145,415	3,155	48,113,400	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,386	171,741,537	37	3,420,218	865	92,802,771	3,288	267,964,526	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,774	201,201,096	40	4,310,138	989	116,126,314	3,803	321,637,548	4,267,236
<b>% of Res Total</b>	72.94	62.56	1.05	1.34	26.01	36.10	49.47	28.11	15.73
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	91	1,395,560	8	189,314	11	147,902	110	1,732,776	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	323	6,445,394	19	433,580	32	1,212,746	374	8,091,720	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	323	35,528,283	19	3,803,626	32	12,310,069	374	51,641,978	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	414	43,369,237	27	4,426,520	43	13,670,717	484	61,466,474	1,713,730
<b>% of Com Total</b>	85.54	70.56	5.58	7.20	8.88	22.24	6.30	5.37	6.32
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	9	317,584	1	15,675	1	7,245	11	340,504	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	4	2,186,340	14	1,036,330	2	1,096,235	20	4,318,905	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	4	30,933,500	14	13,361,283	2	20,113,690	20	64,408,473	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	13	33,437,424	15	14,413,288	3	21,217,170	31	69,067,882	19,484,930
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	41.94	48.41	48.39	20.87	9.68	30.72	0.40	6.04	71.85
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	2	56,425	2	56,425	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	15	0	15	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	15	129,040	15	129,040	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	17	185,465	17	185,465	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.22	0.02	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,774	201,201,096	40	4,310,138	1,006	116,311,779	3,820	321,823,013	4,267,236
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	72.62	62.52	1.05	1.34	26.34	36.14	49.69	28.13	15.73
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	427	76,806,661	42	18,839,808	46	34,887,887	515	130,534,356	21,198,660
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	82.91	58.84	8.16	14.43	8.93	26.73	6.70	11.41	78.17
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,201	278,007,757	82	23,149,946	1,052	151,199,666	4,335	452,357,369	25,465,896
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	73.84	61.46	1.89	5.12	24.27	33.42	56.39	39.54	93.90

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial	3	50,479	3,415,592		0	0	0
20. Industrial	3	216,584	11,383,930		0	0	0
21. Other							
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial	0	0	0		3	50,479	3,415,592
20. Industrial	0	0	0		3	216,584	11,383,930
21. Other							
22. Total Sch II					6	267,063	14,799,522

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing									
24. Non-Producing									
25. Total									

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	245	7	122	374

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	12	612,280	2,394	429,279,660	2,406	429,891,940
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	5	239,325	942	200,931,835	947	201,171,160
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	5	23,990	942	60,584,096	947	60,608,086
30. Ag Total							3,353	691,671,186

## Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	3	2.82	7,055	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	5	0.00	23,990	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	9	12.36	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	10	9.50	165,000	10	9.50	165,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	465	472.54	7,804,530	465	472.54	7,804,530	
33. HomeSite Improvements	483	0.00	39,024,712	483	0.00	39,024,712	276,815
34. HomeSite Total				493	482.04	46,994,242	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	60	345.19	508,135	60	345.19	508,135	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	797	2,496.75	6,204,285	800	2,499.57	6,211,340	
37. FarmSite Improvements	925	0.00	21,559,384	930	0.00	21,583,374	1,377,590
38. FarmSite Total				990	2,844.76	28,302,849	
39. Road & Ditches	3,034	7,312.70	0	3,043	7,325.06	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI				1,483	10,651.86	75,297,091	1,654,405



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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	9	808.30	846,745	9	808.30	846,745

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	110,339.54	53.32%	245,502,905	57.82%	2,224.98
46. 1A	46,444.49	22.44%	99,853,200	23.52%	2,149.95
47. 2A1	13,225.70	6.39%	24,466,755	5.76%	1,849.94
48. 2A	6,645.22	3.21%	11,296,385	2.66%	1,699.93
49. 3A1	15,597.11	7.54%	24,174,825	5.69%	1,549.96
50. 3A	1,207.52	0.58%	1,690,510	0.40%	1,399.99
51. 4A1	9,817.86	4.74%	13,008,400	3.06%	1,324.97
52. 4A	3,678.02	1.78%	4,597,590	1.08%	1,250.02
53. Total	206,955.46	100.00%	424,590,570	100.00%	2,051.60
Dry					
54. 1D1	10,357.58	43.89%	17,969,805	50.35%	1,734.94
55. 1D	4,044.22	17.14%	6,288,380	17.62%	1,554.91
56. 2D1	1,585.94	6.72%	2,283,605	6.40%	1,439.91
57. 2D	1,556.53	6.60%	2,062,165	5.78%	1,324.85
58. 3D1	2,849.77	12.08%	3,775,645	10.58%	1,324.89
59. 3D	224.27	0.95%	257,935	0.72%	1,150.11
60. 4D1	2,179.27	9.23%	2,287,975	6.41%	1,049.88
61. 4D	801.79	3.40%	761,540	2.13%	949.80
62. Total	23,599.37	100.00%	35,687,050	100.00%	1,512.20
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,594.55	0.00%	1,283,395	10.30%	804.86
64. 1G	1,184.89	5.57%	918,175	7.37%	774.90
65. 2G1	1,604.79	7.54%	1,026,990	8.24%	639.95
66. 2G	1,621.42	7.62%	1,037,645	8.33%	639.96
67. 3G1	1,376.91	6.47%	881,190	7.07%	639.98
68. 3G	2,096.96	9.86%	1,205,735	9.68%	574.99
69. 4G1	2,796.55	13.15%	1,607,890	12.91%	574.95
70. 4G	8,995.22	42.29%	4,497,610	36.10%	500.00
71. Total	21,271.29	100.00%	12,458,630	100.00%	585.70
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	206,955.46	81.17%	424,590,570	89.61%	2,051.60
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	23,599.37	9.26%	35,687,050	7.53%	1,512.20
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	21,271.29	8.34%	12,458,630	2.63%	585.70
<b>Waste</b>					
	1,179.55	0.46%	412,770	0.09%	349.94
<b>Other</b>					
	1,962.23	0.77%	686,790	0.14%	350.00
<b>Exempt</b>					
	646.50	0.25%	1,114,285	0.24%	1,723.57
<b>Market Area Total</b>					
	254,967.90	100.00%	473,835,810	100.00%	1,858.41

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	27,977.02	57.27%	69,942,545	59.64%	2,500.00
46. 1A	9,665.67	19.79%	23,921,720	20.40%	2,474.92
47. 2A1	3,642.96	7.46%	8,196,285	6.99%	2,249.90
48. 2A	199.90	0.41%	434,765	0.37%	2,174.91
49. 3A1	4,025.51	8.24%	8,453,215	7.21%	2,099.91
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	2,810.72	5.75%	5,340,185	4.55%	1,899.93
52. 4A	529.71	1.08%	979,855	0.84%	1,849.80
53. Total	48,851.49	100.00%	117,268,570	100.00%	2,400.51
Dry					
54. 1D1	630.23	50.32%	1,093,470	57.96%	1,735.03
55. 1D	131.16	10.47%	203,890	10.81%	1,554.51
56. 2D1	67.74	5.41%	97,490	5.17%	1,439.18
57. 2D	16.98	1.36%	22,495	1.19%	1,324.79
58. 3D1	172.23	13.75%	228,175	12.10%	1,324.83
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	187.55	14.98%	196,900	10.44%	1,049.85
61. 4D	46.44	3.71%	44,075	2.34%	949.07
62. Total	1,252.33	100.00%	1,886,495	100.00%	1,506.39
Grass					
63. 1G1	601.96	0.00%	484,500	25.94%	804.87
64. 1G	114.85	3.73%	89,000	4.76%	774.92
65. 2G1	137.03	4.44%	87,705	4.70%	640.04
66. 2G	34.02	1.10%	21,760	1.16%	639.62
67. 3G1	282.83	9.17%	181,005	9.69%	639.98
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	637.97	20.69%	366,825	19.64%	574.99
70. 4G	1,274.17	41.33%	637,085	34.11%	500.00
71. Total	3,082.83	100.00%	1,867,880	100.00%	605.90
Irrigated Total	48,851.49	91.27%	117,268,570	96.80%	2,400.51
Dry Total	1,252.33	2.34%	1,886,495	1.56%	1,506.39
Grass Total	3,082.83	5.76%	1,867,880	1.54%	605.90
Waste	338.38	0.63%	118,405	0.10%	349.92
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt	480.00	0.90%	830,375	0.69%	1,729.95
Market Area Total	53,525.03	100.00%	121,141,350	100.00%	2,263.27

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	4,688.56	49.19%	9,259,870	52.53%	1,974.99
46. 1A	3,056.30	32.07%	5,959,670	33.81%	1,949.96
47. 2A1	563.87	5.92%	930,390	5.28%	1,650.01
48. 2A	78.75	0.83%	118,120	0.67%	1,499.94
49. 3A1	652.63	6.85%	848,390	4.81%	1,299.96
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	426.28	4.47%	447,590	2.54%	1,049.99
52. 4A	64.48	0.68%	64,465	0.37%	999.77
53. Total	9,530.87	100.00%	17,628,495	100.00%	1,849.62
Dry					
54. 1D1	832.01	40.87%	1,214,730	47.41%	1,459.99
55. 1D	650.87	31.97%	891,670	34.80%	1,369.97
56. 2D1	194.29	9.54%	218,580	8.53%	1,125.02
57. 2D	34.41	1.69%	27,515	1.07%	799.62
58. 3D1	153.24	7.53%	107,270	4.19%	700.01
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	137.45	6.75%	82,455	3.22%	599.89
61. 4D	33.62	1.65%	20,165	0.79%	599.79
62. Total	2,035.89	100.00%	2,562,385	100.00%	1,258.61
Grass					
63. 1G1	238.53	0.00%	192,000	17.29%	804.93
64. 1G	161.43	7.33%	125,110	11.27%	775.01
65. 2G1	39.56	1.80%	25,305	2.28%	639.66
66. 2G	170.84	7.75%	109,345	9.85%	640.04
67. 3G1	67.17	3.05%	38,620	3.48%	574.96
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	159.83	7.25%	73,515	6.62%	459.96
70. 4G	1,365.83	61.99%	546,330	49.21%	400.00
71. Total	2,203.19	100.00%	1,110,225	100.00%	503.92
Irrigated Total	9,530.87	67.87%	17,628,495	82.39%	1,849.62
Dry Total	2,035.89	14.50%	2,562,385	11.98%	1,258.61
Grass Total	2,203.19	15.69%	1,110,225	5.19%	503.92
Waste	58.52	0.42%	20,490	0.10%	350.14
Other	215.26	1.53%	75,340	0.35%	350.00
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	14,043.73	100.00%	21,396,935	100.00%	1,523.59

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	351.40	759,680	264,986.42	558,727,955	265,337.82	559,487,635
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	28.97	49,520	26,858.62	40,086,410	26,887.59	40,135,930
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	51.85	34,860	26,505.46	15,401,875	26,557.31	15,436,735
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	1.40	490	1,575.05	551,175	1,576.45	551,665
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,177.49	762,130	2,177.49	762,130
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	5.50	8,315	1,121.00	1,936,345	1,126.50	1,944,660
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>433.62</b>	<b>844,550</b>	<b>322,103.04</b>	<b>615,529,545</b>	<b>322,536.66</b>	<b>616,374,095</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	265,337.82	82.27%	559,487,635	90.77%	2,108.59
<b>Dry Land</b>	26,887.59	8.34%	40,135,930	6.51%	1,492.73
<b>Grass</b>	26,557.31	8.23%	15,436,735	2.50%	581.26
<b>Waste</b>	1,576.45	0.49%	551,665	0.09%	349.94
<b>Other</b>	2,177.49	0.68%	762,130	0.12%	350.00
<b>Exempt</b>	1,126.50	0.35%	1,944,660	0.32%	1,726.28
<b>Total</b>	<b>322,536.66</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>616,374,095</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,911.02</b>

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

41 Hamilton

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	315,205,527	321,637,548	6,432,021	2.04%	4,267,236	0.69%
02. Recreational	399,035	185,465	-213,570	-53.52%	0	-53.52%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	47,369,508	46,994,242	-375,266	-0.79%	276,815	-1.38%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>362,974,070</b>	<b>368,817,255</b>	<b>5,843,185</b>	<b>1.61%</b>	<b>4,544,051</b>	<b>0.36%</b>
05. Commercial	54,633,091	61,466,474	6,833,383	12.51%	1,713,730	9.37%
06. Industrial	48,071,983	69,067,882	20,995,899	43.68%	19,484,930	3.14%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	27,827,467	28,302,849	475,382	1.71%	1,377,590	-3.24%
08. Minerals	0					
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>130,532,541</b>					
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>493,506,611</b>					
11. Irrigated	499,769,010	559,487,635	59,718,625	11.95%		
12. Dryland	35,545,995	40,135,930	4,589,935	12.91%		
13. Grassland	13,372,150	15,436,735	2,064,585	15.44%		
14. Wasteland	539,925	551,665	11,740	2.17%		
15. Other Agland	771,315	762,130	-9,185	-1.19%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>549,998,395</b>	<b>616,374,095</b>	<b>66,375,700</b>	<b>12.07%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,043,505,006</b>	<b>1,144,028,555</b>	<b>100,523,549</b>	<b>9.63%</b>		

**2008 Plan of Assessment for Hamilton County**  
**Assessment years 2009, 2010, and 2011**  
**Date: June 15, 2008**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes and subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. As per Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02, on or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100 % of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land

General Description of Real Property in Hamilton County

Per the 2008 County Abstract, Hamilton County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	3736	49%	35%
Commercial	483	6%	5%

Industrial	29	1%	5%
Recreational	32		
Agricultural	3360	44%	55%

Agricultural land – taxable acres for 2008 assessment were 322,925.188.

Agricultural land is 55% of the real property valuation base in Hamilton County and of that 91% is assessed as irrigated.

For assessment year 2008, an estimated 145 building permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2008 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

### Current Resources

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the assessor. The assessor, deputy and one office clerk are all certified by the Property Tax Administrator. The three certificate holders will continue to keep their certifications current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours required by the Property Tax Division. At least part of these hours will be courses offered by IAAO or the equivalent. The newly employed office clerk will be encouraged to take the assessor's exam after completing at least one year of employment.

The assessor or a staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current statutes and regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made in them.

The cadastral maps are updated as the transfer statements are processed. They are in poor condition, but with the implementation of GIS, the information is available electronically. New maps will be printed in the near future.

Proposed Office Budget for July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 will be approximately \$147,500 +/- . The proposed Reappraisal Budget for July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 will be \$95,225. The Reappraisal Budget includes all the Maintenance agreements for GIS, CAMA, County Solutions and the web site. Adopted budget by the Board for 2007-2008 was \$151,006 and the reappraisal budget \$51,250.

Aerial photos were taken in early March, 2008, and have replaced the obliques currently on the GIS and Website.

County Solutions is the vendor for the assessment administration and CAMA. ArcView is the GIS software currently being used by Hamilton County and is supported by GIS Workshop in Lincoln, Nebraska. GIS Workshop also is the host for the Hamilton County Website. Available



on the website is the property record information, tax information, latest deed information, parcel lines, land use and aerial photos on the rural sites. The Hamilton County Assessor's office is currently building a GIS mapping system. Parcel splits are entered into the GIS program when they become available in the assessor's office. The county surveyor is also working closely with assessor's office to achieve the most accurate mapping available. The County Surveyor and crew are locating section corners and placing GPS points constantly. Numerous GPS points are now available and the work is to be complete in 2010. The County is also surveying the accretion land and putting in the GPS points along the Platte River which abuts Hamilton County on the North. The last survey done on accretion in Hamilton County was in the late 1800's. This will be completed as funding is available and the surveyor has time to work on the project. Completion date is scheduled for 2009. For 2009 accretion land will be updated for each property owner along with all the land in the river. A study of the land use for accretion will also be completed for 2009 assessment purposes. A market study for this area has begun and the new values will be implemented for 2009 assessment purposes after the exact acre count has been completed. If this project isn't completed for 2009, we are hopeful that it will be complete for 2010 assessment purposes. That will also change the date for the new accretion acre count for 2009.

#### Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Approximately 50 deeds are filed per month at the Hamilton County Register of Deeds office. Real Estate transfer statements are handled daily. Depending on the number of transfers filed, there is a 4-6 week turn around time. Ownership changes are made in the administrative package and updated on the website monthly. Agricultural and Commercial sales are verified by telephone call and physical inspections as necessary. Most residential sales are inspected and new photos taken if necessary. Building permits are checked yearly beginning in April. Pickup work is to be completed by March 1 of each year.

Nebraska Statute 77-1311.03 states that a portion of the real property parcels in the county are to be reviewed and inspected to complete a total review of all properties every 6 years. To comply with this statute, it is the goal of the office to try to review at least 17 percent of the properties yearly. Market data is gathered and reviewed yearly.

Income data is collected every 2 years or sooner on newer commercial properties or as it becomes available by an outside appraisal firm.

Ratio studies are done on all the sales beginning in September. The sales are entered on excel spreadsheets and ratios run on each property type and market area. These studies are used to determine the areas that out of compliance that need reviewing for the next assessment cycle.

The cost manual for commercial and residential properties is from 2006. Depreciation studies are done yearly in the areas that are scheduled for review or have been determined through ratio studies that need review. The cost approach is used to establish the cost new and depreciation is

used to bring the properties to market value. The income approach is also used on the commercial and some of the industrial properties by an outside appraisal firm hired by the Assessor.

Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes and subclasses of Hamilton County.

Agricultural land values are established yearly. A complete land use study was made for 2005 by drive by reviews. Land use is also being updated as the owners have been reporting their acres to the Assessor's office. Our office has been working with the NRD office to report land use to assist them in allocating water for irrigation.

By approximately March 5 of each year, ratio studies are run using the newly established values to see if the areas out of compliance will now meet the guidelines.

Notices of Valuation Change are mailed to the property owners on or before June 1.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	100%	8.74	103.76
Commercial	93%	15.38	98.53
Agricultural Land	72%	14.30	102.10

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2008 Reports & Opinions.

**Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2009:**

A complete review of the tornado damaged properties from May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2008, will be conducted by the Assessor and part of her staff. Verification of the record cards will be made by a physical inspection of each parcel. New digital photos will be taken and home and buildings that are no longer there will be taken off the tax roll for 2009. New structures of any kind will be assessed and added to the 2009 assessment for the County.

The commercial and industrial properties that suffered any kind of storm damage from the aforementioned storm will be reviewed by Standard Appraisal Services Inc, whether they are located within the city limits of Aurora or are rural in location.

**Residential:**

A completion of the review of Aurora city homes will be completed by the Assessor and one of her staff. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, outbuildings, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, deletions, and remodeling are being included as part of these inspections.

A review of Hordville and Stockham along with the rural subdivisions will be conducted by drive by inspections. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, outbuildings, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, deletions, and remodeling are being included as part of these inspections. If there is any change noted, a thorough interior inspection will be conducted. A depreciation study will be completed and used for the assessment year of 2009. Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19, 2009. GIS workshop took aerial photos of all rural buildings in early March 2008. They will replace the obliques currently on the GIS and Website.

#### Commercial:

The Assessor and the County is contracting an outside appraisal firm to review and assess the commercial and industrial properties in and near the city of Aurora. Said Commercial and Industrial properties will be reviewed and new photos taken. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. A depreciation study will be completed and used for the assessment year of 2009.

Standard Appraisal Services Inc will complete pick-up work and building permits. The new assessment will be added to the assessment roll by March 19, 2008, with the assistance of the aforementioned mass appraisal company.

#### Agricultural Land:

Nebraska is implementing a statewide soil survey legend that will enable a seamless digital soil survey coverage across the state. Changes have been made by the Natural Resource Conservation Service to the soil maps and mapping symbols. The Property Assessment Division has received the new numeric identifiers for all Nebraska soils. The soil "lines" across county lines are now rectified so they are the same on both sides of the county lines. There are soils that match across state lines as well. The new numeric identifiers combine several different mapping symbols for similar soils, reducing the total number of soils previously identified. In part, Nebraska Statute 77-2363 requires implementation of the new soils mapping in the assessment year 2009. Hamilton County has nine new 'numeric symbols' along with the new acre count for these soil types. The new numeric symbols will be placed into our land assessment system for the assessment year of 2009.

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Market areas will be reviewed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available. Well permits will be reviewed and drive by inspections will

be conducted as needed. If the survey of the River is not complete for 2009 assessment, it is the goal to have it complete for 2010.

### **Assessment actions planned for assessment Year 2010**

#### **Residential:**

Review of rural residential properties will begin. A market study will be conducted to bring rural residential properties to 100% of market value. Drive by inspections will be conducted. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, outbuildings, deletions or remodeling are being include as part of these inspections. New digital photos will be taken if any change since last review. New obliques of the rural building sites were taken in early March 2008 and will be used in conjunction with the rural review.

A query of homes built from years 2000-2008 will be reviewed and revalued to reflect 80% basement finish as that seems to be the long standing trend of houses that are of new construction and is supported by the sales of these dwellings of this age of construction.

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 1, 2010.

#### **Commercial:**

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 1, 2010.

#### **Agricultural Land:**

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Land use will be updated as needed. Well registration lists will be checked and drive by inspections will be made to verify land use.

### **Assessment Actions planned for assessment year 2011**

#### **Residential:**

A review will be conducted in the villages of Hampton, Phillips, Giltner and Marquette. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, outbuildings, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, deletions, and remodeling are being included as part of these inspections. If there is any change noted, a thorough interior inspection will be conducted. A depreciation study will be completed and used for the assessment year of 2010. Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19, 2011.

#### **Commercial:**

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19, 2011.

#### **Agricultural Land:**

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Land use will be updated as needed. Well registration lists will be checked and drive by inspections will be made to verify land use.

### **Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:**

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the assessor's offices from the register of deeds and the green sheets are worked and exported via internet to the property tax division. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the assessor's office from the surveyor or

county clerk. These are updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer administrative package.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
  - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 1400 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required. As personal property schedules are now available on the web, the site will be updated and hopefully schedules may be filed on line in 2009.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property: annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer approximately 270 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed: review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing: management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates: management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

12. County Board of Equalization: attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals: prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization: attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor Education – attend meetings, workshops and education classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification. The three certificate holders of the assessor's office will meet their 60 hours of education in a 4 year period to maintain it. The new assessment clerk will attend some of the monthly Central District Association meetings with the County Assessor and/or her Deputy.
16. The Deputy Assessor is a member of the Streambed Ownership Workshop Group along with one of the County Surveyors. The Group meets approximately once a month in Lincoln. The objective is to identify the rightful land owner of record along the Platte River and to input information on seeking funding for the control of noxious weeds along said river.

Conclusion:

The Hamilton County Assessor's Office will strive to maintain an efficient and professional office.

Patricia E Sandberg  
Hamilton County Assessor

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$146,260
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$15,000 and an additional \$20,000 for GIS, Website, and ESRI licenses
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$146,260
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$2,000
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$70,225
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	N/A
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$221,891
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes

#### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS



2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Deputy Assessor
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS and Bottom Line Inc

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All towns in the county are zoned
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1970

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	MIPS, GIS and personal property software is contracted through Bottom Line Resources.



## 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 Hamilton County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts